

**UC Berkeley**  
**Dissertations, Department of Linguistics**

**Title**

Manifestations of Ergativity in Quiché Grammar

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/22p292kr>

**Author**

Larsen, Thomas

**Publication Date**

1988

Manifestations of Ergativity in Quiché Grammar

By

Thomas Walter Larsen

B.S. (University of Colorado) 1969

M.A. (University of Colorado) 1973

C.Phil. (University of California) 1983

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Linguistics

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Approved:.....*Charles J. Fillmore*.....*July 17, 1988*.....  
Date  
 ..*Kily Wong Fillmore*.....  
 ..*Wallace D. Chafe*.....  
Chairman

DOCTORAL DEGREE CONFERRED

DECEMBER 20, 1988.....

**Manifestations of Ergativity in Quiché Grammar**

**Copyright c 1988**

**Thomas Walter Larsen**

### Acknowledgements

There are so many people that I wish to thank for the direct and indirect help they have given me that it is difficult to know where to begin. Prominent among these are the members of my committee: Wallace Chafe, Charles Fillmore, and Lily Wong Fillmore. They have helped me not only in the preparation of this dissertation but also in my overall development as a linguist, and they have been ever kind in putting up with my whims. There are so many other ways in which I am also indebted to them that I will probably never be able to fully repay their kindness.

I am especially indebted to the numerous Quiché speakers who have helped me over the years in learning about their language. Obviously this dissertation would never have been possible without their assistance. These include the Quiché-speaking linguists that I worked with at the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquín (PLFM) in Guatemala: Miguel Bulux Vicente, Juan Cac Tzunux, Ernesto Ixchop Poroj, Miguel Lux Carrillo, Jacobo Baltazar Pu Lux, Gaspar Pu Tzunux, and Pedro Sanic Chanchavac. These seven people have taught me most of what I know (or think I know) about the Quiché language. Other Quiché-speaking linguists at the PLFM have also been of great help: Florentino Ajpacajá, Manuel Chox, Diego Guarchaj, Juan Rodrigo Guarchaj, and Lucas Tepaz Raxuleu. During the year in which



I taught at the University of Iowa, I had the good fortune of meeting and working with Luis Enrique Sam Colop. His collaboration has been crucial in the formation of much of my thinking in this dissertation. During my time in California, I have also had the pleasure of knowing and working with Martín Poz Pérez. He provided the data which eventually led to some of the major conclusions reached in this work, and his friendship has at times even been lifesaving. I also wish to thank the PLFM, especially the past and present directors Narciso Cojtí and Martín Chacach, for allowing me to participate in the unique program which permitted me to learn so much about Mayan languages.

Among the other linguists who have helped me in one way or another, special mention must be made of Terrence Kaufman, who has taught me much of what I know (and what everyone else knows) about Mayan languages, and William Norman, who had already blazed a rather large trail in the field of Quichean linguistics before I even thought of entering it. Others who have helped me in my studies include Allen Bell, Leanne Hinton, Paul Kay, Johanna Nichols, David Rood (my first linguistics teacher), Barry Schein, Donca Steriade, and Alan Taylor. In addition I have spent many enjoyable and productive years discussing Quiché, Mayan languages, linguistics, and numerous other topics with Glenn Ayres, John Dayley, Jack Du Bois, Nora England, and Judie Maxwell. I have also benefitted from ~~conversations~~ conversations

with Farrell Ackerman, Judith Aissen, Linda Brown, Lyle Campbell, Colette Craig, Amy Dahlstrom, Karen Dakin, Margaret Datz, Knud Lambrecht, Martha Macri, Robin Mader Quizar, Jim Mondloch, Linda Munson, Cathy O'Connor, Thom Smith-Stark, and Stephen Stewart. It is unlikely that all of these people will approve of what I have done here, but their help and friendship is much appreciated nevertheless.

I wish to thank my parents, Walter H. Larsen and Doris G. Larsen, for supporting me in my studies. And last, but not least, I thank Julia, Oscar, and Adelina for putting up with so much while I worked on this dissertation. Now that this is over, they can all breathe a sigh of relief (at least until the next thing comes along).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Phonology</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.1 Phonemes and Orthography</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.1.1 Vowel Phonemes</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.1.2 The Phoneme /h/</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.1.3 The Prevelar Phonemes</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>2.1.4 The Phoneme /q'/</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2.2 Phonological Rules</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2.2.1 Underlying Phonological Representations</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2.2.2 Phonetic Representations</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>2.3 Other Orthographies</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>3. Morphology I</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>3.1 Morphological Processes</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>3.2 Root and Stem Classes</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>3.3 Personal Pronouns</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>3.4 Nouns</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>3.4.1 Inflection</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>3.4.1.1 Possessor Agreement</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>3.4.1.2 Number</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>3.4.1.3 Subject Agreement</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>3.4.2 Noun Classes</b>	<b>108</b>

3.4.2.1	Class 1	109
3.4.2.2	Class 1a	109
3.4.2.3	Class 2	110
3.4.2.4	Class 3	113
3.4.2.5	Class 4	117
3.4.2.6	Class Y	118
3.4.2.7	Class Z	119
3.4.3	Complex Nouns	119
3.4.4	Noun Subtypes	125
3.4.4.1	Enumeratives	125
3.4.4.2	Relational Nouns	127
3.4.5	Derivation	130
3.5	Adjectives	133
3.5.1	Inflection	134
3.5.1.1	The Attributive and Degree Suffixes	134
3.5.1.2	Subject Agreement	136
3.5.1.3	Number Agreement	137
3.5.2	Derivation	141
	Notes	145
4.	Morphology II	152
4.1	Verbs	152
4.2	Intransitive Verbs	152
4.2.1	Inflection	153
4.2.1.1	Subject Agreement	153
4.2.1.2	Tense/Aspect/Mood	161

4.2.1.3	Phrase-Final Suffix	176
4.2.1.4	Incorporated Movement	180
4.2.2	Derivation	184
	Notes	197
5.	Morphology III	211
5.1	Transitive Verbs	211
5.2	Inflection	212
5.2.1	Subject and Object Agreement	212
5.2.2	Tense/Aspect/Mood	223
5.2.3	Phrase Final and Other Status Suffixes	229
5.2.4	Incorporated Movement	243
5.3	Derivation	247
	Notes	274
6.	Morphology IV	288
6.1	Positionals	288
6.2	Adverbs and Particles	302
6.2.1	Directionals	302
6.2.2	Demonstratives and Articles	309
6.2.3	Prepositions	315
6.2.4	Interrogatives	321
	Notes	326
7.	Syntax I: Word Order	327
	Notes	384
8.	Syntax II	389

<b>8.1 Complex Sentences</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>8.1.1 Complement Clauses</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>8.1.1.1 Finite Complements</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>8.1.1.2 Non-finite Complements</b>	<b>395</b>
<b>8.1.2 Purpose Clauses</b>	<b>415</b>
<b>8.1.3 Temporal Clauses</b>	<b>424</b>
<b>8.1.4 Conditional Clauses</b>	<b>429</b>
<b>8.1.5 Other Types of Subordinate Clauses</b>	<b>431</b>
<b>8.1.5.1 Reason Clauses</b>	<b>431</b>
<b>8.1.5.2 Manner Adverbial Clauses</b>	<b>432</b>
<b>8.2 Negation</b>	<b>433</b>
<b>8.3 Reflexives and Reciprocals</b>	<b>441</b>
<b>8.4 Voice</b>	<b>459</b>
<b>8.4.1 Passive</b>	<b>460</b>
<b>8.4.2 Antipassive</b>	<b>467</b>
<b>8.4.3 Instrumental Voice</b>	<b>472</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>490</b>
<b>9. Syntax III: WH-movement</b>	<b>497</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>536</b>
<b>10. Conclusion: Ergativity in Quiché Syntax</b>	<b>540</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>555</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>558</b>

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

This work is about Quiché, a Mayan language spoken by approximately 900,000 persons (Grimes 1984:59, 61) in the highlands of Guatemala. This language is part of the Eastern Mayan Division of the Mayan Family (see table 1; cf. Kaufman 1976a:11-13 and Kaufman 1976b:85) and is closely related to the neighboring languages Cakchiquel, Tzutujil, Sacapultec, and Sipacapa. Some linguists, especially those of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (e. g., Shaw and Neuenswander 1966) distinguish another language, Achi, spoken in the towns of San Miguel Chica, Cubulco, and Rabinal. Some linguists also include the towns of San Andrés Sajcabajá and Joyabaj. However, Campbell (1977:31) argues that there is no strong reason to distinguish Achi as a language separate from Quiché. Kaufman (1976a:59) classes all of these as dialects of Quiché.<sup>1</sup> The Sacapultec and Sipacapa languages, spoken in the towns of Sacapulas and Sipacapa, respectively, have also been considered by some to be dialects of Quiché; however, Kaufman (1976b) argues that they are separate languages (see also Campbell 1977:15-20 and Du Bois 1981).

At the time of the arrival of the Spanish in 1524, the Quichés controlled a rather extensive tribute state in the Guatemalan highlands, which was destroyed that same year by

TABLE 1

## The Mayan Family

I. Huastecan Group	16. Jacaltec
1. Huastec	17. b) Cotoque (Mochó)
2. Chicomuceltec (Coxoj)	<u>Eastern Division</u>
II. Mayan Group	V. Greater Mamean Branch
3. Yucatec	A. Mamean Proper Group
4. Lacandón	18. Teco
5. Itzá	19. Mam
6. Mopán	B. Ixilan Group
<u>Western Division</u>	20. Aguacatec
III. Greater Tzeltalan Branch	21. Ixil
A. Cholan Group	VI. Greater Quichean Branch
7. Chortí	A. 22. Uspantec
8. Chol	B. Quichean Proper Group
9. Chontal	23. Sipacapa
B. Tzeltalan Proper Group	24. Sacapultec
10. Tzotzil	25. Quiché
11. Tzeltal	26. Tzutujil
IV. Greater Kanjobalan Branch	27. Cakchiquel
A. Chujean Group	C. Pocom Group
12. Tojolabal	28. Pocomam
13. Chuj	29. Pocomchí
B. Kanjobalan Proper Group	D. 30. Kekchí
14. a) Kanjobal	
15. Acatec	



the invaders. To this day, however, the Quichés continue to be one of the largest and most important ethnic groups in Guatemala. Their language is the language of the *Popol Vuh* (*Poopol Wuuj* or *Poop(o) Wuuj*), one of the greatest monuments of aboriginal American literature, which relates, among other things, the history of the Quiché people from the mythical creation of the world to a time shortly after the Spanish conquest.

Soon after the conquest linguistic work on Quiché was begun by Spanish priests who were interested in using the language in their attempts to convert the Quiché to Christianity. One of the most important early grammars of Quiché was the *Arte de las tres lenguas: Cakchiquel, Quiche y Tzutuhil* written by Francisco Ximénez in 1734. The Quiché portions of this grammar were eventually published in 1862 by the French priest Charles Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg under his own name with added commentary in French (Brasseur 1862).

In more recent times there has continued to be interest in the language by linguists and others. The recent published work on Quiché grammar includes, among other things, Alvarado López (1975), Carbonell Pastor (1973), Chávez (no date), Edmonson (1967), Fox (1965), Kaufman (1986a), Mondloch (1978a, 1978b, 1981), Norman (1978, 1980), Sam Colop (to appear), Schultze Jena (1933), Wick and

Cochojil-González (1966-9). The quality of this work runs the gamut from excellent to abysmal. The work of Alvarado López, Chávez, and Sam Colop is interesting because it has been written by native speakers; and Sam Colop's grammatical sketch is actually quite good. Mondloch (1978a) is probably one of the best modern works on Quiché; however, it is pedagogical in approach (as are Fox 1965 and Wick and Cochojil-González 1966-9) and rather limited in scope (as is all of the work listed above). Mondloch (1981) is a very thorough treatment of voice in Quiché and also includes an extensive treatment of verb inflection. In some cases, however, vowel length does not seem to be indicated perfectly although it is certainly better than in most other works. Kaufman (1986a), is also quite good, treating Quiché from a comparative Mayan point of view. Mondloch (1978b) and the two articles by Norman are excellent, but they are all short papers on limited topics in Quiché grammar. In spite of all of the linguistic work that has been done on Quiché in recent times, there has not yet appeared a comprehensive reference grammar of the language written according to modern linguistic principles.

The present work is also not a comprehensive reference grammar; however, it is a rather large step in that direction in that I attempt to cover a relatively wide range of topics as accurately as I am able. The principal purpose of this work is to investigate the phenomenon of ergativity

and the various ways in which it is manifested in Quiché grammar. Quiché is generally recognized as a morphologically ergative language by virtue of its ergative/absolutive verb agreement system, which is discussed in Chapter 5. In Chapter 7 there is a discussion of the ways in which ergativity is manifested in the discourse pragmatics of Quiché. In Chapter 10 there is a discussion of the question of whether or not Quiché is syntactically ergative. Some of the more recent work on the nature of syntactic ergativity has been conducted within the framework of Chomsky's Government-Binding theory and derivatives of that theory (see, e. g., Levin 1987 and Marantz 1984). With this in mind, I present an analysis of some of the features of Quiché syntax within this framework in order to determine the extent to which Quiché does or does not conform to such a theory of ergativity. The results of this investigation turn out to be quite interesting theoretically. I conclude that Quiché is in fact syntactically ergative, but in a manner which has not been recognized in previous studies: ergativity is manifested in Quiché syntax in that "subjects" of intransitive verbs are not dominated by the S node as are the subjects of transitive verbs, but rather are dominated by the VP node as are the direct objects of transitive verbs. Since intransitive "subjects" and transitive direct objects are treated alike syntactically, and both are treated

differently from transitive subjects, this defines an ergative pattern. This pattern is shown to have some rather interesting consequences in Quiché syntax. Thus, it can be concluded that ergative phenomena in Quiché are manifested in morphology, syntax, and discourse.

The language treated in this work is modern Quiché. For the most part I do not deal with older forms of the language as preserved in writings such as the *Popol Vuh* and the older linguistic work. Modern Quiché is spoken in a variety of dialects, and most of the modern published works on Quiché deal with a particular dialect and present that dialect as representative of the language as a whole. One difference between this work and many of the other works on Quiché is that I try to give some idea of the dialectal diversity of the language.

Most of my work on Quiché was done while I was working as an *asesor técnico* at the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquín in Guatemala. From 1976 to 1978 I worked with a group of Quiché speaking students from Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, teaching them basic linguistics, directing them in the compilation of a dictionary, and investigating the grammar of the language. In the linguistics courses that I taught I also had a student from Nahualá. In addition I had contact with some other Quiché speaking linguists at the PLFM from Nahualá and Santa

Catarina Ixtahuacán. In more recent years, while I was in California, I had the good fortune of being able to consult with a speaker from Zunil who is now resident in this country. While teaching at the University of Iowa during the 1985-86 academic year, I had the further good fortune of being able to consult with a speaker from Cantel who was studying linguistics at the University. In my discussion of Quiché I incorporate data from all of these dialects, as well as further data from the published literature representing the dialects of Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Cantel, Chichicastenango, and San Cristóbal Totonicapán among others.

The differences between these dialects is not great, and they are all mutually intelligible. Most of the differences are phonological and, to a lesser extent, lexical. There are relatively few morphological differences and even fewer syntactic differences. Thus, in the discussion of phonology in Chapter 2, there is a rather extensive coverage of the dialectal differences of which I am aware. In the discussion of syntax in Chapters 7-10, on the other hand, most of the examples given are spelled according to the pronunciation of the Momostenango dialect, which is the dialect I am most familiar with. In those chapters dialectal differences are pointed out only when they are known to exist and are relevant to the discussion.

Data which is cited from published sources is generally spelled according to the pronunciation of the dialect being treated in the source although such examples will be respelled in the orthography that I have adopted in this work.

A number of Quichés have criticized certain linguists for what these Quichés consider to be an overemphasis of the dialectal differences of Quiché and other Mayan languages, especially in the creation of alphabets. Some of these people feel that this is a deliberate attempt by linguists and others to keep them divided (the primary loyalty of many Quichés is to their home town rather than to the Quiché nation as a whole) and, thus, thwart their attempts to unite for the purpose of overcoming the oppression which they have suffered for over 460 years and continue to suffer from at the present time. I want to make it clear that my discussion of dialectal differences should in no way be construed as an attempt to undermine the unity of the Quiché people. It should be clear from my discussion that these differences are relatively minor and that all of these dialects are clearly varieties of a single language. This is not to negate the fact, however, that the dialectal differences are interesting in their own right. I believe that the best way to demonstrate the unity of the Quiché language is to try to present it as accurately as possible in all of its various forms (or in this case at least, as

many of its forms as I am able) rather than presenting one particular variety and pretending that everything else that is Quiché simply does not exist.

Chapter 2 presents the phonology of Quiché from a fairly traditional phonemic point of view. Some of the major phonological rules are also presented rather informally, and there is a discussion of the various orthographies which have been used to write Quiché. Chapters 3-6 contain a discussion of morphology and word classes. The treatment of inflectional morphology is relatively extensive and complete. Treatment of derivational morphology on the other hand is somewhat limited, for the most part presenting only some of the more important derivational morphemes, especially those which are relevant to later sections. Chapter 7 is a discussion of word order and its role in discourse. Chapters 8-9 contain a discussion of some of the major syntactic constructions. Most of the syntax is presented rather informally; however, there is a more formal treatment of WH-movement and certain other phenomena from the point of view of Government-Binding (GB) theory (Chomsky 1981, 1982). Chapter 10 concludes with a discussion of syntactic ergativity in Quiché.

## NOTES

1. Although "Achi" dialects may not differ markedly from other Quiché dialects, it does seem to be the case that at least some people from the "Achi" speaking towns consider themselves to be ethnically distinct from the Quiché people. This division has apparently existed since pre-columbian times according to the *Popol Vuh* (see, e. g., Tedlock 1985:357), where the Rabinal people are mentioned as one of the thirteen tribes allied with the Quichés and arriving with them from the east. Part of the Rabinal area was conquered by the Quichés in the fifteenth century.



## CHAPTER 2

## PHONOLOGY

## 2.1. Phonemes and Orthography

The phonemes of Quiché are shown in table 1. The symbols used in this chart are those of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). Those phonemes which appear in parentheses in table 1 are not found in all dialects and will be discussed further below.

Throughout the rest of this work, the phonemes of Quiché will not be written in IPA, but rather will be written according to the practical orthography presented in table 2. This alphabet was developed by Terrence Kaufman and others (Kaufman 1976a)<sup>1</sup>, and has been used primarily in the work of the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquín (PLFM) in Guatemala.

## 2.1.1 Vowel Phonemes

Some dialects of Quiché (e.g., Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Zunil) have ten vowel phonemes: five short vowels and the five corresponding long vowels (see table 1). In such dialects, the short vowels are written as single vowels and the long vowels are written doubled (see table 2). Some other dialects (e. g., Cantel) have only six vowels, phonemic vowel length having been lost in all cases except on the low

**TABLE 1**  
**Phonemic Inventory**

<b>Consonants:</b>		a					
		l					
		v					
		e					
		o					
	b	a	l	p			
	i	l	p	r			g
	l	v	a	e		u	l
	a	e	l	v	v	v	o
	b	o	a	e	e	u	t
	i	l	t	l	l	l	t
	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	l	r	l	r	r	r	l
<b>voiceless stops</b>	p	t		(k)	k	q	ʔ
<b>voiceless affricates</b>		ts	tʃ				
<b>glottalized stops</b>	p'	t'		(k')	k'	(q')	
<b>glottalized affricates</b>		ts'	tʃ'				
<b>voiceless fricatives</b>		s	ʃ			x	(h)
<b>voiced nasals</b>	m	n					
<b>voiced lateral</b>		l					
<b>voiced trill</b>		r					
<b>voiced semivowels</b>	w		j				
<b>Vowels:</b>		<b>short</b>				<b>long</b>	
	<b>front</b>	<b>central</b>	<b>back</b>		<b>front</b>	<b>central</b>	<b>back</b>
<b>high</b>	i		u		(i <sup>•</sup> )		(u <sup>•</sup> )
<b>mid</b>	e		o		(e <sup>•</sup> )		(o <sup>•</sup> )
<b>low</b>		a				(a <sup>•</sup> )	

TABLE 2  
Orthographic Symbols

<b>Consonants:</b>		a					
		l					
		v					
		e					
		o					
	b	a	l	p			
	i	l	p	r			g
	l	v	a	e		u	l
	a	e	l	v	v	v	o
	b	o	a	e	e	u	t
	i	l	t	l	l	l	t
	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	l	r	l	r	r	r	l
<b>voiceless stops</b>	p	t		(ky)	k	q	ʔ
<b>voiceless affricates</b>		tz	ch				
<b>glottalized stops</b>	b'	t'		(ky')	k'	(q')	
<b>glottalized affricates</b>		tz'	ch'				
<b>voiceless fricatives</b>		s	x			j	(h)
<b>voiced nasals</b>	m	n					
<b>voiced lateral</b>		l					
<b>voiced trill</b>		r					
<b>voiced semivowels</b>	w		y				
<b>Vowels:</b>		short				long	
	front	central	back		front	central	back
high	i		u		(ii)		(uu)
mid	e		o		(ee)		(oo)
low		a/ā				(aa/a)	

central vowel. In such dialects the short vowels are written as <ā, e, i, o, u>, while the single long vowel is written as <a> (see table 2). For some purposes it is convenient to refer to some Quiché dialects as "ten vowel dialects" and to others as "six vowel dialects". It should be understood, however, that such a classification is purely typological and in no way corresponds to any recognized genetic classification of Quiché dialects (cf. Campbell 1977:14-20, Edmonson 1965:viii, Fox 1968:190-1, Kaufman 1976a:55-9).<sup>2</sup> At least one dialect, that spoken in the town of Cubulco, is a "five vowel dialect", phonemic vowel length apparently having disappeared completely (Kaufman 1976a:103; Campbell 1977:15).

The Proto-Quichean vowel length contrasts are preserved in modern Quiché only in word-final syllables (Campbell 1977:38). Proto-Quichean long vowels in non-final syllables have all become short in modern Quiché. Many ten vowel dialects, however, do exhibit vowel length contrasts in all syllables. This has come about because Proto-Quichean morphemes of the form \*(C)VhC have come to have the form (C)VVC in Quiché (Campbell 1977:38,42,44-5), and long vowels from this source have not been shortened in many modern ten vowel dialects of Quiché.<sup>3</sup> Some Quiché examples are shown in table 3, together with cognates from Tzutujil, a language which better preserves some of the Proto-Quichean morpheme shapes.

TABLE 3

## Some Proto-Quichean Morpheme Shapes in Quiché and Tzutujil

<u>Proto-Quichean</u>	<u>Quiché</u>	<u>Tzutujil</u>
*sootz' 'bat'	sootz'	sootz'
*iichaaaj 'herb'	ichaaaj	iichaaaj
*pohp 'mat'	poop	pojɸ
*b'ahlam 'jaguar'	b'aalam	b'ajlam

Not all ten vowel dialects have phonemic vowel length in non-final syllables, however. For example, Zunil seems to have ten contrasting vowels; but the one speaker I consulted from that town seemed to only have short vowels in non-final syllables even in those words which have long vowels in some other ten vowel dialects. Thus it appears that Zunil has lost phonemic vowel length from all sources except in final syllables. The situation with six vowel dialects is somewhat less clear. The one six vowel dialect that I am familiar with is Cantel. When I listened to the tapes which accompany the language lessons in Wick and Cochojil-González (1966-9), my impression was that the Quiché speaker (Cochojil-González, from Cantel) preserved the contrast between /ā/ and /a/ in all syllables. However, the one Cantel speaker with which I have worked first hand contrasted these two vowels only in final syllables. I am not certain whether this means I was mistaken about what I had heard on the tapes,<sup>4</sup> or if it means that there is some kind of dialectal difference (perhaps age based) among

Cantel speakers.

### 2.1.2 The Phoneme /h/

As noted above, the Proto-Quichean phoneme \*/h/ has disappeared in morphemes of the form \*(C)VhC, leaving its trace (in at least some cases) in the lengthening of the preceding vowel. This phoneme also underwent other changes in most other environments, remaining in Quiché only in word final position. The way in which /h/ is manifested in this position differs considerably in different dialects, however; and in fact its status as a phoneme is somewhat questionable in all dialects.

The most straightforward situation is that seen in dialects like those of Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. In these dialects the phoneme /h/ appears as a clearly audible [h] in word final position when the word is spoken in isolation or appears at the end of certain types of syntactic phrases ("phrase-final position"). The definition of the term "phrase final position" can here be taken to mean "at the end of a noun phrase or at the end of a clause". The vowel preceding the /h/ is always short regardless of its length in Proto-Quichean,<sup>25</sup> as seen in the examples in (1).

(1) (a) wah 'food (made of corn dough)' < \*wah

(Campbell 1977:52)

(b) b'eh 'road' < \*b'eeh (Campbell 1977:57)

When such a word appears in non phrase-final position, the /h/ is dropped and the preceding short vowel is lengthened. Thus, for example, when the quantifier k'ih 'many' appears in clause final position, as in (2a), the /h/ is present and the vowel is short (as it must be before /h/). However, as seen in (2b), when this quantifier modifies a following noun, and hence does not appear at the end of a clause nor at the end of a noun phrase, the /h/ is dropped and the vowel is pronounced long.<sup>6</sup>

(2) (a) k'oo        k'ih  
           there.be    many  
           'There are many.'

(b) k'oo        k'ii    achijaab'  
           there.be    many    men  
           'There are many men.'

When a short vowel preceding /h/ is lengthened by some grammatical process, the /h/ disappears. Thus, for example, many nouns with short vowels in the final syllable lengthen that vowel when the noun is possessed. If such a vowel appears before /h/, the /h/ disappears when the vowel is lengthened. An example is seen in (3).

(3) (a) wah    'food (made from corn dough)'  
       (b) u-waa    'his/her food'

In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula /h/ is seldom pronounced as [h]. In those rare instances when a speaker does pronounce it as [h], its distribution seems to be similar to that seen in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. More generally, however, the /h/ is voiced in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula; that is to say, it is pronounced as [ʱ]. Furthermore, unlike Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, the vowel preceding the voiced /h/ is always long in monosyllabic stems regardless of its length in Proto-Quichean. The combined auditory effect of the long vowel followed by [ʱ] is an extra long vowel with a certain amount of "breathy voice" near the end. Thus, in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the words seen in (3) are both pronounced with long vowels followed by [ʱ], as seen in (4).

(4) (a) waah 'food (made of corn dough)'

(b) u-waah 'his/her food'

In these dialects there is also a sandhi rule like the one in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán which drops the /h/ in non phrase-final position (though without any change in the vowel length<sup>7</sup>). However, in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the definition of "phrase-final position" is different, at least for the purposes of this rule, in that it seems to include the ends of clauses but not the ends of noun phrases. For example, the word b'aah 'gopher'



has the /h/ when it appears at the end of a clause, as in (5a) but not when it appears at the end of a non clause-final noun phrase as in (5b).

(5) (a) xinkamisaj jun b'aah  
I.killed.it one gopher  
'I killed a gopher.'

(b) ri b'aa xuutij ri ab'ix  
the gopher it.ate.it the corn.plant  
'The gopher ate the corn plant.'

The sentence (5b) would appear as in (5c) in the Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialects.

(5) (c) ri b'ah xutij ri ab'iix.

The situation is somewhat different, however, with polysyllabic stems. Native polysyllabic stems, including those formed by derivation or compounding, that end in /h/ in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula may have either long or short vowels before the /h/. The length of the vowel is not synchronically predictable; however, with a few possible exceptions, it seems to correspond to the length of the vowel in Proto-Quichean.<sup>29</sup> For example, we have already seen the word wah/waah 'food' in (3) and (4) above. In Proto-Quichean this word had a short vowel in the unpossessed form and a long vowel in the possessed form, just as it does now in Nahualá and Santa Catarina

Ixtahuacán. However, in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the vowel is always long. Nevertheless, in the Momostenango compound *kaxlanwah* 'bread' (*kaxlaan* 'foreign' < Spanish *castellano* 'Castillian' + *wa(a)h* 'food'), as well as in the corresponding Santa María Chiquimula form *kaxnwah*, the vowel in this morpheme retains its original length in both the possessed and unpossessed forms, just as it does in Nahaulá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, as seen in (6).

(6) (a) *kaxlanwah* / *kaxnwah* 'bread'

(b) *nu-kaxlanwaah* / *nu-kaxnwaah* 'my bread'

It should be noted in passing that when a short vowel precedes /h/ in these dialects, as it does in (6a), there is an increased probability that a speaker will pronounce the /h/ as [h] rather than as [ʃ]. The variation in vowel length seen in (6) is retained when the /h/ is dropped in non phrase-final position, as illustrated in the Santa María Chiquimula sentences in (7).

(7) (a) *kinloq'* *kaxnwa* *chwe7q*

I.buy.it bread tomorrow

'I will buy bread tomorrow.'

(b) *kinloq'* *nukaxnwaa* *chwe7q*

I.buy.it my.bread tomorrow

'I will buy my bread tomorrow.'

There is a class of polysyllabic borrowings from Spanish which behave somewhat differently from this. Generally when a word is borrowed from Spanish, the vowel corresponding to the stressed vowel in the Spanish word is pronounced long in Quiché while the other vowels are pronounced short though there are some exceptions to this. Stress in Quiché always falls on the final syllable whereas in Spanish it may fall on any of the last three syllables though most commonly it is on the penult. When a Spanish word is borrowed into Quiché, the stress problem may be resolved either by dropping the post-tonic vowel(s) or, especially in older borrowings, by shifting the stress to the final syllable and, if the word ends in a vowel in Spanish, adding /h/ to the end of the word in Quiché. Some examples of this latter type are seen in (8).

- (8) (a) leecheeh 'milk' ( < Spanish leche )
- (b) keexuuh 'cheese' ( < Spanish queso )
- (c) tintaah 'ink' ( < Spanish tinta )
- (d) animaah 'dead person' ( < Spanish ánima 'soul' )

Note that (8c) and (8d) are exceptions to the rule of lengthening the vowel corresponding to the stressed vowel in Spanish.<sup>2</sup> The important thing to note, however, is that in all of these words the final vowel before the /h/ is long in spite of the fact that the vowel was presumably short originally since it was unstressed. (Note that all of the

words in (8), as well as others of this class, have short vowels in the final syllable in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán.) However, as with other polysyllabic /h/-final stems in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, the underlying length of the vowel does show up when these words are in non phrase-final position, as seen in (9).<sup>10</sup>

(9) (a) r-anima                      kaminaq

his/her/its.soul    dead

'dead person's spirit'

(b) u-leeche    waakax

her.milk    cow

'cow's milk'

(Note that the meaning of the possessed form of animaah in (9a) is somewhat different from the meaning of the unpossessed form in (8a) in spite of the fact that the stem is the same.)

Thus it can be seen that the treatment of /h/ in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula is somewhat different from its treatment in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. The situation in other dialects is not known for certain. The transcriptions of Cantel Quiché in Wick and Cochojil-González (1966-9) show sporadic instances of /h/ written at the ends of some words. In my own work with a Cantel speaker I never heard any word which ended in [h]

though I sometimes thought I might have heard an occasional final [ʔ]. I did not have an opportunity to check this more carefully, however. This may indicate that there is a dialectal difference, perhaps age based, among Cantel speakers such that some (older?) speakers pronounce /h/ as [h] while other (younger?) speakers either pronounce /h/ as [ʔ] or have dropped it all together. In all Cantel words that either end in a low central vowel or in such a vowel followed by /h/, the vowel in question is long; that is to say, it is always /a/ rather than /ã/. This suggests that Cantel is (or was) somewhat like Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula in that the vowel before /h/ is always long. Unlike Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, however, such a vowel is also long in all polysyllabic words. Kaufman (1976a:103) indicates that there is no /h/ in the Cuyotenango dialect, and the vowels which would appear before /h/ if it existed in this dialect are always short. The speaker that I worked with from Zunil never seemed to pronounce [h] at the end of any word. Usually, words which ought to end in /h/ were pronounced with a long final vowel and no [h] although occasionally I thought I heard a short vowel followed by [ʔ]. This merits further study, however, since generally I was not specifically listening for this. As pointed out by Du Bois (1985:35), data presented in Kaufman (1976a:106-7,112-3) suggests that while /h/ does not appear in the Totonicapán and Rabinal

dialects, the original vowel length is preserved in at least some cases in words which would have a final /h/ if it existed in these dialects. See the examples in table 4.

In the preceding discussion of the various manifestations of /h/ it has been assumed without question that this segment is a phoneme in those dialects in which it is found. In Proto-Quichean there is no doubt that this segment was in fact a phoneme in every sense of the word (assuming, of course, that the reconstructions are correct). In modern Quiché, however, this is not so certain. It is true that /h/ in modern Quiché generally comes from word-final /h/ in Proto-Quichean. However, it also seems to be the case that the presence or absence of [h] (or [ʰ]) never functions to distinguish words in modern Quiché. This situation has come about because those words which ended in

TABLE 4

## Treatment of vowels preceding \*/h/ in Various Dialects

Proto-Quichean	*k'ih	*b'eeh	*lah	*b'aah
	`many'	`road'	`nettles'	`gopher'
Nahualá	k'ih	b'eh	lah	b'ah
Momostenango	k'iih	b'eeh	laah	b'aah
Cantel	k'i(h)	b'e(h)	la(h)	b'a(h)
Cuyotenango		b'e		
Rabinal	k'i	b'ee		

vowels in Proto-Quichean (see Du Bois 1985 for examples and discussion), as well as those words which have lost their original final consonants, all have [h] (or [ʁ]) added at the end (in those dialects of modern Quiché which have these sounds) when these words appear in phrase-final position. It is true that there are words in Quiché which are always found with a final vowel and never are pronounced with a final [h] or [ʁ]; however, these words are all function words like articles, prepositions, etc. which would never occur in phrase-final position in normal speech anyway. Thus, one could claim that the existence of [h] or [ʁ] is simply a matter of the phonetics of words at syntactic boundaries and has nothing to do with any kind of "phoneme" in the traditional ("taxonomic") sense. On the other hand, as will be seen later, one might also argue, depending on one's theory of phonology, that [h] and/or [ʁ] are indeed surface manifestations of a phoneme /h/ which actually has a much wider distribution in the underlying phonological representations of words.

In any case, whatever one may conclude about the phonemic status of /h/, it has been the practice of the PLFM, primarily for reasons having to do with the development of a workable practical alphabet, to write the /h/ when it occurs in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, on the other hand, it has been the practice of the PLFM not to write the

/h/. Recall that /h/ is generally voiced in these two dialects, and it has not proved feasible to try to teach native speakers (or non-native speakers for that matter) to hear this sound. In any case it is relatively easy to predict the occurrence of /h/ in the latter two dialects: any vowel-final word which appears at the end of a clause will be pronounced with a final [h]. Both of these practices will be followed in the remainder of this dissertation: /h/ will be written when citing forms from Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and it will not be written when citing forms from Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula (except when special attention is being called to its presence).<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, /h/ will not be written when citing forms from Cantel and Zunil since this phoneme has generally not been written in most of my data from these dialects.

### 2.1.3 The Prevelar Phonemes

The prevelar sounds [k̠] and [k̠'] are not found in all dialects of Quiché; and among those in which they are found, in some these sounds are phonemic and in others they are not. In some dialects of Quiché, as well as in some dialects of Cakchiquel, Pocomchí, Pocomam, and all dialects of Tzotujil, there is a rule which fronts velar stops (/k/ and /k'/) before (roughly) unrounded vowels (/i/, /ii/, /e/, /ee/, /a/, /aa/) followed by a uvular consonant (/q/, /q'/,



/j/) as shown in (10).

$$(10) \begin{array}{|l} \text{-cont} \\ \text{+high} \\ \text{+back} \end{array} \rightarrow [-\text{back}] / \begin{array}{|l} \text{+syll} \\ \text{-round} \end{array} \begin{array}{|l} \text{-syll} \\ \text{-high} \\ \text{+back} \end{array}$$

(The details of this rule may differ somewhat from language to language and dialect to dialect.) According to Campbell (1977:116-8) this rule has diffused into some of the Quichean languages from the Mamean languages to the west. If the distribution of the prevelar sounds is determined entirely by a rule like (10), then they are clearly allophones of the velar stop phonemes. However, in some dialects of Quiché other historical changes have taken place which may render unpredictable the distribution of the prevelar stops. In such dialects, then, the prevelar stops may have to be treated as separate phonemes. According to Kaufman (1976a:103) such dialects exist, but he does not say which ones nor give any data.

The only dialect for which I have extensive data on this point is Cantel. In this dialect the situation is rather complex, and the status of the prevelar stops as separate phonemes seems rather marginal. First of all the rule in (10) is not really correct for this dialect. The correct rule must take into consideration, among other things, the position of the stop within the root or stem. Thus, in Cantel the prevelar sounds are found: (a) at the

beginning of a root morpheme if followed by /e/ in a morpheme which ends in /j/ (however, the prevelar sound is in free variation with the velar sound if the root morpheme is unstressed, i. e., not the final syllable); (b) in a stem when followed by /a/ or /ã/ which in turn is followed by /q/ or /q'/; (c) medially in a stem when preceded by /i/ and followed by /a/ or /ã/ which in turn is followed by /j/. Some examples of (a) are seen in (11).

- (11) (a) kyej 'horse' < Proto-Quichean \*keej 'deer'  
 (Campbell 1977:44)  
 (b) -kye7j 'to grind corn' < \*-ke7-e-ej  
 (c) -kyejej ~ -kejejej 'to mount a horse'  
 < \*-keej-e-ej

Note that in stems like -tak-e-j 'to woo' the second consonant is velar rather than prevelar because it is not root-initial. Similarly, the initial consonant in k+e+jab'un-ik 'they scatter' is velar rather than prevelar because it is not part of the root. Some examples of (b) are seen in (12).

- (12) (a) kyāq 'red' < Proto-Quichean \*kaq (Campbell  
 1977:56)  
 (b) ikyaq' 'sling shot'  
 (c) xkyaqarik 'it turned red' (root = kyāq 'red')  
 (d) ky'āq 'flea' < Proto-Quichean \*k'aq  
 (Campbell 1977:50)

(e) ky'aqo7j 'brown'

Again, the initial consonants in words like *k+a+qaj-o* 'you borrow it' and *k+a+q'aluj* 'you embrace him/her/it' are velar rather than prevelar because they are not part of the stem. Examples of (c) are seen in (13).

(13) (a) *ikyāj* 'ax' < Proto-Quichean \**ikaj* (Campbell 1977:60)

(b) *niky'aj* 'half'

Note that the preceding /i/ is necessary, as can be seen from examples like those in (14).<sup>12</sup>

(14) (a) *kaj* 'sky'

(b) *-sokaj* 'to shear'

(c) *k'āj* 'flour'

There are, however, a number of exceptions to these rules. These are shown in (15).

(15) (a) *ky'a* 'many' (and words derived from this)

(b) *-uky'a7* 'atol (a kind of drink)' (and words derived from this)

(c) *kyeb'* 'two' (and some of the words derived from this)

(d) *kaqulja* 'thunder'

The word *ky'a* in (15a) forms a minimal pair with the word *k'a* 'bitter'. Thus, from the point of view of traditional

phonemic theory, /k'/ and /ky'/ would have to be considered to be separate phonemes in Cantel Quiché. It happens, however, that (15a) comes from the word *k'ih* seen in (2) plus the Attributive Suffix *-a* (see section 3.5.1.1): /k'ih+a/ > *k'iya*. Though the form *k'i(h)* is apparently no longer used by at least some Cantel speakers, one could still argue that the word in (15a) should actually be written as *k'ya*. Similarly the stem in (15b) is historically derived from an old verb stem meaning 'to drink' compounded with the word for 'water':<sup>13</sup> \*-uk'-i-ha7 > -uk'iya7. Thus, one could claim that (15b) is correctly written as *-uk'ya7*. Such claims would effectively eliminate /ky'/ as a separate phoneme in Cantel. Similar arguments could be made about the <ky> in (15c). In Proto-Quichean this word was \*ka7-i(i)b' (Campbell 1977:61), consisting of the numeral root *ka7-* followed by the general numeral classifier for plural objects *-i(i)b'* (see section 3.4.4.1, especially note 11). In the modern Quiché dialect of Santa María Chiquimula, this word has the form *ke7eb'*; and in Momostenango, Nahualá, and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, it has the form *keeb'*. This latter form may have come about as follows: *ke7eb'* > *ke7b'* > *keeb'*; a glottal stop cannot appear before a glottalized consonant in Quiché unless there is a syllable break between them. It would not be too far fetched to suppose that the Cantel form *kyeb'* also came from a form like *ke7eb'* by means of contraction: *ke7eb'* > *kye7b'*

> kyeb'. This would be similar to the process seen in words like tyo7j 'fat' < \*ti7-ooj. The form tyo7j results from a rule which is roughly of the form /CV<sub>1</sub>V<sub>2</sub>/ > CyV<sub>2</sub>7 where V<sub>1</sub> is [-back -low -long] and V<sub>2</sub> is [-high]. This rule is not really a regular phonological rule, however, because it seems to apply only to some, not all, of the words which meet the structural description. In some dialects (e. g., Cantel) the rule seems to apply somewhat more consistently than in others (e. g., Nahualá). In any case, if the form kyeb' does result from the application of this rule, then one could argue that the <ky> in (15c) is really a sequence of /k/ followed by /y/ and is not a prevelar stop. This would then effectively eliminate the possibility that there could be a phoneme /ky/ in Cantel. The only "unexplained" word in (15), then, would be (15d). This word should have [kʰ] by rule (b); however, it does not. One might be inclined to think, especially considering the variation seen in (11c), that rule (b) fails to apply in (15d) because the /k/ is too far from the stressed syllable. Unfortunately, though, the prevelar sound does show up equally far from the stressed syllable in (12c) and even farther in (16).

(16) kyaqarināq 'reddened'

It is possible, however, that (12c) and (16) have [kʰ] by analogy with (12a), from which they are both clearly derived. The etymology of (15d), on the other hand, is not

at all certain.

In any case, it can be seen that there is relatively little evidence for treating the prevelar sounds as separate phonemes in Cantel Quiché.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, looking at things from the point of view of a practical orthography, it appears that the prevelar sounds must be written differently from the corresponding velar sounds. This is because even though the initial sounds in (15a-c) can be shown to come from sequences of velar stop followed by /y/, they are pronounced identically to the prevelar sounds seen in (11-13). If one were going to insist on writing some prevelar sounds as <k> or <k'> and others as sequences of <k> or <k'> and <y>, one would essentially have to know the etymology of a word in order to spell it correctly. This is at least partially true of some other successful orthographies used for certain other languages (e. g., English and Spanish); and in the case of Cantel Quiché it would only require one to memorize the spellings of a rather restricted set of words. Nevertheless, it seems that the easiest move to make, and the one which will be employed here, would be to simply write all prevelar sounds as <ky, ky'> regardless of where they come from. This move, however, is not totally unproblematical. There exist a few other words in Cantel Quiché like -yikya7 'to winnow' in which the <ky> is audibly different from the other examples of <ky> we have seen.

This word is derived from a root *-yik* followed by a suffix involving reduplication: *-(V<sub>1</sub>)C<sub>1</sub>a7*. Since the reduplicated vowel /i/ in the penultimate syllable is dropped, as is commonly done in a number of dialects, the reduplicated consonant /y/ immediately follows the /k/ of the root. However, since there is a syllable break between the /k/ and the /y/, the sequence is clearly heard as a /k/ followed by /y/ and not as a prevelar stop. Note, however, that this pronunciation is not accurately reflected in the orthography if we write the prevelar stop as <ky> as I have advocated. For now I will leave this problem unresolved.

I do not have any data on other dialects with prevelar sounds. According to Campbell (1977:116), Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Nahualá, and Zunil are all within the area where prevelar sounds are said to exist. However, contrary to Campbell's claims, I have never heard any prevelar sounds in any of these dialects. All of the Cantel words discussed above in (11-16) are pronounced with plain velar stops in these dialects and are so written in the PLFM orthography.

#### 2.1.4 The Phoneme /q'/'

Most dialects of Quiché have a phoneme /q'/' distinct from /q/, /k/, /k'/', and /ʃ/ as demonstrated by the minimal pairs in (17).

- (17) (a) qaaq' 'our tongues'  
 (b) qaaq 'our pigs'  
 (c) qaaq' 'our chian (a small seed used for making a drink)'  
 (d) kaak' 'their chian'  
 (e) k'aak' 'new'  
 (f) q'aaq' 'fire'  
 (g) kaaq' 'their tongues'  
 (h) kaa7 'grindstone'  
 (i) kaaq 'their pigs'

However, according to Kaufman (1976a:103) and Campbell (1977:15), original /q'/ has become /ʔ/ in Cubulco and Joyabaj. Campbell claims that this has also happened in Rabinal; however, Kaufman claims that Rabinal does have a phoneme /q'/ but that it is pronounced [ʔ].

## 2.2 Phonological Rules

This section will give a brief prose description of some of the more important phonological rules of Quiché.

### 2.2.1 Underlying Phonological Representations

In Quiché the underlying phonological representations that one might want to posit for words are not greatly different from their traditional phonemic shapes; that is to say, the underlying forms of words do not have to be very abstract. The major abstractions involve the length of



vowels and some of the reflexes of Proto-Quichean \*/h/.

As noted above, the Proto-Quichean vowel length contrasts are preserved only in the final (stressed) syllable. In non-final syllables only short vowels are found (except as discussed above and below). Thus, if a morpheme with a long vowel has a suffix added to it, the syllable with the long vowel will no longer be the final syllable and the long vowel will be shortened.<sup>15</sup> Some examples are seen in (18).

(18) (a) b'iis 'sadness'

/-b'iis+o+oj/ > -b'isooj 'to be sad about  
something'

(b) keej 'horse'

/-keej+e+ej/ > -kejeej 'to mount a horse'

(c) -paam 'stomach' (possessed form)

/paam+aaaj/ > pamaaj 'stomach' (unpossessed)

(d) -joloom 'head' (possessed form)

/joloom+aaaj/ > jolomaaaj 'head' (unpossessed)

(e) suutz' 'cloud'

/-suutz'+ir/ > -sutz'ir 'to get cloudy'

There are, however, some long vowels which do not shorten when they appear in non-final syllables. These are

the long vowels which have arisen from the loss of Proto-Quichean preconsonantal \*/h/. In order to distinguish these long vowels from those that undergo the shortening rule, one might want to posit an underlying /h/ in such words and then write a rule which converts the /h/ to vowel length.<sup>16</sup> Some examples are seen in (19).

- (19) (a) /-mahk/ → -maak 'sin' (possessed form)  
 /mahk+aaʃ/ → maakaaj 'sin' (unpossessed)
- (b) /ch'ihch'/ → ch'iich' 'smokey smelling'  
 (adjective)  
 /-ch'ihch'+ool/ → -ch'iich'ool 'smokey smell'  
 (noun)

The presence of this abstract underlying /h/, which distinguishes those long vowels which do not shorten, has been hypothesized largely on the basis of historical evidence. There is only very shaky synchronic evidence that what distinguishes these vowels has anything to do with a phoneme /h/; however, some rather indirect synchronic evidence can be seen in the Nahualá forms of the transitive verb root /-tah/ 'to hear'. Unfortunately, the /h/ at the end of this root is never heard. When this root appears in phrase-final position, it has the form -toh, which presumably results from a contraction of the root with the phrase-final suffix for transitive verbs -oh: /-tah+oh/ → -toh. When the root appears in non phrase-final position,

it has the form -taa. Evidence that this latter form is the non phrase-final form of a morpheme ending in /h/ can be seen from the fact that all transitive verb roots in Quiché have the form CVC; and if we assume that the final consonant is /h/, we can explain the form -taa as resulting from the Nahualá sandhi rule which drops /h/ and lengthens the preceding vowel in non phrase-final position. Further evidence that the final consonant of the root is /h/ can be seen from the fact that the verbal noun which can be derived from this root by means of the suffix -ik has the form tayik. As will be seen later, /h/ regularly becomes /y/ when it appears between vowels. If one agrees that the root indeed has the form /-tah/, then it should be noted that the Completive Passive stem which can be derived from this root by means of the suffix -taj has the form -taataj. The long vowel in the first syllable of this stem can be easily explained if we assume that there is a rule which converts an underlying /h/ before a consonant to length on the preceding vowel.<sup>17</sup>

In addition to the rule discussed above which shortens underlying long vowels in non-final syllables, there is also a sandhi rule in ten vowel dialects which shortens underlying long vowels in word final closed syllables when they appear in non phrase-final position. An example is seen in (20).

- (20) (a) xuukunaaĵ 's/he cured him/her'  
 (b) juun 'one'  
 (c) xuukunaj jun ixoq 's/he cured a woman'

Both of the words in (20a) and (20b) have long vowels in the final closed syllable. However, when both of these words appear in the sentence in (20c), their final vowels are shortened because they appear in non phrase-final position. This sandhi rule does not apply in the six vowel dialect of Cantel. Actually, even in Cantel the vowels /a, e, i, o, u/ sound phonetically shorter in non phrase-final position than they do in phrase-final position. However, the long vowel /a/ still contrasts with the short vowel /ā/ because they differ in quality. Note that the vowels /e, i, o, u/ seem to undergo this phonetic shortening non phrase-finally in Cantel regardless of whether they were historically long or short.

As noted before, there is a rule which changes /h/ to /y/ between vowels. This rule generally applies when a vowel-initial suffix is added to a stem which ends in /h/. Some examples are seen in (21).<sup>18</sup>

- (21) (a) /k'ah/ → k'aa 'bitter'  
 /-k'ah+iil/ → -k'ayiil 'bitterness'  
 (b) /k'ih/ → k'ii 'many'  
 /-k'ih+aal/ → -k'iyaal 'multiplicity'

(c) /xehpuh/ > xeepuu 'fat' (noun) ( < Spanish  
cebo)

/-xehpuh+iil/ > -xeeputyiil 'fatness'

We have seen two phonological rules which seem to operate on a phoneme /h/: one which changes preconsonantal /h/ to length on the preceding vowel and another which changes intervocalic /h/ to /y/. This combined with the fact that there are words in at least some dialects of Quiché which end in [h] or [ʁ] suggests that there is indeed a phoneme /h/ in Quiché which may appear underlyingly in any position except word-initially<sup>19</sup> although in the surface form it only shows up overtly in word final position and then only in some dialects. We have also seen, however, that there is very little synchronic evidence for preconsonantal /h/ in Quiché; and the phenomenon seen in (21) could be equally well described in terms of a rule which inserts a /y/ between a vowel-final stem and a vowel-initial suffix. If one were to choose this latter option, then, as we have seen, the word final [h] or [ʁ] is probably best considered a surface phonetic phenomenon since there seems to be little justification for considering it a phoneme. One's stand on this will generally depend on the kind of phonological theory one subscribes to. Largely for purposes of descriptive convenience I will assume that /h/ is a phoneme of modern Quiché, written or not written according to the orthographic conventions discussed

previously.

Another phonological rule of Quiché changes /w/ to /h/ when it occurs word-finally after a rounded vowel. The /w/ reappears when a suffix is added. Some examples are seen in (22).

(22) (a) /kow/ > koo (= [ko·ʁ]) 'hard' < Proto-  
Quichean \*kaw (Campbell 1977:60)

/-kow+iil/ > -kowiil 'hardness'

(b) /chuw/ > chuu (= [tʃu·ʁ]) 'stinky' < Proto-  
Quichean \*chuw (Campbell 1977:56)

/-chuw+iil/ > -chuiil 'stink' (noun)

The forms in (22b) should be compared with (21c). In (21c) the underlying form of the root ends in /u/ followed by /h/, and the /h/ becomes /y/ when the suffix is added. In (22b) the underlying form of the root ends in /u/ followed by /w/, and the /w/ becomes /h/ in word final position but remains before the suffix.

There is one exception to this rule which changes /w/ to /h/ word finally after a rounded vowel. As will be discussed in Chapter 9, there is a suffix -ow ~ -uw which derives a special verb form called the Focus Antipassive form. As can be seen in the examples in Chapter 9, the /w/ in this suffix does not become /h/ when this suffix appears

in word-final position. Thus, it may be that this phonological rule applies only to root-final /w/.

The final rules to be discussed in this section are the rules of vowel dropping and vowel harmony. These rules are not found in all dialects; and even where they are found they are not always very regular, often differing slightly from speaker to speaker and sometimes even from utterance to utterance by the same speaker. In some dialects there may be a rule which either optionally or obligatorily deletes certain short unstressed vowels in a word. It seems that the vowel that is often the most likely to be affected by such a rule is a short vowel in the penultimate syllable of a stem with three or more syllables although the operation of the rule sometimes may depend on which consonants are flanking the vowel. Consider, for example, the word for market. There is in Quiché a noun root -k'aay meaning 'wares, items for sale'. From this root is derived the transitive verb stem /-k'aay+i+iij/ > -k'ayiiij 'to sell'. From the base of a derived verb like this, one can regularly derive a locative/instrumental noun meaning 'place or instrument for performing the action of the verb' by means of the suffix -b'al. Thus, from the verbal base /k'aay+i-/ one can derive the noun /k'aay+i+b'al/ > k'ayib'al 'market (= place for selling)'. This is the usual form for this word in the Nahualá dialect; however, in Cantel the vowel in the penultimate syllable is usually

dropped in this word and it is pronounced *k'ayb'äl*. In Momostenango the vowel dropping rule is optional so that the word may be pronounced either *k'ayib'al* or *k'ayb'al*. According to Campbell (1977:14-5) such a vowel dropping rule is particularly characteristic of the Chichicastenango dialect, where it regularly applies even to the penultimate vowel in two-syllable stems. He also notes that in the Cunén dialect there is a rule which regularly drops word-initial vowels of polysyllabic words. In Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Santa María Chiquimula there is a rule which deletes the final vowel of many words ending in V(V)7V(V)C in non phrase-final position. Thus, for example, the word *reeta7aam* 's/he knows it' (*reeta7am* in Santa María Chiquimula) loses the final vowel and becomes *reeta7m* in non phrase-final position. In Momostenango and Cantel such words have lost the final vowel in all positions.

The vowel harmony rule tends to apply in many of the same environments as the vowel dropping rule; that is, there is a tendency in some dialects for short unstressed vowels, especially those in the penultimate syllable of stems of three or more syllables, to become identical to some other vowel in the word. This rule is particularly characteristic of the Santa María Chiquimula dialect. But even in this dialect the rule is generally quite irregular and sometimes optional. In many words in this dialect there is a tendency



to pronounce some or all short unstressed vowels identically to the stressed vowel in the final syllable. There is also an opposing tendency, however, to pronounce all short unstressed vowels following the root identically to the root vowel. For example, from the derived intransitive verb /-kuun+a+n/  $\rightarrow$  -kunan 'to cure' one can derive a noun *kunaneel* 'doctor'. Some speakers of the Santa María Chiquimula dialect at least some of the time may pronounce this word exactly as written above; however, sometimes the word will be pronounced as *kuneneel*, harmonizing the short unstressed penultimate vowel with the following stressed vowel, and sometimes this word will be pronounced *kununeel*, harmonizing the vowel with the preceding root vowel. The pressure for the penultimate vowel to harmonize is particularly strong when both the preceding and following vowels are of the same quality, and in some words vowel harmony may even be obligatory in such environments. For example, the verb stem /-kam+isa+aj/ 'to kill' is practically always pronounced as -kamasaaʃ in this dialect. In some cases the direction of the vowel harmony may be influenced by the consonants. Thus, the word for market discussed previously may be pronounced *k'iy(i)b'al*, where the short unstressed root vowel harmonizes with the penultimate vowel, probably under the influence of the intervening /y/.

### 2.2.2 Phonetic Representations

The phonological rules described in this section can for the most part be considered to be either rules which describe the distribution of the allophones of the traditional "taxonomic" phonemes of Quiché or sandhi rules which describe optional phonological phenomena which take place across word boundaries. The allophones of /h/ and the sandhi rules which apply to this "phoneme" have already been described in section 2.1.2 and will not be discussed any further here. Similarly, the prevelar sounds, which may be allophones of the velar stops in some dialects, have already been discussed in section 2.1.3.

The voiceless stops /p, t, k, (ky), q/ generally become very strongly aspirated (i. e., [p<sup>h</sup>, t<sup>h</sup>, k<sup>h</sup>, k<sup>h</sup>, q<sup>h</sup> ] ) in word-final position and before another consonant. They tend to be weakly aspirated in other environments. In the Cantel dialect only /q/ seems to be strongly aspirated in this way; the other stops tend more often than not to be unaspirated in all environments.

The glottalized consonants /b', t', tz', ch', k', (ky'), q'/ are mostly rather weak ejectives. The bilabial phoneme /b'/ is somewhat different in that it is voiced and imploded (i. e., [β] ) before vowels but it becomes a voiceless ejective [p'] in other environments (word-finally and before consonants). In the environments in which /b'/'

is pronounced as [p'] it tends to be unreleased although in some dialects it may have a nasal release in word-final position.<sup>20</sup> In some dialects /q'/ may optionally be voiced and imploded, especially before vowels; and in such cases it seems to be more pharyngeal than uvular. According to Campbell (1977:15), /q'/ is a "pharyngealized glottal stop", which he transcribes as [ʔ], in San Miguel Chicañ and San Andrés Sajcabajá. Kaufman (1976a:103) claims that in Rabinal and Cuyotenango, /q'/ is pronounced as [ʔ], by which he presumably means the voiced pharyngeal fricative or "ʔain". As noted previously, Campbell (1977:15) claims, contrary to what Kaufman says, that \*/q'/ in Rabinal has merged with /ʔ/; therefore, it would appear that his "pharyngealized glottal stop" [ʔ] is not intended to be the same sound as Kaufman's voiced pharyngeal fricative [ʔ]. In Zunil /q'/ generally seems to be a voiceless uvular ejective but with a voiceless uvular or pharyngeal fricative release and, therefore, is actually an affricate. In Cantel /q'/ is simply a rather strongly ejective [q'].

The voiceless uvular fricative /j/ is generally pronounced with very slight friction though it may be pronounced with heavier friction, thus sounding somewhat "raspy", in word-final position and before consonants. In some dialects /j/ may be pronounced as [h] in at least some positions. For example, Kaufman (1976a:103) says that in

Rabinal /j/ is [X] word-finally and [h] elsewhere while in the coastal dialects /j/ is [h] everywhere.

The nasals are generally unproblematical. The phoneme /n/ becomes [ŋ] before velars, [N] before uvulars, and is pronounced [n] elsewhere.<sup>21</sup>

The non-nasal resonants /l, r, w, y/ become voiceless (i. e., [ʃ, ʒ, ʍ, ʎ (or ɟ)]) before consonants and word-finally in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and others. This rule does not apply in Cantel and Zunil, and according to Kaufman (1976a:103) it also does not apply in the coastal dialects of Quiché (e. g., Mazatenango, Cuyotenango, Retalhuleu). Kaufman also says that in Rabinal the rule applies to /l/ and /r/ but not to /w/ and /y/. The same also appears to be true of Zunil. In Santa María Chiquimula /w/ is optionally pronounced by some speakers as a voiced bilabial fricative [β] intervocalically.

In the dialects in which the devoicing rule applies, one sometimes finds apparent exceptions to the rule. These exceptions occur when a vowel which follows the resonant is dropped. Thus, for example, in Nahualá the word *xeewi* 'only' is often pronounced without the final vowel. In such cases the /w/ is voiced even though it appears at the end of the word. In dialects like Momostenango which sometimes drop a short penultimate vowel in a word like *k'ayib'al*

'market', the /y/ is always voiced even when it appears immediately before the following consonant. Thus it can be seen that the resonant devoicing rule must be ordered before the vowel dropping rule. In those dialects which have the devoicing rule, the PLFM advocates writing /l, r, w, y/ as <l", r", w", y"> when they are pronounced voiced before consonants and word-finally (e. g., <xeew">, <k'ay"b'al>).<sup>22</sup> In the Momostenango dialect there is a tendency when speaking at a normal conversational speed to suspend the devoicing rule in non phrase-final position if the resonant is immediately followed by a vowel-initial word. An example can be seen in (23).

(23) xinwil        awanaab'  
       I.saw.her    your.sister  
       'I saw your sister.'

Here the devoicing rule should devoice the /l/ at the end of the first word. However, in Momostenango, unless one is speaking slowly, this /l/ is likely to be pronounced voiced since it is in non phrase-final position and is immediately followed by a vowel.

The phoneme /r/ is generally a voiced alveolar tap [ɾ] intervocalically and an alveolar trill elsewhere. As discussed above the alveolar trill in some dialects is voiceless [ɾ̥] initially, word-finally, and before

consonants. In Santa María Chiquimula the alveolar trill may be voiced [r] before voiced consonants, and in all dialects the alveolar trill is voiced in the environment #C\_V. In some dialects the voiceless allophone is not an alveolar trill but rather a retroflex trill [ɾ] (often referred to as the "sibilant r"). This "sibilant r" is also commonly found in some varieties of colloquial Guatemalan Spanish.

Besides the usual voiced and voiceless allophones of /l/, some speakers of the Santa María Chiquimula dialect also have [ʀ] as an allophone of /l/. The rule which describes the distribution of [ʀ] seems to be somewhat difficult to specify exactly and may vary slightly from speaker to speaker, but the rule seems to be roughly that /l/ becomes [ʀ] when followed by /a/, /aa/, /o/ or /oo/ and preceded by one of these same vowels or by a consonant. Some examples of such words are seen in (24).

- (24) (a) ala 'boy'  
 (b) kinbolo 'I roast it (a cylindrical object like an ear of corn)'  
 (c) b'oloom 'roasted (a cylindrical object like an ear of corn)'  
 (d) tz'lo7j 'alder'  
 (e) sib'laj 'very'

At least some speakers may also apply the rule to a word

final /l/ if it is preceded by one of the above mentioned vowels and it is immediately followed by a word which begins with one of these same vowels. An example is seen in (25).

- (25) kinb'ol      aj  
       I.roast.it    fresh.corn  
       'I roast ears of corn'

There are some complications with this rule, however, some of which call into question the treatment of [ʃ] as an allophone of /l/ in spite of the fact that [ʃ] corresponds to [l] in all other dialects of Quiché, including that of those people of Santa María Chiquimula who do not have the sound [ʃ] in their speech. One such complication involves verb roots like -b'ol which, as we have seen above, have some forms in which the /l/ is pronounced as [ʃ]. The problem here is that some speakers apparently pronounce the /l/ optionally as [ʃ] in other forms derived from such roots even when the /l/ is not found in the proper environment for the above rule to operate. An example is seen in (26).

- (26) /ka#0#b'ohl+ik/ > [kaʃo·likʰ] ~ [kaʃo·ʃikʰ]  
       'it is roasted'

The /l/ at the beginning of the word laj, which indicates the diminutive of the following noun, is also frequently pronounced as [ʃ] contrary to the above rule; however, this word is a shortened form of alaj, where the /l/ does appear

in the proper environment. The more interesting complications arise from the interaction of the above rule with the vowel harmony rule. Apparently the rule which changes /l/ to [ɫ] must be ordered before the vowel harmony rule since /l/ is never pronounced as [ɫ] if the proper environment has been created through the operation of vowel harmony; however, it may be pronounced as [ɫ] even if the proper environment is destroyed by vowel harmony. Some examples are seen in (27).

(27) (a) /wal+i+b'al/ > [walaβaɫ]

'type of fan used in sweat bath'

(b) /wuq+lajuuj/ > [wuq<sup>h</sup>ɫuXu·X]

'seventeen' (cf. /lajuuj/ > [laXu·X] ~ [luXu·X]  
'ten')

In (27a) the /l/ is always pronounced [l], in spite of the fact that the vowel harmony rule creates the proper environment for [ɫ], because in the underlying form the proper environment does not exist. On the other hand, in (27b) the /l/ is in the proper environment in the underlying form; hence, it becomes [ɫ] in spite of the fact that the environment is later destroyed by the vowel harmony rule. Example (27a) is especially interesting because of another word shown in (28).



(28) /w+alab'al/ → [waʃaʃaʃ]

'my nephew' (woman speaking)

Here the proper environment is found in the underlying form; hence, the /l/ is pronounced [ʃ]. As can be seen, (27a) and (28) form a minimal pair.<sup>23</sup> Thus, from the point of view of traditional phonemic theory, [l] and [ʃ] would have to be allophones of separate phonemes. As far as I know, however, (27a) and (28) is the only such minimal pair which exists; therefore, the contrast does not seem to carry a very heavy functional load. And furthermore, from the point of view of a generative phonology it seems clear that [ʃ] is intimately related to the phoneme /l/. On the other hand, the fact that the distribution of [ʃ] seems to be spreading by analogy to new environments, as seen in (26), suggests that [ʃ] may in fact be becoming a new phoneme in this dialect.<sup>24</sup>

In ten vowel dialects the long vowels are generally pronounced long and tense: [iː, eː, aː, oː, uː]. However, the long [+high] vowels may be lowered ([ɪː, ɛː, ɔː, ɔ̃ː]) before uvular consonants. The long vowel /ii/ may also have a central offglide before a uvular consonant. Thus, the word q'iiɟ 'sun, day' is often pronounced [q'ɪːəX]. The short vowels are pronounced short and generally lax in final syllables though sometimes they may be pronounced tense, especially in non-final syllables: [ɪ ~ i, ɛ ~ e, ʌ ~ a, ɔ ~ o, ɔ̃ ~ u]. In six vowel dialects, in those environments

where there is a contrast between /a/ and /ā/, the long vowel /a/ is pronounced tense and optionally long ( [ a ~ aː ] ) while the short vowel /ā/ is generally pronounced as a short [ʌ]. In those environments in which these two vowels do not contrast, the low central vowel written <a> is pronounced [ a ~ ʌ ]. In all environments the other four vowels are pronounced like the corresponding short vowels of the ten vowel dialects.

As was mentioned previously, the Zunil dialect is a ten vowel dialect. Some examples of minimal pairs in this dialect can be seen in (29-30).

(29) (a) oj 'cough'

(b) ooj 'avocado'

(30) (a) aj 'fresh corn'

(b) aaj 'cane'

However, these vowel length contrasts exist only in the final syllable, as was discussed above. Thus, the word /m#at+tzahq+ik/ 'be careful not to fall!' (commonly said to someone who is about to leave) is pronounced as mattzaaqik in many ten vowel dialects but is pronounced as mattzaqik in Zunil.

Though the vowel length contrasts are clearly established by minimal pairs such as those shown in (29-30), I frequently had difficulty hearing vowel length with the

Zunil speaker that I consulted. Nevertheless, final syllable vowel length contrasts are still clearly distinguishable in this dialect by means of pitch: words with a short vowel in the final syllable have high pitch on the final syllable and low pitch throughout the rest of the word whereas words with a long vowel in the final syllable have low pitch on the final stressed syllable and high pitch throughout the rest of the word. Words of four or more syllables with a final long vowel optionally may have neutral pitch on syllables before the stem. Some examples are seen in (31-33), where the acute accents indicate high pitch, the grave accents indicate low pitch, and the lack of an accent mark indicates neutral pitch).

- (31) (a) /x#in#war+ik/ > xɪnwàrik 'I slept'  
 (b) /x#Ø#in#war+tisa+aj/ > xɪnwártisà(à)j 'I put  
 him/her to sleep'
- (32) (a) /r+uxlaab'/ > rúxlà(à)b' 'his/her breath'  
 (b) /x#Ø#uxlaab'+ik/ > xùxlàb'ík 's/he breathed'
- (33) (a) /x#Ø#in+taq+o/ > xɪntàqó 'I ordered him/her'  
 (b) /x#Ø#in+taq##b'i+ik/ > xɪntàq b'i(i)k 'I sent  
 him/her'

Terrence Kaufman (personal communication) also noticed these pitch differences in a dialect survey for Zunil that he checked for the PLFM in the early 1970's. However,

Kaufman's informant also had clear vowel length distinctions in addition to the pitch differences.

Monosyllabic vowel-initial words in Quiché are always pronounced with an initial glottal stop when stressed. Polysyllabic vowel-initial words are pronounced with an initial glottal stop when they occur in utterance-initial position and also when they are preceded by a word ending in a vowel. In other environments such words have no initial glottal stop. In any case these initial glottal stops are never written. The glottal stop is always written in other positions, however, since it is phonemic in these positions. When /ʔ/ appears preconsonantly (i. e., in morphemes of the form (C)VʔC ), there is generally a very short echo vowel following the /ʔ/. This echo vowel may be voiceless. There may also be an optional echo vowel after a word-final /ʔ/. In this case the echo vowel is always voiceless.

There is a sandhi rule which applies to word-final /ʔ/ which is similar to the sandhi rule which applies to word final /h/ discussed in section 2.1.2. In Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán a word final glottal stop is dropped in non phrase-final position and a preceding short vowel is lengthened. This rule applies quite regularly in these dialects to most word-final glottal stops which form part of a suffix or which are the final consonant of a particle; however, it generally does not apply to word final glottal

stops which are part of a root morpheme which is not a particle. The only exception to this that I am aware of is the transitive verb root *-ya7*, which generally has the form *-yaa* in non phrase-final position. An example of this process can be seen in (34).

(34) (a) *ke7ntija7* 'I am going to drink it'

(b) *ke7ntijaa nah* 'I have to go drink it'

This rule seems to be optional in other dialects. In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the rule seems to apply more often than not to the Dependent Status suffix on root transitive verbs *-a7* ~ *-o7* ~ *-u7* (see section 3.2.4.3.1.3), but often does not apply to other word final glottal stops.

There is an additional complication to this rule in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán but not in Momostenango or Santa María Chiquimula. As illustrated in (34b), the glottal stop at the end of the Dependent Status suffix *-a7* is dropped in non phrase-final position, and the short vowel preceding this glottal stop is lengthened. However, when a verb like the one in (34) is followed by a direct object noun phrase, as seen in (35), the glottal stop is dropped but the vowel is not lengthened. This is true even if other constituents intervene between the verb and the noun phrase, as seen in (35b).

(35) (a) ke7ntija                    jun    serwees  
           I.go.to.drink.it    one    beer  
           'I am going to drink a beer'

(b) ke7ntija                    na                    lee    tzaam  
           I.go.to.drink.it    NECESSITATIVE    the    liquor  
           'I have to go and drink the liquor'

In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the vowel of the suffix -a7 is always lengthened when the glottal stop is dropped. Thus, the verb in both of the sentences in (35) would have the form ki7ntijaa in these dialects.

At normal conversational speed there is a contraction rule which often applies when an unstressed vowel-final or glottal stop-final word is followed by a polysyllabic vowel-initial word. In Nahualá, Momostenango, and Santa María Chiquimula the contraction rule deletes the final vowel of the first word (and also the final glottal stop, if present) and inserts a glottal stop after the initial vowel of the second word; that is,  $V_1(V_1)(7)\#\#V_2(V_2)CV(V) \rightarrow V_27CV(V)$ . Some examples are seen in (36).

(36) (a) ri    achii > ra7chii  
           the    man  
           'the man'

(b) ma xaak'am ta uloq  
 not you.carried.it IRREALIS hither  
 > ma xaak'am tu7loq 'You didn't bring it.'

In Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the contraction rule is similar except that rather than inserting a glottal stop, the initial vowel of the second word is simply lengthened as shown in (37).

(37) rii achih > raachih 'the man'

The contraction rule in the six vowel dialect of Cantel is like that seen in Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán except, of course, there is no vowel lengthening since there is no vowel length contrast in non-final syllables. An example is seen in (38).

(38) le ixoq > lixoq  
 the woman  
 'the woman'

### 2.3 Other Orthographies

The PLFM orthography used here is only one of several orthographies that have been used for Quiché. A conversion chart for the principal orthographies which have been used is shown in table 5. The principles upon which the PLFM orthography is based are explained in full in Kaufman (1976a). Basically this orthography is supposed to be an

unambiguous phonemic orthography using only the symbols which may be found on a Spanish typewriter. Furthermore, an attempt is made to avoid using diacritics as much as possible, especially those which would require one to backspace on the typewriter. The letters of the orthography

TABLE 5

## Comparison of Orthographies

PLFM	Colonial	Officialized	Chávez	Salazar/Sam
a/ā	a	ā	a/--	ā
aa/a	a	a	a	a
b'	b	b	b	b
ch	ch	ch	ch	ch
ch'	ch	ch'	*	ch'
e	e	ē	e	ē
ee	e	e	e	e
h	--	--	--	--
i	i/y/j	ī	i	ī
ii	i/y/j	i	i	i
j	h/h	j	j	j
k	c/qu	c/qu	k	k
k'	q	c'/q'u	k'	k'
ky	--	qui	ki	ki
ky'	--	q'ui	ki'	k'i
l	l	l	l	l
m	m	m	m	m
n	n	n	n	n
o	o	ō	o	ō
oo	o	o	o	o
p	p	p	p	p
q	k	k	k	q
q'	q	k'	q'	q'
r	r	r	r	r
s	z/z	s	s	s
t	t	t	t	t
t'	tt	t'	t'	d
tz	tz	tz	tz	tz
tz'	tz	tz'	tz'	tz'
u	u/v	ū	u	ū
uu	u/v	u	u	u
w	u/v/uh	w/u	w/u	w/u
y	i/y/j	y/i	y/i	y/i
7	--(v, v, vv)	'	v/v	'



are to have as much as possible the values that they have in Spanish; however, since Mayan languages have sounds which are not found in Spanish, certain combinations of symbols are used for such sounds that would not be found in the orthography used for Spanish. One of the most important principles is that each symbol should represent one and only one phoneme, and each phoneme should be represented by one and only one symbol. For this reason, the symbol <k> is used to represent the phoneme /k/, in spite of the fact that <k> is used quite rarely for this phoneme in Spanish, because the usual Spanish convention of writing /k/ as <qu> before front vowels and as <c> elsewhere would violate the principle of one symbol for each phoneme. There is also an attempt made to emphasize the similarities between dialects of the same language, and even between different Mayan languages, rather than exaggerate the differences.

One of the more controversial aspects of the PLFM orthography has been the use of <ʔ> for the glottal stop. It was decided not to use the symbol <'> for this phoneme, as is done in some orthographies, because this would cause confusion in some languages which have a distinction between glottalized consonants, written as C', and sequences of non-glottalized consonant followed by /ʔ/. For example, in the Nahaulá dialect of Quiché, there is a word *wachʔil* 'my companion'. The sound of the sequence /chʔ/ in this word is distinct from the sound of /ch'/ in a word like *ach'i7y*

'tough (like rubber or meat)'. However, if the glottal stop were written as <'>, it would be difficult to indicate the difference between /ch7/ and /ch'/. Therefore, a different symbol is needed to write the glottal stop, and I suppose the numeral 7 was chosen because it resembles the standard phonetic symbol for this sound. Nevertheless, many people seem to object to this because they feel uncomfortable with the idea of using a numeral as a letter. As will be seen below, however, there is a precedent for using numerals in this way.

The first orthography used to write Quiché was presumably the native hieroglyphic writing system. Though great strides have been made in deciphering these hieroglyphics in recent years, none of the extant hieroglyphic texts has been demonstrated to be written in the Quiché language. None of the hieroglyphic books which are said to have once existed among the Quichés is known to have survived, and stone monuments with carved hieroglyphic texts were apparently not erected in the Quiché area as they were in some other Mayan areas.

After the Quichés were conquered by Spain in 1524, Spanish priests introduced the writing of Quiché in the Latin alphabet as part of their missionary effort, which began in the early 1540's.<sup>25</sup> The orthography that they developed was used by literate native speakers as well as

foreign missionaries until the nineteenth century. This orthography, shown in table 5 in the column labeled "Colonial", basically follows Spanish orthographic practice of the sixteenth century. However, since Quiché has sounds not found in Spanish, some special symbols were invented to represent these sounds. These special symbols are < 3, 4, 4h, 4,, tz, tt >, which represent the phonemes /q', k', ch', tz', t' / respectively.

The first four of these letters are usually referred to as the "Parra letters" because they are said to have been invented by the Spanish Franciscan priest Fray Francisco de la Parra in 1545 (Edmonson 1971:vii). These four letters are called *tresillo* 'little three', *cuatrillo* 'little four', *cuatrillo con hache* 'little four with h', and *cuatrillo con coma* 'little four with comma'. It is curious that of all the possible symbols that could have been chosen, Parra chose to base these letters on the numerals 3 and 4. It is even more curious that the 3, but not the 4, was written backwards. Historians and linguists do not seem to have wondered too much about this; however, I think there is a reasonable explanation for at least the form of the *tresillo*. It should first of all be remembered that, as discussed above, the phoneme /q'/ is a pharyngeal in a number of Quiché dialects. The Parra letters were also used for writing the Cakchiquel language, and it is probably a

relevant fact that in the Cakchiquel dialects spoken around La Ciudad de Santiago de los Caballeros de Goathemala (the old colonial capital, both at its former location at the site of the present day Ciudad Vieja from 1527 to 1543 and its later location at the site of the present day Antigua Guatemala from 1543 until 1773) the phoneme /q'/ is also pronounced as a pharyngeal in word-initial position. Second of all it should be noticed that the tresillo bears a striking resemblance, especially in its handwritten form, to the Arabic letter "fain", which represents the voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/. It would not be too far fetched to suppose that Parra, or some associate of his, had at least passing familiarity with Arabic. Arabic was widely spoken in Spain for some 800 years, and the last Moorish stronghold in Spain was not reconquered by the Christian Spaniards until 1492, the same year that Columbus "discovered" America and just 36 years before the conquest of the Quichés. Arabic continued to be spoken in parts of Spain for some time after 1492 as evidenced by the fact that Pedro de Alcalá published a grammar, vocabulary, and catechism (Alcalá 1505) in the Arabic dialect of Granada as an aid in the effort to convert the Arabic speaking Muslims to Christianity. Another Arabic vocabulary was produced in Valencia in the early 1600's. Furthermore, Antonio de Nebrija, in his Gramática castellana published in 1492 after the reconquest of Granada but before Columbus' discovery,

makes frequent comparisons of the sounds of Spanish to those of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic. Nebrija's book was the first grammar of a Romance vernacular written in Europe and served as a model for the grammars of Native American languages that were later written in colonial Latin America.<sup>2e</sup> If we assume, then, that Parra may have had some familiarity with Arabic, and if we note that some Guatemalan languages had a pharyngeal sound similar to the Arabic /ʕ/, including the language spoken in the vicinity of the social and political center of the country, then it should not be surprising that it would have occurred to Parra to use the Arabic letter "ʕain", that is, <ʕ>, to write this sound.

The cuatrillo is not so easily explained; however, the logic behind it could conceivably have been something like this: a letter is needed for the sound [k']; this sound is not found in other languages that were well known at the time so a letter could not be borrowed from another language; the /q'/ would be written with the Arabic letter <ʕ>, which looks somewhat like a 3; therefore, one might use the next number, 4, to write /k'/. The fact that this number begins with the sound [k] in Spanish may have had some influence on the choice of this numeral rather than some other like 2. In any case, once the letter <4> was chosen for the /k'/ for whatever reason, the letters for the phonemes /ch'/ and /tz'/ follow quite logically. The phoneme /ch'/ sounds somewhat like the sound of /ch/ but

with a difference which is similar to the difference between /k/ and /k'/. If /ch/ is written as <ch>, that is, by <c> (which has the sound [k] in Spanish except when before front vowels) followed by <h>, then /ch'/ should be written as <çh>, that is by <ç> (which has the sound [k']) followed by <h>. My explanation of <ç> is somewhat more speculative, but perhaps reasonable nevertheless. In Nebrija's time in the 15th century, the Spanish letters <ç> (or optionally <c> before front vowels) and <z> were pronounced [ts] and [dz], respectively. By Parra's time in the 16th century, Spanish had undergone some rather extensive phonological changes. Among these changes was one which changed the sounds of both <ç> and <z> to [s], and thus both of these letters are used for the phoneme /s/ in the colonial Quiché orthography.<sup>27</sup> However, it is possible that Parra had some knowledge of the former pronunciation of <ç>; perhaps there were even some people who still pronounced it that way. If so, then the logic behind <ç> may have been something like this: the sound of /tz'/ is similar to the sound of /tz/; however, /tz'/ differs from /tz/ in the same way that /k'/ differs from /k/; since the sound of the Quiché phoneme /tz/ was formerly written <ç> in Spanish (that is, as <c>, which is pronounced [k] except before front vowels, with a cedilla written underneath), then it would make sense to write /tz'/ as <ç> (which has the sound [k']) with a cedilla underneath; however, it is difficult to write a cedilla under <ç>

because it already has a tail which goes below the line; therefore, one could write the cedilla to the side of the cuatrillo (<4,>).

As can be seen, the letter <k> was used to represent the phoneme /q/. One might consider the possibility of an Arabic connection for this convention too since there seems to be a history of transliterating the Arabic letter "qaaf" as <k> in Spanish: note, for example, that the name of the country Iraq is always spelled <Irak> in Spanish. There are some other facts, however, which make this idea somewhat less than compelling. For one thing, it is known that the colloquial dialects of Arabic spoken in Spain did not have /q/. Thus, Pedro de Alcalá consistently wrote <c> or <qu> (both of which represent the sound [k]) in his transcriptions of Granadan Arabic words which would have had /q/ in Classical Arabic. Furthermore, the letter <k> was used for the sound [k'] in the orthography developed for the Yucatec Maya language, which does not have /q/. I think it is probably more likely that there was simply a tradition of using the letter <k> to transcribe any foreign k-like sound. In Quiché (as in Arabic) that "foreign k-like" sound turned out to be [q] while in Yucatec it turned out to be [k']. Note also that the prevelar sounds were never distinguished in the colonial orthography, which probably means that these sounds did not exist in Colonial Quiché.

The colonial orthography, with the addition of the Parra letters and other special symbols, proved to be a reasonably workable orthography for Quiché. It was not without its problems, however. One of the principal problems was that while some writers used all of the special symbols with extreme accuracy, many others used them very sloppily. Some writers would only use the special letters sporadically in some words while other writers might use any of the various Parra letters indiscriminately for any "strange" sound. Even when the symbols were used accurately, however, there still were potential problems. For one thing, vowel length was never written nor was there any provision for writing /h/. The Spanish grammarians apparently did have some awareness of the vowel length distinctions since they were sporadically noted in some of the early dictionaries. Thus, if two words which formed a minimal pair differing only in vowel length fell together in the dictionary listing, they would be given separate entries with identical spellings. However, one of the entries would have the annotation "breve" ('short') and the other would have the annotation "larga" ('long'). In cases where there was no minimal pair like this, there was no annotation of vowel length.

There were three methods of indicating the glottal stop which were used sporadically in the colonial orthography. Either a grave or circumflex accent was used over the vowel



preceding the glottal stop, or the vowel preceding the glottal stop might be doubled. The latter method was probably a recognition of the echo vowel which sometimes is phonetically inserted after a glottal stop. Thus, the word *chee7* 'tree' might be written as <chè>, <chê>, or <chee>. Most commonly, however, such a word would have been written as <che>; that is, the glottal stop was usually not written at all. Furthermore, the doubled vowel method was ambiguous since two consecutive vowels could also represent a /V7V/ sequence. Thus, both *reeta7aam* 's/he knows it' (phrase-final) and *reeta7m* 's/he knows it' (non phrase-final) could have been written <retaam> (if indeed the second form even existed in Colonial Quiché; if it did exist, it could have also been written <retâm>, <retâm>, or <retam> though I am not sure that it ever was).

Another problem was that /u/, /uu/, and /w/ were never distinguished in the colonial orthography since any of these three phonemes could have been written as <u> or <v> as was common in European languages at the time. Generally the practice was that the first one of these three phonemes to appear in a word was written as <v>, and any subsequent one in the same word was written as <u>. This rule was not always strictly adhered to, however; and a word like *wuuj* 'paper' might appear as <vuĥ>, <uvĥ>, <uuĥ>, or <vvĥ>, though the first was probably the most common way. The

voiceless allophone of /w/ was also frequently written as <uh>. Thus the word uleew 'land' was frequently written as <vleuh>. Note that this means that at least some of the above spellings of wuuj could also be interpreted as /u(u)w/ although no such word seems to exist. Note also that any of these spellings could be taken to represent /u7j/ or /u(u)7u(u)j/.

A similar situation existed with the phonemes /i/, /ii/, and /y/, any of which could be written as <i>, <y>, or <j>. Usually the first such phoneme in a word was written as <y>, and any subsequent one in the same word was written as <i>. Thus, the word iwiiir 'yesterday' could have been written as <yvir>, though there were also other possibilities.<sup>28</sup> The <j> was rather rare, and if it was used at all, it was usually used as the second member of a doubled vowel. Thus, a word like ti7iiij 'meat' might have been written <tijh>. Although /y/, like /w/, may be voiceless in word final position, this was never written as <ih> as might be suspected from the use of <uh>. Similarly the voiceless /r/ was never written as <rh>. Campbell (1977:121) claims that <lh> was used for the voiceless allophone of /l/, but I have never actually encountered this myself.

During the 19th century Brasseur de Bourbourg published a grammar of Quiché (Brasseur de Bourbourg 1862) which was

largely an annotated edition of a manuscript grammar written a century earlier by Francisco Ximénez. Ximénez, of course, had used the colonial orthography; however, Brasseur introduced some changes in his published version: the letter <q> was substituted for <ɸ>, and the letter <g> was substituted for <ɣ>. Furthermore, Brasseur generally wrote <ɸh> as <ch> and <ɸ, > as <tz>; thus, he did not distinguish /ch'/ from /ch/ nor /tz'/ from /tz/. These new conventions have since been followed by others in printed editions of colonial Quiché manuscripts such as those found, for example, in Recinos (1957).

The orthography labeled "Officialized" in table 5 is probably the most commonly used alphabet for Quiché today. This is not to say that it is commonly used since Quiché is seldom written by anybody in any alphabet. Nevertheless, the officialized alphabet is the one which is most commonly taught and the one which has the most published literature (mostly Bible translations, health pamphlets, spelling primers, and the like). This alphabet was approved at a conference held in 1949 for the purpose of deciding upon a practical alphabet for writing the languages of Guatemala. This conference was attended largely by members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (or SIL, affiliated with the Wycliff Bible Translators) and other foreign linguists and anthropologists. The alphabet that was decided upon was adopted by the Summer Institute of Linguistics for use in

its work with the Quiché language. It was also adopted by the Instituto Indigenista Nacional (National Indianist Institute or IIN), and for this reason it is referred to as the "officialized" alphabet. It is not, however, referred to as the "official" alphabet because the Guatemalan government has never enacted any kind of legislation adopting this alphabet as "official" in any sense. Since this alphabet has been adopted by the SIL and the IIN, it has also been used by a number of other entities including those which conduct courses in "castellanización" for the purpose of teaching Indians to speak, read, and write Spanish. In these courses the students are usually taught to read and write their own language first using the officialized alphabet before beginning to learn Spanish. The officialized alphabet has also been used by the recent Proyecto Nacional de Educación Bilingüe (National Bilingual Education Project or PRONEBI) though not without some dissent by some of the participants. The most recent publication describing this orthography is a booklet published by the Instituto Indigenista Nacional (1977).

As can be seen in table 5, the officialized alphabet owes quite a bit to the colonial orthography; however, a number of changes have been made to make it conform more to modern Spanish orthographic practice. Thus, for example, <j> rather than <h> is used for /j/. Also the Parra letters

have been eliminated in favor of symbols which can be found on a typewriter and which more consistently display the nature of the phonemic system. The most important change is that consistent symbols have been adopted for indicating vowel length and the glottal stop. The result is an alphabet which is more or less phonemic in that all phonemic distinctions are made (with the exception of the "phoneme" /h/) and most symbols represent one and only one phoneme. It is not the case, however, that each phoneme is represented by one and only one symbol principally because this alphabet continues to transport into Quiché the traditional Spanish convention of writing /k/ as <qu> before front vowels and as <c> elsewhere.

It should also be noted that the prevelar phonemes are represented as <qui> and <q'ui>. Thus, a word like /kyeej/ 'horse' is written as <quiej>. This is aesthetically unpleasant because it gives the false impression that this word begins with a velar stop followed by a diphthong when in fact it begins with a prevelar stop (in some dialects) followed by a long vowel. Nevertheless, this convention does not seem to cause any kind of problem and actually overcomes one of the problems we saw with the PLFM alphabet. Since the prevelar stop /ky/ is written as <qui>, this leaves the sequence <cy> free to indicate the sequence /k/ followed by /y/ that was seen in the word /-yik+yaʔ/ 'to winnow'. This stem is spelled <-yicya'>, which is

unambiguous since if it had a prevelar stop would have been written <-yiquia'>. This alphabet has other similar peculiarities, however, which are definitely unaesthetic. In some cases the phoneme /y/ is written as <i> as if it were a vowel when, for example, it is preceded by a consonant. An example is the word /tyo7j/ 'fat', which is written <tio'j>. Similarly the phoneme /w/ is sometimes written as <u> under the same conditions, as in /pwaq/ 'money', which is written <puäk>.

The most serious problem with this alphabet is that, like the colonial alphabet, its principles are not consistently applied. Thus, even though it is possible to indicate all of the phonemic distinctions of Quiché using this alphabet, there is a very strong tendency for writers using this alphabet to ignore vowel length and the glottal stop. Furthermore, even if vowel length were consistently indicated, the use of the diaeresis on the short vowels can get to be troublesome. Using the diaeresis on the short vowel /ä/ in a six vowel dialect makes sense, especially if this vowel contrasts with the long /a/ only in final syllables, because the short /ä/ seems to function as the marked vowel in these dialects. However, marking all short vowels with a diaeresis in a ten vowel dialect can get to be rather unwieldy, as can be seen in words like /ka#0#tikir+i+taj+ik/ 'it begins', which would have to be

written <cātiq̄irītājic>. As can be seen, a ten vowel dialect which contrasts vowel length in all syllables would be much easier to read if the long vowels were marked rather than the short ones. Another problem is the use of <'> for the glottal stop since, as we have seen, this makes it difficult to distinguish between /C7/ and /C'//.

The fourth column in table 5 presents an alphabet which was invented by Adrián Inés Chávez. This is the only one of the four orthographies shown in table 5 which has been developed entirely by a Quiché speaker. Chávez was the founder of the Academia de la Lengua Maya-Quiché (Academy of the Maya-Quiché Language) in 1959. He presented his alphabet to the educational authorities in 1963 as a better orthography for alphabetization in Quiché speaking communities, but it was rejected on the grounds that the officialized alphabet was more "scientific" (Sam Colop 1983:29). Chávez's orthography is presented and explained in a book (Chávez no date) which was produced with the aid of a special typewriter, funded by a German foundation, which allows Chávez to type the special characters of his orthography. The fact that there is only one such typewriter, which was produced at great expense, is a serious obstacle to the general adoption of Chávez's alphabet. Furthermore, Chávez's work has been pretty much ignored by the scholarly community. Nevertheless, his alphabet has found favor with some native speakers of

Quiché, who use it occasionally for writing (by hand) letters and other types of documents in Quiché. The Quichés who use this alphabet tend to be some of the younger, more educated ones, many of whom have recently taken an interest in maintaining traditional Quiché culture. Such persons are proud of the fact that one of their own people was able to develop a viable writing system for their language and also tend to resent the fact that the officialized alphabet has been imposed upon them by foreigners and non-Indian Guatemalans. This imposition has been seen as a further example of the same kind of paternalism that they ascribe to the IIN and the program of *castellanización*, which have generally looked upon the native peoples as a "problem" for Guatemala which had to be alleviated by trying to "incorporate" them into the "mainstream" of Guatemalan society (cf. Sam Colop 1983:32-4).

Chávez's orthography employs the special letters < b, \*, v, k, ◊, d, ƒ > for the phonemes /b', ch', k', q, q', t', tz'/, respectively. The letter <\*> resembles a star, which is *ch'umiil* in Quiché, a word beginning with the phoneme /ch'/. The letter <◊> resembles the sun, which is *q'iiij* in Quiché, a word which begins with the phoneme /q'/. The letter <v> is borrowed from scandinavian runes where it represented the sound [k]. Chávez claims that the sound of this letter was similar to the sound of the phoneme /k'/'



which this letter represents in his alphabet (Chávez no date:68). This alphabet also uses the letter <ñ>, which is not shown in table 5. Chavez (no date:68) claims that this letter is used in only one word: <sañab> = /sanyāb'/ 'sand'. Note that in Santa María Chiquimula this word has the form /sanayib'/.

In addition to the special letters, Chávez's alphabet employs a number of accent marks. The grave accent over a vowel represents a word-final glottal stop, as in <chè> = /cheeʔ/ 'tree'. A circumflex accent over a vowel represents a preconsonantal glottal stop, as in <ḅôj> = /b'oʔj/ 'pot'. Apparently Chávez uses these two symbols for the same phoneme because he does not recognize the /ʔ/ as a consonant. He describes the grave accent as representing a rapid pronunciation of the vowel and the circumflex as representing a prolonged pronunciation of the vowel (Chávez no date:69). True vowel length is not consistently indicated in his alphabet, however. Chávez is originally from San Francisco el Alto where a six vowel dialect is spoken. He claims that there are some words in Quiché which do not have vowels, for example, <chj> = /chāj/ 'pine'. Apparently the phoneme /ā/ has a shwa-like sound in his dialect, and he does not seem to consider [ə] to be a vowel. Chávez always writes the long vowel /a/ as <a> as in <chaj> = /chaj/ 'ashes'. Thus, in some cases he does have a way, though a rather strange one, of distinguishing /a/ and /ā/.

However, he is not consistent about this because he writes <a> in numerous words which should have /ã/, for example, <abaj> = /ab'ãj/ 'rock'. Note in table 5 that Chávez's alphabet is similar to the officialized alphabet in the way it represents the prevelar phonemes and in its use of <i> and <u> in certain environments for writing /y/ and /w/.

Chávez also uses an acute accent to indicate stress. This accent is employed according to the same rules as in Spanish orthography. In Spanish it is assumed that the stress falls on the penultimate syllable if the word ends in a vowel, <n>, or <s>, but it is assumed to fall on the final syllable of a word ending in any other consonant. If a given word is stressed in conformity with this assumption, no accent mark is written. However, if the stress falls on a syllable such that it does not conform with the assumption, then an acute accent is written over the vowel of that syllable. Chávez follows this exact same rule for using the acute accent in Quiché. Note, however, that this practice is completely absurd in a language like Quiché. In Spanish stress is phonemic: *termino* 'I finish', *término* 'end (noun)', *terminó* 's/he finished'. However, stress is not phonemic in Quiché. It is entirely predictable, falling regularly on the final syllable; therefore, there is no need to write it at all.

The final orthography shown in table 5 is one that was

originally adopted by Manuel Salazar for use in his thesis on Cakchiquel literature (Salazar Tetzagüic 1978). He does not say in any detail how he arrived at this alphabet other than to say (Salazar Tetzagüic 1978:4) that after studying the various existing alphabets, and having had some experience in trying to transcribe and translate texts, he decided to use the alphabet shown. Thus, this is the second alphabet in table 5 which was developed by a native speaker of a Mayan language; however, unlike Chávez's, Salazar's appears to be a derivative of the others. It appears to be most like the PLFM alphabet since it uses <k, k', q, q'> for the phonemes /k, k', q, q'/. However, Salazar abandons the controversial <7> in favor of the <'> used in the officialized alphabet. Salazar's alphabet is also similar to the officialized alphabet in the way it represents the prevelar sounds and in its use of <i> and <u> in some environments for /y/ and /w/. It also uses <d> for /t'/, which seems to be similar in spirit to Chávez's use of <ɲ> for this phoneme. Enrique Sam, a Quiché speaker, has also occupied himself with the alphabet problem; and in his thesis on bilingual education laws (Sam Colop 1983:29-32), he compares some of the alphabets that have been proposed and concludes that an alphabet which is essentially the same as Salazar's should be adopted as a unified alphabet for the Mayan languages since it includes symbols which are either common to several of the other alphabets or which appear to

him to be the most convenient and practical.

As can be seen, then, there have been a number of attempts to create a practical orthography for Quiché. Each of the alphabets discussed is at least partially phonemic, and each to a greater or lesser degree attempts to incorporate some of the conventions of Spanish orthography. Each of the orthographies has achieved a certain degree of success in trying to represent the reality of Quiché phonology, but none of them is completely without problems of either a linguistic or a sociological nature or both. All of the orthographies currently used, with the possible exception of Chávez's, seem to have more similarities than differences, yet this has not been a deterrent to hostility between the proponents of the different alphabets. Some Quiché speakers and others have considered the proliferation of alphabets to be more of a hindrance to progress than anything else, and there have been some proposals for trying to come to some kind of agreement.

In recent years there have been a number of conferences held for the purpose of trying to resolve the "alphabet question", but generally all that was agreed to is to continue to disagree. However, in 1987, a group of Guatemalans who are native speakers of Mayan languages, many of whom have had training in linguistics, formed the Academia de las Lenguas Mayas, and are trying to attain some

kind of official recognition for the organization. Recently they have taken matters into their own hands and have held a number of meetings in order to decide for themselves what kind of alphabets they will officially recognize for the various Mayan languages. At these meetings, only those who are native speakers of Mayan languages were allowed to vote on the various orthography questions that were considered. The result of these meetings was the adoption, for all of the Mayan languages of Guatemala, symbols and principles which are identical to those advocated by the PLFM and used in this dissertation. The only exception to this is the treatment of the glottal stop. In this case it was decided to use the symbol <'>, as in the officialized alphabet, rather than the controversial <7> formerly advocated by the PLFM. While the Summer Institute of Linguistics has generally been opposed to this development, the PLFM has gone along with the proposals of the Academia and has officially adopted <'> as its symbol for the glottal stop in place of <7>.

On November 23, 1987, as reported in the *Mayan Linguistics Newsletter* (vol. XIV, no. 2, April 1988), the president of Guatemala, Marco Vinicio Cerezo Arévalo signed a presidential decree (acuerdo gubernativo no. 1046-87) which made official the alphabets which had been adopted by the Academia de las Lenguas Mayas. While I personally

approve of and support this development, I have retained the use of <7> for the glottal stop in this work.<sup>29</sup> The principal reason for this is that the major portion of this work was completed before I became aware of the official status of the new alphabet, and I find it too difficult at this point to convert all of my glottal stops to <'> without simultaneously converting all of my numeral sevens also to <'>.

## NOTES

1. Note that there have been some minor modifications, largely made at the suggestion of native speakers, in the practical orthographies used by the PLFM since the publication of Kaufman (1976a). The only such modification which applies to Quiché is the use of doubled vowels (i. e. <aa, ee, ii, oo, uu>) to represent long vowels (see table 2) in place of the vowel + colon (i. e. <a:, e:, i:, o:, u:>) that was advocated in Kaufman (1976a). As of 1987, the PLFM has begun to use the alphabet adopted by the Academia de las Lenguas Mayas, which is discussed at the end of this chapter.
  
2. The "six vowel" system is probably an areal phenomenon. It is also found in some Cakchiquel dialects, which contrast with other "nine vowel dialects" of Cakchiquel. There is some evidence that in Quiché the six vowel system is spreading among younger speakers, at least in some areas. Terrence Kaufman (personal communication; cf. Kaufman 1976a:106-7) reports that older speakers in Totonicapán have ten vowels while younger speakers have six.
  
3. Proto-Quichean morphemes of the form \*(C)V7C have also become (C)VVC in Quiché, and Campbell (1977:38) claims that these long vowels too remain long in non-final

syllables; however, he presents no examples which would demonstrate this to be true. In any case, I think there is plenty of evidence that it is not true. For example, from the adjective teew 'cold' (< \*te7w in Proto-Quichean according to Campbell 1977:44) one can derive a noun stem -tewaal 'cold(ness)' in which the root vowel is clearly short in the non-final syllable. Note, incidently, that modern Quiché morphemes of the form (C)V7C are reconstructed as \*(C)V7VC in Proto-Quichean (Campbell 1977:44). In Cubulco, however, according to Campbell (1977:14), even /7/ from this source has disappeared (without a trace since Cubulco also has lost all vowel length contrasts).

4. One can not resolve this by looking at the transcriptions of the tapes in the text since the marking of vowel length in the text is not always reliable. Furthermore, the tapes are not at present available to me so I have not been able to recheck what I heard. It should be further noted that the contrast between /ā/ and /a/ is not always maintained even in final syllables in Cantel: the contrast is neutralized before /7/ with only the long vowel /a/ appearing in that environment.
5. There is one exception to this: in Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, but not in Nahualá, the word meaning



'house' (Proto-Quichean \*jaah) appears as *jaa*. Thus, rather than shortening the vowel before /h/ in this word, the vowel length is retained and the /h/ is dropped.

6. Certain particles such as *wih* and *nah* are exceptions to this. The particle *wih*, which is placed after a predicate when a locative phrase is fronted, does not lengthen its vowel when it appears in non phrase-final position. This is illustrated in (i).

- (i) (a) *chwa jaa k'oo wih*  
 in.front.of house be.someplace PARTICLE  
 'At home is where s/he is.'
- (b) *chwa jaa k'oo wi chwe7q*  
 PARTICLE tomorrow  
 'At home is where s/he will be tomorrow.'

(Similarly, the particle *nah* does not lengthen its vowel when the /h/ is dropped in non phrase final position.) Kaufman (personal communication) has suggested that this is because the vowel in *wih* is underlyingly short whereas the vowel in *k'ih* is underlyingly long. There is a problem with this, however, in that the vowel in *k'ih* was originally short in Proto-Quichean (cf. Du Bois 1985:68). Nevertheless, there is a further difference between words like *k'ih*

and words like *wih*. Words like *k'ih* ended in /h/ in Proto-quichean; however, there is comparative evidence (see Du Bois 1985) that some words, including *wih* and *nah*, ended in vowels in Proto-Quichean in spite of the fact that they end in /h/ in modern Quiché. It is possible that the different treatment of the vowels may be related to this in some way; for example, the underlying vowel length may be relevant only in those words which originally ended in vowels. It is also possible, however, that the length of these vowels has more to do with the fact that the particles are unstressed in sentences like (1b) (sometimes the vowel is dropped non phrase-finally, as well as the /h/, in *wih* and it is pronounced [u]) whereas the quantifier in (2b) has at least some degree of stress.

7. Again, particles like *wiuh* and *naah* are exceptions in that their vowels are short in non phrase-final position as illustrated in (i) below. (Cf. the Nahualá/Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán forms in footnote 6.)

(i) (a) cho                jaah    k'oo                wiuh  
                              in.front.of house be.someplace PARTICLE  
                              'It was at home that s/he was.'

(b) cho    jaah    k'oo    wi'                chwe7q  
                              PARTICLE tomorrow  
                              'It is at home that s/he will be tomorrow.'

Note that the two sentences above are Momostenango forms. The Santa María Chiquimula forms are identical except that in each case the first word is *chi*.

8. The possible exceptions that I am aware of are *-wareh* 'tooth', *ak'wa(a)h* 'tamal de elote (tamale made of fresh corn)', and *naab'eeh* 'first'. The stem *-wareh* is a compound of *-wa(ch)* 'face' and *r-eeh* 'his/her/its tooth'. The last morpheme, *eeh* 'tooth' now appears in isolation only as a day name in the Mayan calendar; however, it originally had a long vowel (cf. Tzutujil *eey*), which would lead one to expect the final vowel of *-wareh* to be long also. It is also curious that the unpossessed form of this stem, which requires a suffix *-a(a)j*, uncharacteristically shows a glottal stop inserted between the root and the suffix: *wareʔa(a)j*. The second morpheme of *ak'wa(a)h* is the same morpheme *wa(a)h* 'food' that we have already seen; therefore, one would expect this word to pattern like the word *kaxlanwah* discussed below in the text. For some speakers this is true; but some speakers seem to have a long vowel in both the possessed and unpossessed forms while others seem to have a short vowel in both forms. The word *naab'eeh* has the expected long vowel (cf. Tzutujil *najb'eey*). However, in non phrase-final position the vowel often strikes me as being short though I have to admit that for some reason I have a

hard time hearing the length of the final vowel in this word.

9. Actually, (8d) is regular in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, where this word has the form *aanimah*. It may be that the vowel does not lengthen in (8c) because of the consonant cluster. It also may be that the vowel does not lengthen in (8d) in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula because it is in the antepenultimate syllable. Since I do not have other examples of borrowed words with these characteristics, however, I am unable to prove these hypotheses.
  
10. In Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán all words of this class follow the same rules as other words ending in /h/: the vowel is short before /h/, and the /h/ is dropped and the final vowel lengthened when the word is in non phrase-final position. Furthermore, in these two dialects, many, perhaps all, of the nouns in this class are of the type which lengthen their final vowel when possessed. As usual when such a vowel is lengthened, the /h/ is dropped.
  
11. Terrence Kaufman (personal communication) says that one motivation for writing /h/ in dialects like Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán has to do with stress assignment. Stress in Quiché is regularly placed on

the last syllable of a word in isolation. There is at least one exception to this, however. When an adjective appears before a noun that it modifies, the adjective takes a suffix -V. An example is seen in (i).

- (i) (a) nim  
       `big'
- (b) nim-a               jaa  
           big-ATTRIBUTIVE   house  
           `big house'

Though this suffix forms part of the final syllable of the adjective under such conditions, this suffix is never stressed. Indeed, it often sounds like it is the syllable preceding this suffix which receives the stress, although this stress is significantly weaker than the stress on the final syllable of the modified noun. Quiché words generally end in consonants except for those /h/-final words which appear in non phrase-final position, in which case the /h/ is dropped and the vowel lengthened. Thus, a more accurate version of the stress rule could be stated as follows: stress the final syllable of a word which ends in a consonant or in a long vowel. Note that such a formulation of the stress rule may also relate to the presence of a short vowel in the particles *wih* and *nah*, discussed in

footnote 6, which lose /h/, but which do not lengthen their vowels, and which are unstressed, when they appear in non phrase-final position. Actually, of course, an accurate treatment of Quiché phonology would probably have to be stated in terms of lengthening stressed final vowels rather than in terms of assigning stress to final long vowels; however, the point is that by writing /h/ when it occurs in the Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialects one can accurately determine stress placement in written Quiché. Note, however, that writing /h/ would not serve any such useful purpose in dialects like Momostengo and Santa María Chiquimula. In these dialects the vowel is not always lengthened when /h/ is dropped. Thus, for example, in sentence (7a) in the text, the final /h/ is dropped in the word *kaxnwah* because it appears in non phrase-final position. Furthermore, the final vowel in this word is not lengthened; nevertheless, the final vowel in this word is stressed.

12. Henne (1980) lists the word *sik'aj* 'apazote (a type of herb)'; however, my informant insists that this word should be pronounced *siky'aj*.
13. The Proto-Quichean word *\*ha7* 'water' has become *ja7* in modern Quiché; however, *\*/h/* regularly becomes */y/* between vowels.

14. Even if one were to decide that the velars and prevelars were separate phonemes from a traditional point of view, they would still have to be related from the point of view of generative phonology. As will be discussed in section 3.2.3.2, there is a suffix *-C<sub>1</sub>oj* which can be added to an adjective to derive a new adjective meaning 'somewhat (adjective)'. Thus, from the adjective *kaq* 'red' (Momostenango dialect), one can derive the adjective *kaqkoj* 'reddish'. In Cantel this latter word has the form *kyaqkoj*. Since the suffix involves reduplication, this would seem to indicate that the underlying form of this word in Cantel must be the same as the surface form in Momostenango and that there must be a phonological rule which changes /k/ to [k̟] in the appropriate environment. Given, therefore, that such a rule would be needed anyway, one could argue that many, if not all, prevelars should be derived from underlying velars by the appropriate rule.
15. Actually the situation is slightly different for those speakers of six vowel dialects like Cantel Quiché who maintain no vowel length contrasts in non-final syllables. For such speakers the contrast between /a/ and /ã/ is maintained in final syllables that end in any consonant other than /ʔ/ or /h/. But in other environments the contrast is neutralized, and any low

central vowel which appears in such an environment is pronounced either as /a/ or /ā/ in free variation although it is always written as <a>. Some examples are seen in (i).

(i) (a) chak 'work' (noun)

/-chak+un/ > -chakun 'to work'

(b) kyāq 'red'

/-kyāq+ār/ > -kyaqār 'to turn red'

None of this discussion is relevant to the other four vowels of Cantel Quiché since there is no vowel length contrast with these.

16. Of course such a rule would have to be ordered after the vowel shortening rule discussed previously.
17. This example is not as compelling as it could be since some of the forms of this verb (e.g., -toh, as discussed above) are irregular and since some of the forms are different in other dialects. According to Henne (1980), this verb has the form -ta7o in phrase-final position in Chichicastenango. In Cantel, it has the form -ta7 in phrase-final position, and the Completive Passive has the form -ta7tāj. In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the verbal noun has the form ta7ik. All of these forms suggest a final



/ʔ/ in the root rather than a final /h/. However, all of these dialects have -ta(a) in non phrase-final position; and the latter two dialects agree with Nahualá in having -too in phrase-final position. There are also some forms in Cantel which do not exhibit the /ʔ/. Another example of the phenomenon being discussed here, which may be somewhat clearer, can be seen in the adjective tzah 'salty' (in Momostenango, tzaa, i. e., [tsa·ʔ]). As will be discussed in section 3.2.3.2, such adjectives can take a suffix -Cioj, which derives a new adjective meaning 'somewhat (adjective)'. When this suffix is added to tzah, the result is tzaatzoj 'somewhat salty'. The long vowel in the penultimate syllable can be explained if we assume that the root ends in /h/ (which it clearly does) and that there is a rule which changes /h/ to vowel length before consonants. Such examples seem to be pretty few and far between, however.

18. Historically there seem to be some cases where \*/h/ underwent different changes between vowels. For example, there are cases where \*/h/ appeared between two vowels and resulted in a single long vowel in the modern language. One example is paar 'skunk' < Proto-Quichean \*pahar (Campbell 1977:48). This may be what happened with the phrase-final form of the verb -tah discussed above: /-tah+oh/ > -tooh. This latter form

would then become *-toh*, as observed, in Nahualá since, as discussed previously, only short vowels appear before /h/ in this dialect. There are other examples which suggest that \*/h/ sometimes became /w/ between vowels if one of the flanking vowels was [+round]. One example is *k(a)woq*, a day name of the Mayan calendar. The Pocomchí form of this word, *kahog*, suggests that the Proto-Quichean form must have been *\*kahog*. Neither of these rules appears to be synchronically productive, however.

19. Word initial \*/h/ in Proto-Quichean has in Quiché generally become /w/ before rounded vowels and /j/ elsewhere though there are some exceptions to this.
20. In word-final position the most salient difference between /p/ and /b'/, at least to the ears of a non-native speaker, is the aspiration of the /p/. In Cantel, where /p/ is generally unaspirated, it is rather difficult to hear the difference between /p/ and /b'/ in word-final position.
21. According to Campbell (1977:15), there is a rule /m/ > /n/ /\_\_\_# in the dialect of Joyabaj. In the other dialects with which I am familiar it often sounds like /n/ becomes /m/ before bilabials; however, the native speakers I have worked with unanimously reject this

claim and insist on writing <n> for underlying /n/ before bilabials.

22. I will observe this orthographic convention here; however, it should be noted that native speakers have a very strong tendency to ignore the convention. I know of no case where the presence or absence of the quotation mark would lead to ambiguity by failing to distinguish between two native words although it is technically a possibility. There are a few such ambiguities involving Spanish borrowings, e. g., uul 'landslide', uul" 'rubber' (< Spanish.. hule). Some speakers, however, may have some kind of vowel at the end of the second of these words.
23. For those speakers of the Santa María Chiquimula dialect who do not have [ʃ], (27a) and (28) are pronounced identically. In other dialects these two words are pronounced differently, (27a) being [waliʃaʃ] and (28) being either [walaʃaʃ] or [walʃaʃ].
24. The speakers I have worked with who have the sound [ʃ] seem to feel rather strongly that this sound should be written as <d> and tended to resist the suggestion that it should be written as <l>. They continued to feel uncomfortable writing this sound as <l> even after they came to understand what phonemes and allophones were and how the PLFM orthography was supposed to work.

Even arguments phrased in terms of Quiché unity did not entirely convince them. These strong feelings could be taken as evidence for native speakers' intuitions about what is and is not a phoneme in this dialect. However, it is also possible that these strong feelings resulted from a knowledge of Spanish: [ʃ] is an allophone of /d/ in Spanish and is always written as <d>. It is also possible that a certain amount of home-town pride was involved in their reluctance to spell words in the same way as other dialects. Thus, this evidence should probably be considered inconclusive.

25. As Campbell (1977:120) notes, this date even rivals that of the earliest written documents in some European languages such as Finnish (1543) and Latvian (1531). Actually if one also considers the older hieroglyphic writing system, it is possible that the beginning of writing in Quiché may antedate that of many other languages too.

26. Alonso de Molina, in his Nahuatl grammar *Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana* published in Mexico City in 1571, clearly continues Nebrija's tradition of comparing the sounds of languages when he writes that the Nahuatl letter <ll> was to be pronounced as in Latin and not as in Spanish and that the letter <tz>, which has the same sound in Nahuatl as it does in

Quiché, should be pronounced like the Hebrew letter "tzade" (i. e., <צ>). Thus Molina, like Nebrija, must have had some familiarity with Semitic languages. It may or may not be relevant that Nebrija himself published a study of the Hebrew alphabet (Nebrija 1523). It is also the case that Nebrija's Latin-Spanish and Spanish-Latin dictionaries served as the model for Molina's *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana* (Mexico City, 1571) as well as for other bilingual dictionaries of Native American languages.

27. The letter <s> was rarely if ever used to write /s/ in Quiché. This was probably because this letter did not have the sound [s] in 16th century Spanish. Spanish words written with <s> which were borrowed into Quiché at this time usually have the sound [ʃ] in Quiché (see, e. g., example 8b in the text). However, the sound of <s> could not have been [ʃ] in Spanish since the letter <x> had that sound. It seems likely, then, that <s> must have had the sound that it has in modern Madrid Spanish, which sounds somewhat between the alveolar [s] and the alveolopalatal [ʃ]. Actually it is a voiceless tip-alveolar fricative, whereas /s/ in many modern Latin American dialects is a voiceless blade-alveolar fricative as in English. Quiché speakers probably would have identified the tip-alveolar fricative with

their phoneme /x/ rather than with their /s/. The letter <ç> is no longer used in modern Spanish. The letters <c> (before front vowels) and <z> both have the sound [θ] in modern Madrid Spanish, while <c> (before front vowels), <z>, and <s> are all pronounced [s] in modern Guatemalan Spanish.

28. Note that in Cakchiquel the word for 'house' is *jay* (= Quiché *jaa*) while the word for 'two' is *ka7i7* (= Quiché *keeb'*). As can be seen, the sounds of these two words are quite different; yet in the colonial orthography the first of these words was commonly written <hay> and the second was commonly written <cay> as if they rhymed (which in fact they do not).
29. It might be noted, however, that I did use an orthography identical to that which was eventually adopted by the Academia de las Lenguas Mayas in Larsen (1987).

## CHAPTER 3

### MORPHOLOGY I

In this and the next three chapters the most important aspects of Quiché morphology will be described. The inflectional morphology will be covered rather thoroughly; however, only some of the more important aspects of the derivational morphology will be considered here. Some of the important derivational processes will be omitted in the morphology chapters because they are more conveniently covered in the chapters on syntax.

#### 3.1 Morphological Processes

The primary morphological processes in Quiché are prefixation and suffixation. The vast majority of the prefixes are inflectional whereas the vast majority of the suffixes are derivational. Some of the derivational suffixes involve reduplication. Compounding is another important word-formation process, especially in the formation of nouns, of which there are a wide variety of compound types.

#### 3.2 Root and Stem Classes

The major root classes of Quiché are (1) pronoun, (2) noun, (3) adjective, (4) intransitive verb, (5) transitive verb, (6) positional, (7) adverb, and (8) particle. These

nine root classes are each defined by their inflectional and derivational possibilities and will be discussed in turn below.

Kaufman (1986a) distinguishes one further root class, which he calls "Affect" roots. These are mostly onomatopoeic morphemes, from which one can derive transitive and intransitive verbs by means of derivational suffixes some of which are said to be peculiar to this root class. One example of such an Affect root given by Kaufman (1986a) is the root *ch'in*, which can be used as an onomatopoeic word for the tinkling of a bell: *ch'in ch'in* 'tinkle tinkle'. A transitive verb can be derived from this root by means of the Repetitive suffix  $-V_2C_2a7$ :  $x+\emptyset+uu-ch'in-ich'a7$  's/he tinkled it repeatedly'. One can also derive an intransitive middle verb from this root by means of the suffix  $-V_2C_2ot$ :  $x+\emptyset+ch'in-ich'ot-ik$  'it tinkled'. Note, however, that the suffixes  $-V_2C_2a7$  and  $-V_2C_2ot$  can not be members of the set of derivational affixes which are peculiar to Affect roots because they may also be used on transitive and positional roots. There also seems to be a rather large degree of overlap between Affect roots and transitive roots in Quiché. These Affect roots and the special Affective verb stems which can be derived from them will not be discussed further here.

There are nine major stem classes in Quiché. Each of



the above mentioned root classes (including Affect roots) is also a stem class except for the positional class since positional roots are always bound.

A "root" is defined as "the most important morpheme of a word" in the sense that it is the bearer of the main lexical meaning. There is generally only one root morpheme in a word although in the case of compounds there may be two or more. A "stem" is the root plus any derivational affixes such that at most only inflectional morphemes must be added to form a complete word. In this work I will also employ the term "base" to refer to a form which consists of the root plus one or more derivational affixes but which is not a complete stem; that is, at least one more derivational affix must be added, in addition to any obligatory inflectional morphemes, in order to form a complete word. The term base generally will not be used to refer to any arbitrary collection of root plus derivational affixes, but rather will be used to refer just to those forms from which a family of related stems are derived. The term "word" refers to any form which may appear as a (non-phasal) sentence constituent without any additional inflectional or derivational morphology.

The morphology of personal pronouns, nouns, and adjectives will be discussed in this chapter. Intransitive verbs will be discussed in Chapter 4 and transitive verbs in

Chapter 5. Chapter 6 will deal with positionals, adverbs, and particles.

### 3.3 Personal Pronouns

The independent personal pronouns of Quiché are shown in table 1. The first person plural pronoun has the form *uj* in Cantel and Zunil. The third person plural pronoun is a contraction of *ee are7*, where *ee* is a plural morpheme. Some older speakers in Santa María Chiquimula still pronounce it this way. The normal form of the third person plural pronoun in Cantel is *e are7*. Some dialects, e. g. Chichicastenango (Henne 1980:xi), do not have the second person formal pronouns shown in table 1. James Mondloch (personal communication) says that there are coastal dialects of Quiché which use the second person plural pronoun *ix* for the formal second person (singular or plural). This usage is apparently also found sporadically in the *Popol Vuh*, as suggested by Brasseur (1861), although Edmonson (1971:78) denies that this is the case.<sup>1</sup> One also finds the formal second person pronouns

TABLE 1

#### Independent Pronouns

1 sg.	<i>in</i>	1 pl.	<i>oj</i>
2 sg. familiar	<i>at</i>	2 pl. familiar	<i>ix</i>
2 sg. formal	<i>laal</i>	2 pl. formal	<i>alaq</i>
3 sg.	<i>are7</i>	3 pl.	<i>a7re7</i>

shown in table 1 being used in the *Popol Vuh*.

### 3.4 Nouns

#### 3.4.1 Inflection

##### 3.4.1.1 Possessor Agreement

Nouns in Quiché are generally inflected for possessor agreement by means of a set of prefixes. These prefixes, shown in table 2, are sometimes referred to as "set A prefixes". As can be seen in table 2, each of the prefixes has two forms: one which is prefixed to consonant-initial stems and another which is prefixed to vowel-initial stems.<sup>2</sup> It should also be noted that in the formal second person the possessor agreement is not indicated by prefixes

TABLE 2  
Possessive Prefixes on Nouns

	<u>preconsonantal forms</u>	<u>prevocalic forms</u>
1sg	nu-	w-
2sg familiar	a-	aw-
2sg formal	laa	laa
3sg	u-	r-
1pl	qa-	q-
2pl familiar	i-	iw-
2pl formal	alaq	alaq
3pl	ki-	k-

but rather by one of the enclitic particles *laa* (singular) or *alaq* (plural). An example of a consonant-initial noun declined in all persons and numbers is shown in (1). A similar paradigm of a vowel-initial noun is shown in (2).<sup>3</sup>

- (1) (a) *sii7* 'firewood'  
 (b) *nusii7* 'my firewood'  
 (c) *asii7* 'your (sg.) firewood'  
 (d) *sii7 laa* 'your (sg. formal) firewood'  
 (e) *usii7* 'his/her firewood'  
 (f) *gasii7* 'our firewood'  
 (g) *isii7* 'your (pl.) firewood'  
 (h) *sii7 alaq* 'your (pl. formal) firewood'  
 (i) *kisii7* 'their firewood'
- (2) (a) *ooj* 'avocado'  
 (b) *wooj* 'my avocado'  
 (c) *awooj* 'your (sg.) avocado'  
 (d) *ooj laa* 'your (sg. formal) avocado'  
 (e) *rooj* 'his/her avocado'  
 (f) *qooj* 'our avocado(s)'  
 (g) *iwooj* 'your (pl.) avocado(s)'  
 (h) *ooj alaq* 'your (pl. formal) avocado(s)'  
 (i) *kooj* 'their avocado(s)'

In some dialects (e. g., Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, but not Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, or Cantel) the first person singular preconsonantal possessive

prefix has the form *in-* rather than *nu-* on a handful of nouns, mostly kinship terms. Thus, for example, the word *taat* 'father' has the first person singular form *intaat* 'my father' in Nahualá but *nutaat* in Momostenango.<sup>4</sup>

There are a few vowel-initial nouns which take the preconsonantal possessive prefixes rather than the expected prevocalic forms. Generally these nouns tend to be ones which are rarely, if ever, possessed anyway. Thus, for example, the noun *us* 'gnat', if it were to be possessed at all, would have the form *nu7uus* in the first person singular rather than the form *wuus*. One would rarely, if ever, have occasion to say 'my gnat', however. In any case, such words could be considered as having an initial glottal stop in the underlying form (e. g., /7us/) rather than merely the usual glottal stop inserted in the surface phonetic form (see section 2.2.2). In this way, then, such words actually would be consonant-initial; and the glottal stop which appears following the prefix in such words would be automatically accounted for.

#### 3.4.1.2 Number

Most nouns are not inflected for number; however, there are a few nouns which do take special suffixes to indicate plurality. The set of nouns taking plural inflection consists of some, but not all, of the nouns indicating

persons. The most common plural suffix has the form -VVb', where the vowel is usually either /aa/ or /ii/ but is otherwise unpredictable. Some examples are seen in (3-8).

- (3) (a) ixoq 'woman'  
 (b) ixoqiib' 'women'
- (4) (a) achii 'man'  
 (b) achyaab' (Momostenango) / achijaab' (other dialects) 'men'
- (5) (a) ak'aal 'child'  
 (b) ak'alaab' 'children'
- (6) (a) ajchaak 'worker'  
 (b) ajchakiib' 'workers'
- (7) (a) ajq'iiij 'calendar priest'  
 (b) ajq'ijaab' 'calendar priests'
- (8) (a) ajmiq'ina7 'person of Totonicapán'  
 (b) ajmiq'ina7iib' 'people of Totonicapán'

A few nouns have irregular plural forms, such as the examples in (9) and (10).

- (9) (a) ala 'boy, young man'  
 (b) alab'oom 'boys, young men'

(10) (a) ali 'girl, young woman'

(b) alitoom (Santa María Chiquimula, Nahualá, and  
Chichicastenango: alitomaab'; Cantel:  
alito7m) 'girls, young women'

### 3.4.1.3 Subject Agreement

Quiché nouns not only appear as the heads of noun phrases but also as predicates since there is no copula in Quiché. Predicate nouns are inflected for subject agreement by means of a set of proclitic particles. This set of proclitic particles, which is often referred to as "set B" (as opposed to the "set A" prefixes seen in table 2), are shown in table 3. As can be seen in table 3, the set B clitics are identical to the independent pronouns shown in table 1 except in the third person and in the formal second person singular. Note that the formal second person particles are enclitics rather than proclitics. Thus, the formal second person set B clitics are identical to the formal second person set A enclitics. In Cantel, Nahualá,

TABLE 3

#### Set B Clitics

1 sg.	in	1 pl.	oj
2 sg. familiar	at	2 pl. familiar	ix
2 sg. formal	laa	2 pl. formal	alaq
3 sg.	∅	3 pl	e7 ~ ee

and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the first person plural clitic has the form *uj*. In Cantel and Zunil the third person plural clitic has the form *e*. This morpheme *e7 ~ ee ~ e* is the same plural morpheme which comprises part of the third person plural independent pronoun *a7re7* ( < *ee are7* ). This plural clitic is also sometimes used in noun phrases before an animate noun to indicate that it is plural. Some examples can be seen in (11-12). As shown in (12) this morpheme is sometimes used even if the noun takes one of the special plural suffixes.□

(11) *ri e7 k'amal b'ee*  
 the PLURAL taker road  
 'the guides'

(12) *ri e7 achy-aab'*  
 the PLURAL man-PLURAL  
 'the men'

Note that the contraction rule discussed in section 2.2.2 will usually apply in such constructions. Therefore, (11) will most often be pronounced as *re7 k'amal b'ee*, and (12) will most often be pronounced as *ri a7chyaab'*. A sample paradigm of a predicate noun is shown in (13) using the noun *kunaneel* 'doctor'.

(13) (a) *in kunaneel* 'I am a doctor'  
 (b) *at kunaneel* 'you (sg.) are a doctor'



- (c) kunaneel laa 'you (sg. formal) are a doctor
- (d) kunaneel '(s/he is a) doctor'
- (e) oj kunaneel 'we are doctors'
- (f) ix kunaneel 'you (pl.) are doctors'
- (g) kunaneel alaq 'you (pl. formal) are doctors'
- (h) e7 kunaneel 'they are doctors'

The bare noun shown in (13d) would not ordinarily be interpreted as a predicate noun unless it were accompanied by some kind of overt subject NP. In all of the forms shown in (13), an independent pronoun may be used as an overt subject NP. A pronoun so used always appears preposed and is stressed. Such a pronoun will ordinarily be interpreted as contrastive although this is not necessarily so in the third person singular. Some examples are seen in (14).

- (14) (a) in in kunaneel  
I 1SG.B doctor  
'I am a doctor.'
- (b) a7re7 e7 kunaneel  
they 3PL.B doctor  
'They are doctors.'
- (c) are7 kunaneel  
s/he doctor  
'S/he is a doctor.'

(d) laal                      kunaneel    laa  
       you (sg. formal)    doctor        2SG.FORMAL  
       'You (sg. formal) are a doctor.'

There is another way of expressing a formal second person predicate noun, in addition to the way seen in (13c), (13g), and (14d), which avoids the ambiguity discussed in footnote 3 by using the independent pronouns. Using this alternative, 'you (sg. formal) are a doctor' would be expressed as (laal) laal kunaneel (cf. 13c and 14d) while 'you (pl. formal) are doctors' would be expressed as (alag) alag kunaneel (cf. 13g). Apparently this alternative expression is the only one possible in Nahaulá according to Mondloch (1978a:15).

### 3.4.2 Noun Classes

There have been a number of different schemes devised for classifying the nouns of Quiché and other Mayan languages (cf. for example, the classification in Henne 1980:xiii-xiv). One popular system classifies simple noun stems according to their behavior when possessed. This classification was originally devised by Kaufman (1971:106) for Tzeltal and has since been adapted by Kaufman and others for other Mayan languages (see, e. g., England 1983:66-70 for Mam and Dayley 1985:142-6 for Tzutujil). According to this classification, there are seven classes of nouns in Quiché, which are presented below.

### 3.4.2.1 Class 1

Class 1 nouns are those which undergo no change when possessed except for the addition of the set A possessive prefix. Some examples of these have already been seen in (1) and (2) above. Another example is seen in (15).

(15) (a) aj 'ear of fresh corn'

(b) waj 'my ear of fresh corn'

### 3.4.2.2 Class 1a

Class 1a includes those nouns which lengthen a short vowel in the final syllable when possessed. Many, but not all, nouns having a short vowel in the final syllable belong to this class. (An exception was seen in 15 above.) Some examples have already been seen in (3) and (6) of Chapter 2. Another example is seen in (16).

(16) (a) kinaq' 'bean(s)'

(b) nukinaaq' 'my bean(s)'

This class apparently does not exist in Cantel Quiché. In this dialect all nouns which have short vowels in the final syllable in the unpossessed form belong to class 1.

There are a number of nouns which originally had long vowels in the final syllable and belonged to class 1 but which now belong to class 1a in Momostenango and Santa María

Chiquimula because the final vowel has been shortened in the unpossessed form. For example, the word for 'corn' in Momostenango and Santa Maria Chiquimula is *ixim* while the first person singular form is *wixim* 'my corn'. Thus, this noun belongs to class 1a. However, in Nahualá this noun is in class 1, the unpossessed form being *ixim*; and this must have been the original form since the reconstructed form in Proto-Quichean is *\*ixi7m* (Campbell 1977:52).

### 3.4.2.3 Class 2

This class consists of those nouns which add a suffix in the possessed form. This suffix is generally of the form *-VV1*, where the quality of the vowel is unpredictable. Some examples are seen in (17-19).

(17) (a) *kik'* 'blood'

(b) *nukik'eel* 'my blood'

(18) (a) *b'aaq* 'bone'

(b) *nub'aqiil* 'my bone(s)'

(19) (a) *mu7j* 'shadow; shade'

(b) *umu7jaal* 'his/her/its shadow'

There is actually a fair number of nouns which belong to both class 2 and also either class 1 or class 1a, usually with some difference in meaning. An example is seen in (20).

(20) (a) tz'u7m 'skin; leather' (phrase-final form tz'u7um in Santa María Chiquimula, tz'u7uum in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán)

(b) nutz'u7m 'my leather' (phrase-final nutz'u7um in Santa María Chiquimula, nutz'u7uum in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán)

(c) nutz'u7maal 'my (own) skin'

Dayley (1985:146-7) relates this difference in meaning to a distinction between what he calls "normal" and "abnormal" possession. "Normal possession" is supposed to be a relatively prototypical possessive relationship between two things. For example when a human being owns some object of a type which people typically may obtain or lose, then the prototypical relationship between the person and such an object would be one of alienable possession. "Abnormal possession" would be a relationship between two things which deviates from the prototype in some significant way. Thus, for example, consider an inanimate object like a bone (b'aaq). If I buy a soup bone at the butcher shop for making soup, then the relationship between me and that bone would be one of alienable ownership, and this would be the normal relationship between a human being such as myself and an inanimate object such as a bone. Thus, I could say that it is nub'aaq 'my bone'. However, the relationship between me and the bones of my own body deviates from this

prototypical relationship: the relationship is inalienable and is not, strictly speaking, one of ownership of an inanimate object since my bones are actually a part of me. Thus, in this case, I would not say *nub'aaq*, but rather *nub'aqiil* 'my bone(s)', as seen above in (18). In the case of the noun *b'aaq*, then, prototypical possession is expressed by treating the noun as a member of class 1 while non-prototypical possession is expressed by treating the noun as a member of class 2. It seems clear that this is also what is going on in (20). It is probably the case that all nouns in class 2, regardless of whether or not they have class 1 or class 1a counterparts, indicate a non-prototypical possessive relationship when they are possessed. It should be noted, however, that "abnormal" or "non-prototypical" possession is not the same as traditional "inalienable" possession since what is considered prototypical or non-prototypical is relative to the nature of the particular possessor and the particular possessee and to what are considered to be prototypical relationships between them. Thus, consider the expression in (21).

(21) *jun u-xaaq ri chee?*  
 one its.leaf the tree  
 'a leaf of the tree'

Here the relationship between the tree and the leaf is not one of alienable ownership between a human being and an

inanimate object; rather it is an inalienable part-whole relationship between two inanimate objects. Nevertheless, this is the normal relationship between leaves and trees: leaves are normally thought of as an integral part of some plant and not as inanimate objects normally possessed by humans. Therefore, the possessive relationship in (21) is expressed as prototypical possession: the noun *-xaaq* 'leaf' simply takes the possessive prefix and does not exhibit class 2 possession.<sup>6</sup>

#### 3.4.2.4 Class 3

Class 3 consists of those nouns which normally appear possessed and require a special suffix when used in the unpossessed form. In Quiché this suffix is most often *-aaj* (*-aj* in Santa María Chiquimula). In a few rare cases the suffix may have some vowel other than /a(a)/. Some examples are seen in (22-29).

(22) (a) *aqanaaj* 'foot, lower leg'

(b) *waqan* 'my foot, lower leg'

(23) (a) *q'ab'aaj* 'hand, lower arm'

(b) *nuq'ab'* 'my hand, lower arm'

(24) (a) *pamaaj* 'stomach; diarrhea'

(b) *nupaam* 'my stomach'

- (25) (a) ware7aaʃ 'tooth'  
 (b) nuware 'my tooth'
- (26) (a) jolomaaʃ 'head'  
 (b) nujoloom 'my head'
- (27) (a) ti7ʃ (Momostenango, Cantel) ~ ti7iʃ (Santa  
 María Chiquimula) ~ ti7iiʃ (Nahualá, Santa  
 Catarina Ixtahuacán) 'meat'  
 (b) nutii7 'my meat (for eating)'
- (28) (a) sokaʃ 'nest'  
 (b) usook 'his/her/its nest'
- (29) (a) b'i7aaʃ 'name'  
 (b) nub'i7 'my name'

As seen in these examples, many of these nouns are body parts although there are some exceptions (e. g., 27-29). In most cases the nouns of this class denote things, such as body parts, which are typically thought of as being inalienably possessed (though 27 appears to be an exception to this). It should be noted that body parts like those in (22-26) are ones which are not ordinarily thought of as being separated from the bodies which they form parts of. Body parts like (17), (18), and (20), on the other hand, which belong to class 2, are ones which are frequently encountered separated from the body, ones which are often bought, sold, and used for other purposes (e. g., blood to



make blood sausage, bones for soup, leather for shoes).<sup>7</sup>

While the objects denoted by class 3 nouns are ordinarily thought of as belonging to someone or something, it is possible in certain circumstances to talk about such objects generically without reference to a possessor. Some examples are seen in (30-1).

(30) q'oxom jolomaa*j*  
 pain head  
 'headache; head cold'

(31) yakow b'i7aa*j*  
 raise name  
 'census' (lit., 'name raising')

As can be seen, the "absolute" suffix *-a(a)*j** must be used on these nouns in such cases. Since the absolute suffix is used to indicate genericness, the unpossessed forms of class 3 nouns are sometimes translated as plurals. Thus, for example, *aqanaa*j** 'leg' is sometimes translated as 'legs (in general)'. However, these absolute nouns are not true plural forms. In some cases, (e. g., 24a) the unpossessed form of a class 3 noun may be used with a different meaning from the possessed form.

Another important group of class 3 nouns includes certain kinship terms. As with the body part nouns

discussed above, these kinship terms denote things which are ordinarily thought of as belonging to someone in an inalienable sense. Thus, these nouns are most commonly found in their possessed form. Nevertheless, in some cases it is possible to talk about these relationships in generic terms without reference to a possessor; however, in such cases the noun must be used with an absolutive suffix. The most common absolutive suffix used with kinship terms is *-(V)xeel*. Some examples are seen in (32-4).

(32) (a) *nanaxeel* 'mother'

(b) *nunaan* 'my mother'

(33) (a) *chaq'ixeel* 'man's younger brother; woman's younger sister'

(b) *uchaag'* 'his younger brother / her younger sister'

(34) (a) *jya7xeel* ( < /*jii7-axeel*/) (Santa Maria Chiquimula: *ji7xeel*) 'son-in-law'

(b) *ujii7* 'his/her son-in-law' (also 'his parent-in-law')

There are a few kinship terms which take *-oom* as the absolutive suffix and a few others which take *-atz*. Some examples are seen in (35-6).<sup>20</sup>

(35) (a) *achajiloom* 'husband'

(b) *wachajilil* 'my husband'

(36) (a) alib'atz 'daughter-in-law'

(b) raliib' 'his/her daughter-in-law' (also 'her  
parent-in-law; her sister-in-law')

Some class 3 nouns can appear unpossessed without the absolutive suffix when they are used in certain special constructions. For example, the stem *agan* of the noun *aganaaj* 'foot, lower leg' can be so used in constructions like those seen in (37) and (38).

(37) *chi agan*

at foot

'on foot'

(38) *jun agan*

one foot

'a kick'

Note, however, that with some nouns the absolutive suffix is used in the construction shown in (38), as seen in (39).

(39) (a) *ch'ekaaaj* 'knee'

(b) *nuch'eek* 'my knee'

(c) *jun ch'ekaaaj* 'a blow with the knee'

#### 3.4.2.5 Class 4

Class 4 nouns are those for which the possessed and unpossessed forms are suppletive; that is, different stems are used in the possessed and unpossessed forms of the noun.

Some examples are seen in (40-1).

(40) (a) jaa 'house'

(b) wochooch (Nahualá and Santa Catarina  
Ixtahuacán: wo7ch) 'my house'

(41) (a) k'uul 'blanket'

(b) nuq'uu7 'my blanket'

These two may very well be the only members of this class in Quiché.

#### 3.4.2.6 Class Y

Class Y consists of those nouns which can only appear possessed. Thus, these nouns can be said to express true inalienable possession since they have no unpossessed form, not even one with an absolutive suffix. All nouns of this class denote body parts, family members, qualities, etc. which are generally only talked about as belonging to somebody or something. One example is the noun -xaaq 'leaf' which was already seen in (21). Other examples are seen in (42-4).

(42) r-achalaal 'his/her family member; his/her  
brother/sister (in a general  
sense)'

(43) u-b'aq' 'its seed, pit'

(44) u-q'eqaal 'its blackness'

As can be seen from the examples, some of these nouns look like class 1 nouns (e. g., 43) and some look like class 2 nouns (e. g., 44, which comes from the root q'eq 'black'). However, true class 1 and 2 nouns, unlike those of class Y, have unpossessed forms.

#### 3.4.2.7 Class Z

Class Z consists of all nouns which do not have possessed forms. Such nouns denote things which are not commonly owned by people nor which are commonly thought of as forming a part of something else. Some examples are seen in (45-7).

(45) kaaj 'sky'

(46) jab' 'rain'

(47) jamariil 'peace'

#### 3.4.3 Complex Nouns

There is a wide variety of complex noun types in Quiché. Some of these are simple compounds, that is, stems composed of two or more roots but which otherwise behave like simple nouns stems and can be included in the above noun classes. Some examples are seen in (48-9).

- (48) (a) nimaq'iiǰ     'fiesta'     (nim 'big' + -a  
   'ATTRIBUTIVE' + q'iiǰ 'day')
- (b) unimaq'iiǰ   'his/her/its fiesta' (Class 1)
- (49) (a) kaxlanwa     'bread'     (kaxlaan 'foreign' + waa  
   'food (made of corn dough)')
- (b) nukaxlanwaa 'my bread' (Class 1a)

Others are phrasal compounds, some of which have characteristics which place them outside the above classification of simple noun stems in terms of their behavior under possession. One type of phrasal compound is that seen above in (31). This type consists of an uninflected verb stem of a special type known as the "Focus Antipassive" form (see Chapter 9 below). This verb stem is followed by a simple unmodified and uninflected noun stem which is understood to be the "direct object" of the verb stem. The entire phrasal compound is understood as the name of the activity described by the verb phrase. Another example is seen in (50).

- (50) jopin     triikoo  
           scatter wheat  
           'sowing of wheat' (lit., 'wheat scattering')

Though there seem to be a fair number of such "Verb Phrase Compounds", the process appears not to be entirely productive; that is, these compounds do not seem to be

productively formed from just any verb followed by an appropriate noun. Phrasal compounds of this type apparently cannot be possessed. Therefore, they could be considered to be members of Class Z.

Another type of phrasal compound is one that is sometimes called the "Noun-of-Noun construction". The Noun-of-Noun construction consists of a possessed noun stem followed by a second noun stem which can be understood as the possessor of the first noun. When the entire phrasal compound is possessed, the possessor inflection shows up on the second noun. An example is seen in (51).

- (51) (a) u-wi7            q'ab'-aaʃ  
           3SG.A-point hand/lower.arm-ABSOLUTIVE  
           'finger(s)'
- (b) u-wi7 nu-q'ab'  
           1SG.A-hand/lower.arm  
           'my finger(s)'

As can be seen, (51a) can be literally understood as "its point hand" or "the point of the hand". Hence the name "Noun-of-Noun construction". The possessed form in (51b) can be literally understood as "its point my hand" or "the point of my hand". It should be pointed out, however, that while these literal interpretations seem readily apparent to the linguist, for some reason they are not always so apparent to native speakers. That is to say, these Noun-of-

Noun constructions seem to be completely lexicalized as nouns with their non-literal meanings (e. g., 'finger' in the case of 51a). Even some native speakers who have had training in linguistics seem to be quite surprised and unbelieving when the literal analysis of a Noun-of-Noun construction is first pointed out to them. Thus, it should perhaps not be too surprising that Noun-of-Noun constructions occasionally do get reanalyzed as simple compounds in which the literal analysis is not always so obvious. Some examples are seen in (52-4).\*

(52) (a) xaqchaj 'pine needles' (presumably < \*u-xaaq  
chaj 'leaves of pine')

(b) nuxaqchaaj 'my pine needles' (Class 1a)

(53) (a) ware7aaj 'tooth' (presumably < \*u-wa(ch) r-eeh  
'the face/surface of his/her/its tooth' +  
-aaj 'ABSOLUTIVE')

(b) nuware 'my tooth' (Class 3)

(54) (a) b'aq'ach ~ b'aq'wach 'eye' (presumably <  
\*u-b'aq' wach 'the seed/pit of the face/')

(b) nub'aq'ach ~ nub'aq'wach 'my eye(s)' (Class 1)

The final type of complex noun construction to be discussed here will be what is sometimes called the "Noun-Noun construction". Quiché ritual speech, as discussed, for example, by Norman (1980), is characterized by grammatically



parallel couplets based on formulaic pairs of semantically related lexical items. Many of these formulaic pairs have idiomatic (usually metaphorical) meanings. In (55) are given four lines (two couplets) from a ritual speech delivered by a ritual practitioner hired by a man to present a formal petition for a bride (taken from Norman 1980:388; note that this excerpt is in the Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialect).

(55) xneek'aama      chu7loq  
I.was.brought    now.hither

xneeyaaka      chu7loq  
I.was.raised    now.hither

chwa    ri    nutz'aaq  
before   the   my.wall

chwa    ri    nuk'axtuun  
before   the   my.fortress

In the first two lines, the verb roots *-k'am* 'bring/take' and *-yak* 'raise' are paired. This particular collocation of verbs means 'to hire a *k'amal b'ee'*, where *k'amal bee* 'guide' (lit., 'road bringer') is the name of the type of ritual practitioner who performs this type of oration. The second two lines pair the nouns *tz'aaq* 'wall' and *k'axtuun* 'fortress'. This particular collocation means

'home'. Thus the two couplets in (55) could be interpreted as 'I was hired (to come) here before my home'. Many of these formulaic pairings occur only in ritual speech. Indeed the word *k'axtuun* is never used in modern Quiché except when paired with *tz'aaq*. In some cases, the metaphorical meanings of particular pairs are known only to the ritual practitioner (if anyone knows them at all). In some other cases, however, certain pairings of nouns are in common everyday use in Quiché. It is these common everyday formulaic pairs of nouns which are called Noun-Noun constructions. What distinguishes the Noun-Noun construction from simple compounds, as well as from other types of phrasal compounds, is that when possessed the set A prefix is placed on both members of the pair. Some examples are seen in (56-7).

- (56) (a) *naan taat*  
           mother father  
           'parents'
- (b) *qa-naan qa-taat*  
           1PL.A-mother 1PL.A-father  
           'our parents; our ancestors'

- (57) *qa-maam q-ati7t*  
       1PL.A-grandfather 1PL.A-grandmother  
       'our grandparents'  
       (possessed only)

### 3.4.4 Noun Subtypes

In addition to classifying nouns according to their behavior when possessed (3.4.2) or in terms of the number of roots (3.4.3), Quiché nouns may also be classified in terms of their semantic features (common nouns, proper names, etc.) and in terms of their syntactic function (numbers,<sup>10</sup> quantifiers, measures, vocatives, etc.) Two such subtypes, both characteristic of Mayan languages, will be discussed here: enumeratives and relational nouns.

#### 3.4.4.1 Enumeratives

Enumeratives are a special class of nouns which function somewhat like numeral classifiers in some languages. Like numeral classifiers, enumeratives are used when counting objects to specify the form, shape, position, condition, unit of measure, or semantic domain of the object being counted. Unlike true numeral classifiers, however, enumeratives are not obligatory when counting things. Some examples are seen in (58).

(58) (a) jun xajaab'

one sandal

(b) ju-k'ulaaʃ xajaab'

one-pair sandal

a/one pair of sandals

(c) oxib' xajaab'

three sandal

'three sandals'

(d) ox-k'ulaaʃ xajaab'

three-pairs sandal

'three pairs of sandals'

(e) oxib' k'aam ulew

three chord land

'three chords of land'

(1 chord = about 625 sq. ft.)

As shown in (58a) and (58c), enumeratives are not obligatory when counting things. When enumeratives are used, as in (58b) and (58d), they must be prefixed with a shortened form of a numeral. All enumeratives can be used with *ju-*, the shortened form of *juun* 'one'. Some enumeratives can also be used with numbers higher than one. The numbers between two and nine in Quiché (*keeb'*, *oxib'*, *kajib'*, *joob'*, *waaqib'*, *wuquub'*, *wajxaqiib'*, *b'elejjeeb'*) all consist of a root followed by a suffix *-V(V)b'*. The shortened form of these numbers used with enumeratives consists of the root without the suffix (*kaʃ-*, *ox-*, *kaj-*, *oʃ-*, *waq-*, *wuq-*, *wajxaq-*, *b'elej-*) as in (58d).<sup>11</sup> The number ten, *lajuuj*, does not have a suffix; and it is not shortened (except for the regular shortening of the second

vowel) when used with an enumerative. Apparently no enumerative can be used with a number above ten in modern Quiché. As illustrated in (58e), not all measure words are enumeratives. The measure used in (58e) must be used with the whole number (root plus suffix) rather than just the root.

Enumeratives may also be used without a following noun, e. g., *juk'ulaaj* 'a pair, a couple'; and some enumeratives are only used in this way, e. g., *jumuul* 'once', *ka7muul* 'twice', *oxmuul* 'three times', etc.

#### 3.4.4.2 Relational Nouns

In many languages, such as English and Spanish, oblique cases are indicated by means of prepositions placed before noun phrases in an oblique case. This is also true in Quiché to some extent; however, in many situations in Quiché oblique cases are not marked by prepositions but rather by relational nouns. Relational nouns are like prepositions in that they are placed before an "object" noun phrase to indicate the case of that noun phrase, but unlike prepositions they are formally possessed nouns with the following object noun phrase being formally the possessor of the relational noun. Some examples of relational nouns are seen in (59-62).<sup>12</sup>

(59) r-ee(ch)            ri    tinimit  
 3SG.A-possession the    town  
 'of the town' (lit., the town's possession)

(60) k-ee(ch)            ri    a        Xwaan    rach'il  
 3PL.A-possession the    MALE    John    and  
                           ri    al        Xwa7n  
                           the    FEMALE    Jane  
 'of John and Jane'

(61) r-uk'                ri    achii  
 3SG.A-with the    man  
 'with the man'

(62) k-uk'                ri    ixog-iib'  
 3PL.A-with the    woman-PLURAL  
 'with the women'

When the "object" of the relational noun is pronominal, there is no overt NP following the relational noun, the "object" being indicated entirely by the possessive prefix: w-ee(ch) 'of me' (lit., 'my possession), r-uuk' 'with him/her/it'.

Some relational nouns, mostly some of the locative ones, are themselves preceded by prepositions, usually either chi 'at, to' or pa 'in, at'. Some examples are seen in (63-7).

- (63) **ch-w-ee(ch)**  
 at-1SG.A-possession  
 'to me' (lit., 'to my possession')
- (64) **chi-k-ee(ch)**            **ri**    **ala-b'oom**  
 at-3PL.A-possession    the    boy-PLURAL  
 'to the boys'
- (65) **ch-u-pam**            **ri**    **q'eeb'al**  
 at-3SG.A-stomach    the    water.jug  
 'inside the water jug'
- (66) **ch-a-paam**  
 at-2SG.A-stomach  
 'inside of you'
- (67) **p-u-wi7**            **ri**    **jaa**  
 in-3SG.A-top    the    house  
 'on top of the house'

The roots of many of the relational nouns are clearly recognizable noun roots which also have non-relational uses (e. g., *-paam* 'stomach', *-wi7* 'point, top, (head) hair', etc.). In some cases the root is only found in the relational noun (e. g., *-uuk'* 'with'). The root *-ee(ch)* is not used as a common noun in modern Quiché; however, the cognate form in some other Mayan languages is used as a common noun meaning 'possession'. This same root does show up in modern Quiché in the derived transitive verb stem

**-ech-e-b'e-ej** 'to take possession of'.

### 3.4.5 Derivation

A variety of different types of stems can be derived from noun roots and stems. Only two of these processes will be discussed here.

One of these processes involves a prefix **aj-**. This is one of the few derivational prefixes in Quiché. This prefix is added to noun roots and stems to form a derived noun stem meaning roughly 'one who is characterized by the reference of the root or stem'. Some examples can be seen in (68-77).

(68) (a) **-k'aay** 'wares, items for sale'

(b) **ajk'aay** 'seller. merchant' (i. e., 'one who is characterized by items for sale')

(69) (a) **chaak** 'work' (noun)

(b) **ajchaak** 'worker'

(70) (a) **ch'ami7y** 'staff, cane'

(b) **ajch'ami7y** 'alguacil (a town official)' (i. e., 'one who is characterized by a cane'; an **alguacil** is given a cane as a symbol of his office)

(71) (a) **ik'** 'moon, month'



- (b) aj7iik' 'maid, servant girl' (Girls who work as servants are typically hired on a monthly basis)
- (72) (a) q'iij 'sun, day'  
 (b) ajq'iij 'diviner, calendar priest' (i. e., 'one who is characterized by days (of the Mayan calendar)')
- (73) (a) -maak 'sin' (noun, class 3)  
 (b) ajmaak 'sinner'
- (74) (a) q'ojom 'marimba, musical instrument'  
 (b) ajq'ojom 'musician, marimba player'
- (75) (a) tz'iib' 'writing'  
 (b) ajtz'iib' 'secretary'
- (76) (a) uwach ulew 'earth, world' (lit., 'the surface of the land/earth', Noun-of-Noun construction)  
 (b) ajuwach ulew 'inhabitant of the earth, worldly being'
- (77) (a) Chwi Tz'aaq 'Momostenango' (lit., 'above the wall')  
 (b) ajchwi tz'aaq 'Momosteco, preson from Momostenango'

As can be seen in (71b), when aj- is prefixed to a

monosyllabic vowel initial noun (e. g., *ik'*), the initial glottal stop of the root can be clearly heard following the prefix. This is not the case, however, when *aj-* is prefixed to polysyllabic vowel-initial stems, as can be seen in (76b). This could be taken as evidence that *aj-* is in fact a proclitic particle rather than a prefix. Remember that monosyllabic vowel initial words, but not necessarily polysyllabic ones, are always pronounced with an initial glottal stop when stressed (see section 2.2.2). Also note that there is never a glottal stop following one of the prevocalic set A prefixes.

There are a few cases where *aj-* appears on forms other than noun stems. This is additional evidence that this morpheme should be considered a clitic rather than a prefix. Some examples are seen in (78-9).

(78) (a) *chi q'iij* (prepositional phrase)

to day

'by day'

(b) *ajchi q'iij* 'day laborer'

(79) (a) *waraal* 'here' (demonstrative adverb)

(b) *ajwaraal* 'a native of this place'

Another derivational process applying to nouns involves a suffix *-V*, where the quality of the vowel is lexically

determined. This "thematic suffix" derives transitive verbal bases. Such verbal bases must then undergo further derivation by means of suffixes such as *-Vj* 'NON-PERFECT STATUS', *-n* 'INTRANSITIVE/ANTIPASSIVE', *-x* 'PASSIVE', etc. in order to become complete verbal stems. These derivations will be further described in section 5.3. For now, (80-4) will suffice as examples of the use of the thematic vowel *-V*.

(80) (a) q'ojom 'marimba, musical instrument'

(b) q'ojom-a- 'to play a marimba, to play a  
musical instrument'

(81) (a) keej 'horse'

(b) keej-e- 'to mount a horse'

(82) (a) atz'aam 'salt'

(b) atz'am-i- 'to salt, to put salt on'

(83) (a) b'iix 'song'

(b) b'ix-o- 'to sing'

(84) (a) yuuq' 'pasturing, tending flocks'

(b) yuq'-u- 'to tend (sheep)'

### 3.5 Adjectives

While there are a large number of native noun roots in Quiché (more than 1000 according to Kaufman 1986a), there are a relatively small number of native adjective roots

(less than 100). Many other adjectives, however, are derived from other types of roots (e. g., verbal roots). Furthermore, there are a number of roots which can function as both nouns and adjectives.

### 3.5.1 Inflection

#### 3.5.1.1 The Attributive and Degree Suffixes

When adjectives are used as noun modifiers in Quiché, they generally precede the nouns they modify. In such cases, non-derived adjectives, and some derived adjectives, take a suffix -V, where the quality of the vowel is lexically determined but is usually /a/, less often /i/, and rarely another vowel. Some examples are given in (85-7) (see also Chapter 2, footnote 11, example (i) (b)).

(85) q'an-a                      kootz'i7j  
       yellow-ATTRIBUTIVE flower  
       'yellow flower'

(86) saq-a                      k'uul  
       white-ATTRIBUTIVE blanket  
       'white blanket'

(87) joron-a                    ja7  
       cold-ATTRIBUTIVE water  
       'cold water'

There are some dialects (e. g., Cantel, San Francisco el Alto), in which this is not true. Thus, in these dialects, noun phrases like (85-7) are pronounced without the attributive suffix.<sup>13</sup>

It is also possible for an adjective to follow the noun it modifies. In this case the attributive suffix is absent in all dialects. An example is seen in (88).

(88) kootz'17j q'an  
       flower       yellow  
       'yellow flower'

Given that there is no copula in Quiché, it is possible to analyze constructions like the one in (88) as relative clauses ('flower (which is) yellow') rather than as simple noun phrases. Since adjectives do not take the attributive suffix when they are used as predicates, the fact that there is no attributive suffix in (88) could be taken as evidence for such an analysis.

In addition to the attributive suffix, adjectives used as prenominal modifiers may also take a suffix -laj following the attributive suffix. This suffix is also used in this way following the attributive suffix even in those dialects which otherwise lack the attributive suffix. In these latter dialects one may want to analyze the attributive suffix -V followed by -laj as a single suffix

**-Vlaj.** The suffix **-(V)laj** functions as a degree adverbial modifier of the adjective, adding the meaning 'very' to the meaning of the adjective.<sup>14</sup> An example is seen in (89).

(89) jun nim-a-laj                      jaa  
       one big-ATTRIBUTIVE-very house  
       'a very big house'

With some adjectives the degree suffix **-laj** is obligatory when these adjectives are used as prenominal modifiers. An example is seen in (90).

(90) (a) utz-a-laj                      q'iiij  
       good-ATTRIBUTIVE-very day  
       '(very) good day'

(b) \*utz(-a) q'iiij

### 3.5.1.2 Subject Agreement

In addition to their function as noun modifiers, Quiché adjectives may also function as predicates in the same way as nouns. Like predicate nouns, predicate adjectives exhibit subject agreement by means of the set B clitics seen in table 3. When an adjective functions as a predicate, it takes neither the attributive suffix nor the degree suffix. A sample paradigm of a predicate adjective is given in (91) using the adjective **utz** 'good'.

- (91) (a) in utz 'I am good'  
 (b) at utz 'you (sg.) are good'  
 (c) utz laa 'you (sg. formal) are good'  
 (d) (are7) utz '(he/she/it is) good'  
 (e) oj utz 'we are good'  
 (f) ix utz 'you (pl.) are good'  
 (g) utz alaq 'you (pl. formal) are good'  
 (h) e7 utz 'they are good'

As with predicate nouns, the second person formal forms of predicate adjectives can be expressed using independent pronouns. Thus, 'you (sg. formal) are good' can be expressed as (laal) laal utz (cf. 13c), and 'you (pl. formal) are good' can be expressed as (alaq) alaq utz. Again, these forms using the independent pronouns appear to be the only forms possible in Nahualá, according to Mondloch (1978a:15).

### 3.5.1.3 Number Agreement

For the most part Quiché adjectives do not exhibit any agreement phenomena with nouns. A few adjectives, however, have special plural forms; and these adjectives then do exhibit number agreement with the nouns that they modify and also, when they function as predicates, with their subjects. The plural forms are generally formed by adding the suffix -V7q to the adjective, where the vowel has the same quality as the attributive suffix. When the adjective functions as

a prenominal modifier, the /7/ of the plural suffix is dropped in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, Nahualá, and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán; however, it is not dropped in the Cantel dialect. Some examples are seen in (92-3).

(92) (a) nim ri keej  
           big the horse  
           'the horse is big'

(b) e7 nim-a7q ri keej  
       3PL.B big-PLURAL the horse  
       'the horses are big'

(93) (a) ri nim-a keej  
           the big-ATTRIBUTIVE horse  
           'the big horse'

(b) ri nim-aq keej  
       the big-PLURAL horse  
       'the big horses'

(c) ri keej nim-a7q  
       the horse big-PLURAL  
       'the horses which are big'

There is at least one adjective which has an irregular plural form: the plural form of the adjective *ch'uti7n* 'small' is *ch'uti7q*.



Though plural agreement is generally considered an inflectional process, it would seem that the Quiché plural suffix for adjectives should actually be considered a derivational suffix. This is because the plural forms of adjectives may undergo further derivation. For example, as will be discussed below in section 3.5.2, an intransitive verb may be derived from an adjective by means of a suffix *-Vr*. Thus, from the adjective *choom* 'fat' we can derive *-choomar* 'to become fat'. The adjective *choom* also has a plural form *chooma7q*, and an intransitive verb can also be derived from this plural form: *-chooma7qir*. Since the plural suffix *-a7q* appears between the root *choom* and the derivational suffix *-ir* in this form, it would seem that *-a7q* must also be considered derivational rather than inflectional.

It should be noted that the vowel of the regular plural suffix *-V7q* when used on a particular adjective is always the same as the vowel of the attributive suffix used on that adjective. Thus, it could be claimed that the plural suffix *-V7q* is in fact *-V-7q* '-ATTRIBUTIVE-PLURAL'. This analysis is one which I formerly believed in and seems also to be suggested by the discussion in Kaufman (1986a). However, there are problems with such an analysis. For one thing, since the plural suffix is a derivational suffix, then it would follow that the attributive suffix must also be derivational since it would appear between the root and the

derivational suffix -7q on this analysis. However, it is hard to imagine how the attributive suffix could be considered a derivational suffix since it changes neither the meaning nor the grammatical class of the adjectival stem. The only way I can think of to consider the attributive suffix to be derivational would be to consider all adjectives to be basically verbs (or predicates of some kind) and to consider the attributive suffix to be a derivational suffix deriving attributive adjectives from these predicate stems. However, this analysis would run into further problems in the face of examples like (92b) and (93c) in which, under this analysis, the attributive suffix would appear on forms being used as predicates rather than as attributive adjectives. It would not seem wise to want to claim that the attributive suffix appears on predicate adjectives like those in (92b) and (93c). It should also be noted that the attributive suffix only shows up in constructions like those shown in (85-7). The attributive suffix can never be added to an adjective uttered in isolation as a citation form. This, then, also argues against treating the attributive suffix as derivational. Therefore, it would seem that the best analysis would be one in which the plural suffix has the form -V7q where the vowel is identical to the vowel of the attributive suffix but which is not the attributive suffix itself. Further evidence will be seen in section 6.1.

### 3.5.2 Derivation

There are two derivational processes applying to adjective stems which can be taken as criteria for defining this stem class. From each adjectival stem it is possible to derive an abstract noun by means of a suffix -VVI. As can be seen, this suffix is identical to the one that appears on possessed nouns of class 2 (see section 3.4.2.3); and indeed most (though not all) of these abstract nouns are obligatorily possessed. Also from each adjectival stem it is possible to derive a special type of intransitive verb. This intransitive verb is usually called a "versive" (Kaufman 1986a) or "inchoative" (Dayley 1985;198) intransitive verb and means 'to become (adjective)'. The most common versive suffix is -Vr although others such as -Vj and -ob' also exist. Usually the vowel of the suffix -VVI and the vowel of the suffix -Vr are of the same quality although there are some exceptions to this. The vowel is usually /a/ or /i/, rarely some other vowel. With some adjectives both /a/ and /i/ are possible. Some examples are seen in (94-8).

- (94) (a) nim  
           'big'

(b) nim-aal  
 big-ABSTRACT  
 'bigness; pride'

(c) -nim-ar  
 big-VERSIVE  
 'to become big'

(95) (a) rax  
 'green'

(b) u-rax-ill  
 3SG.A-green-ABSTRACT  
 'his/her/its greenness'

(c) -rax-ir  
 green-VERSIVE  
 'to become green'

(96) (a) tz'ill  
 'dirty'

(b) u-tz'il-ool  
 3SG.A-dirty-ABSTRACT  
 'his/her/its dirtiness'

(c) -tz'il-ob' (Momostenango: -tz'il-oj)  
 dirty-VERSIVE  
 'to become dirty'

(97) (a) **chaq'**

**'ripe, cooked'**

(b) **u-chaq'-aal**

**3SG.A-ripe-ABSTRACT**

**'its ripeness, its cookedness'**

(c) **-chaq'-aj**

**ripe-VERSIVE**

**'to get ripe, to (get) cook(ed)'**

(98) (a) **b'aaq 'skinny'**

(b) **u-b'aaq-iil**

**3SG.A-skinny-ABSTRACT**

**'his/her/its skinniness'**

(c) **-b'aaq-ir ~ -baq-ar**

**skinny-VERSIVE**

**'to become skinny'**

Example (98a) is an example of a root which can be used either as a noun ('bone') or as an adjective ('skinny'). Another example is (96a), which can mean either 'dirty' (adjective) or 'filth' (noun). Other such stems include *mooy* 'blind (person)', *ri7j* 'old (person)', *q'inom* 'rich (person)'. These words are considered nouns because they can function as the heads of noun phrases and can be possessed. They are also considered adjectives because

abstract nouns and versive intransitive verbs can be derived from them.

One further derivation to be considered here involves a suffix  $-C_1oj \sim -C_1uj$ . This suffix, when added to an adjectival root creates a new adjective meaning 'somewhat (adjective)' or '(adjective)-ish'. The form with the vowel /u/ is used if the root vowel is /u/; otherwise the form with the vowel /o/ is used. Some examples are seen in (99-100).

(99) (a) kaq 'red'

(b) kaqkoj 'reddish'

(100) (a) piim 'thick'

(b) pimpoj 'somewhat thick'

## NOTES

1. Edmonson prefers to consider these uses of the second person plural pronoun in singular contexts as copyist's errors. However, given that the plural pronoun is used quite consistently in the text when certain characters address certain others, it seems rather unlikely that these could be merely "typos". And given that there are supposed to be modern dialects which use the second person plural in this way, it seems likely that Brasseur's suggestion was in fact correct.

2. In Cantel there is an optional phonological rule which deletes the vowel of the first person singular prefix *nu-* and the first person plural prefix *qa-* on consonant-initial stems when they are preceded by an unstressed vowel-final word. Some examples are seen in (i) and (ii) below.

(i) le nutz'i7 ~ le ntz'i7  
 the my.dog  
 'my dog'

(ii) le qatz'i7 ~ le qtz'i7  
 the our.dog  
 'our dog'

3. Note that forms like (1d) *sii7 laa* and (1h) *sii7 alaq* are potentially ambiguous being interpretable either as

'your firewood' or as 'you are firewood'. Such an ambiguity would be even more likely with a different noun like *keej* 'horse': *keej laa* 'your horse; you are a horse'. Generally, however, such forms are not ambiguous in context. The possessed noun will generally be preceded by the definite article (e. g., *ri keej laa*), and such a construction would not ordinarily be interpreted as a non-verbal sentence. (See section 3.4.1.3 on predicate nouns.) Another way to make sure that the phrase is interpreted as a possessed noun phrase is to use the Relational Noun *-ee(ch)*: *ri keej eech laa* 'your horse' (lit. 'the horse of you'). (See section 3.4.4.2 on Relational Nouns.)

4. Nevertheless, in Momostenango, one frequently finds that when *nutaat* is preceded by certain words, e. g. the definite article *ri*, the combination is pronounced as *riintaat*. This could be interpreted as an example of the vowel-dropping rule found in Cantel which was discussed in footnote 2 (i. e., *ri nu-taat*  $\rightarrow$  *ri(i) n-taat*); however, given that this only seems to happen in this and perhaps a very few other words, it seems more likely that this is really a vestige of the prefix *in-* in Momostenango (i. e., *ri in-taat*  $\rightarrow$  *riin-taat*). Note that the use of *in-* rather than *nu-* on a limited set of



words is also found in some dialects of Cakchiquel, which suggests that this may be a feature of Proto-Quichean which is being lost in some dialects rather than an innovation in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán.

5. It is possible that the forms in (11) and (12) are not simple noun phrases but actually relative clauses. If so, then (11) would literally be 'the (=those who) are guides', and (12) would literally be 'the (=those who) are men'.
6. Actually, *-xaaq* is not a class 1 noun either. As discussed below, it belongs to class y: nouns which are always possessed.
7. Teeth (see example 25) are frequently lost, pulled, or knocked out; but even so, they are still typically thought of as being one's teeth. They are not typically bought, sold, or used for other purposes.
8. Note that *-achajiil* 'husband' appears to be derived from *\*-achij* 'man' (> *achii* in modern Quiché; *achij* means 'male (of animals)' in modern Cakchiquel) + *-iil*, the suffix used on the possessed forms of class 2 nouns. We see the same thing in *ixoq* 'woman', *w-ixoq-iil* 'my wife', *ixoq-il-oom* 'wife'. Thus, it appears that at least some of the class 3 nouns taking

the absolutive suffix *-oom* are originally class 2 nouns: the relationship between husband and wife is not one of prototypical possession. Note, however, that the unpossessed form in *-oom* has a different meaning from the simple suffixless unpossessed form. It is also interesting to note, given that the absolutive suffix *-a(a)j* is sometimes translated as if it were a plural suffix, that the absolutive suffix *-oom*, seen here, apparently has the same form as the irregular plural suffix *-oom* seen in (9b) and (10b). (The consonants /b'/ and /t/ seen in these forms were originally part of the stems.) It is possible that the absolutive suffix *-atz* seen in *alib'atz* 'daughter-in-law' is not really a suffix. It may be that *alib'atz* is actually a compound of the noun *-aliib'* 'daughter-in-law, woman's parent-in-law, woman's sister-in-law' with the noun *-atz* 'older sibling of the same sex'. It is not clear how likely this would be, however.

9. The word *b'aq'ach* ~ *b'aq'wach* seen in (54a) is also pronounced *b'oq'och*, *b'oq'wach*, *waq'ach*, or *wog'och*. It is not clear whether or not the latter two forms have the same etymology as the others. This noun may also be used as a Class 3 noun, e. g., *b'aq'achaaaj* 'eye', *nub'aq'ach* 'my eye'.

10. Numbers are considered true nouns in Quiché because

they can be possessed. The third person singular possessed forms of the numbers above two form the ordinal numbers. Thus, for example, the third person singular possessed form of *kaj*, the root of *kaj-ib'* 'four', is *ukaaaj* 'fourth' (lit., 'its four'). When the number root begins with a vowel, however, the ordinal number is formed by prefixing two third person singular set A prefixes in modern Quiché. For example, from *ox*, the root of *ox-ib'* 'three', one forms the ordinal *u-r-oox* 'third'. This was not the case in older forms of the language, however. The attested forms in Colonial Quiché only have one prefix: <rox>.

11. Historically, the system of enumeratives may have actually been a numeral classifier system, with the suffix *-V(V)b'* as a general numeral classifier for plural things. Some Mayan languages (e. g., Jacalteco) still have a system of numeral classifiers; however, the Quiché system is no longer considered a true numeral classifier system for the reasons stated in the text. Note further that the suffix *-V(V)b'* is obligatory even when counting (i. e., reciting the list of numbers from one to ten or whatever). In this respect, this morpheme does not behave like a true numeral classifier in modern Quiché.

12. The word *r-ach'il* 'and, together with' in (60) is

itself a relational noun whose literal meaning is 'his/her/its companion'. In Cantel this word has the form *r-achi7l*, but a shorter form *chil* is often used for the relational noun. This shorter form is also used in Nahualá while the non-relational noun has the form *r-ach7il* in that dialect. Note also that in this sentence the masculine name *Xwaan* is preceded by a particle *a* while the feminine name *Xwa7n* is preceded by a particle *al*. These particles are used before the first names of people whom one would address with the second person familiar pronouns. The names of people whom one would address with the second person formal pronouns either have no preceding particle or are optionally preceded by the word *taat* 'father' (for masculine names) or the word *naan* 'mother' (for feminine names). In Santa María Chiquimula the masculine familiar particle has the form *al* and the feminine familiar particle has the form *ali*. The particle *a ~ al* is derived from the word *ala* 'boy' while the particle *al ~ ali* is derived from the word *ali* 'girl'.

13. Chávez (no date:42), who speaks a dialect which lacks the attributive suffix, claims that adjectives appearing with the attributive suffix in colonial Quiché manuscripts are erroneous and that these forms appear only because the manuscripts were written by

Spaniards who tended to hispanize Quiché pronunciation. Clearly, however, such an assertion is ridiculous given that this suffix is found in many modern dialects and given that its use is clearly unlike anything found in Spanish. Clearly, if a Spaniard had difficulty pronouncing the word *q'an* in a construction like (85), he would have had equal difficulty pronouncing it in a construction like (88). Nevertheless, neither in colonial manuscripts nor in modern Quiché does an adjective have a final vowel added in constructions like (88).

14. One might want to analyze the attributive suffix *-V* followed by the suffix *-laj* as a simple suffix *-Vlaj* in all dialects. However, in those dialects which regularly use the attributive suffix, it would have to be stipulated that the vowel of the suffix *-Vlaj* is identical to the vowel of the attributive suffix (although that vowel may undergo vowel harmony in some dialects). It would also be possible to analyze *-laj* as an adverbial particle rather than as a suffix. This is in fact what Dayley (1985:196, 268) does for Tzutujil. I am unaware of any evidence that would argue for one analysis over the other; however, if one chose to treat *laj* as an adverbial particle, as Dayley does, then one would probably have to treat the preceding vowel as the attributive suffix.

**CHAPTER 4**  
**MORPHOLOGY II**

**4.1 Verbs**

In Quiché, verbs can be distinguished from other types of (non-verbal) predicates (e.g., predicate nouns, predicate adjectives) by the fact that the former, but not the latter, have inflections for tense, aspect, and/or mood. Quiché verbs come in two basic types: transitive and intransitive. Furthermore, transitive verbs are of two different types: root (or non-derived) and derived. These three different types of verbs can be distinguished by their inflections and by their derivational possibilities. This chapter will deal with the morphology of intransitive verbs.

**4.2 Intransitive Verbs**

Intransitive verbs are those which have inflections for subject agreement but not for direct object agreement. In the simplest cases, the structure of an intransitive verb is as shown in (1).

(1) tense/aspect/mood+agreement+stem(-phrase.final.suffix)

Derived intransitive verbs (generally those with polysyllabic stems) are treated identically to non-derived intransitive verbs (generally those with monosyllabic stems) with respect to morphology.

#### 4.2.1 Inflection

##### 4.2.1.1 Subject Agreement

Subject agreement on intransitive verbs is marked by means of the set B clitics shown in table 3 of Chapter 3. A sample paradigm of an intransitive verb is shown in (2).<sup>1</sup>

- (2) (a) x+in+war-ik 'I slept'  
 (b) x+at+war-ik 'you (sg.) slept'  
 (c) x+war laa 'you (sg. formal) slept'  
 (d) x+∅+war-ik 's/he slept'  
 (e) x+oj+war-ik 'we slept'  
 (f) x+ix+war-ik 'you (pl.) slept'  
 (g) x+war alaq 'you (pl. formal) slept'  
 (h) x+e7+war-ik 'they slept'

The set B clitics seen in (2) have generally been written together with the verb, as shown, in most of the orthographies that have been used for Quiché, including that of the PLFM. (Two exceptions to this are the orthographies used by Brasseur (1862) and Chávez (no date).) Indeed, the set B morphemes have often been considered prefixes when used on verbs (e. g., by Mondloch 1978b:3 and Dayley 1981:16). However, Kaufman (1986b:24) claims that the set B morphemes in Proto-Mayan were enclitic to the first word of the predicate. Looking at (1) one could perhaps say that the set B morphemes are still enclitic to the first word of

the predicate in modern Quiché, where "first word of the predicate" would be interpreted to mean the initial tense/aspect/mood particle. I am inclined to think, however, that this really is not quite correct for modern Quiché because the set B morphemes do not seem to be enclitic to anything when used with predicate nouns and predicate adjectives. In some Mayan languages the set B clitics appear after the stem in such situations. It might make more sense to say that in modern Quiché the set B morphemes have become proclitics.

Nevertheless, whatever their exact status may be as enclitics, proclitics, or whatever, I see no reason to believe that the set B morphemes have become prefixes in modern Quiché. Zwicky and Pullum (1983) offer the following six criteria for distinguishing between clear cases of clitics and inflectional affixes:

- A. Clitics can exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts, while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems.
- B. Arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.



- C. Morphophonological idiosyncracies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.
- D. Semantic idiosyncracies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.
- E. Syntactic rules can affect affixed words, but cannot affect clitic groups.
- F. Clitics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot.

If we compare the set A morphemes, which seem to be fairly clear cases of inflectional prefixes, with the set B morphemes on each of the above six criteria, it would appear that the set B morphemes behave somewhat more like clitics:<sup>2</sup>

- A. Set A prefixes can only appear on nouns and transitive verbs. Set B morphemes can appear on nouns and transitive verbs as well as on adjectives, intransitive verbs, and certain minor word classes.
- B. I am not aware of any arbitrary gaps in the set of Set B + Predicate combinations. A possible gap in the set of Set A - Noun combinations would be with those noun stems of class Z (nouns which are never

possessed, section 3.4.2.7).

- C. There are few (if any) cases where Set B + Predicate combinations exhibit morphophonological idiosyncracies. However, there are a number of such idiosyncracies with Set A - Stem combinations. These include the unexpected use of *in-* rather than *nu-* on nouns (section 3.4.1.1) and the use of the preconsonantal prefixes on vowel initial words. As will be discussed in section 5.2.1, there are also some idiosyncracies in the forms of the first person singular set A prefix used on vowel initial transitive verbs. One might also include here the rather idiosyncratic forms of the various allomorphs of the different set A prefixes. There is little or no allomorphic variation in the forms of the set B morphemes.
- D. I am unaware of any semantic idiosyncracies with either the set A prefixes or the set B morphemes.
- E. Set A - Stem combinations are always treated as units by syntactic operations. However, it seems that the same is true of Set B + Predicate combinations (assuming that set B morphemes are in fact proclitics as I have suggested). Thus, set A prefixes and set B morphemes do not differ on this point.

F. As will be discussed below, set B morphemes can attach to material already containing clitics (the incorporated movement morphemes). However, set A prefixes can only be attached directly to the stem.

Thus, while set A and set B morphemes do not seem to differ with respect to criteria D and E, they seem to differ significantly with respect to the other four criteria. The set A morphemes seem to be fairly prototypical inflectional affixes with respect to all six criteria. Therefore, I will assume throughout the rest of this work that the set B morphemes are not prefixes but rather are clitic particles. This conclusion makes sense in another respect also: namely that in most cases the forms of the set B clitics are identical to the forms of the independent pronouns while in many cases the forms of the set A prefixes are unique. Even though I consider the set B morphemes to be clitic particles, however, I will continue to follow the orthographic tradition of writing them together with the verb word.

When the set B clitics appear on a vowel-initial intransitive verb, the initial vowel of the stem is lengthened except in the third person plural.<sup>29</sup> The lengthening does not take place in this latter case because

the third person plural clitic and the stem undergo the contraction rule described in section 2.2.2 (in spite of the fact that the third person plural clitic ends in a glottal stop in many of these dialects). This latter point may perhaps be additional evidence that the set B morphemes are clitics since this rule generally applies across word boundaries. A sample paradigm is shown in (3) using the intransitive verb root *-ok* 'to enter, go in, come in'. The short vowel of this root shows up, for example, in the action nominalization *okeem*.<sup>4</sup>

- (3) (a) *x+in+ook-ik* 'I entered'  
 (b) *x+at+ook-ik* 'you (sg.) entered'  
 (c) *x+ook laa* 'you (sg. formal) entered'  
 (d) *x+∅+ook-ik* 'he/she/it entered'  
 (e) *x+oj+ook-ik* 'we entered'  
 (f) *x+ix+ook-ik* 'you (pl.) entered'  
 (g) *x+ook alaḡ* 'you (pl. formal) entered'  
 (h) *x+o7k-ik* 'they entered' (< /x#e7#ok+ik/)

There are actually three degrees of vowel length discernable in the forms of such vowel initial verbs. The short vowels in (3), as well as the short vowel in *okeem*, are quite short. The initial vowel of the stem is quite long in the third person singular form in the Imperfective aspect<sup>5</sup> (e. g., *k+∅+ook-ik* 'he/she/it leaves'). In all other finite inflected forms (e.g., all of the forms in 3),

the length of the initial vowel of the stem seems to be intermediate between that of a short vowel that of the very long vowel in forms like *kookik*. Native speakers generally seem to identify the intermediate vowels more with the long vowel of forms like *kookik* rather than with the short vowels; therefore these intermediate vowels are written as long vowels.

It is not clear why these vowels should lengthen in this way; however, I would like to speculate about this a little. In another Mayan language, *Aguacatec*, one finds that when a non-zero set B clitic appears before a vowel-initial intransitive verb, a glottal stop is inserted after the initial vowel of the verb stem. Some examples are seen in (4).

(4) (a) ja                    Ø+ook  
           RECENT.PAST 3SG.B+enter  
           `he/she/it entered'

(b) ja                    n+o7k ( < /ja#n#ook/ )  
           RECENT.PAST 3SG.B+enter  
           `I entered'

We might speculate that at one time a similar process may have existed in *Quiché*. That is to say, at one time it may have been the case that /x#in#ok+ik/ > \*xino7kik. Then, at a later stage in the history of the language, such glottal

stops changed to vowel length, i. e., \*xinoʔkik > xinookik. There are two pieces of evidence that might make this seem reasonable. As for the insertion of the glottal stop, there seem to still be sporadic instances of such a process in the Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula dialects. One place where this occurs is when the number *juun* 'one' precedes a noun with the third person singular possessive prefix. In such a situation a glottal stop is optionally inserted after the prefix in these dialects, as seen in (5).

- (5) *jun u-keej* ~ *jun uʔkeej*  
 one 3SG.A-horse  
 'a horse of his/hers, one of his/her horses'

It should be noted that this is not quite the same as the regular contraction rule discussed in section 2.2.2 because there is no contraction of vowels but only the insertion of the glottal stop. However, like the contraction rule, this glottal stop insertion rule only applies (albeit irregularly) when an unstressed word precedes an unstressed vowel-initial syllable which is part of the same syntactic phrase. As for the conversion of the glottal stop to vowel length, some such thing clearly seems to have happened (for the second time around?) in the modern dialect of Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. As was seen in section 2.2.2, where the contraction rule applies in Nahualá, Momostenango, and Santa María Chiquimula, the Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán

dialect shows a long vowel where the other dialects show a glottal stop. Thus, *ri achih* 'the man' contracts to *raachih* in Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán whereas in Nahualá the result of the contraction is *ra7chih*. Thus, given that such processes still persist in some dialects of modern Quiché, it would not be too unreasonable to suppose that the vowel lengthening in vowel-initial intransitive verbs came about in such a way. Additional evidence for this will be presented in section 4.2.1.3.

#### 4.2.1.2 Tense/Aspect/Mood

As seen in (1), the subject agreement clitic is preceded by a morpheme indicating tense and/or aspect and/or mood. Though these morphemes have generally been treated as prefixes, they must in fact be clitic particles if, as was argued in the previous section, the subject agreement morphemes are clitic particles.<sup>6</sup> The tense/aspect/mood clitics have generally been written together with the subject agreement morphemes in all of the orthographies that have been used for Quiché except for that of Brasseur (1862).

The five tense/aspect/mood clitics which are used in modern Quiché are *ka* 'Imperfective', *x* 'Past Perfective', and *cha* (*chi* in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán) 'Imperative/Potential', *j* 'Directional Imperative', *ma* 'Admonitive'.<sup>7</sup> In Colonial Quiché there was also a clitic







- (8) *tajin k+in+chakun-ik*  
 PROG IMPERF+1SG.B+work-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'I am/was/will be working.' (\*'I work.')

Actually, the morpheme *tajin* is not really a particle but rather an intransitive verb stem; and as such, it can take the inflections appropriate to an intransitive verb. Thus, besides (8), it is also possible to say (9).

- (9) *ka+Ø+tajin k+in+chakun-ik*  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+PROG IMPERF+1SG.B+work-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'I am/was/will be working'

This construction is actually a complex sentence where the second clause (*kinchakunik*) is the subject of the verb of the main clause (*katajin*). Both verbs must obligatorily have the Imperfective aspect clitic, and the verb *tajin* must obligatorily be inflected for third person singular subject agreement. In some cases it is possible for the verb *tajin* to be used with a nominal subject. An example is seen in (10).

- (10) *ka+Ø+tajin jab'*  
 IMPERF+3SG.B-PROG rain (noun)  
 'It is raining'

In constructions like (10), the verbal inflections are obligatory on *tajin*. However, when *tajin* has a sentential subject, as in (9), the verbal inflections on *tajin*, which

are fixed anyway and which do not seem to contribute anything to the meaning of the sentence, are optional, as seen in (8). The construction in (8) seems to be slightly more common in modern Quiché than the construction in (9). Thus it appears that the intransitive verb *tajin* is in the process of being reanalyzed as an aspect particle.

In modern Quiché the future tense reading of the Imperfective clitic is often forced by using the Necessitative particle *naa* following a verb with the Imperfective clitic. An example is seen in (11).

- (11) *k+in+chakun*            *naa*  
       IMPERF+1SG.B+work    NEC  
       'I will work'

It should be carefully noted, however, that the particle *naa* does not mean 'future tense'. Rather, this Necessitative particle is a modal particle which adds the meaning 'have to' to the meaning of the verb. Thus, the meaning of the Quiché sentence in (11) is not really 'I will work'. Rather, the translation 'I will work' is an inference derived from the literal meaning of (11), namely, 'I have to work'. Nevertheless, this is a fairly standard way of forcing a future tense reading from the Imperfective aspect clitic.<sup>10</sup> The Necessitative particle may also appear with other tense/aspect/mood particles, however, without any

necessary inference of (absolute) futurity (though one probably could infer a relative future meaning). An example in the Past Perfective is shown in (12).

- (12) x+in+chakun            naa  
 PERFV+1SG.B+work    NEC  
 'I had to work.'

According to Henne (1980:116), the Necessitative particle indicates a "more intensive degree" when used with an adverb or adjective. He gives the example shown in (13) (presumably from the Cantel dialect).

- (13) nim na xuya            ri ab'ix            kamik chuwäch  
 big NEC it.gave.it the cornfield now before.it  
 ri junab'ix  
 the one.year.ago  
 'The cornfield produced more this year than last year.'

The Past Perfective clitic *x* indicates past tense and perfective aspect. Sample paradigms have already been seen in (2) and (3). In the past tense there is thus a clearly marked distinction between the perfective aspect (*x*) and the imperfective aspect (*ka*). However, in the non-past tenses in Quiché, only the Imperfective aspect clitic may be used. Thus, it is impossible in Quiché to present a non-past event from a perfective point of view. The Past Perfective clitic

is compatible only with adverbial expressions of past time, as in (14a), and can never be used in non-past contexts (see 14b).

(14) (a)  $x+\emptyset+kam$                        $iwiir$   
           PERFV+3SG.B-die    yesterday  
           's/he died yesterday'

(b)  $*x+\emptyset+kam$                       (na)     $chwe7q$   
           PERFV+3SG.B-die    (NEC)    tomorrow

In texts in the Santa María Chiquimula dialect one sometimes finds that the Past Perfective clitic is omitted on the third person singular forms of consonant-initial intransitive verbs in contexts where the tense and aspect are clear from the context.

Fox (1965:56) claims that the meaning of  $x$  is purely aspectual and that it can be used in non-past contexts. To demonstrate this he gives the examples shown in (15) (which presumably are from the dialect of San Cristóbal Totonicapán).

(15) (a)  $ya$                        $x+\emptyset+pe$                        $ri$      $q'eqmuj$   
           already PERFV+3SG.B+come    the cloudiness  
           'the storm is coming (now)'

(b) ya            x+Ø+pe            jāb'  
 already    PERFV+3SG.B+come    rain  
 'the rain is coming now' (i. e., 'it is about  
 to rain')

(c) x+Ø+pe            jun ch'ich'  
 PERFV+3SG.B+come    one    metal  
 'a car is coming'

However, it should be noted that the intransitive verb root *-pe* (Momostenango, *-pee*) 'come', which appears in each of these examples, does not mean 'to arrive (here)' (that would be *-ul* in Quiché), but rather means 'to start out in this direction' or 'to be moving in this direction'. Thus, after consulting with a native speaker, I have become convinced that the meaning of the sentences in (15) are not literally that the cloudiness, rain, or a car is coming or is about to arrive, but rather that the cloudiness, rain (or rain clouds), or a car have started (in the past) to move in this direction. While one can infer from the literal meaning of these sentences that the storm, rain, or car is currently on its way here, the morpheme *x* is not literally being used in a non-past context in these sentences.

In Colonial Quiché the Past Perfective clitic could be preceded by a particle *mi*, which indicated Recent Past tense. Though this morpheme still appears as the root of the adverb *meer* 'earlier today' (Nahualá and Santa Catarina

Ixtahuacán: *m(i)yeer*, Cantel: *m(i)yer*), it is no longer used as a tense particle except in ritual speech. In Momostenango this morpheme has the form *ma* as seen in (16), which consists of some of the words spoken by the *chuchqajaaw* (a type of ritual practitioner) at the end of a marriage ceremony. (Spanish words are in italics.)

(16) *ma*                    *x+Ø+utzir-ik*  
 RECENT.PAST    PERFV+3SG.B+become.good-PHRASE.FINAL

*ma*                    *x+Ø+ramtaj-ik*  
 RECENT.PAST    PERFV+3SG.B+be.cut-PHRASE.FINAL

*ni*            *chojb'eenasan*            *q'iij*  
 neither    let's.cause.to.go    day

*ni*            *chojb'eenasan*            *hora*  
 neither    let's.cause.to.go    hour

*Dios ta*            *k'ut*    *kakaanajasan*    *alaq*            *chi7*  
 God    IRREALIS    then    he.causes.you.to.stay    here

'It has ended,  
 It has been cut,  
 Neither let us delay,  
 Nor let us waste time,  
 May God be the one who makes you stay here'

The 'Imperative/Potential' clitic *cha* (~ *chi*) indicates

Imperative mood (= imperative, optative, or hortative) or Potential mood (= possibility, probability, or hypothetical future). The difference between Imperative and Potential is marked by the phrase-final suffix, which has the form -oq in the Imperative and -ik in the Potential. (See the next section on phrase-final suffixes). A sample imperative paradigm is shown in (17) using the intransitive verb stem -kam 'die'. Note that the vowel of the Imperative/Potential clitic is dropped when immediately followed by a vowel.<sup>11</sup>

- (17) (a) ch+in+kam-oq 'would that I die'  
 (b) ch+at+kam-oq 'die!' (sg.)  
 (c) cha+kam-a laa 'die!' (sg. formal)  
 (d) cha+∅+kam-oq 'would that s/he die'  
 (e) ch+oj+kam-oq 'let's die'  
 (f) ch+ix+kam-oq 'die!' (pl.)  
 (g) cha+kam-a alaq 'die!' (pl. formal)  
 (→ chakama7laq)  
 (h) ch+e7+kam-oq 'would that they die'

According to Mondloch (1978a:35) the first person singular form (as in 17a) is rarely found. In fact, the speakers that I have worked with have claimed that while the form is theoretically possible and understandable, it is not really acceptable.

In Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Nahualá



the Imperative/Potential clitic is omitted (optionally in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, obligatorily in Nahualá) in the third person singular Imperative form of consonant-initial intransitive verbs. Thus, *kamoq* ~ *chakamoq* ) 'would that s/he die'. In these same three dialects the Imperative/Potential clitic is also omitted (optionally in Santa María Chiquimula and Momostenango, obligatorily in Nahualá) on the formal second person forms. Thus, *kama laa* ( ~ *chakama laa* ) 'hit him/her/it' (sg. formal), *kama7laq* ( ~ *chakama7laq* ) 'hit him/her/it' (pl. formal). In Cantel it is possible to omit the Imperative/Potential clitic in the second person singular; however, the subject agreement clitic is not omitted. Thus, in this dialect, *chatkamoq* ~ *atkamoq*. There are a few verbs, though, which have shortened second person singular forms in Cantel. One such verb is *-el* 'leave, go/come out', which has the forms *ch+at+el-oq* ~ *t+el-oq*. Another such verb is *-ok* 'enter, go/come in': *ch+at+ok-oq* ~ *t+ok-oq*.

At least two intransitive verbs have irregular Imperative forms in Quiché. One of these is the verb *-b'ee* 'go'. This verb has the irregular forms *jat* (2 sg.), *oj* (3 sg.), *jo7* (1 pl.), *jix* (2 pl.), *che7oj* (3, pl.). The verb *-pee(t)* 'come' also has a variety of irregular Imperative forms in different dialects. Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula have the forms *t+aan-oq* (2 sg.), *ix+aan-oq*

(2pl.). Momostenango also has the forms *ch+at+sa7j* (2 sg.) and *ch+ix+sa7j* (2 pl.). Nahualá has either *k+at+aan-oq* (2 sg.), *k+ix+aan-oq* (2pl.) or *k+at+ojo7* (2 sg.), *k+ix+ojo7* (2 pl.). Cantel has the forms *tasa7j* (2 sg.) and *chisa7j* (2 pl.). The second person singular form in Cantel also has a shortened form *sa7j* 'come!' which may be used in isolation. The verb *-pee(t)* also has a regular paradigm which is sometimes used in some dialects: *chatpeetoq*, *(cha+)peetoq*, *chojpeetoq*, *chixpeetoq*, *che7peetoq*.

A paradigm of the Potential form is shown in (18) using the intransitive verb stem *-b'ee* 'go'.

- (18) (a) *ch+in+b'ee-k* 'I should go; I will go'  
 (b) *cha+at+b'ee-k* 'you (sg.) should go;  
                                   you will go'  
 (c) *cha+b'ee laa* 'you (sg. formal) should go;  
                                   you will go'  
 (d) *cha+Ø+b'ee-k* 's/he should go; s/he will go'  
 (e) *ch+oj+b'ee-k* 'we should go; we will go'  
 (f) *ch+ix+b'ee-k* 'you (pl.) should go;  
                                   you will go'  
 (g) *cha+b'ee alaq* 'you (pl. formal) should go;  
                                   you will go'  
 (h) *ch+e7+b'ee-k* 'they should go; they will go'

In modern Quiché these Potential forms are only used in certain very specific syntactic contexts.<sup>12</sup> For example,

they can be used following the adverbial particle *raj* 'soon, almost' to indicate an immediate future tense, as seen in (19).

- (19) *raj ch+in+b'ee-k*  
 soon POT+1SG.B+go-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'I'm going soon'

They can also be used to indicate future tense in conditionals, as seen in (20) (from Kaufman 1986a, Nahualá dialect).

- (20) *wee chi+Ø+peet-ik,*  
 if POT+3SG.B+come-PHRASE.FINAL  
*ch+Ø+in-toj-oh*  
 POT+3SG.B+1SG.A-pay-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'If he should come, I would pay it.'

The potential forms are also used to indicate future tense in time adverbial clauses, as seen in (21) (from a text in the Santa María Chiquimula dialect).

- (21) ... reech k'u ma k'oo ta kaarigo  
 so that nothing you.find.it  
 chri7 ri ch+Ø+aa-b'an chi  
 when the POT+3SG.B+2SG.A-do again  
 ri nik'aj taq sataq chik.  
 the half DISTRIBUTIVE.PL things again  
 '... so that nothing will happen to you when  
 you do the other things.'

The directional imperative clitic *j* is apparently related to the irregular Imperative forms *jat* 'go!' (sg.), *jix* 'go!' (pl.), *jo7* 'let's go!'. Its use is similar to the regular Imperative clitic except that it adds the meaning 'go (and)' to the meaning of the Imperative form. Some examples are given in (22) using the intransitive verb stem *-chakun* 'work'.

- (22) (a) *j+at+chakun-oq* 'go work!' (sg.)  
 (b) *j+ix+chakun-oq* 'go work!' (pl.)

As can be seen in (22), the Directional Imperative takes the phrase-final suffix *-oq* just like the regular Imperative.

The Admonitive clitic *ma* appears on forms which are similar in meaning to the negative imperative. The form of the clitic is clearly related to the independent negative particle *ma(n)* (see section 8.2). A paradigm is given in (23) using the intransitive verb stem *-q'ab'ar* 'get drunk'.

As can be seen, the vowel of the clitic is dropped when immediately followed by another vowel.

- (23) (a) m+in+q'ab'ar-ik 'let me not get drunk'  
 (b) m+at+q'ab'ar-ik 'don't get drunk' (sg.)  
 (c) ma+q'ab'ar laa 'don't get drunk' (sg. formal)  
 (d) ma+∅+q'ab'ar-ik 'let him not get drunk'  
 (e) m+oj+q'ab'ar-ik 'let's not get drunk.'  
 (f) m+ix+q'ab'ar-ik 'don't get drunk' (pl.)  
 (g) ma+q'ab'ar alaḡ 'don't get drunk' (pl. formal)  
 (h) m+e7+q'ab'ar-ik 'let them not get drunk'

Mondloch (1978a:119) claims that such forms are Negative Imperatives. However, the speakers that I have worked with have claimed that they are really not. They say that the true negative imperative (in the second person singular familiar) would be expressed as a Negative Imperfective Indicative: ma k+at+q'ab'ar taj. The context would determine whether this form would be interpreted as an order ('don't get drunk!') or as an assertion ('you will not get drunk'). However, the form in (23b), they insist, is never interpreted as an order but rather as an admonition, the correct translation of which would be something more like 'be careful not to get drunk!' or 'you'd better not get drunk'.

As can be seen in (23), the Admonitive forms take the phrase-final suffix -ik. This is true in all of the

dialects with which I am familiar except the Cantel dialect. In this latter dialect the forms in (23) never take *-ik* but rather take the phrase-final suffix *-oq* which is also seen in the Imperative and Directional Imperative. I do not know whether this is just a trivial morphological difference in the Cantel Admonitive form or if it means that these forms are true negative imperatives in the Cantel dialect.

#### 4.2.1.3 Phrase-Final Suffix

The final element to be discussed in (1) is the phrase-final suffix. According to Kaufman (1986a), all verbs in Quiché are marked for one of three "status" categories, which are called "Plain", "Dependent", and "Perfect". These three status categories are marked on intransitive verbs by means of the following suffixes: *-ik* 'Plain' (on some verbs, *-k*), *-oq* 'Dependent', and *-inaq* 'Perfect'. The only exception to this is the quotative intransitive verb *-chaʔ* 'say', which never takes a status suffix. The Perfect suffix marks verbs in the Perfect aspect and will be discussed further in section 4.2.2. The dependent suffix is used in the Imperative mood and when the verb has an Incorporated Movement clitic (see section 4.2.1.4). In all other cases the Plain status suffix is used.

Two of these status suffixes, the Plain and the Dependent suffixes, are referred to as "phrase-final

suffixes" because they have the characteristic that they are only present when the verb is in "phrase-final position", that is to say, when the verb is the last non-empty constituent of its clause. Thus, for example in (24), the verb is in clause final position; therefore, the phrase-final suffix is found on the verb.

- (24) *iwiir*            *x+in+aatin-ik*  
           yesterday    PERFV+1SG.B+bathe-PHRASE.FINAL  
           'yesterday I took a bath.'

However, in (25), the verb is not in clause final position; therefore, the phrase-final suffix is not present.

- (25) *x+in+aatin*            *iwiir*  
           PERFV+1SG.B+bathe    yesterday  
           'I took a bath yesterday.'

It should be clearly understood that "phrase-final position" is clause final, not sentence final. This can be seen by looking at sentences like the one in (26).<sup>13</sup>

- (26) *k+in+kuun-ik*                            *k+in+b'ee-k*  
           IMPERF+1SG.B+be.able-PF    IMPERF+1SG.B+go-PF  
           'I am able to go'

In (26) the first verb, *kinkuunik*, has the phrase-final suffix even though it is not in sentence final position. This is because there are two finite clauses in (26), the

literal meaning of which is something like 'I am able, I (will) go.' Since the first verb appears at the end of its clause, it has the phrase-final suffix even though it is followed by another word. This construction should be compared with that in (27), which is an alternative way of expressing the meaning of (26).<sup>14</sup>

(27) k+in+kuun                      chi b'een-aam  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+be.able    at    go-NOM  
 'I am able to go.'

In (27) the second verb shows up in a nominalized form as the object of the preposition *chi*. Since this prepositional phrase is a constituent of the main clause, and since it appears after the verb of that clause, that verb does not have the phrase-final suffix. Example (26) should also be compared with example (9). These two examples are superficially similar in that they consist of one intransitive verb followed by another. However, in (9) the first verb does not have the phrase-final suffix. This is because the second clause in (9) is a constituent of the first clause: namely, it is the subject of the verb *-tajin*. In (26), on the other hand, the second clause does not form a constituent of the first clause. Therefore, the phrase-final suffix is appropriate on the first verb in (26).

We have already seen in the previous section how the



Dependent status suffix is used on Imperatives and Directional Imperatives. We have also seen how this suffix appears on Admonitive forms in the Cantel dialect (but not in all dialects). It should also be pointed out that the Dependent status suffix can be used together with the Imperfective clitic. Verbs which have both the Imperfective clitic and the Dependent suffix are understood to be Imperatives (providing there is no Incorporated Movement clitic). Apparently there is no difference in meaning between Imperatives formed with the Imperfective clitic and the Dependent suffix and Imperatives formed with the Imperative/Potential clitic and the Dependent suffix.

While the Dependent status suffix is also a phrase final suffix, its behavior is somewhat different from that of the Plain status suffix. When a Plain status verb appears in non phrase-final position, the suffix *-ik* disappears completely. When a Dependent status verb appears in non phrase-final position, however, the suffix *-oq* does not completely disappear but rather just changes its form to *-a*. Some examples are seen in (28).

(28) (a) k+at+b'iin-oq

IMPERF+2SG.B+walk-DEPENDENT

'walk!'

(b) k+at+b'iin-a                      pa k'ayib'al  
 IMPERF+2SG.B+walk-DEPENDENT in market  
 'walk to the market!'

This is not true in the Cantel dialect, however. In Cantel the suffix *-og* disappears completely in non phrase-final position just like the suffix *-ik*. In those dialects in which *-og* changes to *-a*, the suffix *-a* is always unstressed; and in fact it often sounds like the syllable preceding this suffix may have a slightly greater degree of stress than does *-a*. In this respect the Dependent suffix form *-a* is similar to the Attributive suffix discussed in section 3.5.1.1.

#### 4.2.1.4 Incorporated Movement

There is one further set of inflectional morphemes that appears on intransitive verbs but which was not shown in (1). This is the set of Incorporated Movement clitics, which can optionally appear between the subject agreement clitic and the stem. There are two such clitics in modern Quiché. One is *e7* (Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán *ee*, Cantel *e*). This clitic is related to the intransitive verb root *-b'ee* 'go', which has the alternative form *-e7* in Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel. This clitic has the form *b'e* in Momostenango when it appears after the third person plural set B clitic *e7* and before a consonant-initial verb stem. The clitic adds the meaning 'go to' to the meaning of

the verb. The other clitic has the form *ul*, which sometimes has the alternative forms *il* in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, *al* in Momostenango, and *el* in Cantel (according to Wick and Cochojil-González 1966-9) and Momostenango. In Momostenango the clitic optionally has the form *le* for some speakers when it follows the third person plural set B clitic *e7* and precedes a consonant-initial stem. The clitic *ul* is related to the intransitive verb root *-ul* 'arrive here'. This clitic, which apparently is no longer in use by some Cantel speakers, adds the meaning 'come to' to the meaning of the verb. For those Cantel speakers who do not use this clitic, the other clitic, *e*, can be used to mean either 'go to' or 'come to'. When one of these Incorporated Movement clitics is used, the verb must take the Dependent status suffix. Some examples are seen in (29).

(29) (a) *x+in+e7+chakun-oq*

PERFV+1SG.B+go+work-DEPENDENT

'I went to work'

(b) *x+at+ul+chakun-oq*

PERFV+2SG.B+come+work-DEPENDENT

'you came to work'

(c) *j+at+e7+chakun-oq*

DIR.IMPV+2SG.B+go+work-DEPENDENT

'go to work!'



Similarly, (29g) can only mean 'someone went to get the bench' (lit., 'the bench was gone to be gotten'). It cannot be interpreted as 'the bench went to be gotten'. Two other examples of this were seen previously in example (55) of Chapter 3. In that example *x+n+ee+k'aam-a chi+uloq* can only mean 'someone went to bring me here' (lit., 'I was gone to be brought again hither'), not 'I went to be brought here'. Similarly, *x+n+ee+yaak-a chi+uloq* can only mean 'someone went to get me up' (lit., 'I was gone to be raised again hither'), not 'I went to be raised up.'

Notice in (29e) that when the clitic *e7* appears before a vowel-initial verb stem, the contraction rule applies. This could be taken as evidence that the Incorporated Movement morphemes are clitics rather than affixes. Other than this, there is not a whole lot of evidence one way or the other for treating the Incorporated Movement morphemes as clitics or affixes. About the best that can be said is that there are no arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations and that there are no morphophonological or semantic idiosyncracies. These morphemes do not seem to differ significantly from inflectional affixes with respect to Zwicky and Pullum's other three criteria. Nevertheless, the fact that the Incorporated Movement morphemes originated as intransitive verbs is quite transparent, and this would not ordinarily be the case with inflectional affixes.

In any case, if one decides that the Incorporated Movement morphemes are clitics, then the set B morphemes must also be clitics since they precede the Incorporated Movement clitics. An additional possible bit of evidence for treating the set B morphemes as clitics is that glottal stop insertion (section 4.2.1.1) sometimes applies to the Incorporated Movement morpheme *ul* (~ *il*) in Santa María Chiquimula. Thus, for example, the verb *x+in+il+ch'ajan-oq* 'I came to wash' has been recorded with the form *x+in+i7l+ch'ajan-oq*. Since, as discussed previously, this glottal stop insertion is otherwise only known to occur across word boundaries, this could be taken as evidence that the set B morpheme must be cliticized to the Incorporated Movement morpheme rather than prefixed to it. Furthermore, given that the Incorporated Movement morphemes were originally intransitive verbs, the fact that glottal stop insertion sometimes applies to these may be evidence in favor of the suggestion that was made in section 4.2.1.1 about the origin of initial vowel lengthening in intransitive verbs.

#### 4.2.2 Derivation

In this section we will look at four derivational affixes which can be added to intransitive verb stems. These are *-inaq* 'PERFECT STATUS', *-ib'al* 'LOCATIVE/INSTRUMENTAL NOUN' *-eel* 'AGENT NOMINALIZATION',

-eem ~ -ik 'ACTION NOMINALIZATION', and -isa 'CAUSATIVE'.

As mentioned in section 4.2.1.3, the suffix *-inaq* marks one of the three status categories, namely the Perfect Status, on intransitive verbs. Specifically, the suffix *-inaq* derives Perfect Participles from intransitive verbs. The Perfect Participle can function as a non-verbal predicate which, like any other non-verbal predicate, exhibits subject agreement by means of the set B clitics but does not have a tense/aspect/mood clitic. When the Perfect Participle is used as a predicate, it can be translated into English as a verb in the Perfect aspect.<sup>15</sup> Unlike the English Perfect construction, however, the Quiché Perfect Participle is not further marked for tense and therefore can be translated in English into either the Present Perfect, Past Perfect (Pluperfect), or Future Perfect according to the context. A paradigm is given in (30) using the intransitive verb stem *-b'iin* 'walk'.<sup>16</sup>

- (30) (a) *in b'iininaq* 'I have/had/will have walked'  
 (b) *at b'iininaq* 'you (sg.) have/had/will have walked'  
 (c) *b'iininaq laa* 'you (sg. formal) have/had/will have walked'  
 (d) *(are7) b'iininaq* '(he/she/it) has/had/will have walked'  
 (e) *oj b'iininaq* 'we have/had/will have walked'

(f) ix b'iininaq 'you (pl.) have/had/will have  
walked'

(g) b'iininaq alaq 'you (pl. formal) have/had/  
will have walked'

(h) e7 b'iininaq 'they have/had/will have  
walked'

In addition to indicating the Perfect aspect, some Perfect Participles, in particular those derived from verbs which assign patient-like semantic roles to their subjects, can also function as stative non-verbal predicates. Some examples are seen in (31) using the intransitive verb stem *-kam* 'die'.

(31) (a) at kaminaq 'you have died; you are dead'

(b) e7 kaminaq 'they have died; they are dead'

In some cases these stative Perfect Participles are best translated into English in the Progressive aspect.<sup>17</sup> An example is seen in (32).

(32) war-inaq ri ak'aal  
sleep-PERFECT the child  
'The child is sleeping'

Example (32) can also be translated as 'the child has slept', 'the child has fallen asleep', and 'the child is asleep', all of which indicate a state which persists at the present time and which resulted from a change of state in



the past. Thus, all of these translations are consistent with the notion of perfect aspect. Another example of this can be seen with the Perfect Participle *peet-inaq*, which, when used as a predicate, is often translated 's/he is coming' or 's/he is on his/her way' rather than 's/he has come'. This makes sense considering that in English, 's/he has come' generally means that s/he has arrived here. The Quiché intransitive verb root *-pee(t)*, however, unlike the English verb *come*, can only mean 'to start out in this direction', not 'to arrive here'. The notion of arriving here is expressed by the intransitive verb root *-ul* in Quiché. It should be easy to see how from a Perfect form of *-pee(t)*, whose literal meaning would be 's/he has started out in this direction', it could be inferred that s/he is coming or that s/he is on his/her way.

The stative Perfect Participles can also be used as attributive adjectives. The Perfect Participle, however, never takes the Attributive suffix nor the Degree suffix. An example is seen in (33).

- (33) *jun kam-inaq tz'i7*  
 one die-PERFECT dog  
 'a dead dog'

Even though the Perfect Participle can be used as an attributive adjective, it is different from ordinary Quiché

adjective stems in that, with a few exceptions, one cannot derive abstract nouns and versive intransitive stems from them. Note, in any case, that if a versive stem could be derived from a Perfect Participle, its meaning would probably be the same as the meaning of the intransitive stem from which the Perfect Participle was derived anyway. Stative Perfect Participles can also be used as nouns, as seen in (34).

- (34) iwiiir            xmuuq                    ri    kaminaq  
           yesterday s/he.was.buried the dead(.person)  
           'Yesterday the dead person was buried'

The Locative/Instrumental suffix *-ib'al* derives a noun which denotes either an instrument for performing the action denoted by the verb stem or a place where the event denoted by the verb stem takes place. The initial vowel of the suffix is often dropped in those dialects which have the vowel dropping rule, and it often undergoes vowel harmony in those dialects which have the vowel harmony rule. Some examples are seen in (35).

- (35) (a) atin-ib'al  
           bathe-LOC/INST  
           'bath, place for bathing'

- (b) war-ib'al  
 sleep-LOC/INST  
 'bedroom, dormitory'
- (c) el-eb'al  
 leave-LOC/INST  
 'exit'
- (d) ok-ob'al  
 enter-LOC/INST  
 'entrance'
- (e) oq'-ib'al  
 cry-LOC/INST  
 'something lamentable'

Most such nouns are of class 1a since the final vowel is lengthened in the possessed form. A few such nouns, such as the ones seen in (36), have idiomatic meanings.

- (36) (a) u-peet-ib'aal  
 3SG.A-come-LOC/INST  
 'his/her arrival'
- (b) u-b'iin-ib'aal  
 3SG.B-walk-LOC/INST  
 'his/her way of walking'

There are also a few such nouns which have irregular forms, such as the ones in (37), both of which are derived from the

irregular intransitive verb -wa7 'to eat' (Plain phrase-final form -wa7ik ~ -wi7k, Dependent phrase-final form -wo7q ~ -wo7qoq, Dependent non phrase-final form -wa7qa).

(37) (a) weeb'al 'instrument for eating, plate'

(b) wo7qib'al 'place for eating, dining room'

The Agentive Nominalization suffix -eel derives a noun which denotes the "doer" of the action described by the verb stem. Actually the name Agentive Nominalization is not a very apt name since this suffix can also derive nouns which denote patients or themes rather than agents when it appears on intransitive verb stems which assign patient- or theme-like semantic roles to their subjects. Thus, for example, when this suffix is added to the intransitive verb stem -b'iin 'walk', it derives an agent noun b'iineel 'walker, traveller, passenger'. However, when added to the intransitive verb stem -kam 'die', it forms a patient noun kameel 'dier, one who dies'. This latter word is used, for example, in the proverb shown in (38) (from Mondloch 1978a:153, Nahualá dialect).

(38) xaa uj kam-eel, xaa uj ok'ow-eel  
 just 1PL.B die-AGENT just 1PL.B pass-AGENT  
 pa wee u-wach uleew  
 in the 3SG.A-face earth  
 'We are just diers, we are just passersby in this  
 world'

Colonial grammars of Quiché (e. g., Brasseur 1862:78-117) often treated these Agentive Nominalizations as "future participles" such that a form like *kameel* was taken to mean 'one who has to die'. As can be seen in the first clause of (38), these agentive nouns can be used as non-verbal predicates with a future tense interpretation: this first clause could be translated as 'we are just (ones who are) going to die'. However, this future tense interpretation is an inference derived from the literal meaning of the predicate and real world knowledge. The future tense interpretation is not obligatory, as can be seen from the second clause of (38), which clearly is intended to mean that we ARE just passersby in this world, not that we WILL BE passersby in this world.

There are a few Agentive Nominalizations which either optionally or obligatorily take the prefix *aj-* (see section 3.4.5). For example, the Agentive Nominalization derived from the intransitive verb stem *-t'iiso7man* 'sew' is *ajt'iiso7maneel* 'tailor, seamstress, one who sews'. There

are also a few non-productive Agentive Nominalizations in -oom, e. g. *elaq'oom* 'thief' (< *-elaq'* 'to steal').

The suffix -eem derives the Action Nominalization from intransitive verb stems. Some examples are seen in (39).

- (39) (a) *b'iin-eem*  
 walk-NOM  
 'walking, a walk, trip'
- (b) *eetz'an-eem*  
 play-NOM  
 'playing, game'
- (c) *atin-eem*  
 bathe-NOM  
 'bathing, bath'

In a few exceptional cases the suffix has a vowel other than /ee/. All such examples that I am aware of are shown in (40).

- (40) (a) *b'een-aam*  
 go-NOM  
 'going'
- (b) *war-aam*  
 sleep-NOM  
 'sleeping, sleepiness'

- (c) wi7-m (Nahualá, wa7-iim; Cantel, wa7-im)  
 eat-NOM  
 'eating'

Note that in (40a), the intransitive verb root meaning 'go', which usually has the form -b'ee (or in some dialects, -e(e)(7)), has the form b'een- when it takes the suffix -aam. One might also note that the intransitive verb root meaning 'come', which often has the form -pee, has the form peet when it takes any suffix, including the Action Nominalization suffix, as seen in (41).

- (41) (a) ka+Ø+pee                      chwe7q  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+come tomorrow  
 'S/he is coming tomorrow.'
- (b) ka+Ø+peet-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+come-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'S/he comes.'
- (c) peet-inaq  
 come-PERFECT  
 'S/he is coming, s/he is on his/her way'
- (d) peet-eem  
 come-NOM  
 'coming'

There is another suffix, -ik, which can also derive

Action Nominalizations from intransitive verb stems. Some intransitive stems (including the majority of non-derived intransitive stems and many derived intransitive stems) take the suffix *-eem* while others take the suffix *-ik*. Note that while the Action Nominalization suffix *-ik* is identical in form to the Plain Status suffix for intransitive verbs, there is a difference in that the Plain Status suffix is a phrase final suffix whereas the Action Nominalization suffix is not. Some examples of Action Nominalizations in *-ik* are shown in (42).

- (42) (a) *jiiq'-ik*  
           choke-NOM  
           'choking'
- (b) *q'abar-ik*  
           get.drunk-NOM  
           'getting drunk'

There may be some dialectal variation as to which stems take *-eem* and which take *-ik*. Mondloch (1978a) lists *kameem* in his vocabulary as the Action Nominalization of the intransitive verb root *-kam* 'die' in the Nahualá dialect whereas the usual form in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula seems to be *kamik*.<sup>18</sup> There are also some verbs which have both forms, e. g., *peeteem* ~ *peetik* 'coming'. It is not clear whether there is any difference in meaning between the two forms.



At least one intransitive verb root, *-og'* 'to cry', has an irregular Action Nominalization: *og'eej* 'crying'.

The suffix *-isa* derives transitive causative verb bases from intransitive verb stems.<sup>19</sup> This suffix can probably be added to any intransitive stem which assigns a patient- or theme-like semantic role to its subject. It can not productively be added to any intransitive stem which assigns an agent- or experiencer-type role to its subject, but it can be added to a few such stems. The transitive bases derived by this suffix must undergo further derivation by means of suffixes such as *-Vj* 'TRANSITIVE NON-PERFECT STATUS', *-x* 'PASSIVE', *-n* 'INTRANSITIVE/ANTIPASSIVE', etc. As usual, the subject of the intransitive stem corresponds to the direct object of the transitive causative form while the causer shows up as the subject of the transitive causative form. Some examples are seen in (43-48).

- (43) (a) *-kam* 'to die'  
 (b) *-kam-isa-* 'to kill'
- (44) (a) *-kow-ir*  
           *hard-VERSIVE*  
           'become hard'.  
 (b) *-kowir-isa-* 'make hard'

- (45) (a) -poq'ow `to boil' (intransitive)  
 (b) -poq'ow-isa- `to boil (transitive), to make  
 boil'
- (46) (a) -xojow `to dance'  
 (b) -xojow-isa- `to make dance'
- (47) (a) -atin `to bathe' (intransitive)  
 (b) -atin-isa- `to bathe' (transitive)
- (48) (a) -b'iin `to walk'  
 (b) -b'iin-isa- `to make walk, to drive'

At least one verb takes an irregular form of the causative suffix. This is shown in (49).

- (49) (a) -war `to sleep'  
 (b) -war-tisa- `to put to sleep'

At least two intransitive roots have irregular forms when the causative suffix is added. These are shown in (50-1).

- (50) (a) -el `leave, go/come out'  
 (b) -ee-sa- `to make leave, take/bring out,  
 extract'
- (51) (a) -qaaɟ `to fall, descend, go/come down'  
 (b) -qaa-sa- `to lower, make descend, bring/take  
 down'

## NOTES

1. In Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel and Zunil the first person plural clitic in (2e) has the form *uj*. In Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the third person plural clitic in (2h) has the form *ee*. In Cantel it has the form *e*. When citing the morphological analysis of words, as in (102), I will use the symbol "+" to represent clitic boundaries and the symbol "-" to represent affix boundaries. Since *laa* and *alaq* are clitics, the symbol "+" should be used with these too; however, since these particles are written separately in the orthography, this has not been done in (2).
2. In the following discussion I ignore the formal second person morphemes *laa* and *alaq*. These morphemes are clearly enclitic particles. Furthermore, since their forms are identical whether they are functioning as set A forms or as set B forms, and since their position is different from that of the other set A and set B forms, they really fall outside the set A/set B dichotomy.
3. This variation in vowel length, of course, is not found in six vowel dialects. With monosyllabic vowel-initial intransitive verbs in Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán and Nahualá, this vowel lengthening occurs only in the third person singular form in the Imperfective aspect (e. g., *k+Ø+ook-ik*). In all other cases (e. g., the

forms shown below in 103) the vowel stays short in these dialects. With polysyllabic vowel-initial stems the vowel is always lengthened in the finite inflected forms. The Santa María Chiquimula dialect is generally like Momostenango in that the vowel lengthening occurs in all finite inflected forms of vowel-initial intransitive verbs. However, the stem *-atin* 'to bathe' is irregular in that the initial vowel is not lengthened in any finite form in the third person singular. Thus, for example, Santa María Chiquimula has *x+Ø+atin-ik* 's/he bathed', whereas Momostenango and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán have *x+Ø+aaatin-ik*. All three dialects have *x+in+aaatin-ik* 'I bathed'.

4. In Cantel the third person plural form seen in (3h) does not undergo the contraction rule. In very slow speech a glottal stop is pronounced following the clitic *e*; however, in fast speech there is no such glottal stop. Thus, (3h) is pronounced *xeʔokik* ~ *xeokik* in this dialect. Another example, using the stem *-atin* 'to bathe', is *xeʔatinik* ~ *xeatinik*. Furthermore, with vowel-initial intransitive stems, the third person plural clitic may optionally have the form *eb'* in Cantel. Thus, one can also say *xeb'okik*. The form *eb'* seems to be obligatory with stems which begin with the vowel /e/. For some reason the stem *-atin* 'bathe'

seems to be irregular, however, in that it does not accept the form *eb'*. The existence of forms like *xeatinik* may constitute additional evidence that the set B morphemes are clitics rather than prefixes because diphthongs like /ea/ do not otherwise exist word internally in any dialect of Quiché.

5. As noted in footnote 4, this is the only form which undergoes such vowel lengthening in monosyllabic stems in Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. The reason why this particular form seems to involve greater than normal lengthening in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán (among others?) may be that the underlying form of the Imperfective aspect particle ends in a vowel: /ka/. Thus, the increased length probably involves some kind of contraction of the vowels.
6. Additional evidence that at least the Past Perfective morpheme *x* is a clitic rather than a prefix can be seen from the fact that this morpheme can appear on other word classes besides verbs. For example, it can appear on numbers when these are used in past time adverbial expressions. An example is shown in (i) (from the Santa María Chiquimula dialect).

(i) jee taq                      wa7 x+lujuj    junaab'  
 like DISTRIBUTIVE.PL this PERFV+ten year  
 'ten years ago'

7. I will follow the convention of Comrie (1976) and use terms with initial capital letters (e. g., Imperfective, Past Perfective, etc.) to indicate language particular grammatical categories. Similar terms spelled with initial lower case letters (e. g., imperfective, perfective, past, etc.) will be used for (presumably universal) semantic notions of tense, aspect, mood, etc.
8. In the Cantel dialect the Imperfective aspect clitic always has the form /k/ and never has a vowel. Thus, example (6d) would have the form  $k+\emptyset+b'in-ik$  'he/she/it walks'. In forms like  $kb'inik$  which have an initial consonant cluster, the initial /k/ is rather heavily aspirated. In the officialized alphabet such forms are always written as <cābinic> where <cā> is the Imperfective aspect clitic. This would seem to indicate that this morpheme does have a vowel in this dialect; however, the one Cantel speaker that I worked with very clearly did not have a vowel in such forms (unless one were to interpret the aspiration as a voiceless vowel). It should also be noted that in Colonial Quiché the Imperfective aspect clitic had the

form *q-* before the first person plural set B clitic *oj*, as noted in colonial grammars such as that published by Brasseur (1862:21). This can also be found in modern Cakchiquel and Tzutujil (in which languages the morpheme cognate with the Quiché Imperfective clitic marks the Imperative; see Dayley 1985:87-8 for Tzutujil); however, as seen in (6e), the paradigm seems to have been regularized in modern Quiché. Nevertheless, in the Santa María Chiquimula dialect I have seen a text, consisting of a formal "dialogue" between two men about the history of the town, in which the *q-* allomorph of the Imperfective clitic seems to be consistently used before the first person plural set B clitic. Thus it may be the case that this allomorph is still used in at least some dialects in certain formal styles.

9. The Progressive particle *tajin* actually indicates progressivity and does not just force a simple imperfective reading. Thus, in translating Quiché into Spanish, a form like *kachakunik* in the past tense would generally be translated into the Imperfect (= past imperfective) in Spanish (i. e., *trabajaba* 's/he was working; s/he used to work') whereas a form like *tajin kachakunik* in the past tense would generally be translated into the Imperfect Progressive (= past progressive) in Spanish (i. e., *estaba trabajando* 's/he

was working'). Note further that like the Progressive in English, the Quiché Progressive cannot generally be used with statives, as illustrated in (i).

- (i) \*tajin ka+Ø+r-aaʃ  
 PROG IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-want  
 \*'S/he is wanting it.'

According to Comrie (1976:32-40), this is one of the defining characteristics of progressivity.

10. Sam Colop (to appear) mentions two other modal particles which can also force a future tense inference. One such particle is waʃ, which he says indicates an action which should be executed very soon, a hope or conformity that something will take place or that it is very likely to happen. One of the examples he gives (in the Cantel dialect) is shown in (i).

- (i) k+in+eʃ                      waʃ  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+go PARTICLE  
 'I should go now.'

He also says that this particle can be used together with the Necessitative particle, as seen in (ii).

- (ii) kineʃ na waʃ  
 I.go NEC PARTICLE  
 'Well, I have to go.'





the fact that the verbs are immediately followed by *ri7*. This would not be the case with the demonstrative pronoun *ri7*. The comma in Mondloch's example suggests that *ri7* may be some kind of parenthetical expression, which would be consistent with the presence of the phrase final suffixes.

11. In the Cantel dialect the Imperative/Potential clitic never has a vowel, appearing as *ch* even before consonants. According to Mondloch (1981:84) the Imperative form is also used in certain constructions to relate one action to another. He refers to the Imperative form in this context as the "relative aspect". From Mondloch's examples this use of the imperative form is used in main clauses associated with a temporal clause such that the time reference of the main clause is a relative future with respect to the time reference of the temporal clause. Such main clauses are often introduced by *k'aa te7* 'then, later, afterward, just' or *maja7* 'not yet'. In these constructions, however, the introductory adverbial particles take an enclitic particle *oq ~ (o)qa*. Some examples are shown in (i) and (ii) (Nahualá dialect).

(i) k'aa to7+qa Ø+saq-ir-oq  
 just 3SG.B+white-VERSIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 aree taq k+uj+wa7lij-ik  
 when IMPERF+1PL.B+arise-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'It will have just gotten light when we arise.'

(ii) majo7+qa ch+Ø+qa-wok-oo  
 not.yet IMP+3SG.B+1PL.A-build-DEPENDENT.STATUS  
 lee jun jah aree taq x+Ø+alax  
 the one house when PERFV+3SG.B+be.born  
 q-alk'u7aal  
 1PL.A-child  
 'We had not yet built the house when our child  
 was born.'

Note that in (i) the Imperative/Potential clitic *chi* is absent under conditions which will be discussed below in the text. In (ii) the Imperative verb form is transitive. Transitive verbs will be discussed in the next chapter. The example in (iii), from Henne (1980:112), appears to be an example of this same construction in the Cantel dialect.

(iii) majo+q ch+Ø+ul ri a  
 not.yet IMP/POT+3SG.B+arrive.here the MALE  
 Xwan are tāq x+Ø+pil  
 John when PERFV+3SG.B+butcher.PASSIVE  
 ri aq  
 the pig  
 'Before John came, the pig was butchered.'

12. It is possible that the Potential forms do not exist in the Cantel dialect. I checked forms like those in (19-21) with a speaker of that dialect, and he refused to accept any of these examples, preferring instead to use the imperfective clitic *k* rather than the Imperative/Potential clitic *ch* in such sentences. According to Mondloch (1981:82), the Potential form (which he calls "affirmative mood") was more common in Colonial Quiché than it is now. He also says that even in the cases in which it is still used in the modern language, it is always interchangeable with the Imperfective form. In addition to the environments discussed in the text, Mondloch (1981:83) also says that the Potential form may be used following *k'aa te7* 'then, later, afterwards, just' and in "optative constructions" using the Irrealis Particle *taj*. Examples are shown in (i) and (ii) (Nahualá dialect).

(i) k'aa te7 ch+in+wa7-ik  
 later POT+1SG.B+eat-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'I'll eat later.'

(ii) ch+pee ta lah  
 POT+come IRR 2SG.FORMAL  
 'May you (sg. formal) come.'

It should be noted, however, that the Potential form can only be used in these environments to indicate future tense.

13. The verb *-kuun* in (26) is pronounced *-k(o)win* in Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel. In the construction illustrated in (26), the tense/aspect clitic on the two verbs must obligatorily be the same. Another characteristic of this construction is that the two verbs must have the same subject.
14. In Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel the preposition *che(e)* would be used in place of *chi* in (27).
15. The analysis of *-inag* as a Status suffix is Kaufman's (1986a). A similar analysis is given by Dayley (1985:76-85) for Tzutujil. Personally, however, I have a little difficulty with the idea of the Perfect suffix being a status suffix on the same order as *-ik* and *-oq*. My qualms about this not only have to do with the fact

that the Plain and Dependent status suffixes are phrase-final while the Perfect suffix is not, but also with the fact that the Plain and Dependent suffixes are inflectional while the Perfect suffix is clearly derivational. The Plain and Dependent status suffixes do not change the meaning nor the grammatical class of the stem they are attached to. Rather they indicate (in conjunction with other morphemes) inflectional categories such as mood and/or certain kinds of dependency. The Perfect status suffix is used to indicate Perfect aspect, and aspect is generally an inflectional category. However, the Perfect aspect in Quiché is not marked by any special kind of inflectional morphology but rather by the use of a special kind of non-verbal predicate instead of a normal verb. This special non-verbal predicate is the Perfect Participle, which, as will be clearly seen below, is a type of deverbal adjective, DERIVED from an intransitive verb stem by means of the suffix *-inaq*. Thus, the suffix *-inaq* clearly does change the grammatical class of the stem it is attached to and, therefore, must be considered a derivational affix. I would rather have the notion of Status be reserved for true verbs and treat the Perfect suffix as a derivational affix, which has nothing to do with the system of status inflections.

16. In many dialects, especially those in which the vowel dropping rule applies, the first vowel of the suffix *-inaq* is generally dropped. In those dialects in which the vowel harmony rule applies, this same vowel usually undergoes vowel harmony.
17. Chafe (1980) notes a similar phenomenon in Seneca and Japanese. He argues that those forms in these languages which are best translated into the English Present Perfect are those which denote events which have "perceptible consequences". Those forms which are best translated into the English Present Progressive are those which denote events which do not have such consequences. This is probably what is going on in Quiché also. Notice that a Perfect Participial predicate like *e7 kaminag* 'they have died, they are dead' denotes a state which has resulted from a past event (dying), and which has had very serious consequences for the those beings denoted by the subject of this predicate. Also note that while this predicate can be translated as a Perfect, it can NOT be translated as a Progressive: \*'they are dying'. On the other hand, the predicate *e7 warinaq* can be translated as a Progressive ('they are sleeping'); and it can be seen that here the past change of state has not had very serious consequences for those denoted by the

subject.

18. The form *kamik* can also mean 'death'; however, with this meaning the word often has the abstract noun suffix: *kamikaal*. In some dialects (e. g., Cantel) the form *kamikaal* seems to be the only form possible with the meaning 'death'. This could possibly be due to the fact that in a six vowel dialect the word *kamik* would be indistinguishable from the word *kamiik* 'today'.
19. In many dialects, especially those in which the vowel dropping rule applies, the first vowel of the suffix *-isa* is often dropped. In those dialects in which the vowel harmony rule applies, the initial vowel of *-isa* often undergoes vowel harmony.



CHAPTER 5  
MORPHOLOGY III

5.1 Transitive Verbs

Transitive verbs differ from intransitive verbs in that they not only exhibit subject agreement but also direct object agreement. Transitive verbs also differ from intransitive verbs in that only intransitive verbs take the phrase-final suffixes *-ik* and *-oq*. Transitive verbs either take a different phrase-final suffix or no phrase-final suffix at all. There are two basic types of transitive verbs: non-derived (or root) transitive verbs and derived transitive verbs. The basic structure of a root transitive verb is shown in (1).

(1) tns./asp./mood+obj.agr.+subj.agr.-root-phrase.final

Transitive verb roots are all monosyllabic morphemes of the form CVC. Derived transitive verb stems, on the other hand, are mostly polysyllabic. As seen in (2), the basic structure of a derived transitive verb differs from that of a root transitive verb in that there is no phrase-final suffix.

(2) tns./asp./mood+obj.agr.+subj.agr.-stem

Derived transitive verb stems are of three basic types: those ending in /j/, those ending in the suffix *-V,b'aʔ*, and

other stems ending in /ʔ/. The differences between these will be discussed below.

## 5.2 Inflection

### 5.2.1 Subject and Object Agreement

Transitive verbs do not mark subject agreement in the same way as intransitive verbs: rather than marking subject agreement by means of the set B clitics, transitive verbs use the set A prefixes seen in table 2 of Chapter 3 for this purpose. Transitive verbs do also take the set B clitics, but these are used to indicate direct object agreement rather than subject agreement. Thus it can be seen that Quiché has an ergative/absolute verb agreement system. The set B clitics mark subject agreement on intransitive verbs and direct object agreement on transitive verbs while subject agreement on transitive verbs is marked by the set A prefixes. Note, however, that the verb agreement is not ergative/absolute in the formal second person. In this case, intransitive subjects, transitive direct objects and transitive subjects are all three marked by means of the enclitic particles *laa* (sg.) and *alaa* (pl.). This does not lead to any confusion, though, because one can never have both a formal second person subject and a formal second person direct object in the same clause (except in the case of reflexives and reciprocals, which are marked differently).

There are some slight differences between the forms of the first person singular set A prefixes used on transitive verbs and those of the first person singular set A prefixes, shown in table 2 of Chapter 3, which are used on nouns. As discussed in section 3.4.1.1, the first person singular prefix used on consonant-initial nouns is generally *nu-* although on a few nouns in some dialects this prefix has the form *in-*. On vowel-initial nouns the first person singular prefix has the form *w-*. On consonant-initial transitive verbs, however, the usual form of the first person singular set A prefix is *in-*. On vowel-initial transitive verbs the first person singular prefix may either have the form *w-* or the form *inw-*. In the dialects with which I am most familiar, it seems to be the case that the form *w-* is often used on the vowel-initial derived transitive verb stem *-aaj* 'want' but that the form *inw-* is most common on all other vowel-initial transitive verbs. Nevertheless, native speakers seem to agree that either form can in principle be used on any vowel-initial transitive verb. Although the form *in-* is the one which is practically always used on consonant-initial transitive verbs, the form *nu-* is used in the Nahualá dialect when the verb has an Incorporated Movement clitic (see section 5.2.4). Colonial grammars of Quiché testify to the fact that in older forms of the language the form *nu-* was used more extensively on

consonant-initial transitive verbs. According to Brasseur (1862:44, 47) the form *nu-* was apparently obligatory following the Imperfective aspect clitic, and it was in free variation with *in-* following the Past Perfective clitic and the Imperative/Potential clitic.

It might be noted that the allomorph *in-* of the first person singular set A prefix is identical in form to the corresponding set B clitic. It is also true that ergative/absolutive systems generally display "split ergativity" (Silverstein 1976, Dixon 1979). One variety of split ergativity that has been found in some languages is one in which there is a nominative/accusative system in the first and/or second person and an ergative/absolutive system elsewhere. Thus, one might consider the possibility that Quiché has such a split ergative verb agreement system. I am inclined to think, however, that the identity of form in the first person singular morphemes is fortuitous and does not mean that the verb agreement is split ergative. For one thing, note that the verb agreement is not nominative/accusative in the first person singular since the form *in* appears not only as a marker of agreement with transitive subjects and intransitive subjects but also with direct objects. It can also be seen that there are other allomorphs of the first person singular set A prefix which are identical to the forms used with nouns (or in any case, different from the set B clitic). It would be unusual, to

say the least, to find a split ergative system in which the split occurred with only some first person singular forms but not others. Furthermore, it can also be seen that which allomorph of the set A prefix is used depends entirely on the morphophonological environment and has nothing to do with either syntax or semantics. It does not seem to make much sense to me to say that the verb agreement system is ergative/absolutive on first person singular vowel-initial transitive verbs and consonant initial transitive verbs with an Incorporated Movement clitic, but that it is not ergative/absolutive on consonant-initial transitive verbs without Incorporated Movement clitics. This would not be one of the normally recognized environments for "split ergativity" (Dixon 1979).<sup>1</sup>

A paradigm of a consonant-initial transitive verb with third person singular direct object is given in (3) using the transitive verb root *-b'an* 'do, make'.

- (3) (a) *x+∅+in-b'an-o* 'I did it'  
 (b) *x+∅+aa-b'an-o* 'you (sg.) did it'  
 (c) *x+∅+b'an laa* 'you (sg. formal) did it'  
 (d) *x+∅+uu-b'an-o* 's/he did it'  
 (e) *x+∅+qa-b'an-o* 'we did it'  
 (f) *x+∅+ii-b'an-o* 'you (pl.) did it'  
 (g) *x+∅+b'an alaḡ* 'you (pl. formal) did it'  
 (h) *x+∅+ki+b'an-o* 'they did it'

As can be seen in (3b, d, and f) the set A prefixes which have the form V(w)- when used on nouns (as shown in table 2 of Chapter 3) have long vowels when used on the verb in (3). In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula this vowel lengthening occurs whenever these three set A prefixes appear on a transitive verb following the third person singular set B clitic.

This is also true in Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, but only when the Imperfective aspect clitic is used. William Norman (personal communication) says that Nahualá is like Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán; however, the Nahualá forms given in Mondloch (1978a) seem to show the lengthening with any tense/aspect/mood clitic as in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula. The one Nahualá speaker that I consulted on this matter seemed to always have short vowels in the set A prefixes used on transitive verbs when the prefix appeared three or more syllables from the end of the word; however, if one of the set A prefixes of the form V(w)- appeared in the penultimate syllable of a transitive verb, the vowel was always lengthened following the third person singular set B clitic regardless of which tense/aspect/mood clitic was present. Thus, for example, in the verb  $x+\emptyset+a-b'an-oh$  'you did it', this speaker had a short vowel because the prefix  $a-$  is three syllables from the end of the word. The same would be true when the verb has the Imperfective aspect

clitic. However, when this verb appears in non phrase-final position, the phrase-final suffix is dropped, and the set A prefix is in the penultimate syllable. In this case, then, the Nahualá speaker I consulted lengthened the vowel of the set A prefix:  $x+\emptyset+aa-b'an$  *iwiir* 'you did it yesterday'. In all four of these dialects the vowels of these three set A prefixes are short whenever they are preceded by any non-zero set B clitic. Some examples are shown in (4) using the transitive verb root *-ch'ay* 'hit'.

- (4) (a)  $k+in+a-ch'ay-o$  'you (sg.) hit me'  
 (b)  $k+at+u-ch'ay-o$  's/he hits you (sg.)'  
 (c)  $k+oj+i-ch'ay-o$  'you (pl.) hit us'

When the third person plural set B clitic  $e7$  appears before one of the vowel initial set A prefixes, or immediately before a vowel initial verb stem, the contraction rule applies. A paradigm is given in (5) using the vowel-initial transitive verb root *-il* 'see'.<sup>2</sup>

- (5) (a)  $xi7nwilo$  ( $\leftarrow /x\#e7\#inw+il+o/$ ) 'I saw them'  
 ~  $x+e7+w-il-o$   
 (b)  $xa7wilo$  ( $\leftarrow /x\#e7\#aw+il+o/$ ) 'you (sg.) saw  
 them'  
 (c)  $xi7l\ laa$  ( $\leftarrow /x\#e7\#il\#laa/$ ) 'you (sg.  
 formal) saw them'  
 (d)  $x+e7+r-il-o$  's/he saw them'

- (e) x+e7+q-il-o 'we saw them'
- (f) xi7wilo (< /x#e7#iw+il+o/) 'you (pl.) saw  
them'
- (g) xi7l alaq (< /x#e7#il#alaq/) 'you (pl.  
formal) saw them'
- (h) x+e7+k-il-o 'they saw them'

There are certain complications involved in the use of the formal second person morphemes on transitive verbs. The problem can be seen by looking at forms like *xinch'ay laa* and *xinch'ay alaq*, which, given the identity of the forms of the first person singular set A and set B morphemes, could theoretically be parsed in two different ways, as shown in (6) (where the three dots represent the possible position of a set A or set B morpheme if there were one).

- (6) (a) x+...in-ch'ay laa 'I hit you (sg. formal)'
- (b) x+in+...ch'ay laa 'you (sg. formal) hit me'

Mondloch (1978a:46-7,68) claims that this form indeed has the ambiguity shown in (6) in the Nahualá dialect. However, the Nahualá speakers that I have consulted personally, as well as speakers from Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel, all agree that *xinch'ay laa* can only be interpreted as in (6b), where *in* is understood to be a set B clitic indicating the direct object and where *laa* indicates the subject. In order to express the meaning of (6a), a special construction, called the



"Absolutive Antipassive" construction is used. This construction, which will be discussed in detail in section 8.4.2, is illustrated in (7).

- (7) x+in+ch'ay-an                      chee    laa  
 PERFV+1SG.B+hit-ANTIPASSIVE    to    2SG.FORMAL  
 'I hit you (sg. formal)'

Mondloch (1978a:68) also mentions the form in (7) as a way of disambiguating (6). There are also other ways of expressing the meaning of (6a), some of which are shown in (8). (These forms will be discussed in detail in later sections.)

- (8) (a) COMPLETIVE PASSIVE  
 x+ch'ay-ataj              laa              w-umaal  
 PERFV+hit-PASSIVE    2SG.FORMAL    1SG.A-by  
 'you (sg. formal) were hit by me'
- (b) FOCUS ANTIPASSIVE  
 in x+in+ch'ay-ow              laa  
 I    PERFV+1SG.B+hit-FOCUS    2SG.FORMAL  
 'I was the one who hit you.'

However, the Absolutive Antipassive form shown in (7) seems to be the least pragmatically marked of these three constructions. It might also be noted that the meaning of (6b) can also be expressed by means of these alternative

constructions; however, the active transitive construction in (6b) seems to be the least pragmatically marked.

In addition to the obvious problems with the first person singular forms in (6), there also seem to be complications with the use of the third person set A prefixes together with the formal second person morphemes. The forms in question are shown in (9).

(9) (a) x+uu-ch'ay            laa  
           PERFV+3SG.A-hit 2SG.FORMAL  
           `s/he hit you (sg. formal)'

(b) x+ki-ch'ay            laa  
           PERFV+3PL.A-hit 2SG.FORMAL  
           `they hit you (sg. formal)'

(c) x+uu-ch'ay            alaq  
           PERFV+3SG.A-hit 2PL.FORMAL  
           `s/he hit you (pl. formal)'

(d) x+ki-ch'ay alaq  
           PERFV+3PL.A-hit 2PL.FORMAL  
           `they hit you (pl. formal)'

Though there does not seem to be anything obviously wrong with these forms in principle, Mondloch (1978a:48) claims that these forms are ungrammatical. In order to express the meanings of these forms, one of the alternative

constructions in (10) must be used.

(10) (a) SIMPLE PASSIVE

x+ch'aay                      alaq                      k-umaal  
 PERFV+hit.PASSIVE    2PL.FORMAL    3PL.A-by  
 'you (pl. formal) were hit by them'

(b) ABSOLUTIVE ANTIPASSIVE

x+e7+ch'ay-an                                      chee    alaq  
 PERFV+3PL.B+hit-ANTIPASSIVE    to    2PL.FORMAL  
 'they hit you (pl. formal)'

(c) COMPLETIVE PASSIVE

x+ch'ay-ataj                      alaq                      k-umaal  
 PERFV+hit-PASSIVE    2PL.FORMAL    3PL.A-by  
 'you (pl. formal) were hit by them'

(d) FOCUS ANTIPASSIVE

a7re7    x+e7+ch'ay-ow                                      alaq  
 they    PERFV+3PL.B+hit-FOCUS    2PL.FORMAL  
 'they were the ones who hit you (pl. formal)'

Apparently (10a and b) are the least pragmatically marked of these. The speakers I have consulted from Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula, on the other hand, seem to find nothing at all wrong with the forms in (9). The speaker I consulted from Cantel agreed that at least the form in (9a) exists (and also 9d?); however, he says that it is not commonly used. Furthermore, he claims that this form does

not have the meaning given. Rather he says that this form should be correctly analyzed as in (11) where the third person singular set A subject agreement prefix agrees with a formal second person singular subject treated as a third person singular noun phrase.

- (11) x+Ø+uu-ch'ay                    laa  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit    2SG.FORMAL  
 'you (sg. formal) hit him/her/it'

The literal translation of (11) is supposed to be something like 'your (sg. formal) personality hit me'. If this is correct, it can be seen that this construction would have a somewhat unusual structure, which may explain its rarity (or in some dialects perhaps, its ungrammaticality).

Apparently the only set A prefix that can be used together with a formal second person clitic without any complication in any dialect is the first person plural prefix. This is illustrated in (12).

- (12) x+qa-ch'ay                    laa  
 PERFV+1PL.A-hit    2SG.FORMAL  
 'we hit you (sg. formal)'

Thus, aside from forms like (12), a formal second person clitic on a transitive verb will in most cases be taken as marking the subject.<sup>3</sup>

### 5.2.2 Tense/Aspect/Mood

The tense/aspect/mood clitics used with transitive verbs are identical to those used with intransitive verbs (see section 4.2.1.2) with the exception of the Future clitic, which has the form *xch(i)* rather than *xk(a)* when used on a transitive verb which has the third person singular set B clitic  $\emptyset$ . As with the form *xk(a)*, however, the form *xch(i)* only appears in ritual speech in modern Quiché. Some examples of the use of the Imperfective clitic have already been seen in (4). Examples of the use of the Past Perfective clitic have been seen in (3, 5, 6, and 12). An example of the Potential use of the Imperative/Potential clitic on a transitive verb was seen in the second verb of example (20) of Chapter 4. Some examples of the use of the other clitics can be seen in (13-15).

(13) (a) *ch+in+a-ch'ay-a7*

IMP/POT+1SG.B+2SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'hit me!' (sg.)

(b) *chu7ch'aya7* (< /ch#e7#u+ch'ay+a7/)

IMP/POT+3PL.B+3SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'would that s/he hit them'

(c) *ch+ $\emptyset$ +ii-ch'ay-a7*

IMP/POT+3SG.B+2PL.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'hit him/her/it!' (pl.)

(14) (a) j+Ø+aa-b'an-a7

DIR.IMP+3SG.B+2SG.A-do-DEPENDENT

'go and do it!' (sg)

(b) ji7kamisaa7 (< /j#e7#i-kamisaa7/)

DIR.IMP+3PL.B+2PL.A-kill

'go and kill them!' (pl.)

(15) (a) m+Ø+aa-b'an-o

ADMON+3SG.B+2SG.A-do-PHRASE.FINAL

'don't do it!' (sg.)

(b) m+in+u-ch'ay-o

ADMON+1SG.B+3SG.A-hit-PHRASE.FINAL

'let him/her not hit me!'

As can be seen in (13c), (14a), and (15b), the vowel lengthening of certain set A prefixes also occurs after the Imperative/Potential, Directional Imperative, and Admonitive clitics (in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Nahualá). There is one exception to this, however, in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula. In these two dialects the vowel does not lengthen in the second person singular imperative with a third person singular direct object, as seen in (16).

(16) chach'aya7 'hit him/her!' (sg.)

There is reason to believe, however, that the form in (16)

should not be analyzed as a form in which vowel lengthening has failed to apply to the set A prefix; that is to say, it should not be analyzed as shown in (17).

(17)  $ch+\emptyset+a-ch'ay-a7$

POT/IMP+3SG.B+2SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT

Rather it seems that (16) should properly be analyzed as a form which lacks a set A prefix, as shown in (18).

(18)  $cha+\emptyset+ch'ay-a7$

POT/IMP+3SG.B+hit-DEPENDENT

There are a number of reasons for believing this. For one thing, it seems that the Imperative/Potential clitic can optionally be omitted on a transitive verb if the following conditions are met: (1) the set B clitic is  $\emptyset$  (third person singular), and (2) the resultant form begins with a consonant.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the possibility exists for omitting the clitic on forms like the following:  $(cha+)\emptyset-ch'ay-a7$  *laa* 'hit him/her! (sg. formal)',  $(cha+)\emptyset-qa-ch'ay-a7$  'let's hit him/her!',  $(cha+)\emptyset-ch'ay-a7$  *alaq* 'hit him/her (pl. formal)',  $(cha+)\emptyset-ki-b'ana7$  'would that they hit him/her',  $(cha+)\emptyset-r-il-a7$  'would that he see him/her'. But in forms like  $ch+\emptyset+uu-ch'ay-a7$  'would that s/he hit him/her', the Imperative/Potential clitic cannot be omitted because the resulting form would begin with a vowel. The only exception to this is in the formal second person forms on vowel

initial verbs where it is possible to omit the Imperative/Potential clitic even though the result begins with a vowel: (ch+)il-a7 laa 'see him/her/it! (sg. formal)', but note here that the initial vowel is the vowel of the root, not the vowel of a set A prefix as would be the case in all of the prohibited forms. Now looking at the second person singular form in (16), it can be seen that the morphemes which appear before the root morpheme are identical in form to the morphemes which appear before the root in the formal second person singular form *chach'aya7 laa*, which clearly has no set A prefix since the subject is marked by the enclitic particle *laa*. Furthermore, it is possible to omit the Imperative/Potential clitic in (16), which results in the form *ch'aya7*. Note that this form is perfectly consistent with the above two criteria for dropping the Imperative/Potential clitic provided we assume that there is no set A prefix a(a)- in (16).<sup>2</sup> Further evidence for this can be seen from the fact that the vowel of the clitic *cha* tends to undergo vowel harmony, especially in Santa María Chiquimula. Thus, the third person plural form *cha+Ø+ki-ch'ay-a7* is generally pronounced *chikich'aya7* in both Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula. This is also often the case with the second person singular forms in Santa María Chiquimula. Thus the form *chakira7* 'untie it! (sg.)' would sometimes be pronounced *chikira7* in Santa María Chiquimula (cf. *chiikira7* 'untie it (pl.)'). This is



significant because set A prefixes generally are not subject to vowel harmony in any dialect.

The Past Perfective clitic *x*, examples of which have been seen above, has a slightly different form in the Santa María Chiquimula dialect when used with transitive verbs. In this dialect the Past Perfective clitic has the form *xV* when it is followed by the third person singular set B clitic  $\emptyset$ , if this is in turn followed by either the first person plural set A prefix *qa-* or the third person plural set A prefix *ki-* on a consonant-initial transitive verb. Said more simply, the Past Perfective clitic has the form *xV* with consonant-initial transitive verbs when the clitic is followed immediately by a consonant initial set A prefix. The quality of the vowel of *xV* is determined by vowel harmony. Some examples of this phenomenon are seen in (19) (cf. 3 e and h).

(19) (a) *xa+ $\emptyset$ +qa-b'an-o* 'we did it'

(b) *xi+ $\emptyset$ +ki-b'an-o* 'they did it'

If the transitive verb stem begins with a vowel, the Past Perfective clitic does not have a vowel even when the other conditions mentioned above are met. However, in these cases the clitic *x* is syllabic. Note that since the third person singular set A prefix is consonant-initial on vowel initial transitive verbs, the Past Perfective clitic is syllabic

immediately before this prefix too. This is illustrated in (20), where the space after the Past Perfective clitic is intended to represent the syllabicity of this morpheme. (The syllabicity is not actually represented in the PLFM orthography.)

- (20) (a) x Ø+r-il-o 's/he saw him/her/it'  
 (b) x Ø+q-il-o 'we saw it'  
 (c) x Ø+k-il-o 'they saw it'

Notice that the phenomena being discussed here are found only when the Past Perfective clitic appears immediately before a consonant initial set A prefix. The clitic neither has a vowel nor is syllabic if there is no set A prefix even if the clitic otherwise is immediately followed by a consonant. Thus, as seen in (21), when the Past Perfective clitic appears immediately before a consonant-initial transitive verb with a formal second person subject, or immediately before a consonant initial intransitive verb, the clitic forms a simple consonant cluster with the following consonant.

- (21) (a) x+Ø+b'an laa 'you (sg. formal) did it'  
 (b) x+Ø+b'an alaqa 'you (pl. formal) did it'  
 (c) x+Ø+kam-ik 's/he died'

In the Momostenango dialect the Past Perfective clitic never has a vowel; however, it is syllabic in exactly the

same environments in which it is syllabic in Santa María Chiquimula, and furthermore it is syllabic in Momostenango in exactly the same environments in which it has a vowel in Santa María Chiquimula. In Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel the Past Perfective clitic never has a vowel nor is it ever syllabic. All of this might perhaps indicate that the Past Perfective clitic originally ended in a vowel which is in the process of being lost. As far as I know, however, there is no evidence for such a vowel in Colonial Quiché manuscripts.<sup>6</sup> It is also not clear why evidence for such a vowel would only show up before consonant-initial set A prefixes and not before other consonants. Another possibility is that the Past Perfective morpheme, since it is a clitic and, hence, a separate word rather than a prefix, was originally syllabic but that this syllabicity is being lost except in certain environments in Santa María Chiquimula where the syllabicity has been reinterpreted in the form of an epenthetic vowel. Again, however, it is not clear why the syllabicity only remains before consonant initial set A prefixes nor why the epenthetic vowel is inserted only before such prefixes on consonant-initial verbs.

### 5.2.3 Phrase-Final and Other Status Suffixes

The three Status categories, Plain, Dependent, and Perfect (see section 4.2.1.3) are not marked in the same way

on transitive verbs as they are on intransitive verbs. Furthermore, the status categories are marked differently on the various types of transitive verbs.

On root transitive verbs, the Status categories are marked by the following suffixes (following Kaufman 1986a): -o ~ -u 'PLAIN', -a7 ~ -o7 ~ -u7 'DEPENDENT', -oom ~ -uum 'PERFECT'. Of these three suffixes, the Plain Status suffix is a phrase-final suffix while the Dependent and Perfect Status suffixes are not. The Perfect Status suffix is a derivational suffix which derives Perfect Passive Participles from transitive verb roots. The Plain and Dependent Status suffixes, on the other hand, are inflectional suffixes whose sole purpose is to mark their respective Status categories.<sup>7</sup>

The Plain Status suffix for root transitive verbs, as noted above, has two allomorphs. The allomorph -u is used on roots with the vowel /u/ while the allomorph -o is used on all other roots as seen in (22).

- (22) (a) x+Ø+in-b'an-o 'I did it'  
 (b) x+Ø+in-k'ex-o 'I changed it'  
 (c) x+Ø+in-miq'-o 'I heated it'  
 (d) x+Ø+in-koj-o 'I used it'  
 (e) x+Ø+in-pus-u 'I slit it'

Like the intransitive Plain Status suffix -ik, the root

transitive Plain Status suffix *-o ~ -u* is a phrase-final suffix because it is present only when the verb to which it is suffixed is the last overt constituent of its clause, as illustrated in (23).

(23) (a) *iwiir*            *x+Ø+in-b'an-o*  
 yesterday PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-do-PLAIN  
 'yesterday I did it'

(b) *x+Ø+in-b'an*                    *iwiir*  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-do yesterday  
 'I did it yesterday'

(c) *ri ja7*    *ri*    *x+Ø+in-tij-o*  
 the water the PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-drink-PLAIN  
*x+Ø+uu-b'an*                    *k'ax chwe*  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do harm to.me  
 'The water that I drank made me sick'

Note in particular that the first verb in (23c), *xintijo* 'I drank it', has the phrase-final suffix *-o* because it is the last overt constituent of the relative clause *ri xintijo* 'that I drank'. On the other hand, the second verb in (23c), *xuub'ano* 'it did it', does not have a phrase-final suffix because it is not the last overt constituent of the main clause *ri ja7 ... xuub'an k'ax chwe* 'the water made me sick'.

A number of transitive verb roots have irregular forms.

These are mostly roots which end in /ʔ/ or /h/. One example is the root /tah/ 'to hear' (phrase-final form -too, Chichicastenango -taʔo, Cantel -taʔ; non phrase-final form -taa, Cantel -ta), which was already discussed in section 2.2.1. The verb /chah/ 'to choose' has forms parallel to those of /tah/. Other examples are -tiʔ 'bite', and -yaʔ 'give'. Both of these latter two verbs may have regular phrase-final forms: -tiʔ-o and -yaʔ-o. However, some speakers pronounce these as -tyoʔ and -yoʔ in Momostenango. The form -tyoʔ apparently results from the operation of the optional phonological rule /CV<sub>1</sub>ʔV<sub>2</sub>/ > CyV<sub>2</sub>ʔ which was discussed in section 2.1.3. In Santa María Chiquimula these are pronounced -tyo and -yoʔo while in Cantel they are pronounced -tyoʔ and -yaʔ. The non phrase-final form of -tiʔ is pronounced -tiʔ (Cantel -tya) while the non phrase-final form of -yaʔ is -ya in Cantel and -yaa in the other dialects. The verbs -suʔ(-u) 'to wipe' and -toʔ(-o) 'to help' lack phrase-final suffixes in Cantel as do all transitive roots that end in /ʔ/.

The Dependent Status suffix for root transitive verbs has three allomorphs. The allomorph -uʔ is used with roots with the vowel /u/, -oʔ is used with roots with the vowel /o/, and -aʔ is used with all other roots. As with the intransitive Dependent Status suffix, the transitive Dependent suffix is used on Imperatives and on verbs with

Incorporated Movement clitics (see section 5.2.4).  
Imperative examples are seen in (24).<sup>25</sup>

- (24) (a) cha+Ø+b'an-a7 'do it!'  
 (b) cha+Ø+k'ex-a7 'change it!'  
 (c) cha+Ø+miq'-a7 'heat it!'  
 (d) cha+Ø+koj-o7 'use it!'  
 (e) cha+Ø+pus-u7 'slit it!'

The Dependent Status suffix -a7 ~ -o7 ~ -u7, unlike the Plain Status suffix -o ~ -u, is not a phrase-final suffix because it is not dropped in non phrase-final position. However, as discussed in section 2.2.2, the word-final glottal stop dropping rule often applies to this suffix in non phrase-final position. One might consider the possibility that at least the /ʔ/ of the Dependent suffix is a phrase-final suffix, but this move would not seem to be warranted given that the word-final glottal stop dropping rule seems to be optional in many dialects.

Some of the irregular transitive verb roots discussed above have the irregular Dependent forms shown in (25).

- (25) (a) /tah/ 'to hear': -ta7  
 (b) -ti7 'to bite': -tya7 (Santa María Chiquimula), -ti7a7 (Momostenango, Nahualá)

- (c) -ya7 'to give': -ya7 (Momostenango),  
 -y(7)a7 (Santa María Chiquimula),  
 -ya7a7 (Nahualá)

The Perfect Status suffix -oom ~ -uum derives Perfect Passive Participles from transitive verb roots. The allomorph -uum is used on roots with the vowel /u/ while -oom is used on all other transitive roots. Some examples are seen in (26).

- (26) (a) b'an-oom  
 do-PERFECT  
 'done'
- (b) k'ex-oom  
 change-PERFECT  
 'changed'
- (c) miq'-oom  
 heat-PERFECT  
 'heated'
- (d) koj-oom  
 use-PERFECT  
 'used'
- (e) pus-uum  
 slit-PERFECT  
 'slit'



Some irregular forms are *toom* 'heard' (from /tah/ 'to hear') and *yoom* (Momostenango) 'given' (from -ya7 'to give'). The Perfect Passive Participles derived from transitive verb roots ending in /7/ generally have regular forms in Nahualá, e. g., *to7oom* 'helped' from -to7. However, these forms undergo the vowel dropping rule discussed in section 2.2.1 in non phrase-final position, e. g., *to7m*. The same is true in Santa María Chiquimula except that in that dialect the vowel of the Perfect suffix is short following a /7/: *to7om* ~ *to7m*. In Momostenango (except in the form *yoom* seen above) the Perfect suffix never has a vowel following a glottal stop: *to7m*.

The use of the Perfect Passive Participle parallels that of the Perfect Participle derived from intransitive verbs as seen in section 4.2.2. The Perfect Passive Participle is basically a deverbal adjective which can function as a noun modifier, as illustrated in (27), and as an adjectival predicate, as seen in (28). Note in (27) that the vowel of the Perfect Passive Participle is shortened in non phrase-final position.

- (27) *tzak-om*            *saqmo7l*  
       *cook-PERFECT* *egg*  
       'boiled egg'

(28) e7        muq-uum

3PL.B bury-PERFECT

'they are buried; they have been buried'

Perfect Passive Participles can also be used as nouns, as seen in (29).

(29) (a) mok-oom

ask.for.the.services.of-PERFECT

'(one who has been) asked for the services of;  
servant'

(b) nu-mok-oom

1SG.A-ask.for.the.services.of-PERFECT

'my servant'

Also, in the same way that the Perfect Participle can be used to indicate Perfect aspect in an intransitive clause, the Perfect Passive Participle can be used to indicate Perfect aspect in a transitive clause. In such cases subject agreement is indicated by a set A prefix on the Perfect Passive Participle and direct object agreement is indicated by a set B clitic. Examples are seen in (30).

(30) (a) at        nu-ch'ay-oom

3SG.B 1SG.A-hit-PERFECT

'I have hit you'

(b) e7 w-il-oom  
 3PL.B 1SG.A-see-PERFECT  
 'I have seen them'

In addition, like the Perfect Participle, some Perfect Passive Participles are best translated into English in the Progressive aspect rather than the Perfect, as illustrated in (31).<sup>9</sup>

(31) (a) ri achii Ø u-chap-om  
 the man 3SG.B 3SG.A-grab-PERFECT  
 r-ikaaj aree x+Ø+oopan  
 3SG.A-axe when PERFV+3SG.B-arrive.there  
 pa k'ache7laaj  
 in forest  
 'the man was holding his axe when he arrived  
 at the forest'

Note that except for the lack of tense/aspect/mood clitics, the forms in (30-1) look similar to transitive verbs rather than non-verbal predicates because they exhibit both subject and object agreement. Thus, one could argue that these forms are a type of transitive verb where the PERFECT suffix is simply a Status marker rather than a derivational suffix. However, it should be noted that in the cases where there is a difference, the set A prefixes used on the Perfect Passive Participle are the forms that are used with nouns, never the forms used with ordinary

transitive verbs, as seen in (30). Thus, forms like those in (181) actually do look, at least superficially, like non-verbal predicates of the type seen in (32).

(32) at      nu-k'ajool  
               2SG.B 1SG.A-man's.son  
               'you are my son'

One could, therefore, argue that a form like (30a) literally means something like 'you are my one-who-has-been-hit'. This would then be consistent with the adjectival and nominal uses of the Perfect Passive Participle seen in (27-29). I will not pursue the consequences of such an analysis here, however.

As was seen in (1-2), root transitive verbs and derived transitive verbs differ in that derived transitive verbs have no phrase-final suffix. Another difference between these two types of verbs is that the Plain and Dependent status categories are not distinguished on derived transitive verbs. As mentioned before, there are three types of derived transitive verbs: those ending in /j/, those ending in the suffix -V<sub>r</sub>b'aʔ, and those ending in other /ʔ/-final suffixes. With derived transitive verbs ending in /j/, both the Plain and Dependent Statuses are marked by the suffix -V<sub>r</sub>j, according to Kaufman (1986a), where V<sub>r</sub> indicates lengthening of the vowel which precedes

this suffix. On the other two types of derived transitive verbs, the Plain and Dependent Statuses are both unmarked. Some examples are seen in (33-36).<sup>10</sup>

(33) (a) x+Ø+aa-kej-e-ej (Plain)  
 PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-horse-THEMATIC.V-PLAIN/DEP  
 'you mounted it'

(b) cha+Ø+kej-e-ej (Dependent)  
 IMP/POT+3SG.B+horse-THEMATIC.V-PLAIN/DEP  
 'mount it!' (sg.)

(34) (a) x+Ø+uu-kam-isa-aj (Plain)  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP  
 's/he killed him/her/it'

(b) cha+Ø+uu-kam-isa-aj (Dependent)  
 IMP/POT+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP  
 'would that s/he kill him/her/it'

(35) (a) k+e7+qa-q'oy-ob'a7-Ø (Plain)  
 IMPERF+3PL.B+1PL.A-lying-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP  
 'we (will) leave them in a lying position'

(b) ch+e7+qa-q'oy-ob'a7-Ø (Dependent)  
 IMP/POT+3PL.B+1PL.A-lying-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP  
 'let's leave them in a lying position'

(36) (a) x+Ø+ii-ch'ay-ala7-Ø (Plain)

PERFV+3SG.B+2PL.A-hit-CELERITIVE-PLAIN/DEP

'you (pl.) hit him/her/it rapidly'

(b) ch+Ø+ii-ch'ay-ala7-Ø (Dependent)

IMP/POT+3SG.B+2PL.A-hit-CELERITIVE-PLAIN/DEP

'hit him/her/it rapidly!' (pl.)

Though these derived verbs do not have phrase final suffixes, the vowel shortening sandhi rule, which was discussed in section 2.2.1, applies to derived transitive verbs in /j/ in non phrase-final position. An example is seen in (37).

(37) ri achii ri x+Ø+in-kunaaj

the man the PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-cure

x+at+u-ch'aab'ej iwiiir

PERFV+2SG.B-3SG.A-speak.to yesterday

'the man who I cured spoke to you yesterday'

In this example, the first verb, *xinkunaaj* 'I cured him/her', has a long vowel in the final syllable because it is the last overt constituent in the relative clause *ri xinkunaaj* 'who I cured'. The second verb, *xatuch'aab'eej* 's/he spoke to you', has a short vowel in the final syllable because it is not the final overt constituent in the main clause *ri achii ... xatuch'aab'ej iwiiir* 'the man spoke to you yesterday'. The other two types of derived transitive

verbs may optionally undergo the rule of word-final glottal stop deletion, discussed in section 2.2.2, when in non phrase-final position.

There is a special subclass of derived transitive verbs ending in /j/ which behave slightly differently from the forms described above. These are those stems which have a /7/ preceding the thematic vowel. With such stems, the thematic vowel is always identical to the vowel which precedes the glottal stop. In Nahualá the formation of these verbs is regular, as seen in (38).

- (38) (a) -tze7eej 'to laugh at' ( < tze7 'laughter' )  
 (b) -b'oochi7ii7 'to plead with, to woo'  
 ( < b'oh '?' + chii7 'mouth' )

However, as usual with forms like these with intervocalic glottal stops, the final vowel is lost in non phrase-final position: -tze7j, -b'oochi7j. In Santa María Chiquimula the final vowel in such forms is short in phrase-final position (-tze7ej) while in Momostenango and Cantel such verbs lack the final vowel in all positions (-tze7j, and in Cantel: -b'ochi7j). (Note that the verb -b'oochi7(ii)j has the form -b'o7chii7 in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula.)

The Perfect Status is marked by the suffix -V<sub>r</sub>m on derived transitive verbs ending in /j/ and those ending in -V<sub>r</sub>b'a7, where V<sub>r</sub> in the Perfect Status suffix represents

lengthening of the preceding vowel. Verbs ending in the suffix *-V<sub>2</sub>b'a7* lose the final glottal stop before the suffix *-V<sub>2</sub>m*. On the other type of derived transitive verb, the Perfect Status is indicated by means of the suffix *-m*; however, the final vowel of the verb stem changes to /o/. Examples of Perfect Passive Participles of derived transitive verbs are seen in (39) (cf. 33-6).

- (39) (a) *kej-e-em*  
horse-THEMATIC.V-PERFECT  
'mounted'
- (b) *kam-isa-am*  
die-CAUS-PERFECT  
'killed'
- (c) *q'oy-ob'a-am*  
lying-CAUS-PERFECT  
'left in a lying position'
- (d) *ch'ay-alo7-m*  
hit-CELERITIVE-PERFECT  
'hit rapidly'

According to Mondloch (1981:101), derived transitive verbs in the Nahualá dialect which end in /7/, but not involving the Causative suffix *-V<sub>2</sub>b'a7* nor the Celeritive suffix *-V<sub>2</sub>la7*, form the Perfect Status with the suffix *-oom ~ -uum* just as on root transitive verbs. However, in non phrase-



final position, these verbs contract as is usual with stems ending in /ʔ/. Thus, the Perfect Passive Participles of *-ch'uy-uch'uʔ* 'to pester' (< *-ch'uy* 'to shake', *-V,C,uʔ* 'REPETITIVE') and *-yik-iyəʔ* 'to shake, winnow' (< *-yik* 'to shake', *-V,C,aʔ* 'REPETITIVE') are, respectively, *ch'uyuch'uʔuum* and *yikiyaʔoom* in phrase-final position, but *ch'uyuch'uʔm* and *yikiyoʔm* in non phrase-final position in Nahualá. The Perfect forms of the special subclass of derived transitive verbs ending in /j/ parallel the Plain/Dependent forms seen in (38), as illustrated in (40).

- (40) (a) phrase-final:    *tzeʔeem* (Nahualá),    *tzeʔem*  
                                   (Santa María Chiquimula),    *tzeʔm*  
                                   (Momostenango, Cantel) 'laughed at'
- (b) non phrase-final:    *tzeʔm*

#### 5.2.4 Incorporated Movement

Like intransitive verbs, transitive verbs may also take the incorporated movement clitics *e(ʔ) ~ b'e* 'go' and *ul ~ al ~ el ~ il* 'come' (see section 4.2.1.4). Also like intransitive verbs, transitive verbs which take Incorporated Movement clitics must be marked for Dependent Status. When used on transitive verbs, the Incorporated Movement clitics follow the set B clitic and precede the set A prefix. Some examples are seen in (41).

- (41) (a) x+at+e7+qa-ch'ay-a7  
 PERFV+2SG.B+go+1PL.A-hit-DEPENDENT  
 'we went to hit you (sg.)'
- (b) x+at+ul+qa-ch'ay-a7  
 PERFV+2SG.B+come+1PL.A-hit-DEPENDENT  
 'we came to hit you (sg.)'
- (c) xati7nkamisaa7 ( < /x#at#e7#in+kam+isa+aj/ )  
 PERFV+2SG.B+go+1SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP  
 'I went to kill you (sg.)'
- (d) x+at+ul+in-kam-isa-aj  
 PERFV+2SG.B+come+1SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP  
 'I came to kill you (sg.)'
- (e) k+Ø+e7+ch'ay-aa                      laa  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+hit-DEPENDENT    2SG.FORMAL  
 'you (sg. formal) (will) go to hit  
 him/her/it'
- (f) ki7nwila7 ( < /ka#Ø#e7#inw+il+a7/ )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+go+1SG.A-see-DEPENDENT  
 'I went to see him/her/it'
- (g) xi7nch'aya7 ( < /x#Ø#e7#in+ch'ay+a7/ )  
 PERFV+3SG.B+go+1SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT  
 'I went to hit him/her/it'

(h) x+∅+ul+in-ch'ay-a7

PERFV+3SG.B+come+1SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'I came to hit him/her/it'

(i) xe7linch'aya7 ( < /x#e7#ul#in+ch'ay+a7/ )

PERFV+3PL.B+come+1SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'I came to hit them'

In Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the preconsonantal first person singular set A prefix has the form *nu-* following an Incorporated Movement clitic; however, when the Incorporated Movement clitic has the form *e7*, the vowel of the prefix *nu-* is dropped. Thus, the verb seen in (41d) has the form *xatulnukamisaa7* in Nahualá, and the verb in (41h) has the form *xulnuch'aya7*. The verb seen in (41c) has the form *xate7nkamisaa7* in Nahualá, and the verb seen in (41g) has the form *xe7nch'aya7*. These latter two forms are also possible in Momostenango, but the forms in (41) seem to be the more common ones in that dialect. In Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula the Incorporated Movement clitic *e7* may optionally have the form *b'(e)* in some environments. For example, the verb seen in (41g) may optionally have the form *xib'i7nch'aya7* ( < /xi#∅#b'e#in+ch'ay+a7/ ) in Santa María Chiquimula.<sup>11</sup>

In Cantel the Incorporated Movement clitic meaning 'go' has the form *e*. An example is seen in (42).

(42) x+at+e+qa-ch'ay-a7

PERFV+2SG.B+go+1PL.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'we went(/came) to hit you (sg.)'

When the clitic appears before a vowel-initial prefix, the contraction rule discussed in section 2.2.2 applies as in the other dialects. However, it will be recalled that the contraction rule does not insert a glottal stop in Cantel; thus, the clitic disappears entirely in this situation, as seen in (43).

(43) xatinch'aya7 ( < /x#at#e#in+ch'ay+a7/ )

PERFV+2SG.B+go+1SG.A-hit-DEPENDENT

'I went(/came) to hit you (sg.)'

As can be seen in this example, the only indication of the presence of the Incorporated Movement clitic is the Dependent Status suffix on the verb. On derived transitive verbs, which do not distinguish the Plain and Dependent Statuses, the forms with the Incorporated Movement clitic are impossible if the set A prefix is vowel-initial because they are indistinguishable from the forms without the clitic. Thus, for example, while one can say x+at+e+ki-kamisaa7 'they went to kill you (sg.)', a form like xatukamisaa7 is theoretically ambiguous, being interpretable either as x+at+u-kamisaa7 's/he killed you (sg.)' or as x+at+e+u-kamisaa7 's/he went to kill you (sg.)'. In fact, however, it would ordinarily only be

interpreted as 's/he killed you (sg.)'. It is also impossible to use the Incorporated Movement clitic *e* before a vowel-initial set A prefix on a verb which already has a distinctive Dependent Status suffix for another purpose. For example, the form *chatuch'aya7* can only be understood as 'would that s/he hit you', not as 'would that s/he go(/come) to hit you'. However, it is possible to say *ch+at+e+ki-ch'ay-a7* 'would that they go(/come) to hit you'. Note that in those dialects in which the contraction rule does insert a glottal stop, similar potential ambiguities exist, for example, in forms like *xi7nkamisaa7*, which could be interpreted either as 'I killed them' or 'I went to kill him/her/it' since both the third person plural set B clitic and the Incorporated Movement clitic meaning 'go' have the form *e7* and there is no distinction between the Plain and Dependent Status on the derived transitive verb to distinguish these.

### 5.3 Derivation

Transitive verbs may very well have more derivational possibilities than any other stem class. I will only mention a few of these derivations here. Many of the derivational affixes which can be added to transitive verb stems and bases derive new transitive verb stems which have an added adverbial or aspectual meaning. We have already seen examples (e. g., 36) of the Celeritive suffix *-V,la7*,

which derives transitive verb stems from transitive verb roots and which generally adds the meaning 'quickly, rapidly' to the meaning of the root. With a few transitive verb roots this suffix seems to add a Repetitive rather than a Celeritive meaning. With derived transitive verb bases the suffix has the form -la7. Further examples are seen in (44-5).

(44) (a) x+Ø+uu-sik'-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-pick.up-PLAIN

's/he picked it up'

(b) x+Ø+uu-sik'-ila7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-pick.up-CELERITIVE

's/he picked it (various ones) up, s/he  
picked it up repeatedly'

(45) (a) x+Ø+uu-kam-isa-aj

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP

's/he killed him/her/it'

(b) x+Ø+uu-kam-isa-la7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-CELERITIVE

's/he killed him/her/it rapidly'

Another such suffix is the Thematic Vowel suffix. This suffix, as was seen in section 3.4.5, can derive transitive verb bases from nouns. This same suffix, when added to a

transitive verb root, derives a transitive verb base with an added Repetitive or Intensive meaning. Some examples are seen in (46-7).

(46) (a) x+Ø+uu-yitz'-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-twist-PLAIN

's/he twisted it, s/he wrung it out'

(b) x+Ø+uu-yitz'-i-ij

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-twist-THEMATIC.V-PLAIN/DEP

's/he gave it various twists, s/he wrung it out hard'

(47) (a) x+Ø+uu-b'oq-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.a-pull.out-PLAIN

's/he pulled it out'

(b) x+Ø+uu-b'oq-i-ij

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-pull.out-THEM.V-PLAIN/DEP

's/he pulled it (various ones) out'

There is another Intensive suffix for transitive verb roots which has the form  $-V_2C_2e$ . With a few transitive verb roots the meaning of this suffix may also be Repetitive. Some examples of this are seen in (48-9).

(48) (a) x+Ø+uu-yitz'-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-twist-PLAIN

's/he twisted it, s/he wrung it out'

(b) x+Ø+uu-yitz'-itz'e-ej

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-twist-INTENSIVE-PLAIN/DEP

's/he wrung it out very hard'

(49) (a) x+Ø+uu-ch'ay-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit-PLAIN

's/he hit him/her/it'

(b) x+Ø+uu-ch'ay-aye-ej

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit-INTENSIVE-PLAIN/DEP

's/he hit him/her/it repeatedly'

It should be noted that the two suffixes  $-V$  and  $-V_1C_2e$  are not totally productive. Their use may depend in some way on the semantics of the root. Of the three forms seen here, ROOT, ROOT- $V$ , and ROOT- $V_1C_2e$ , some verbs have only one of these forms and some others may have two of these forms. Only a very few transitive verbs (e. g.  $-yitz'$ ) have all three of these forms.

There are two types of passive intransitive verb stems which can be derived from transitive verbs. The formation of these is different for root transitive verbs and derived transitive verbs. The Simple Passive stem is derived from a transitive verb root by means of lengthening the root vowel. Historically this vowel lengthening results from an infixed morpheme  $*-h-$  'PASSIVE'. Some examples are seen in (50).



- (50) (a)  $x+\emptyset+uu-b'an-o$   
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do-PLAIN  
 's/he did it'
- (b)  $x+\emptyset+b'aan-ik$   
 PERFV+3SG.B+do.PASSIVE-PLAIN  
 'it was done'
- (51) (a)  $x+\emptyset+uu-muq-u$   
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-bury-PLAIN  
 's/he buried him/her/it'
- (b)  $x+\emptyset+muuq-ik$   
 PERFV+3SG.B+bury.PASSIVE-PLAIN  
 'he/she/it was buried'

The irregular verb /tah/ 'to hear' has the Simple Passive form *-tay-ik* (Nahualá) ~ *-ta7-ik* (others) phrase-finally and the form *-taa* non phrase-finally. In the Dependent Status this verb has the Simple Passive form *-toq* phrase-finally and the form *-taga* 'non phrase-finally'. Similar irregular forms are seen with those transitive verb roots which end in /7/. Thus, the verb *-ya7* 'to give' has the Simple passive form *-ya7-ik* in the Plain Status, *-yo7-oq* phrase-finally in the Dependent Status, and *-yo7qa* non phrase-finally in the

**Dependent Status.** In Momostenango the verb *-ya7* optionally has the Simple Passive forms *-yi7k* (phrase-final) ~ *-ya7* (non phrase-final), *-yo7q*, and *-yo7qa*. In Cantel, the Simple Passive of the verb *-ya7* is *-yi* in the Plain Status non phrase-finally. A few verbs, such as the verb *-tij* 'to eat, drink', has both the regular Simple Passive form *-tiij-ik* and an irregular Simple Passive form *-tij-ow-ik*. The suffix *-ow* on the latter Simple Passive form more generally derives the Focus Antipassive form to be discussed in Chapter 9.

In six vowel dialects like Cantel, vowel length distinctions exist only with the low central vowels. Therefore, with those transitive verb roots which have vowels other than /ā/ there is no distinction between the transitive verb root and the derived Simple Passive intransitive stem in these dialects. Nevertheless, Simple Passives like *xmuqik* can still be distinguished from transitive verbs like *xumuqu*, because the former have no set A prefix and they take the intransitive phrase-final suffix *-ik* rather than the transitive phrase-final suffix *-o* ~ *-u*.

With derived transitive verbs the Simple Passive is formed by means of the suffix *-x*. On derived transitive verbs in *-V,b'a7*, the glottal stop is dropped before the Simple Passive suffix. On other derived transitive verbs ending in *V7*, *V* is /u/ if the preceding vowel is /u/ and it

is /o/ otherwise. Some examples are seen in (52-4).

(52) (a) x+Ø-uu-kam-isa-aj

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN/DEP

's/he killed him/her/it'

(b) x+Ø+kam-isa-x-ik

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PASS-PLAIN

'he/she/it was killed'

(53) (a) x+Ø+uu-q'oy-ob'a7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-lying-CAUS

's/he left him/her/it in a lying position'

(b) x+Ø+q'oy-ob'a-x-ik

PERFV+3SG.B+lying-CAUS-PASS-PLAIN

'he/she/it was left in a lying position'

(54) (a) x+Ø+uu-ch'ay-ala7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit-CELERITIVE

's/he hit him/her/it rapidly'

(b) x+Ø+ch'ay-alo7-x-ik

PERFV+3SG.B+hit-CELERITIVE-PASS-PLAIN

'he/she/it was hit rapidly'

The special subclass of derived transitive verbs in /j/ which have a /7/ before the Thematic Vowel lack the Thematic Vowel in the simple passive. Thus, the verb -tze7(-e)-(e)j 'to laugh at' has the Simple Passive form -tze7-x-ik 'to be

laughed at'.

The other passive form in Quiché is the Completive Passive. Whereas the Simple Passive simply indicates that a certain patient or theme underwent a certain event, the Completive Passive indicates that the patient or theme achieved some kind of final state as a result of the event. Thus, for example, the Simple Passive form (-kun-a-x) of the verb meaning 'to cure' simply means that the patient underwent some type of curative process with no indication of whether or not the patient actually regained his or her health. The Completive Passive of this same verb, on the other hand, indicates that the patient in fact did achieve the state of being cured of the ailment in question. This could be translated into English as 'to get cured', 'to become cured', or 'to finish being cured'. The Completive Passive is formed by means of the suffix -V<sub>r</sub>ta<sub>j</sub> on root transitive verbs and by the suffix -ta<sub>j</sub> on derived transitive verbs. The reduplicated vowel of the allomorph -V<sub>r</sub>ta<sub>j</sub> tends to undergo vowel harmony in those dialects which have this rule and it tends to be dropped in those dialects which have the vowel-dropping rule. The /r/ in the suffix -V<sub>r</sub>b'a<sub>7</sub> is dropped before the suffix -ta<sub>j</sub>. Some examples are seen in (55-60).

- (55) (a) x+∅+uu-b'an-o  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do-PLAIN  
 's/he did it'
- (b) x+∅+b'an-ataj-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+do-PASS-PLAIN  
 'it was done, it was finished'
- (56) (a) x+∅+uu-kun-a-aj  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-?-THEMATIC.V-PLAIN/DEP  
 's/he cured him/her'
- (b) x+∅+kun-a-taj-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+?-THEMATIC.V-PASS-PLAIN  
 's/he was cured'
- (57) (a) x+∅+uu-q'oy-ob'a7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-lying-CAUS  
 's/he left him/her/it in a lying position'
- (b) x+∅+q'oy-ob'a-taj-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-lying-CAUS-PASS-PLAIN  
 'he/she/it was left in a lying position'
- (58) (a) x+∅+uu-ch'ay-ala7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit-CELERITIVE  
 's/he hit him/her/it rapidly'

(b) x+Ø+ch'ay-alo7-taj-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+hit-CELERITIVE-PASS-PLAIN  
 'he/she/it was hit rapidly'

(59) (a) x+Ø+uu-to7-o  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-help-PLAIN  
 's/he helped him/her'

(b) x+Ø+to7-taj-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+help-PASS-PLAIN  
 's/he was helped'

(60) (a) x+Ø+uu-tze7(-e)-(e)j  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-laughter(-THEM.V)-PLAIN/DEP  
 's/he laughed at him/her'

(b) x+Ø+tze7-taj-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+laughter-PASS-PLAIN  
 's/he was laughed at'

According to Mondloch (1978a:63) the Completive Passive in the Imperfective aspect can also be used to mean 'it can be VERB-ed'. Thus, for example, ka+Ø+choom-a-taj-ik 'it is/will be (finished being) arranged' can be used to mean 'it can be arranged'.

Another similar derivational suffix which can be added to transitive verbs is -V,tal ~ -tal. This suffix derives a non-verbal stative predicate meaning 'to be in the state

which results from having undergone the event denoted by the verb stem'. This stative predicate is like any other non-verbal predicate in that it indicates subject agreement by means of set B clitics and in that it is not inflected for tense/aspect/mood. However, unlike the other non-verbal predicates seen thus far, the stative predicate in  $-(V_r)tal$  takes the phrase-final suffix  $-ik$ , which is usually seen on intransitive verbs in the Plain Status. Some examples are seen in (61-2).<sup>12</sup>

(61) (a) in        il-ital-ik  
                   3SG.B see-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
                   'I am (in the state of being) seen'

(b) at        il-ital-ik  
                   3SG.B see-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
                   'you (sg.) are seen'

(c) il-ital        laa  
                   see-STATIVE 2SG.FORMAL  
                   'you (sg. formal) are seen'

(62) (a) oj        kun-a-tal-ik  
                   1PL.B ?-THEMATIC.V-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
                   'we are (in the state of having been) cured'

(b) Ø        kun-a-tal                    ri    achii  
                   3SG.B ?-THEMATIC.V-STATIVE the man  
                   'the man is cured'

In addition to the passive forms described above, Quiché also has an antipassive form. This antipassive form is often referred to as the Absolutive Antipassive to distinguish it from another form called the Focus Antipassive, which will be discussed in section Chapter 9. The Absolutive Antipassive form is an intransitive stem which indicates that the event described by the transitive verb stem was participated in by the agent or experiencer without mentioning the patient or theme. This form is not used with all transitive verb stems because with some stems the form seems to be semantically anomolous. Some of the examples given below could even be rejected out of context by some native speakers. The Absolutive Antipassive form is derived by means of the suffix *-an ~ -on ~ -un* on root transitive verbs and by means of the suffix *-n* on derived transitive verbs. The allomorph *-un* is used on roots with the vowel /u/, *-an* is used on roots with the vowel /a/, and *-on* is used on all other roots. These vowels may, however, undergo vowel harmony when unstressed in the dialects which have the vowel harmony rule. The suffix *-V,b'a7*, as usual, loses its glottal stop before the suffix *-n*. Other derived transitive verbs ending in /7/, as usual, change the vowel preceding the glottal stop to /o/ or /u/. Examples are seen in (63) (including some irregular forms).



- (63) (a) ka+Ø+ch'ay-an-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+hit-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he hits, s/he fights'
- (b) ka+Ø+mes-on-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+sweep-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he sweeps'
- (c) k+Ø+iil-on-ik ( < -il )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+see-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he sees'
- (d) ka+Ø+b'oq-on-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+pull.out-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he pulls (things) out'
- (e) ka+Ø+k'ut-un-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+show-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he shows (things)'
- (f) ka+Ø+k'ay-i-n-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+wares-THEM.V-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he sells'
- (g) ka+Ø+q'oy-ob'a-n-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+lying-CAUS-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he leaves (things) in a lying position'

- (h) ka+Ø+ch'ay-alo7-n-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+hit-CELERITIVE-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he hits rapidly'
- (i) ka+Ø+taa-n-ik ( < /tah/ )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+hear-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he hears'
- (j) ka+Ø+su7-n-ik  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+wipe-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he wipes (things)'
- (k) ka+Ø+tyo7-n-ik ( < -ti7 )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+bite-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `he/she/it bites'
- (l) ka+Ø+yo7-n-ik ( < -ya7 )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+give-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he gives (things)'
- (m) ka+Ø+tze7-n-ik ( < -tze7-e- )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+laughter-ANTIPASS-PLAIN  
 `s/he laughs'
- (n) ka+Ø+tob'(-an)-ik ( < -to7 )  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+help(-ANTIPASS)-PLAIN  
 `s/he helps'

(o) ka+Ø+tik-on-ik ~ ka+Ø+tiik-o7n-ij-ik

IMPERF+3SG.B+plants-ANTIPASS-PLAIN

's/he plants'

(p) ka+Ø+loog'-o7m-an-ik ( < -loq' )

IMPERF+3SG.B+buy?-ANTIPASS-PLAIN

's/he buys'

(q) ka+Ø+q'ol-ow-ik

IMPERF+3SG.B+pick-FOCUS-PLAIN

's/he picks (coffee, beans, etc)'

Note that the verb in (63q) actually has the Focus Antipassive suffix (see Chapter 9) rather than the Absolutive Antipassive suffix; however, the verb is interpreted as an Absolutive Antipassive form. There is a small number of root transitive verbs which form the Absolutive Antipassive form in this way.

With a few transitive verb stems a middle or reflexive meaning is possible with the Absolutive Antipassive form. Some examples are shown in (64c) and (65b). Most Absolutive Antipassive stems, however, only have meanings like those seen in (63) and (64b).

(64) (a) x+Ø+uu-ch'aj-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-wash-PLAIN

's/he washed him/her/it'

(b) x+Ø+ch'aaj-o7m-an-ik

PERFV+3SG.B+wash-ANTIPASS-PLAIN

's/he washed (clothes), s/he did the wash'

(c) x+Ø+ch'aj-an-ik

PERFV+3SG.B+wash-ANTIPASS-PLAIN

's/he washed (things), s/he washed  
(himself/herself)'

(65) (a) x+Ø+uu-raq-i-ij

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-open.up?-THEM.V-PLAIN/DEP

'he/she/it cracked it open'

(b) x+Ø+raq-i-n-ik

PERFV+3SG.B+open.up?-THEM.V-ANTIPASS-PLAIN

's/he cracked (things) open, it cracked  
(itself) open'

As can be seen in examples (64c) and (65b), the English translations of the such Absolutive Antipassive forms may also have such middle or reflexive interpretations.

As discussed in section 4.2.2, some intransitive verbs have Action Nominalizations in -eem, others have Action Nominalizations in -ik, and some have both forms. Transitive verbs generally have two different Action Nominalizations. One of these is sometimes called the Passive Verbal Noun and the other may be called the Absolutive Verbal Noun. The Passive Verbal Noun is simply

the Action Nominalization in *-ik* of the Simple Passive form of the transitive verb. Some examples are seen in (66).

- (66) (a) b'aan-ik           ( ← -b'an 'to do')  
do.PASSIVE-NOM  
'being done'
- (b) muuq-ik           ( ← -muq 'to bury')  
bury.PASSIVE-NOM  
'being buried'
- (c) kam-isa-x-ik       ( ← -kamisaaj 'to kill')  
die-CAUS-PASS-NOM  
'being killed'
- (d) q'oy-ob'a-x-ik       ( ← -q'oyob'a7 'to leave  
lying-CAUS-PASS-NOM       in a lying position')  
'being left in a lying position'
- (e) ch'ay-alo7-x-ik       ( ← -ch'ayala7 'to  
hit-CELERITIVE-PASS-NOM       hit rapidly')  
'hitting rapidly'

The Absolute Verbal Noun is simply the Action Nominalization in *-ik* of the Absolute Antipassive form of the transitive verb. Some examples are seen in (67).

- (67) (a) b'an-an-ik  
do-ANTIPASS-NOM  
'doing'
- (b) muq-un-ik  
bury-ANTIPASS-NOM  
'burying'
- (c) kam-isa-n-ik  
die-CAUS-ANTIPASS-NOM  
'killing'
- (d) q'oy-ob'a-n-ik  
lying-CAUS-ANTIPASS-NOM  
'leaving in a lying position'
- (e) ch'ay-alo7-n-ik  
hit-CELERITIVE-ANTIPASS-NOM  
'hitting rapidly'

Both the Passive Verbal Noun and the Absolutive Verbal Noun can be possessed (as can all intransitive Action Nominalizations). In Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the final vowel of all Action Nominalizations in -ik is lengthened when they are possessed (although this long vowel will get shortened in non phrase-final position, i. e., when the Action Nominalization is not the last overt constituent of the noun phrase). This is not true, however, in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula nor, of course, in

six vowel dialects like Cantel. Thus, these Verbal Nouns are nouns of class 1a in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, but they are nouns of class 1 in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Cantel. Some examples are seen in (68).

- (68) (a) u-b'aan-i(i)k  
 3SG.A-do.PASSIVE-NOM  
 `its being done`
- (b) a-kam-isa-x-i(i)k  
 2SG.A-die-CAUS-PASS-NOM  
 `your being killed`
- (c) ki-muq-un-i(i)k  
 3PL.A-bury-ANTIPASS-NOM  
 `their burying`
- (d) nu-kun-a-n-i(i)k  
 1SG.A-?-THEMATIC.V-ANTIPASS-NOM  
 `my curing`

Some transitive verbs have irregular Absolutive Verbal Nouns. Some examples are seen in (69-75).

- (69) (a) -chak-u-uj `to work`  
 (b) chaak `working, work (noun)`

- (70) (a) -ch'aj 'to wash'  
 (b) ch'aajo7n 'washing, (the) wash'
- (71) (a) -elaq'-a-aj 'to rob'  
 (b) elaq' 'robbing, robbery'
- (72) (a) -eeq-a-aj 'to carry (on the back)'  
 (b) eeqa7n 'carrying, load (noun)'
- (73) (a) -loq' 'to buy'  
 (b) looq'o7manik 'buing'
- (74) (a) -tziib'-a-aj 'to write'  
 (b) tz'iib' 'writing'
- (75) (a) -yaj 'to scold'  
 (b) yaaaj 'scolding'

The nouns in (69b), (71b), and (74b) are actually not nominalizations of their respective transitive verbs but rather are the nouns from which the transitive verbs in (69a), (71a), and (74a) are derived. These three nouns are examples of a special class of nouns that Kaufman (1986a) calls "Action Nouns".

There is another nominalized form of root transitive verbs derived by means of the suffix -ooj ~ -uoj, where the allomorph -uoj is used with roots which have the vowel /u/ and -ooj with all other roots. In many dialects of modern Quiché, including Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and



Cantel, this "Active Nominalization" is apparently no longer productive though it shows up quite frequently in colonial manuscripts and still is productive in the closely related Tzutujil language as well as in some dialects of the closely related Cakchiquel language. In the above mentioned dialects of modern Quiché, however, the suffix only shows up on a number of frozen forms such as those seen in (76).<sup>13</sup>

- (76) (a) ch'olooj `plowed land prepared for sowing  
wheat' < -ch'ol `to peel, skin'
- (b) ch'ayooj `threshing' < -ch'ay `to hit'
- (c) muquuj `sowing of wheat' < -muq `to bury'
- (d) q'atooj `reaping of wheat' < -q'at `to cut'
- (e) tzuruuj `bullfight' < -tzur `to molest, to  
bull-fight'
- (f) tz'onooj `formal marriage proposal' < -tz'on  
(the root of -tz'onooj `to supplicate')
- (g) xojooj `dance' < -xoj (the root of -xojow  
`to dance' )
- (h) yoq'ooj `threshing of wheat' < -yoq' `to  
thresh'
- (i) ch'akooj `earnings' < -ch'ak `to earn, to  
win, to win over'

Note that the exact meanings of the Active Nominalizations in (76) are not always completely predictable from the meanings of their roots.

In the modern dialects of Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, on the other hand, the Active Nominalization is at least semiproductive. However, even in these dialects, except for frozen forms such those seen in (76), this form can only be used in the type of "Verb Phrase Compounds" that were discussed above in section 3.4.3. All dialects, including Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, have phrasal compounds like the one in (77) which consist of a transitive verb root with the suffix -ow ~ -uw (see Chapter 9) followed by a "direct object" noun.

(77) b'an-ow            sii7  
       do/make-FOCUS firewood  
       `firewood making'

However, in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the more common way of forming such nominalized verb phrase compounds from transitive verb roots is to use the Active Nominalization in place of the verbal form seen in (77), as seen in (78).

(78) b'an-oj            sii7  
       do/make-NOM firewood  
       `firewood making'

Forms like (78) are impossible in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Cantel. However, it is interesting to note that many of the forms like those in (76) seem to imply a particular "direct object" noun as part of their meaning.

The suffix *-b'al* derives Locative/Instrumental nouns from transitive verbs. These nouns indicate either the instrument for performing the action denoted by the verb or the location where the event takes place or both. Some examples are seen in (79).

(79) (a) *chap-b'al*

*grab-LOC/INST*

'trap'

(b) *ch'aa-b'al* ( < /*ch'ah/*, root of *ch'aa-w-eem*

*speak-LOC/INST*

'speaking')

'word, language'

(c) *ch'aj-b'al*

*wash-LOC/INST*

'wash water'

(d) *ch'ay-b'al*

*hit-LOC/INST*

'whip'

- (e) eet-a-b'al ( < -eet-a-aj 'to measure')  
 sign-THEM.V-LOC/INST  
 'measuring instrument'
- (f) kun-a-b'al ( < -kun-a-aj 'to cure')  
 ?-THEM.V-LOC/INST  
 'medicine'
- (g) k'ay-i-b'al ( < -k'ay-i-ij 'to sell')  
 wares-THEM.V-LOC/INST  
 'market'
- (h) mes-b'al  
 sweep-LOC/INST  
 'broom'

Most of these nouns are of class 1a because the final vowel is lengthened in the possessed form, e. g. nu-mes-b'aal 'my broom'. One exception to this is ch'aab'al: a-ch'aa-b'al 'your language'. At least one Locative/Instrumental noun has an irregular form of the root: q'eeb'al 'water jug' < -q'ej 'to pour (water)'. These nouns also can form a kind of phrasal compound when they are followed by a "direct object" noun. An example is seen in (80).

- (80) chap-b'al          ch'oo  
 grab-LOC/INST    mouse  
 'mousetrap (instrument for catching a mouse)'

The final derivation to be considered here is the Agent Nominalization. The usual Agent Nominalization of transitive verbs is simply the intransitive Agent Nominalization in *-eel* (see section 4.2.2) of the Absolutive Antipassive form of the verb.<sup>14</sup> Some examples are seen in (81).

- (81) (a) *sub'-un-eel*  
 deceive-ANTIPASS-AGENT  
 'deceiver'
- (b) *kam-isa-n-eel*  
 die-CAUS-ANTIPASS-AGENT  
 'killer'

At least one transitive verb has an irregular Agent Nominalization: *elaq'-oom* 'robber, thief', derived from the Action Noun *elaq'* 'robbery', from which is also derived the transitive verb *-elaq'-a-aj* 'to steal'.

Transitive verbs also have another Agent Nominalization formed by means of the suffix *-(V)l*. This suffix has the form *-l* with derived transitive verb bases, the form *-al* on transitive verb roots with the vowel /a/, the form *-ul* on transitive verb roots with the vowel /u/, and the form *-ol* on all other transitive verb roots. In modern Quiché this transitive Agent Nominalization can only be used together with a "direct object" noun phrase to form a type of phrasal

compound. Some examples are seen in (82).

(82) (a) ch'ay-al ch'iich'

hit-AGENT metal

'blacksmith'

(b) k'am-al b'ee

bring/take-AGENT road

'guide'

(c) riq'-ol tziij

find-AGENT word

'gossip, one who gossips'

(d) qup-i-l wi7-aaɟ ( < qup-i-ij 'to cut

?-THEM.V-AGENT hair-ABS with scissors')

'barber'

(e) elaq'-a-l pwaq

robbery-THEM.V-AGENT money

'one who steals money'

(f) b'an-al b'o7ɟ

do/make-AGENT pot

'potter'

Although the transitive Agent Nominalization is only used in this type of phrasal compound in the modern language, this was not always the case in older forms of the language. For example, in the *Popol Vuh* one of the deities

mentioned is called Tz'aqool, which is often translated as 'Maker' and which consists of the transitive verb root -tz'ag 'to construct out of clay, mud, etc.' (note that the noun tz'aaq 'wall', seen in example (55) of Chapter 3, is derived from this same root) with the transitive Agent Nominalization suffix -ool. This and many other similar nouns found in older manuscripts are not necessarily followed by any kind of "direct object". In the modern language, however, there do seem to be a few transitive Agent Nominalizations which take the prefix aj- and the suffix -ob' ~ -ub' (the latter form used if the root vowel is /u/) and which do not take a direct object. One such verb is the root -xaj ~ -xoj, which is the root of the derived intransitive verb stem -xoj-ow 'to dance' and the Active Nominalization xoj-ooj 'dance', and which forms the transitive Agent Nominalization aj-xoj-ol-ob' 'dancer'.

## NOTES

1. My own personal theory of the origin of these set A forms is that in Proto-Mayan (or perhaps in Pre-Proto-Mayan) the set B clitics were simply person/number morphemes. These person/number morphemes could be used with intransitive verbs to indicate subject agreement and with transitive verbs to indicate direct object agreement. They were also used to indicate subject agreement with transitive verbs; however, in this case the stem took a prefix (or clitic?) \*u- before consonants ~ \*w- before vowels, the latter of which perhaps had an allomorph \*r- in certain cases. Thus, the modern Quiché set A prefixes (in some cases, at least) resulted from the combination of person/number clitics with the Ergative morpheme \*u- ~ \*w- ~ \*r- as shown in (i).

- (i) 1SG. \*in+u- > in- ~ nu-  
       \*in+w- > inw- ~ \*nw- > w-  
       2SG. \*at+u- > a-  
       \*at+w- > aw-  
       3SG. \*Ø+u- > u-  
       \*Ø+r- > r-

There is also a possibility that the second person plural set A prefix developed in a similar way: \*ix+u- > i-, \*ix+w- > iw-. However, Kaufman (1986b)



reconstructs \*eer- for the second person plural prevocalic set A prefix. If this is correct, it suggests that there may have been some kind of variability in the use of the prevocalic allomorphs \*w- and \*r- of the ergative prefix. Note that the idea of absolutive agreement being indicated by person/number morphemes and ergative agreement being indicated by the same person/number morphemes plus an ergative morpheme is quite consistent with the idea that universally in ergative/absolutive case systems the absolutive is the unmarked case while the ergative is marked (Dixon 1979). As an example of a roughly similar set of verb agreement morphemes, one might compare the Wasco-Wishram Chinook ergative/absolutive verb agreement discussed by Silverstein (1976:129-34). In Wasco-Wishram many (though not all) of the ergative verb agreement markers have the same form as the absolutive verb agreement markers followed by a morpheme -k-. Thus, for example, the second person absolutive dual absolutive affix is -mt-, and the corresponding ergative form is mt-k-. There is some difficulty reconciling the theory presented here with the forms of the modern Quiché first and third person plural set A prefixes. Perhaps it could be done, but it would take us too far afield to go into that here. For what it's worth, the Chinookan set is not perfectly

consistent either. There may be some evidence for the form \*in+u-, at least, in Colonial Quiché. Brasseur (1862:44) shows that the first person singular set A prefix preceded by the Past Perfective clitic had the forms xin- ~ xinu- ~ xnu-. There are, however, alternative explanations for the second form, as will be seen below. I should also point out that this theory is not, as far as I am aware, subscribed to by anyone else. In particular, it is at variance both with the reconstructions presented by Kaufman (1986b) and with those of Robertson (1980). But in any case, I am convinced that the identity of form between some of the allomorphs of the set A and set B morphemes in the first person singular is an accident of the phonological history of the language. I see no reason to agree with Croft (no date) that the set B morpheme has come to be used in place of the set A morpheme in the first person singular and that this is "the beginning of the end of the active ergative morphology" in Quiché.

2. Again, the contraction rule does not apply in these situations in Cantel. In that dialect the third person plural set B clitic has the forms e (with or without following glottal stop) or eb' when followed by a vowel (see Chapter 4, footnote 4). Thus, the verb meaning 'I

hit them' in Cantel has the forms *xeb'inch'ayo* ~ *xe7inch'ayo* ~ *xeinch'ayo* [ʎeyntʃ'ayo]. The verb meaning 'you (sg. formal) saw them' has the forms *xeb'il laa* ~ *xe7il laa* ~ *xeil laa* (cf. 5c).

3. One might consider trying to explain the complications in the use of the formal second person forms in terms of a hierarchy of features like that discussed by Silverstein (1976). Simplifying things somewhat, Silverstein argues that features such as those of person form a hierarchy such as that shown in (i).

(i) 1 > 2 > 3

Since the formal second person clitics *laa* and *alaq* do not distinguish separate set A and set B forms, one must resort to other means to determine whether these clitics are marking subject agreement or object agreement. One possible means of making such a determination may be in terms of a hierarchy like that in (i). Since the second person is higher on the hierarchy than third person, the second person would therefore ordinarily be interpreted as the subject when it appears together with a third person argument in a transitive clause. Note that this is clearly what happens in forms like *xch'ay laa* 'you (sg. formal) hit him/her/it'. A problem arises, however, in forms like those shown in (9) (e. g., *xuuch'ay laa*). Here the

second person argument (marked by *laa*) should be interpreted as the subject because it is higher on the hierarchy than the third person argument. On the other hand, the third person argument is marked by the set A prefix *uu-*, and set A prefixes can only mark subject agreement, not object agreement. Therefore, in some dialects at least, this conflict means that the forms shown in (9) are deemed ungrammatical (unless one circumvents the conflict by interpreting these forms as suggested by my Cantel informant). It is also possible that in some dialects (e. g., Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula) the normal interpretation of the set A prefixes overrides the interpretation based on the hierarchy in (i) so that the forms in (9) are deemed grammatical in these dialects. On the other hand, forms like the one in (12) (*xqach'ay laa 'we hit you (sg. formal)'*) are perfectly grammatical in all dialects because the first person is higher on the hierarchy in (i) than the second person; therefore, the first person argument is the one with the most right to subjecthood. The problem with this theory, however, lies with first person singular forms like the one seen in (6) (*xinch'ay laa*). Since the first person ranks higher than the second person, it would seem that the ambiguity in (6) ought to be resolved in such a way that the first person singular argument is interpreted

as the subject. However, as we have seen, this form is generally interpreted as 'you (sg. formal) hit me' with the second person argument as the subject. This might suggest that the actual form of the hierarchy should be as shown in (ii).

(ii) 1pl. > 2 > 1sg., 3

However, such a hierarchy would be totally inconsistent with Silverstein's theory. Furthermore, note that forms like *xojch'ay laa* 'you (sg. formal) hit us' are perfectly grammatical in spite of the fact that they conflict with both of the hierarchies (i) and (ii). Thus, one will probably have to seek elsewhere for an explanation of these phenomena.

4. In the Nahualá dialect, according to Mondloch (1978a:54), the Imperative/Potential clitic must always be omitted in the first person plural and in the formal second person unless the verb stem begins with a vowel. Apparently the clitic cannot be omitted in other cases. Also note that in this dialect the set A prefix is definitely present on second person singular Imperatives because the vowel is long (at least according to Mondloch): *chaach'aya7* (but see the discussion of vowel lengthening in Nahualá in section 5.2.1). Even if the vowel is short in this form, we

can assume that the set A prefix is present because the preconsonantal form of the Imperative/Potential clitic is *chi* in this dialect.

5. There are some curious facts, however, about vowel initial verb stems. With these it is not possible to omit the Imperative/Potential clitic even though it seems like it should be possible in principle since the resultant form would be *ilaʔ*, which would not violate any of the criteria that have been established for such forms. Nevertheless, the form shown in (i) represents the only second person singular Imperative form possible with this verb.

(i) *chawilaʔ* 'see him/her/it! (sg.)'

If we accept, as argued in the text, that the second person singular imperative does not have a set A prefix, the form shown in (i) is problematic. For one thing, the first vowel is short, which is consistent with the idea that this is not a set A prefix. On the other hand, it can be seen that there is a /w/ before the root *-il*; and this /w/ should be part of the second person singular prevocalic set A prefix *a(a)w-*. We could perhaps take this to be evidence for the theory presented in footnote 1 according to which *\*w-* was originally a separate morpheme. It is not clear, however, how reasonable it would be to assume that in

modern Quiché only the /a/ of the prefix aw- has been omitted in (i).

6. There is one possible exception to this: the optional form xinu- given by Brasseur (1862:44). It was suggested in footnote 1 that this form could be analyzed as  $x+\emptyset+inu-$  where *inu-* is an archaic form of the first person singular set A prefix. It might also be possible, however, to analyze this form as  $xi+\emptyset+nu-$ , where *xi* would then constitute evidence for a vowel-final form of the Past Perfective clitic. Unfortunately, however, Brasseur only shows the form *x* before the first person plural and third person plural set A prefixes, which are exactly the environments in which we would expect to find a form like *xi* given the evidence of the modern dialects. Thus it may be that  $x+\emptyset+inu-$  is the best analysis of this form after all.
7. Thus, I have the same qualms about the transitive Perfect suffixes that I expressed in footnote 15 of Chapter 4 about the intransitive Perfect suffix.
8. We saw in section 4.2.1.3 that with intransitive verbs, Imperatives can be formed in two ways: with the Imperative/Potential clitic and the Dependent Status suffix or with the Imperfective clitic and the Dependent Status clitic. We have seen that Imperatives

of root transitive verbs can be formed by means of the Imperative/Potential clitic and the Dependent Status suffix; however, it is not clear to me whether or not the other formation available to intransitive verbs is also available to transitive verbs. At one time some Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula speakers told me that the Imperfective clitic could be used to form transitive Imperatives, but only on those verbs with non third person singular and non formal second person direct objects. Thus, forms like *k+in+a-ch'ay-a7* 'hit me! (sg.)', *k+at+u-ch'ay-a7* 'would that s/he hit you (sg.)', and *ka7ch'aya7* ( < /k#e7#a-ch'ay+a7/ ) 'hit them! (sg.)' were possible, but not forms like *\*k(a)+Ø+((a)a-)ch'ay-a7*, *\*ka+qa-ch'ay-aa laa*, *\*k+Ø+ii-ch'ay-a7*, etc. On a later occasion, however, the same speakers seemed to tell me that the opposite was true, namely that forms like *k+Ø+ii-ch'ay-a7* 'hit him/her/it (pl.)' were acceptable but that forms like *\*k+in+a-ch'ay-a7* were not. Neither Mondloch (1978a) nor Brasseur (1862) make any mention of the Imperfective clitic being used on transitive imperatives. It should also be noted that, as with intransitive verbs, the Dependent Status suffix is used on root transitive verbs in the Admonitive mode in the Cantel dialect whereas Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Momostenango, and Santa María Chiquimula



all use the Plain Status suffix on such verbs (cf. examples in 15).

9. Again it can be seen that in example (31), the axe's state of being held, which has resulted from the past act of having been grabbed by the man, has not had any serious consequences for the axe. Thus, this example is also consistent with Chafe's (1980) theory that was discussed in footnote 14 of Chapter 4.
  
10. It is not obvious to me that the suffix  $-V_rj$  should be analyzed as a Status suffix. According to Kaufman's (1986a) analysis, a derived transitive verb like *-kejeej* 'to mount (a horse)' consists of a root *keej* 'horse' plus a derivational suffix *-e*, which derives a transitive verb stem, plus the Status suffix  $-V_rj$ . Another possible analysis would be to say that this verb consists of the root *keej* plus a derivational suffix *-e*, which derives a verbal base (which does not distinguish transitivity), plus a derivational suffix  $-V_rj$ , which derives the transitive verb stem from the verbal base. One can also derive intransitive verbs from the same base by means of suffixes like *-n* 'INTRANSITIVE/ANTIPASSIVE', *-x* 'SIMPLE PASSIVE', *-taj* 'COMPLETIVE PASSIVE', etc. in place of the suffix  $-V_rj$ . On this second analysis, the Plain/Dependent Status suffix would be  $-\emptyset$ , the same as with the other types of

derived transitive verbs. Kaufman's analysis probably makes more sense within the context of comparative Mayan (and perhaps also within the context of a theory which treats Perfect as a Status category); however, from the point of view of a synchronic analysis of modern Quiché I have mixed feelings about such an analysis. My qualms, once again, have to do with the fact that Status seems like it should be an inflectional category; but in some respects it seems like  $-V_j$  might best be treated as a derivational suffix though this is not completely clear. One reason for considering  $-V_j$  to be derivational is that it seems to be this suffix, not the thematic vowel, which clearly identifies the stem as a transitive verb stem. Note that the same thematic vowel also appears on all of the various intransitive forms derived from the same verbal base; thus, it is the suffix following the thematic vowel which identifies the stem as transitive or intransitive. Furthermore, there are a few intransitive verbs, such as the one seen in (i), which have the form ROOT-V-n but which apparently do not have a corresponding transitive verb of the form ROOT-V-V<sub>j</sub>.

- (i) (a) kaach' 'chewing gum'  
 (b) -kach'-u-n 'to ruminate'

Though historically it might possibly be the case that

the intransitive stem *-kach'un* was derived from a transitive stem *-kach'u*, it would seem a little strange to say this in a synchronic analysis of modern Quiché if in fact there is no transitive verb *-kach'uuj*. I prefer to keep an open mind about these matters; but, for the purposes of this dissertation, I have adopted the practice of saying that forms like *-kach'u* are "transitive verb bases" and that the suffix *-V<sub>2</sub>j* is a derivational suffix which derives transitive verb stems in the Plain/Dependent Status from transitive verbal bases. I have to admit, however, that I feel very uncomfortable with that analysis. Note that Mondloch (1981) analyzes *-V<sub>2</sub>j*, as well as *-V7* on other types of derived transitive verbs, as an active voice suffix.

11. Note that in this form, the Past Perfective clitic has the form *xi*. Thus, it appears that the Past Perfective clitic in Santa María Chiquimula has the form *xV* not only before consonant-initial set A prefixes on consonant initial verbs, but also before consonant initial Incorporated Movement clitics (on consonant initial verbs?). Also note that the fact that the contraction rule applies when *b'e* appears before the vowel-initial set A prefix *in-* can be taken as additional evidence that the Incorporated Movement morpheme is a clitic rather than a prefix.

12. One could obviously analyze the suffixes  $-(V_r)taj$  and  $-(V_r)tal$  still further. One way of doing this would be to say that  $-(V_r)ta$  means something like '(COMPLETIVE) PASSIVE',  $-j$  means something like 'INTRANSITIVE', and  $-l$  means something like 'STATIVE'. If so, the suffix  $-j$  might be related to the versive suffix  $-V_j$  mentioned in section 3.5.2, and the suffix  $-l$  may be related to the Stative suffix  $-V_r l$  to be discussed in section 6.1.
13. The existence of the noun  $k'ayijj$  'wares, items for sale', related to the derived transitive verb stem  $-k'ayijj$  'to sell', suggests that there may also be Active Nominalizations of derived transitive verbs. However, this is not certain. The possessed form of  $k'ayijj$  is  $nu-k'aay$  'my wares'. Thus, it appears that  $-k'aay$  is a noun of class 3 and that  $-ijj$  is an allomorph of the Absolutive suffix that goes on the unpossessed forms of noun of this class. True Active Nominalizations do not behave this way when possessed.
14. The Agent Nominalization suffix  $-eel$  apparently can not be productively added to passive stems. The only Agent Nominalization I am aware of which is derived from a passive stem is  $tijoxeel$  'student, disciple', which is derived from  $-tijox$ , the Simple Passive form of the transitive verb  $-tijooj$  'to teach (someone)'.

This transitive verb stem is ultimately derived from the transitive verb root *-tij*, which in modern Quiché is generally used to mean 'to eat, to drink', but whose original meaning seems to be 'to try, to practice'. The original meaning still shows up in idioms like *k+Ø+uu-tij u-chug'aab'* 's/he makes an effort' (lit. 's/he tries his/her strength'). The Agent Nominalization of the Absolutive Antipassive form of *-tijooj* also exists: *tijoneel* 'teacher'. Another word for teacher is *aj-tiiij*. It is not clear whether *-tijooj* is derived directly from *-tij* or if it is derived directly from the noun *\*tiiij* ('teaching?'), which is in turn derived from *-tij*. In modern Quiché, *tiiij* apparently only shows up in the word *ajtiiij*.

CHAPTER 6  
MORPHOLOGY III

6.1 Positionals

Positional roots are a root class which seems to be peculiar to the Mayan languages. These roots generally indicate positions (hence, the name "Positional"), shapes, qualities, conditions, or other kinds of states. Within the Mayan family these roots are somewhat unusual in that, unlike the situation with all other root classes, there are no non-derived Positional stems; that is to say, all words involving Positional roots are derived. There are three derivations in particular which define the class of Positional roots and distinguish them from other root classes. These three defining derivations are derived by means of the suffixes  $-V,l$ ,  $-i7$ , and  $-V,b'a7$ .

The suffix  $-V,l$  derives a non-verbal stative predicate meaning 'to be in the state denoted by the root' or 'for some object in the state denoted by the root to be in some place'. This form is sometimes called the Positional Adjective though it is not a true adjective. The suffix has an allomorph  $-an$  which is used on roots which have the consonants /l/ or /r/. This type of stative predicate takes the phrase-final suffix  $-ik$ . Some examples of Positional Adjectives are shown in (1).

- (1) (a) q'oy-ol-ik  
 lying-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 `lying'
- (b) tak'-al-ik  
 standing-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 `standing'
- (c) t'uy-ul-ik  
 sitting-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 `sitting'
- (d) ket-el-ik  
 discoid-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 `discoid'
- (e) ch'aq-al-ik  
 wet-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 `wet'
- (f) b'ol-an-ik  
 cylindrical/long/horizontal-STAT-PHRS.FINAL  
 `long, horizonatal, and cylindrical'
- (g) k'ul-an-ik  
 married-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 `married'

- (h) sur-an-ik  
 nearly.spherical-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'nearly spherical'
- (i) ko7-1-ik  
 small-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
 'small'

Note in (11) that when the root ends in /ʔ/, the Stative suffix has no vowel. The Positional root -k'as 'alive, awake' has an irregular Positional Adjective form: k'aslik. In many dialects the non phrase-final form of this Positional Adjective is also irregular: k'as; however, in Cantel the non phrase-final form is regular: k'asāl. Some examples of Positional Adjectives used as predicates can be seen in (2).

- (2) (a) e7        tak'-al-ik  
                   3PL.B standing-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
                   'they are standing'
- (b) t'uy-ul                ri    achii  
                   sitting-STATIVE    the    man  
                   'the man is sitting'
- (c) ri    ak'aal    q'oy-ol-ik  
           the    child    lying-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL  
           'the child is lying (down), the lying child,  
           the child who is lying (down)'



- (d) ri xoot ket-el cho jaa  
 the comal discoid-STATIVE before house  
 'the comal (= a disk shaped clay griddle)  
 is lying in the patio'

The suffix -i7 (-a7 in Santa María Chiquimula) derives an intransitive verb meaning 'to come to be in the state denoted by the root'. The Plain Status suffix on this verb has the usual form -ik in Santa María Chiquimula, but it has the form -k in other dialects. Some examples are seen in (3).

- (3) (a) x+Ø+tak'-i7-k

PERFV+3SG.B+standing-INTRANS-PLAIN

's/he stood (up)'

- (b) x+Ø+ket-i7-k

PERFV+3SG.B+discoid-INTRANS-PLAIN

'it came to be discoid (in shape)'

- (c) x+Ø+ch'aq-i7-k

PERFV+3SG.B+wet-INTRANS-PLAIN

'he/she/it got wet'

- (d) k+e7+k'ul-i7-k

IMPERFV+3PL.B+married-INTRANS-PLAIN

'they are getting married'

The intransitive verb corresponding to the Positional Adjective *ku7-l-ik* 'sitting' uses an alternate form of the root in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Cantel (though apparently not in Nahualá): *-kub'-i7*. Aside from the Plain Status forms like those seen in (3), all other forms of such intransitive verbs are based on the Positional Adjective stem rather than the intransitive verb stem. These include the Imperative forms (e. g., *ch+at+t'uy-ul-og* 'sit (down)!'), the forms with Incorporated Movement clitics (*x+in+e7+t'uy-ul-og* 'I went to sit (down)'), the Perfect Participle (*t'uy-ul-inaq* 's/he has sat (down)'), and the Action Nominalization (*t'uy-ul-eem* 'sitting (down)').

The suffix *-V,b'a7* derives a transitive verb meaning 'to leave something in some place in the state denoted by the root' or, in some cases, 'to cause to be in the state denoted by the root'. Some examples are seen in (4).

(4) (a) *x+∅+uu-q'oy-ob'a7*

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-lying-CAUS

's/he left him/her/it in a lying position'

(b) *x+∅+uu-ket-eb'a7*

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-discoid-CAUS

's/he left it (a discoid shaped object in some place)'

(c) x+Ø+uu-ch'aq-ab'a7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-wet-CAUS

's/he got him/her/it wet'

(d) x+Ø+uu-k'ul-ub'a7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-married-CAUS

's/he married him/her off'

The allomorph *-kub'* is used in Momostenango, Santa María Chiquimula, and Cantel in forming this transitive stem from the Positional root *-ku7 ~ -kub'* 'sitting': *-kub'-(u)b'a7*.

The Positional root */k'oj/ ~ /k'oh/* is very commonly used and has some irregular derivatives. The meaning of this root is very general: 'to be in a place' (Spanish *estar*). The Positional Adjective derived from this root has the phrase-final form *k'oolik* (*/k'oh+(o)l+ik/*) and the irregular non phrase-final form *k'oo*. This Positional adjective not only is used to mean 'located in a place', as illustrated in (5a), but is also used as the existential predicate 'there is/are/was/were/will be' (Spanish *haber*), as illustrated in (5b).

(5) (a) in k'oo waraal

1SG.B be here

'I am here'



Other forms include the Perfect Participle *k'oolinaq* 'have been (in a place)', the Action Nominalization *k'ooleem* 'being in a place', and the Locative/Instrumental noun *k'oolib'al* 'place'. Note that the intransitive verb derived from *-k'oj* is used rather than the corresponding Positional Adjective in those cases when it is necessary to explicitly mark tense, aspect, and/or mood, all of which are not marked on non-verbal predicates.

The number of forms which can be derived from Positional Roots is probably close to, if not greater than, the number of forms which can be derived from transitive verb roots. The three most important derivations were already seen above. I will only consider two others here. One of these is an adjectival form derived by means of the suffix *-V<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>* followed by the suffix *-ik*. This form is sometimes called the Permanent Adjective. The Permanent Adjective may be used either as a true adjective, i. e. a pronominal modifier, or as a noun. Also, like any noun or adjective, it can be used as a non-verbal predicate. The Permanent Adjective differs in meaning from the Positional Adjective. The Positional Adjective indicates that an entity is, at the reference time, in the state denoted by the root or that an entity in the state denoted by the root is, at the reference time, in a particular location. The Permanent Adjective, on the other hand, indicates that the state denoted by the root

is an inherent characteristic of the root in question. The Permanent Adjective also differs from the Positional Adjective in that the suffix *-ik* at the end of the Permanent Adjective is not a phrase-final suffix like it is with the Positional Adjective. Some examples of Permanent Adjectives are seen in (8).

(8) (a) tak'-at-ik

standing-ADJ-SUFFIX

'tall, stiff, rigid'

(b) ket-ek-ik

discoid-ADJ-SUFFIX

'discoid; disk'

(c) b'ol-ob'-ik

long/horizontal/cylindrical-ADJ-SUFFIX

'long, horizontal, and cylindrical; long  
horizontal cylinder'

(d) sur-us-ik

nearly.spherical-ADJ-SUFFIX

'ball' (e. g., of yarn)

(e) kiy-ik-ik

unbraided-ADJ-SUFFIX

'unkempt; fringe'

Some examples of the use of such forms is given in (9).

(9) (a) are7 jun tak'atik achii  
 he a tall man  
 'he is a tall man' (adjective)

(b) ketekik ri xoot  
 discoid the comal  
 'the comal is discoid' (non-verbal predicate)

(c) k'oo kiyikik chee nu-q'uu7  
 there.is fringe to 1SG.A-blanket  
 'there is fringe on my blanket' (noun)

Permanent Adjectives all have plural forms which are formed by replacing the *-ik* of the Permanent Adjective suffix *-V,C,ik* by the usual plural suffix *-a7q* ( ~ *-aq* when the Permanent Adjective is used as a prenominal modifier; see section 3.5.1.3). Some examples are seen in (10).

(10) (a) tak'-at-a7q  
 standing-ADJ-PL  
 'tall, stiff, rigid (ones)'

(b) ket-et-a7q  
 discoid-ADJ-PL  
 'discoid (things); disks'

(c) b'ol-ob'-a7q  
 long/horizontal/cylindrical-ADJ-PL  
 'cylindrical (things); cylinders'

(d) sur-us-a7q  
 nearly.spherical-ADJ-PL  
 'balls'

(e) kiy-ik-a7q  
 unbraided-ADJ-PL  
 'fringes'

Note that the vowel of the Plural suffix is always /a/ even though the Permanent Adjective never takes an Attributive suffix -a. This is additional evidence that the vowel of the Plural suffix should not be identified with the Attributive suffix, as argued in section 3.5.1.3.

The final derivation to be considered here is a transitive verb stem meaning 'to carry something in the state denoted by the root'. Kaufman (1986a) refers to this form as the "Portative" stem. It is formed by lengthening the vowel of the root (that is to say, by infixing /h/ after the vowel of the root) and by adding the Thematic Vowel suffix -e. Some examples are seen in (11).

(11) (a) x+Ø+uu-b'ool-e-ej  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cylindrical-PORT-PLAIN/DEP  
 's/he carried it (a long horizontal  
 cylindrical object, e. g., a drunk person)'



(b) x+Ø+uu-keet-e-ej

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-discoid-PORT-PLAIN/DEP

's/he carried it (a disk-shaped object,  
e.g., a comal)'

Positional roots seem to have a lot in common with transitive verb roots. Both have the form CVC. Many transitive verb roots can take the Positional Adjective suffix to form a non-verbal predicate meaning 'capable of undergoing the action denoted by the root'. Some examples are seen in (12-13).

(12) (a) x+Ø+uu-wiq-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-adorn-PLAIN

's/he adorned it'

(b) wiq-il-ik

adorn-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL

'adornable'

(13) (a) x+Ø+uu-b'it'-o

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-tear-PLAIN

's/he tore it (paper or cloth)'

(b) b'it'-il-ik

tear-STATIVE-PHRASE.FINAL

'tearable'

There are also some roots, sometimes called "bivalent

roots", which have all of the properties of both transitive verb roots and Positional roots. My own experience has been that these "bivalent", or "transitive/Positional" roots are rather numerous though this fact generally seems to have gone unrecognized. An example is seen in (14).

(14) (a) x+Ø+uu-pich-o

PERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-act.with.long.thin.straight.

object-PLAIN

's/he hit him/her/it with a long thin stick;  
s/he took it (e. g., a splinter) out (with  
the point of a needle)'

(b) pich-il-ik

long/thin/straight/vertical-STAT-PHRASE.FINAL

'long, thin, straight and vertical; sticking  
up through a surface'

(c) x+Ø+pich-i7-k

PERFV+3SG.B+long/thin/straight/vertical

-INTRANS-PLAIN

'it became long, thin, straight, and  
vertical; it stuck up through the surface'

(d) x+Ø+uu-pich-ib'a7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-long/thin/straight/vertical

-CAUS

's/he left it ( a long, thin, straight,  
and vertical object)'

The root transitive verbs formed from such transitive/Positional roots (e. g., 14a) generally mean 'to act on or with an object in the state denoted by the root' or 'to produce something in the state denoted by the root'. However, the particular action which is done on or with the object is often quite vague and may differ with different roots. I think that a case could probably be made for uniting the class of Positional roots with the class of transitive verb roots if one could show that which forms each root actually participated in were a result of the composition of the semantics of the root with the semantics of any derivational affixes. To my knowledge no one has yet attempted to do this. However, Norman (1973) notes that the major semantic difference between transitive roots, "bivalent" roots, and Positional roots is that with transitive roots some verbal concept is central, with "bivalent" roots the verbal concept is marginal, and with Positional roots the verbal concept is absent. He then goes on to suggest that at a deeper level of analysis these three types of roots may constitute a single class defined in terms of notions other than transitivity. Note that such a

move might seem desirable in that it would eliminate the somewhat anomalous status of Positional roots as the only root class in Mayan languages which must undergo derivation.

## 6.2 Adverbs and Particles

There are a wide variety of adverbs and particles in Quiché. Although these are quite interesting, I will not discuss them in detail here. Of the adverbs I will only consider one special class known as Directionals. Particles are morphemes with a variety of syntactic and semantic functions but which are never inflected nor do they undergo derivation (although they may participate in compounds). In general I will discuss the properties of such particles only if and when they come up in the course of discussion. The only particles which will be discussed in this section are the demonstratives, the definite articles, prepositions, and those particles which form the interrogative pronouns and adverbs.

### 6.2.1 Directionals

Directionals are a special small set of adverbs which may follow a verb to indicate direction. Their use is similar to that of directional adverbs like *up, down, in, out, hither, thither*, etc. in English. Also like such directional adverbs in English, the Quiché Directionals may have metaphorical meanings. Unlike the English directional



shorten that vowel in non phrase-final position. The vowels shown in Parentheses are in general optional; however, if the Directional is preceded by an unstressed vowel-final particle, the initial vowel of the Directional is obligatorily present and generally undergoes the contraction rule (see section 2.2.2) with the preceding vowel. In the Cantel dialect the Directional in (15d) apparently also has an optional initial vowel: (a)qajog ~ (a)qāj. In Santa María Chiquimula the directional in (15d) has the form kaajog ~ kaaj. It is possible that the Directional (u)ko-q does not exist in Cantel. The non phrase-final form of the Directional (a)pan-oq may optionally have the form (a)pano in Santa María Chiquimula.

In general these Directionals indicate the direction of motion (or in the case of *kaan-oq*, the lack of motion) of the direct object of a transitive verb or of the subject of an intransitive verb. Some examples are seen in (16-22).

(16) (a) x+Ø+wa7lij                      (u)b'i-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+get.up    thither-PLAIN  
 's/he got up (and left)'

(b) x+Ø+uu-k'am                      (u)b'i  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-bring/take    thither  
 pa    k'ayib'al  
 to    market



- (c) x+Ø+uu-k'aq                      aq'an ri xoot  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-throw up the tile  
 ch+w-e  
 to+1SG.A-possession  
 's/he threw the tile(s) up to me'
- (19) (a) x+Ø+qaaj qaaj-oq  
 PERFV+3SG.B+descend down-DEP  
 's/he went/came down'
- (b) x+Ø+uu-koj                      qaj ri ab'aj  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-put down the rock  
 's/he put the rock down'
- (20) (a) x+Ø+uu-k'am                      (u)ko pa jaa  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-bring/take in in house  
 's/he brought/took him/her/it into the house'
- (b) x+Ø+k'am                      lu7koq  
    /laa#uko+q/  
 PERFV+3SG.B+bring/take 2SG.FORMAL in-DEP  
 'you (sg. formal) brought/took him/her/it in'
- (21) (a) x+Ø+uu-k'aq                      (a)pan ri ab'aj  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-throw over.there the rock  
 's/he threw the rock over there'





(23) (a) x+Ø+uu-b'iij                      chi ka+Ø+pee  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-say that IMPERF+3SG.B+come  
 chi      naa  
 again NEC  
 's/he said that s/he would come again'

(b) x+Ø+uu-b'iij                      kan      chi  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-say staying that  
 ka+Ø+pee      chi      naa  
 IMPERF+3SG.B again NEC  
 'he left word that he would come again'

One might also note examples like the one in (24), where the Directional does not literally indicate the direction of movement of the direct object but rather indicates the direction in which the direct object is located relative to the subject.

(24) cha+Ø+w-il-a7                                      apan-oq  
 IMP/POT+3SG.B+(SET.A?)PREFIX-see-DEP over.there  
 -DEP  
 'look at that over there!' (sg.)

In some cases Directionals may appear in other types of syntactic constructions besides verb phrases. For example, in (25) it appears as part of a locative Relational Noun phrase.

(25) k'oo ch+u+xukut apan ri w-achooch  
 be to+3SG.A+side over.there the 1SG.A-house  
 'it is over there beside my house'

### 6.2.2 Demonstratives and Articles

The basic demonstrative pronouns in Quiché form a three-way system: wa7 'this' (near speaker, or presented as if it were near speaker), la7 'that' (visible, near hearer, or presented as if it were visible or near the hearer'), and ri7 'that' (far away, invisible, or presented as if it were far away or invisible, or mentioned previously in the discourse). Corresponding to each of these demonstrative pronouns there are three definite articles: wa, la, ri 'the'. Similarly there are three demonstrative adverbs: waraal ~ chi7 'here' (near speaker, or presented as such), chila7 'there' (visible, near hearer, or presented as such), chiri7 'there' (far away, invisible, or presented as such, or previously mentioned in discourse). In addition to these, there are two special demonstrative forms used in pointing something out to someone: rii7 'this one, right here; that one (far away or invisible), way over there', laa7 'that one (near hearer or visible), right there'. All of this is summarized in table 1. In addition to the forms shown in table 1, there are other demonstratives that can be formed by compounding with other particles. For example, the three demonstrative pronouns can be compounded with the

TABLE 1

## Demonstratives

	Near Speaker	Near Hearer	Far Away
Pronouns	wa7	la7	ri7
Definite Articles	wa	la	ri
Adverbs	waraal ~ chi7	chila7	chiri7
Pointing	rii7	laa7	rii7

particle *jee7* 'like this/that, yes', to form a set of three demonstrative manner/directional adverbs: *jee wa7* 'like this, this way, in this direction', *jee la7* 'like that, that way, in that direction', *jee ri7* 'like that, that way, in that direction'. The same three demonstrative pronouns can be compounded with the Focus particle *aree* (Santa María Chiquimula and Cantel are) to form a set of "emphatic" demonstrative pronouns used in contrastive contexts: *aree wa7* 'this (one) (not any of the others)', *aree la7* 'that (one) (not any of the others)', *aree ri7* 'that (one) (not any of the others)'. The demonstrative adjectives are formed by using the demonstrative pronouns of table 1 followed by the corresponding definite article before the noun being modified. Examples are seen in (26).

- (26) (a) wa7 wa tz'i7  
           this the dog  
           'this dog'

(b) la7 la tz'i7  
 that the dog  
 'that dog' (visible or near speaker)

(c) ri7 ri tz'i7  
 that the dog  
 'that dog' (invisible or far away or  
 mentioned previously)

Another similar construction has the demonstrative pronoun after the noun rather than before the definite article. Some examples are seen in (27).

(27) (a) wa tz'i7 wa7  
 the dog this  
 'this dog (here)'

(b) la tz'i7 la7  
 the dog that  
 'that dog (there)'

(c) ri tz'i7 ri7  
 the dog that  
 'that dog (there)'

In this latter construction it is not necessary that the definite article be paired with its corresponding demonstrative pronoun. That is to say, certain combinations, such as in wa tz'i7 ri7 'this dog', are also

possible. The use of these different combinations of definite article and demonstrative pronoun has to do with the interaction between the denoted object's position in the (real or text) world relative to the speech act participants and its status in the flow of information. For example, *wa tz'i7 ri7* 'this dog' seems to present the dog as an important participant in the discourse (i. e., "visible" and "near the speaker", therefore, *wa*) and furthermore indicates that the dog has been previously mentioned in the discourse (i. e., is old information, therefore, *ri7*). I will not discuss this in detail here, however. It is also possible to use reduplicated forms of the demonstrative pronouns in this construction, e. g., *wa tz'i7 wawa7* 'this dog', *wa tz'i7 riri7*, etc. I do not fully understand the use of these reduplicated forms; however, my feeling is that the given examples might be translated as something like 'this dog right here/over there'.

One of the curious things about Quiché and other Mayan languages is that the definite articles can be used together with the indefinite article *juun*. In such situations the combination of articles is sometimes translated as a demonstrative, e. g., *wa jun tz'i7* 'this dog'. Dayley (1985:284) claims that such constructions in the closely related Tzutujil language denote entities which are "identifiable" (and, therefore, definite) but not "given" (i. e., not assumed to currently be in the consciousness of

the hearer and, therefore, marked with *juun*). My own cursory examination of some Quiché texts, however, suggests very strongly that Dayley's claim is not true for Quiché since one frequently finds this construction used in stories in noun phrases denoting the main character of the story at points where that main character clearly must be in hearer's consciousness. My own feeling about this construction in Quiché is that the indefinite article, when used together with the definite article, does not mark indefiniteness nor old information but rather something that might be called "specificity". On this view, a noun phrase like *wa jun tz'i7* actually means something like 'the particular dog', for which the most felicitous translation in English would probably be 'this dog'. I am not prepared to argue this very persuasively here, however; and furthermore, I do not at present fully understand the use of this construction in discourse. It might also be noted that *juun* is also, probably more commonly than not, used in the construction illustrated in (227), e. g., *ri jun tz'i7 ri7* 'that (particular?) dog', *wa jun tz'i7 riri7* 'this (particular?) dog (right there)', etc.

There is a certain amount of dialectal variation in the forms shown in table 1. For example, in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the "visible, near hearer" pointing demonstrative has the form *lee7* rather than *laa7*. Also the

"near speaker" and the "visible, near hearer" definite articles have the forms *wee* and *lee*, respectively, in these dialects. In colonial Quiché manuscripts one frequently finds demonstrative forms like <*wae*> 'this, here' and <*lae*> 'that, there'. I assume that these orthographic forms represent /waʔ#ee/ and /laʔ#ee/; and furthermore, I assume that the forms *wee* and *lee* of the definite articles developed from these colonial demonstratives *waʔee* and *laʔee*. The morpheme *ee* still occurs in forms like *jeʔee* 'okay' <*jeeʔ* 'like this/that, yes'.

There are further differences in the Cantel dialect. In this dialect, the form *waʔ* is used by itself as a demonstrative pronoun and also in the emphatic form *are waʔ* and in the manner/directional adverb *je waʔ*. However, in all other constructions mentioned above, the form *riʔ* is used in place of *waʔ*. The form *are we riʔ* 'this (one)' also exists in addition to *are waʔ*. Similarly, the form *laʔ* is used in the emphatic form *are laʔ* and in the manner/directional adverb *je laʔ*. However, in all other situations, including the simple demonstrative pronoun, the form *leʔ* is used in place of *laʔ*. The "near speaker" and the "visible, near hearer" definite articles have the forms *we* and *le*. The form *riʔ* apparently is never used to mean 'that (far away)' in Cantel. Rather, this dialect uses a special form *jaleleʔ* for that purpose. Thus, in Cantel, one finds, *we tz'iʔ riʔ* 'this dog (here)', *le tz'iʔ riʔ* 'this



dog (here)', *ri tz'i7 ri7* 'this dog (here)', and *le tz'i7 le7* 'that dog (there, pointing at it)', but *le tz'i7 jalele7* 'that dog (way over there)'.

### 6.2.3 Prepositions

In section 3.4.4.2 it was seen that many oblique cases in Quiché were indicated by means of a special type of possessed noun called a relational noun. Some oblique cases in Quiché, however, are marked by prepositions similar to the prepositions found in languages like English and Spanish. Though prepositions and relational nouns have similar functions in Quiché, prepositions differ from relational nouns in that prepositions are simple, uninflected, monomorphemic particles whereas relational nouns are (minimally) noun stems inflected for possessor agreement. Furthermore, as was discussed in section 3.4.4.2, some relational nouns are actually preceded by a preposition, usually either *chi* or *pa*. The complete set of Quiché prepositions is shown in table 2. It is possible that not all of the prepositions in table 2 exist in all dialects. For example, I have so far encountered *chi7* and *chij* only in the Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialects. Of these prepositions, only *chi* can be reconstructed in Proto-Mayan (\**tya*, Kaufman 1986a). The others are all shortened forms of relational nouns. Thus, *chi7* < *ch+u-chii7* 'on the edge of it' (< *-chii7* 'mouth,

TABLE 2  
Prepositions

chi	'to, at'
chi7	'on the edge of'
chij	'behind'
chil	'together with, and'
cho	'before, in front of'
chwi	'above'
ma ~ mal	'because of'
pa	'in, at'
tza7m ~ tzam	'at the edge of'
xee	'under'
xo7l	'between'
xukut	'beside'

lip'), *chij* < *chi+r-ij* 'behind it, on its (curved) surface' (< *-ij* 'back, shell, bark, covering'), *chil* < *r-ach'il* 'together with it' (< *-ach'il* 'companion', see footnote 12 of Chapter 3), *cho* < *ch+u-wach* 'in front of it, on its (flat) surface' (< *-wach* 'face'; note that in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the preposition has the form *chwa*), *chwi* < *ch+u-wi7* 'above it' (< *-wi7* 'top, point, head hair'), *ma(l)* < *r-umaal* 'by it' (< *-umaal* 'by'), *pa* < *ch+u-paam* 'inside of it' (< *-paam* 'stomach'), *tza(7)m* < *u-tza7m* 'at its edge' (lit., 'his/her/its nose'), *xee* < *ch+u-xee7* 'under it' (< *-xee7* 'root'), *xo7l* < *chi+ki-xo7l*

'between them' (< -xo71 'interval'), xukut < ch+u-xukut 'beside it' (< -xukut 'side'). There might also be a possibility that chi is ultimately related to ch+u-chii7 (-chii7 'mouth, lip' < Proto-Mayan \*tyii7) although the difference in the vowels, plus the fact that there is another preposition chii7 which is related to this same relational noun, might make such a claim problematic.

The prepositions chi and pa always lose their vowels before a vowel-initial word.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes these two prepositions may optionally lose their vowels even before consonants. This is especially true in the Cantel dialect. In Santa María Chiquimula the preposition chi generally has the form chu when the vowel is present. In Cantel the preposition xukut has the form xkut.

There is an important syntactic difference between prepositions and relational nouns which might be mentioned here. Quiché prepositions must always be followed by an overt noun phrase argument. They can not be left "stranded". Relational nouns, on the other hand, since they are inflected for agreement with the "possessor" noun phrase, may be left "stranded" in this way, for example, when the possessor noun phrase is pronominal. Some examples are seen in (28-30).

(28) (a) k'oo ja7 ch+u-pam ri q'eeb'al  
 there.is water at+3SG.A-stomach the water.jug  
 'There is water inside the water jug.'

(b) k'oo ja7 pa ri q'eeb'al  
 there.is water in the water.jug  
 'There is water in the water jug.'

(29) (a) k'oo ja7 ch+u-paam  
 there.is water at+3SG.A-stomach  
 'There is water inside of it'

(b) \*k'oo ja7 pa  
 there.is water in

(30) (a) ri q'eeb'al ri k'oo ja7  
 the water.jug the there.is water  
 ch+u-paam  
 at+3SG.A-stomach  
 'the water jug that has water inside of it'

(b) \*ri q'eeb'al ri k'oo ja7 pa  
 the water.jug the there.is water in

With this in mind, it is interesting to consider the relational noun *chee(ch)*, a complete paradigm of which is given in (31).

(31) (a) ch(u)+w-e(ech)	'to me'
(b) ch+aw-e(ech)	'to you (sg.)'
(c) ch+e(ch) laa	'to you (sg. formal)'
(d) ch+ee(ch)	'to him/her/it'
(e) ch(a)+q-e(ech)	'to us'
(f) ch+iw-e(ech)	'to you (pl.)'
(g) ch+e(ch) alaq	'to you (pl. formal)'
(h) chi+k-e(ech)	'to them'

As can be seen in (31c), the third person singular form of this relational noun unexpectedly does not include the third person singular set A prefix *r-*. This might suggest that the form *chee(ch)* is actually a preposition in the same way that, for example, *cho* ~ *chwa* (a shortened form of *chuwach*, without a set A prefix) is a preposition (see table 1 above).

As evidence for this, one might note that in Cantel the preposition *chi* alternates with *che* under certain conditions (see section 8.1.2). In these situations only *chi* is used in Momostenango. It should also be noted that in the Santa María Chiquimula dialect the third person singular form of the relational noun has its expected shape, *chi+r-e(ech)*; and the form *chee(ch)* does not exist in that dialect. Furthermore, the Santa María Chiquimula dialect is like the Momostenango dialect in using the preposition *chu* (= *chi*) in some of the places where Cantel would use *che*. In fact, the

Santa María Chiquimula dialect uses the preposition *chu* in some situations where even Momostenango would use *chee*. For example, in Santa María Chiquimula the preposition *chu* is used to mark an instrumental noun phrase whereas Momostenango, like Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel, would use *chee(ch)* for this purpose. All of this might suggest that *chee(ch)* is a preposition which derives from the relational noun *chire(ech)* and which in some dialects is taking over some of the functions of the preposition *chi*.

There are at least two problems with this hypothesis, however. For one thing, all of the prepositions shown in table 2 exist side by side with the third person singular form of the corresponding relational noun. This is not true with *chee(ch)*, however: those dialects which have *chee(ch)* do not have *chire(ech)*, and those dialects which have *chire(ech)* do not have *chee(ch)*. A more serious problem, however, is that *chee(ch)*, like any other relational noun, but unlike any other preposition, can be left stranded, as can be seen in (32).

- (32) (a) x+Ø+in-yaa                      jun kootz'i7j  
           PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-give one flower  
           chee ri ali  
           to the girl  
           'I gave a flower to the girl.'

(b) ri ali ri x+∅+in-yaa jun  
 the girl the PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-give one  
 kootz'i7j chee  
 flower to  
 'the girl that I gave a flower to'

The phenomenon seen in (32b) seems somewhat strange given that *chee(ch)* does not appear to have a set A prefix. Apparently one would have to say that *chee(ch)* is not a preposition, but rather a relational noun with an idiosyncratic allomorph ∅- of the third person singular set A prefix. It is still tempting to suggest, however, that *chee(ch)* is (or was) in the process of becoming a preposition derived from the relational noun *chire(ech)* in the same way that the prepositions of table 2 presumably became prepositions derived from their respective relational nouns. It appears, however, that *chee(ch)*, unlike the prepositions of table 2, has not (yet) attained full prepositionhood since it still retains many of the essential properties of the relational noun from which it derives.

#### 6.2.4 Interrogatives

The interrogative pronouns and adverbs are *jachinaq* 'who?', *jasach* 'what?', *jachike* 'which?', *jampa7* 'when?', *jawichi7* 'where?', *janipa7* 'how much, how many, how long?', and *jarupa7* 'how much, how many?'. The form *jachinaq* is

used only when this interrogative is used as a non-verbal predicate in phrase-final position as, for example, in (32a). In other cases the shortened form *jachin* is used, as seen in (32b).

(32) (a) at        *jachinaq*

2SG.B who

'Who are you?'

(b) *jachin x+Ø+aaaw-il-o*

who        PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-see-PLAIN

'Who did you see?'

The form *jasach* is used only in isolation or as a non-verbal predicate in simple clauses as in (33a). In other cases the form is either *jasa* or *jas*. The form *jasa* is always used as a clefted constituent, as illustrated in (33b). In other cases either form may be used, as illustrated in (33c), although the form *jas* seems to be slightly more common.

(33) (a) *jasach la7*

what        that

'What is that?'

(b) *jasa ri xuub'ano*

what        the        s/he.did.it

'What is it that s/he did?'



(c) *jas(a) xuub'ano*  
 what s/he.did.it  
 'What did s/he do?'

There is a certain amount of dialectal variation in these forms. Some of these variants are (1) 'who?': *jachinoq* (sentence final: Cantel), *chiinoq* (sentence final ~ *chin* non sentence-final: Santa María Chiquimula); (2) 'what?': *jaas* (Totonicapán, Kaufman 1976:106), *jas uwach* (predicative, non-predicative *jasa* ~ *jas*: Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Nahualá), *sach* (predicative, non-predicative *sa* ~ *su*: Santa María Chiquimula), *su uwach* (predicative, non-predicative *su*: Chichicastenango, Henne 1980); (3) 'which?': *chike* (Santa María Chiquimula), *jaachikeh* (Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán); (4) 'when?': *jampa7* ~ *junpa7* (Santa María Chiquimula); (5) 'where?': *chi7l wii* (Santa María Chiquimula), *jawi7* (Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán), *jaw"chi7* (Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán), *jaw(i)jechi7* ~ *jawije7* (Cantel), *chiw"chi7* (Chichicastenango, Henne 1980); (6) 'how much, how many, how long?': *jampa7* (Cantel), *janik'pa7* (Chichicastenango, Henne 1980); (7) 'how much, how many?': *jorupa7* (Santa María Chiquimula), *joropa7* (Cantel).

As can be seen, the interrogative pronouns and adverbs generally, with the exception of some Chichicastenango forms and most Santa María Chiquimula forms, consist of a particle *ja(a)* compounded with one or more other morphemes. In many

cases these other morphemes are peculiar to the interrogatives or perhaps to these and a handful of other forms. In some cases these other morphemes are clearly recognizable. For example, *chi+k-e*, which appears in some of the forms for 'which?' is a Relational Noun (see section 6.2.3) meaning 'to them'. The morpheme *chi7*, which appears in some of the forms meaning 'where?', is a word meaning 'here' (see section 6.2.2). Also, the morpheme *w(i)(i) ~ wi7* appearing in all of the forms for 'where?' is related to the particle *wii* seen in footnotes 6 and 7 of Chapter 2. The form *u-wach*, which appears in some of the forms for 'what?' means 'its face; its kind'. The form *jas uwach* can also mean 'what kind of...?' in Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, and Cantel (*su uwach* in Chichicastenango, Henne 1980).

Many other interrogatives can be formed in the same way as *jas uwach*: combining an interrogative form with another word. Some other examples are: *jachin chike(ech)* 'which one (of them)?' (*chi+k-e(ech)* 'to them'), *jachin chqe* 'which one of us?' (*ch+q-e(ech)* 'to us'), *jas(a) chee* 'why?' (*chee* 'to'), *jachin ree(ch)* 'whose?' (*r-ee(ch)* 'of him/her/it'), *jachin ruuk'* 'with whom?' (*r-uuk'* 'with him/her/it'), *jas ruuk'* 'with what?', *jas ub'aanik* 'how?' (*u-b'aan-ik* 'its manner', lit. 'its being done'), etc. In Momostenango the form *jas* is practically always used rather than *jas* in such combinations.

Some of the interrogative pronouns and adverbs are also used as indefinite pronouns and adverbs. For example, *jachin chike*, in addition to meaning 'which one of (them)?', can also mean 'whichever'. Similarly, *jarupa7* can also mean 'however many'. Some other indefinites are: (1) 'whoever, anyone': *pajachin(aq)* (Momostenango), *pachiinoq ~ pachin* (Santa María Chiquimula), *pachin(aq)* (Nahualá, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán), *apachin(oq)* (Cantel); (2) 'whatever, anything' *pasach* (Momostenango); (3) 'whichever, anyone, anything' *pajachin chike* (Momostenango), *pachike* (Santa María Chiquimula), *apachike* (Cantel); (4) 'wherever, anywhere' *apawije* (Cantel).

## NOTES

1. In the closely related Cakchiquel language, the preposition *pa* has the form *pān* before vowel initial words. In some Cakchiquel place names, the form *pān* is used even before consonants.

CHAPTER 7  
SYNTAX I: WORD ORDER

I will begin the presentation of Quiché syntax with a discussion of word order. The order of the major constituents of the clause is highly variable in Quiché, though not entirely "free". This is in contrast to the order of the constituents of noun phrases and prepositional phrases, which is relatively fixed. In this chapter I will confine myself to a discussion of the relative ordering of verbs and their obligatory arguments in an attempt to determine the "basic word order" of Quiché.

One of the earliest statements of word order in Quiché that I am aware of is the one given by Fox (1965:28-9). Fox claims that in an intransitive sentence the order of constituents is VS, that is, the verb precedes the subject, as illustrated in (1). (All of Fox's examples are in the dialect of San Cristóbal Totonicapán).

- (1) x+Ø+pe                      ri    achi  
       PERFV+3SG.B+come    the   man  
       'The man came.'

In a transitive sentence, on the other hand, Fox claims that the order of constituents is either VSO (or, using the terminology of Dixon 1979, VAO<sup>1</sup>) or SVO (i.e., AVO), as illustrated in (2).

(2) (a) x+Ø+u-log'                      ri    achi jun kamixa7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-buy the man one shirt  
 'The man bought a shirt.'

(b) ri    achi x+Ø+u-log'                      jun kamixa7  
 the man    PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-buy one shirt  
 'The man bought a shirt.'

Fox's statement of word order is inadequate, however, because in both transitive and intransitive clauses, other orders of V, S, A, and O are possible in addition to the ones illustrated in (1) and (2). Fox also makes no claim about which of the two orders he does give for transitive clauses is the basic order. It might be noted that the order most frequently encountered in elicitation contexts is AVO, and this may have led some people to assume that this is the basic order.<sup>2</sup> As will be seen, however, there is little justification for such an assumption.

A more thorough study of Quiché word order was done by James Mondloch and later published as Mondloch (1978b). Mondloch was concerned with how subjects were distinguished from direct objects in Quiché. Since there is no case marking on nouns, it is not obvious, given the variability of the word order, how one might distinguish between the subject and direct object in transitive clauses where both of these arguments are expressed as full (non-pronominal) third person noun phrases of the same number (singular or

plural). One of the mechanisms he considered as a means of disambiguation in such cases was word order. However, in a sample of 1,380 lines of narrative text transcribed from tapes, Mondloch found only twenty clauses in which such ambiguity could possibly arise. Among these twenty clauses Mondloch claimed to have found at least one instance of each of the six logically possible orders of V, A, and O: 7 instances of VOA, 4 instances of AVO, 4 instances of AOV, 3 instances of OVA, 1 instance of OAV, and 1 instance of VAO. Mondloch (1978b:18) noted, however, that his one example of an OAV sentence was problematic. In actual fact, this sentence, shown below in (3), is not an OAV sentence at all but rather a noun phrase containing a relative clause in which the head noun functions as direct object. (Mondloch's examples are presumably in the Nahualá dialect.)

(3) u-chaak        rii    a        Pedr" de Mal"  
       3SG.A-work    the    MALE   Pedro de Malo  
       x+Ø+uu-b'an-oh  
       PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do-PLAIN  
       'the work that Pedro de Malo did'

Thus, in actual fact, Mondloch's sample included only 19 transitive clauses with two full NP arguments of the same number; and among these 19 clauses, there were instances of all of the logically possible orderings of V, A, and O except OAV.

Note that the most frequent order that Mondloch found was VOA (7 instances), an order that was not even mentioned by Fox. Of the two orders that Fox did mention, AVO ran a distant second with 4 instances, and VAO was tied for last place with only 1 instance. In any case, however, it can be seen that the order of the major clause constituents is quite variable in Quiché; and, therefore, word order by itself will not distinguish subjects and direct objects.

Mondloch also considered semantic features as a disambiguating mechanism. He noted that inanimate nouns rarely occur as the subject of a transitive clause. Therefore, if a transitive clause has one human or animate noun phrase and one inanimate noun phrase as arguments, the human or animate argument will practically always be interpreted as the subject. Mondloch found that of his nineteen potentially ambiguous transitive clauses, seventeen of them were disambiguated in this way: the one human or animate noun phrase was understood to be the subject, and the one inanimate noun phrase was understood to be the direct object. One of the remaining two clauses had one human noun phrase and one non-human animate noun phrase. However, since the verb (-pil 'butcher') was one which requires a human subject, the human noun phrase must then be understood as the subject. The order of constituents in this sentence was VOA. The other sentence was the only one



which was truly ambiguous (out of context) since it had one human noun phrase and one non-human animate noun phrase, and the verb (-il 'see') was one which would permit either noun phrase to be the subject. From the context, however, it was clear that the human noun phrase must be the subject; and the word order in this case was VAO.

Mondloch finally considered voice as a disambiguating mechanism. He claimed that sentences like (4), with two human noun phrases, are ambiguous and that native speakers will interpret such sentences in two ways, as shown.

- (4) x+Ø+uu-kunaj                      rii   achih   rii   ixoq  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cure   the   man   the   woman  
 'The man cured the woman.'  
 or  
 'The woman cured the man.'

Mondloch then claimed that sentences like (4) are disambiguated either by recasting them in one of the passive constructions (see section 8.4.1) or by recasting them in one of the antipassive constructions (see section 8.4.2 and Chapter 9).

It is not clear how to interpret the results of Mondloch's study with respect to the problem of basic word order in Quiché. On the one hand, the order which appeared most frequently in Mondloch's sample was VOA. Since text

frequency is sometimes taken as a criterion for determining basic word order, one might take this as evidence for VOA being the basic order in Quiché. On the other hand, it is often believed that the basic word order should be the one which is least ambiguous; and it was seen that the one sentence in Mondloch's sample that could not be disambiguated by means of semantic features had the order VAO. Thus, if one believes that it is the word order which disambiguates this example (though it is not clear that this is actually the case), one could take this as evidence that VAO is the basic order. It can be seen then, that two of the commonly used criteria for determining basic order seem to give different results in Quiché. Actually, the situation is even more problematic than this. Although there were more VOA sentences in Mondloch's sample than VAO sentences, the actual numbers of these two types of sentences in the sample differed only by 6. As was mentioned previously, Mondloch only found 19 transitive sentences with two full noun phrases in 1,380 lines of text. It would seem unwise to try to draw any firm conclusions about basic word order from such a small number of sentences, and in fact Mondloch did not make any claims about basic word order in his paper.

One of the most important studies of word order in Quiché was presented by William Norman in a talk at the

Taller Maya/Mayan Workshop in San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas, Mexico in 1977. Norman's study was never published; however, his conclusions have generally been accepted by other Mayanists and are often cited, e. g., by Kaufman (1986a), and also by Norman (1978:458) himself. Norman's basic approach to word order in Quiché was to determine which orders were possible and then to try to determine the discourse pragmatic function of each of the possible orders. In order to determine which of the possible orders was the basic order, he started with the premise that the basic order was the one from which the other possible orders could be derived, but not the reverse. He then noted the following implications of this premise:

- (5) (a) The basic order should not be marked by special affixes or particles not found in the other orders.
- (b) The basic order should not be ambiguous.
- (c) The basic order should be neutral with respect to "thematic structure" (i. e., theme vs. rheme or topic vs. comment) and "information structure" (new information, focus, etc.). That is to say, the basic order should not be used for some marked discourse pragmatic purpose.

(d) Sentences which manifest the basic order should not be highly dependent on some special context.

(e) The basic order could be the most frequent order in texts.

Norman noted, however, that given Mondloch's experience of finding very few transitive sentences in texts with two full noun phrases, one cannot conclude too much from text frequencies (point 5e).

As for which orders were possible, Norman found that simple transitive clauses in Quiché could manifest one of the following four orders: VOA, AVO, OVA, and AOV. Examples of each of these orders are shown in (6). (All of Norman's examples are given in the Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialect). In order to get a handle on the pragmatic differences between these different orders, Norman considered what kinds of questions the different examples in (6) might be appropriate answers to. Such questions are shown for each of the examples in (6).<sup>2</sup>

(6) (a) VOA (What happened?)

x+Ø+ki-k'ux                      lee atz'yaq lee ch'oh  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3PL.A-eat the clothes the mouse  
 'The mice ate the clothes.'

(b) AVO (What happened? What did the mice do?)

lee ch'oh xkik'ux lee atz'yaq  
 'The mice(, they) ate the clothes'

(c) OVA (What happened to the clothes?)

lee atz'yaq, xkik'ux lee ch'oh  
 'The clothes, the mice ate them.'

(d) AOV (What did the mice eat?)

lee ch'oh, atz'yaq x+Ø+ki-k'ux-uh  
 the mouse clothes PERFV+3SG.B+3PL.A-eat-PLAIN  
 'The mice, (it was) CLOTHES (that) they ate.'

In addition to the four possible orders shown in (6), Norman also noted that sentences with apparent OAV order were possible, but only if the Focus Antipassive construction (see Chapter 9) was used. This order is not possible, however, in a simple transitive clause. It should be noted that, as will be argued in Chapter 9, the focus antipassive construction is syntactically intransitive; and, thus, the OAV order does not occur at all in transitive clauses. An example is shown in (7). Also shown in (7) is an example of the Focus Antipassive construction with apparent AVO order. This does not particularly concern us, however, since as seen in (6b), this order is also possible with a simple transitive clause.

(7) (a) OAV (What happened to the clothes?)

lee atz'yaq, ch'oh x+ee+k'ux-uw-ik

the clothes mice PERFV+3PL.B-eat-FOCUS-PLAIN

'The clothes, (it was) MICE (that) ate them.'

(b) AVO (Who/what ate the clothes?)

(lee) ch'oh xee+k'uxuw lee atz'yaq

'(It was) (the) MICE (that) ate the clothes.'

Given Norman's criteria for determining basic word order, one could not conclude that OAV (see 7a) was the basic order because of (5a): the order OAV requires special morphemes, namely, the suffix -uw which derives the Focus Antipassive verb form. Given (5b), one would also not want to take either AVO or OVA as the basic order since these are potentially ambiguous (see 6b and 6c). This leaves VOA (see 6a) and AOV (see 6d) as the remaining possibilities for basic word order. Neither of these orders is ambiguous (see 5b): AOV could not be confused with OAV because it does not involve the Focus Antipassive construction, and VOA could not be confused with VAO because the latter is not a possible order.<sup>4</sup> However, of these two orders, VOA seems to be the least pragmatically marked (see 5c) since, as suggested by the question shown in (6a), the VOA order is used to present an entire event as new information. The AOV order, on the other hand, as suggested by the question shown in (6d), is more pragmatically marked in that it is used to

specify the identity of one of the participants (the referent of the NP in O function) in an event where the other participant (the referent of the NP in A function) and the nature of the event are both given information. Note that, as shown in (6b), the order AVO can also be used in pragmatically unmarked situations like VOA; however, it can also be used in marked situations and, in any case, is ambiguous as discussed above. Thus, Norman concluded that the basic word order in Quiché was VOA.

Norman's initial premise, it will be remembered, was that the basic word order should be the one from which all of the other possible orders can be derived, but not the reverse. In order to account for all of the orders that he observed in Quiché, Norman argued that there were two special preverbal positions where constituents could be placed for certain marked pragmatic purposes. Immediately preceding the verb is a position into which a "more prominent constituent" may be placed. I will refer to this position as "Focus Position" due to the fact that constituents placed in this position are generally understood to be "focussed" (i. e., contrastive; see Chafe 1976:33-8). Preceding the Focus Position is another special position for what Norman called the "theme" (i. e., the main discourse topic). I will refer to this position as the "Topic Position" since constituents in this position may be considered to be topicalized (or perhaps left-dislocated if

one takes verb agreement to be equivalent to a resumptive pronoun). Thus, Norman argued, the basic structure of a simple transitive clause was as sketched out in (8).

(8) TOPIC    FOCUS    V    O    A

In pragmatically unmarked contexts, there are no focussed or topicalized constituents; and, therefore, the basic order VOA is manifested. In other pragmatically marked contexts, however, one or two of the constituents which ordinarily follow the verb may appear before the verb in either the Topic or Focus Positions. If the NP in O function appears in Topic Position, the order OVA is manifested, as illustrated in (6c). Similarly, the O may appear in Focus Position, manifesting the same OVA order. In this latter situation, however, the NP in O function is likely to be preceded by the Focus Particle *aree*; and the sentence would be best translated as '(It was) THE CLOTHES (that) the mice ate.' If the NP in A function appears in Topic Position, and the NP in O function also appears preverbally in the Focus Position, then AOV order is manifested, as illustrated in (6d). If the NP in O function were definite in (6d), it would probably also be preceded by the Focus Particle *aree*. If the NP in A function appears in Topic position, and if it is the only preverbal NP, then the AVO order is manifested, as illustrated in (6b). As will be discussed below in Chapter 9, however, it happens that if



one wants to put the NP in A function into Focus Position in Quiché, one has to use the Focus Antipassive construction as illustrated in (7b). Such a sentence with a focussed A could not be expressed as a simple transitive clause. This, then, explains why OAV order is only possible when the Focus Antipassive construction is used: as illustrated in (7a), if the NP in O function appears in Topic Position, and the NP in A function appears in Focus Position, then OAV is manifested; however, since the Focus Antipassive construction must be used when the A is focussed, the OAV order can only be manifested when the Focus Antipassive construction is used.

In addition to explaining why OAV order was only possible with the Focus Antipassive construction, Norman was also able to offer an explanation for the above noted prevalence of AVO order in elicitation contexts: since a speaker does not ordinarily, in normal speech situations, produce isolated sentences out of context, there is a tendency for a Quiché speaker to provide a context for sentences uttered in isolation. One way to provide such a context would be to introduce a new topic via topicalization. If one takes the NP in A function to be the most natural topic NP in a simple transitive clause, then it is easy to see why AVO order is so common in such contexts: the NP in A function has been put in the preverbal Topic

Position in order to introduce the new discourse topic.

Thus, by taking VOA to be the basic order, Norman was able to account not only for all of the observed word orders but also for the pragmatic differences between them. Furthermore, he was able to account for the fact that OAV order requires the Focus Antipassive construction. An additional interesting aspect of Norman's analysis, which may not be immediately obvious, is that he was also able to account for the non-occurrence of VAO order: if one accepts, as sketched out in (8), that VOA is the basic word order and that the A and/or the O may appear in the preverbal Topic and Focus Positions rather than their normal positions, then it can be seen that the VAO order simply cannot be derived in this way.

This, however, brings up a serious problem with Norman's analysis. If VAO order cannot be derived under this analysis, then how does it happen that both Fox and Mondloch claim that VAO order does in fact occur? Actually, Norman did not claim that VAO order never occurs. What he did claim was that VAO order only occurred when the NP in O function was complex (or "heavy"). Thus, since a sentence with VOA order would be difficult to process if the NP in O function were very complex, Norman claimed that such an NP would undergo "heavy NP shift" and appear at the end of the clause, thus manifesting VAO order. Looking at the one

example of a VAO sentence that Mondloch (1978b:18) found in his texts, which is shown below in (9), it can be seen that the NP in O function in this sentence is indeed complex since it contains a relative clause.

- (9) k'a        tee            ka+Ø+r-il                    lee achi  
 until suddenly IMPF+3SG.B+3SG.A-see the man  
 rii jun keej xaa maa                    pwaq  
 the one horse just EXCLAMATORY money  
 k+Ø+uu-kisiij  
 IMPF+3SG.B+3SG.A-shit  
 'Suddenly the man sees a horse that is just  
 shitting money.'

Thus, Mondloch's VAO sentence is in conformity with Norman's theory. This is not the case, however, with Fox's VAO sentence, which was seen above in (2a). According to Norman's analysis, such a sentence should be ungrammatical.

Before discussing this problem further, however, I want to consider one further potential problem with Norman's analysis. Norman pointed out that there are certain restrictions that apply to the noun phrases in a VOA sentence. These restrictions are that (a) the NP in A function must be definite (as marked by one of the definite articles), and that (b) if the NP in O function is animate, it must be "non-definite" (i. e., either indefinite, as marked by the indefinite article juun, or not marked by any

article). Thus, the VOA order is acceptable with a definite A and unmarked animate O, as in (10a), with a definite A and definite inanimate O, as in (10b), and with a definite A and unmarked inanimate O, as in (10c).<sup>25</sup>

(10) (a) k+Ø+u-q'ab'ar-sa-j

IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-get.drunk-CAUS-PLAIN

winaq lee tzaam

person the liquor

'Liquor gets people drunk.'

(b) x+Ø+u-ram

lee chee7 lee achih

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut the tree the man

'The man cut the tree.'

(c) x+Ø+u-q'aj

chee7 lee kaqiiq'

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-break tree the wind

'The wind broke trees.'

On the other hand, if the NP in A function has no article, as in (11a), or if the NP in O function is animate and definite, as in (11b) and (11c), VOA order is not acceptable.

(11) (a) \*x+Ø+ki-k'ux

lee atz'yaq ch'oh

PERFV+3SG.B+3PL.A-eat the clothes mouse

'Mice ate the clothes.'

(b) \*x+Ø+u-ti7                      lee achih lee tz'i7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-bite the man    the dog  
 'The dog bit the man.'

(c) \*k+Ø+u-q'abar-sa-j  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-get.drunk-CAUS-PLAIN  
 lee achih lee tzaam  
 the man      the liquor  
 'The liquor makes the man drunk.'

Note that all of this would seem to indicate that the sentence shown in (4) above, which Mondloch claimed was ambiguous, should in fact be judged ungrammatical: since both of the NP's are animate and definite, this sentence could not be understood to have VOA order because that would violate Norman's restrictions on VOA order; and furthermore, since neither of the NP's in (4) is complex, this sentence could not, according to Norman's analysis, be understood to have VAO order. Therefore, this must be an impossible sentence. But however this may be, these restrictions, which involve notions like definiteness and animacy, seem to present another even more serious problem for Norman's analysis in that they suggest that VOA order is dependent on context, which would run afoul of Norman's point (5d) above.

In view of such problems with Norman's account of word order in Quiché, I investigated some of his claims on my own with speakers from Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula.

At a later time I also checked some of these points with a speaker from Cantel. For the most part, my informants tended to agree with Norman's on what were the possible word orders and under what conditions they were used. However, there were a number of interesting disagreements, the principal ones being (a) that my informants were much more willing than Norman's apparently were to accept VAO sentences and (b) that my informants were much more willing than Norman's to accept VOA sentences which violated Norman's restrictions on such sentences. Thus, for example, my informants tended to accept sentences like (2a) and (4) as acceptable VAO sentences. Furthermore, my informants also tended to accept sentences like (4), (11b), and (11c) as acceptable VOA sentences. Note, therefore, that my informants seemed to agree with Mondloch's that sentences like (4) are ambiguous, being interpretable as either VOA or VAO sentences. Some other VAO sentences accepted by my informants are seen in (12); and (13) shows some additional VOA sentences which violate Norman's restrictions, but which were accepted by my informants.

- (12) (a) x+Ø+uu-choy                      ri achii ri sii7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut the man    the firewood  
 'The man cut the firewood.'

(b) x+Ø+uu-ch'ay                    ri    achii jun ixog  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit the man    a    woman  
 'The man hit a woman.'

(13) (a) x+Ø+uu-choy                    ri    sii7        jun achii  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut the firewood a    man  
 'A man cut the firewood.'

(b) x+Ø+uu-kamisaj                    jun kumatz jun tz'i7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-kill a    snake a    dog  
 'A dog killed a snake.'

However, it is often dangerous to attempt to investigate word order phenomena by means of eliciting sentences. And in fact, it turns out that even though my informants might, when presented with sentences like (4), (11b), (11c), (13a), and (13b), accept these as good VOA sentences, they never seemed to produce such sentences spontaneously. All examples of VOA sentences which I have found in texts, as well as all simple declarative VOA sentences which my informants produced spontaneously in isolation, seem to conform to Norman's restrictions. Similarly, even though my informants might accept sentences like (2a), (4), (12a), and (12b) as well-formed VAO sentences, I have never encountered such sentences in texts. All of the examples of VAO sentences that I have seen in texts, like Mondloch's example shown in (9), have been sentences with a complex NP in O function with one





(16) (a) la x+Ø+u-tzuq                      le r-aq  
 Q PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-feed the 3SG.A-pig  
 le ali  
 the girl  
 'Did the girl feed his/her pig?'

(b) jachin che x+Ø+u-ya                      wi  
 who to PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-give PART  
 le kab' le achi  
 the candy the man  
 'Who did the man give the candy to?'

In many cases, VAO order is not even acceptable in a yes/no question, as shown by the examples in (17), which were elicited from a speaker from Zunil.

(17) (a) a x+Ø+u-log'                      jun ch'iich' le achi  
 Q PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-buy one metal the man  
 'Did the man buy a car?'

(b) ?\*a x+Ø+u-log'                      le achi jun ch'iich'  
 Q PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-buy the man one metal

I suspect that the VAO order in (14) has to do with the fact that the NP in A function is an independent pronoun. This is difficult to demonstrate, however, because simple transitive sentences with independent pronouns in A function are relatively infrequent, and also because I have not, nor to my knowledge have Norman or Mondloch, ever made a serious

attempt to investigate word order in such sentences.<sup>e</sup> But however that may be, it seems that one must conclude from all of this, especially given the existence of pairs of sentences like (15) and (16a), that VAO is a possible word order in Quiché; and this fact makes Norman's argument for VOA as the basic word order somewhat less compelling than it originally seemed.

There was another interesting difference seen in my data as compared with Mondloch's (1978b) study. As was discussed above, Mondloch found that the most frequent word order found in his sample was VOA. However, it has been my impression that the VOA order is actually quite rare in texts and that the most frequent word order in the texts I have examined seemed to be AVO. In order to check this, I did some counts of the word orders which occur in three Quiché texts found in the published literature. Text 1 is a story in the Santa Catarina Ixtahuacá dialect published by Norman (1976); Text 2 is another version of the same story in Text 1, this time told in the Nahualá dialect and published in Mondloch (1978a:192-203); and Text 3 is another story in the Nahualá dialect also from Mondloch (1978a:204-22). The results of these counts are shown in table 1.

As can be seen in table 1, the most frequent order found in these three texts is AVO with 20 examples out of 41 transitive clauses with two full NPS. The VOA order, on the

TABLE 1

	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	TOTAL
Total Number of Clauses:	417	144	249	810
Total Number of Transitive Clauses with Two Lexical NPs:	15	12	14	41
AOV:	0	0	0	0
AVO:	7	7	6	20
OVA:	4	2	3	9
OAV:	0	0	0	0
VAO:	4	2	3	9
VOA:	0	1	2	3

other hand, was the least frequent of the four orders which actually occur: 3 examples out of 41 clauses. There were nine examples of the VAO order, all of which had complex NPs in O function except for one, which was already seen above in (14). There were as many examples of OVA order as there were of VAO order. The figures seen in table 1 for AVC and VOA clauses, unlike Mondloch's figures, seem to correspond quite well to my general impressions of all of the Quiché texts I have examined of whatever dialect. The fact that VOA order is so infrequent in these texts would also seem to be problematic for Norman's theory.

Given that word order in Quiché is so highly variable, and especially given that the basic word order seems to be so difficult to determine, one might be tempted to suggest

that there is no basic word order. Mithun (1987) argues that the assumption that all languages have a basic, syntactically defined, word order is not universally valid. She cites Cayuga, Ngandi, and Coos as examples of languages in which the order of constituents reflects their pragmatic functions rather than their syntactic functions and in which none of the possible orderings can be considered more basic than any of the others. Such languages are typologically distinct from languages like English, in which the ordering of constituents is relatively fixed, and also distinct from languages like Czech, in which pragmatic factors do have an effect on the observed constituent orders but in which one of the occurring orders can be identified as syntactically basic.

However, from Mithun's discussion, it does not appear that Quiché can be considered to be a pragmatically based language like Cayuga, Ngandi, and Coos. For one thing, these three pragmatically based languages are all highly polysynthetic, and Mithun argues that this is a significant typological feature of pragmatically based languages. Quiché, on the other hand, although it does have subject and object agreement prefixes and clitics, is not polysynthetic nearly to the degree found in the three above named languages.<sup>7</sup> Another characteristic of pragmatically based languages is that the word order is quite free, and all possible orderings of V, A, S, and O occur. We have seen,

though, that word order in Quiché is not completely free: the order OAV cannot occur in a simple transitive clause. Furthermore, in Quiché, unlike the the pragmatically based languages that Mithun discusses, the ordering of constituents within noun phrases and prepositional phrases is relatively fixed. Mithun also notes that the word order in pragmatically based languages tends to proceed left to right from more "newsworthy" constituents to less "newsworthy" ones, where a constituent may be newsworthy because it represents significant new information, because it introduces a new topic, or because it points out a significant contrast. This principle tends to make the OVA order slightly more frequent in texts because NPs in A function generally tend to be less newsworthy than direct objects in discourse. But as was seen above, Mondloch found only three examples of OVA order in 1,380 lines of text, and there were fewer examples of OVA sentences in Mondloch's sample than there were examples of VOA, AVO, and AOV sentences. Also in the three texts summarized in table 1, there were more than twice as many AVO clauses as OVA clauses. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a progression from more newsworthy to less newsworthy constituents in Quiché. As was seen in (8), Norman argued that a focussed (hence, newsworthy) constituent may appear before the verb. However, he also argued that the initial position in a Quiché sentence may be occupied by a Topic NP;

and Topics are generally not very newsworthy in discourse.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, it might make more sense to say that Quiché is a language typologically like Czech with a syntactically defined basic word order and the possibility of deviating from the basic order for certain pragmatic purposes. However, we still have the problem of determining just what that basic word order is. I would now like to present additional evidence that, in spite of the problems discussed above, the basic word order in Quiché is indeed VOA as Norman has argued.

The first argument I want to consider involves looking at additional textual data. Generally, as was seen in Mondloch's study discussed above, studies of basic word order in Quiché involving data from texts have generally been concerned only with those few transitive clauses which happen to occur with two full NPs in A and O functions. However, as we have noted, the majority of transitive clauses in Quiché texts have at most one full noun phrase. If we consider those transitive sentences with only one NP, some interesting facts emerge. Table 2 displays some data from the same three texts that were considered above in table 1. Each of the numbers shown in table 2 represents the number of transitive clauses in each text which had a single overt NP in either A or O function in a particular order with respect to the verb. Also shown are the numbers

TABLE 2

	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Total
VA:	8	1	9	18
AV:	7	4	1	12
VO:	60	25	27	112
OV:	17	3	8	28
V:	42	21	29	92

of transitive verbs which occur with no overt NP arguments. A number of interesting patterns emerge from the data in table 2. For one thing, it can be seen, comparing table 2 with table 1, that the majority of the transitive clauses in these texts contain a single overt NP argument (170, vs. 92 with no overt arguments and 41 with two overt arguments). Furthermore, it can be seen that in the majority of the transitive clauses with only one overt NP argument, that NP is in O function (140, vs. 30 with the single NP in A function). Another pattern that emerges from this data is that among those transitive clauses which have a single overt NP in O function, the vast majority of these have the NP in O function following the verb (112, vs. 28 with the NP in O function preceding the verb). This strongly suggests that the unmarked position for the NP in O function is postverbal; and if this is true, it means that the basic word order could not be OVA, AOV, or OAV. This leaves AVO, VOA, and VAO as the only possibilities. The situation is

less clear, however, with those transitive clauses which have a single overt NP in A function. As has already been noted, there are not nearly as many of these clauses as there are clauses with a single NP in O function; and the number of clauses which have the A before the verb (=12) is not very different from the number of clauses with the A after the verb (=18). Nevertheless, there does seem to be a slight preference for having the A after the verb: 60% of the overt NPs in A function follow the verb while 40% of them precede the verb. This suggests that perhaps the unmarked position for the NP in A function is also postverbal. If this is true, then the only possible candidates for basic word order in Quiché are VOA or VAO.

This conclusion, however, is perhaps not particularly compelling, especially if one considers the data for Text 2 and Text 3 individually. If we consider the data from tables 1 and 2 together, we find a total of 32 overt NPs in A function which appear before the verb in these three texts and a total of 39 overt NPs in A function appearing after the verb. Thus, we still note a slight preference for NPs in A function to appear after the verb (55%, vs. 45% before the verb); however, it can also be seen that the difference is now even narrower. We might also note that in Mondloch's data discussed above there is a similar slight preference for overt NPs in A function to appear after the verb (11 examples, vs. 8 examples before the verb) in transitive



clauses with two overt NP arguments. Unfortunately, however, Mondloch does not report any data on transitive clauses with only one overt NP argument nor does he report any data on transitive clauses with two overt NPs which differed in number.

In spite of the fact that there is such a small difference in these figures, I think that the mere fact that the number of postverbal NPs in A function is generally slightly greater than the number of preverbal NPs in A function is still a significant argument for postverbal position as the unmarked position for such NPs. As noted above, Norman has argued that the initial position in Quiché is a Topic Position. It also seems to be the case that NPs in A function are generally more highly topical in the world's languages than are NP's in O function (Givón 1983a:22). Therefore, we might expect to find a significant percentage of overt NPs in A function to appear in Topic position; and in fact we do find this to be true: nearly half of the overt NPs in A function appear before the verb. However, we also find that slightly more than half of the overt NPs in A function appear postverbally. If we assume that the unmarked position for NPs in A function is postverbal, then there seems to be a ready explanation for all of this. Many NPs in A function appear postverbally because that is the unmarked position for such NPs; however,

many other NPs in A function appear preverbally because they have been topicalized, and NPs in A function are the ones most likely to be highly topical.

In order to test this hypothesis, I have investigated topic continuity in Text 2 (Mondloch 1978a:192-203) using techniques discussed by Givón (1983a). Givón has developed three measures of topic continuity in texts: Referential Distance, Potential Interference, and Persistence. Referential Distance "assesses the gap between the previous occurrence in the discourse of a referent/topic and its current occurrence in a clause, where it is marked by a particular grammatical coding device" (Givón 1983a:13). This is measured by counting the number of clauses to the left from the current occurrence of a participant to its immediately preceding occurrence. The minimal Referential Distance would be 1, which means that the participant was last mentioned in the immediately preceding clause and represents maximal continuity. The maximum upper bound on Referential Distance is arbitrarily set at 20. Potential Interference "assesses the disruptive effect which other referents within the immediately preceding register may have on topic availability or identification within a clause" (Givón 1983a:14). This measure is given a value of 1 if a potentially interfering referent is found in the preceding one to five clauses and is given a value of 0 otherwise. Persistence is a measure of "topic persistence in subsequent

discourse" and is "a reflection of the topic's importance in the discourse" (Givón 1983a:14). This is measured by counting "the number of clauses to the right ... in which the topic/participant continues an uninterrupted presence as a semantic argument of the clause, an argument of whatever role and marked by whatever grammatical means" (Givón 1983a:15).

These three measures have been made on each of the A, O, and S NPs, both overt and "empty" (i. e., non-overt NPs indicated only by agreement), in Text 2. Table 3 shows the average values of these three measures for all such noun phrases in the text. As can be seen, the figures for Referential Distance are nearly identical for NPs in O and S function; however, the figure for NPs in A function is significantly less. This suggests that, in general, NPs in A function are more topical than NPs in O or S function, as was originally claimed above. This conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that the figure for Persistence is higher for NPs in A function than it is for NPs in O and S

TABLE 3

	A	O	S
Referential Distance	2.02	6.96	6.42
Potential Interference	0.35	0.50	0.64
Persistence	1.48	0.88	0.97

function.

Pursuing this line of investigation further, separate measures were calculated for empty A, S, and O NPs in Text 2 as opposed to overt ones. These figures are shown in table 4. As is perhaps not too surprising, the empty NP arguments appear to be more topical than the corresponding overt NP arguments as suggested by the fact that the average Referential Distance for the empty NPs is less than the average Referential Distance for the overt NPs. It can also be seen in table 4, looking at both Referential Distance and Persistence, that overt NPs in A function are much more highly topical than are overt NPs in O and S function.

Table 5 shows the average values of the three measures of topic continuity for overt preverbal A, O, and S NPs as opposed to overt postverbal A, O, and S NPs. As can be seen from the figures for Referential Distance in table 5, Preverbal NPs in A function seem to be less topical than postverbal A NPs. However, looking at the figures for Persistence in table 5, it can be seen that preverbal NPs in

TABLE 4

	empty A	empty O	empty S	overt A	overt O	overt S
Referential Dist.	1.48	2.61	1.03	3.69	10.77	8.56
Potential Interf.	0.28	0.39	0.59	0.56	0.59	0.67
Persistence	1.42	1.00	0.83	1.69	0.78	1.07

TABLE 5

	preverbal			postverbal		
	A	O	S	A	O	S
Referential Dist.	4.40	13.83	4.00	2.50	9.76	9.76
Potential Interf.	0.60	0.67	1.00	0.50	0.57	0.57
Persistence	2.30	1.00	1.67	0.67	0.71	0.91

A function are more important topics than postverbal NPs in A function. What all of this seems to mean is that an NP in A function which appears in the preverbal Topic Position indicates a switch from one main topic to another. Since the new topic (i. e., the referent of the preverbal NP in A function) is being reintroduced as the main topic, it is of relatively low topicality since it was not, in general, the main topic of the immediately preceding clause(s). Thus, the figure for Referential Distance is relatively high. However, since this participant now becomes the main topic of the clause, its topicality can be expected to persist in subsequent discourse. Thus, the figure for Persistence is also relatively high. If all of this is true, note that it is quite consistent with the claim that the preverbal Topic Position is a pragmatically marked position. This then constitutes additional evidence that the unmarked position for an NP in A function is postverbal. A similar argument can also be made for overt NPs in O function. Though the differences in the figures are not as dramatic for O NPs as they are for A NPs, it can still be seen in Table 5 that

preverbal NPs in O function are less highly topical than postverbal ones in terms of Referential Distance, but tend to be more important topics in discourse than postverbal ones as measured by Persistence. This again suggests that the preverbal Topic Position is relatively marked pragmatically and that the unmarked position for NPs in O function is postverbal.

Thus, to recapitulate, if we assume that the unmarked position for NPs in A function is postverbal, then it seems reasonable that many overt A NPs appear in that position; and it also seems reasonable that nearly as many of them appear in the preverbal Topic Position because, as was seen in table 3, NPs in A function are generally more highly topical than NPs in O or S function and, therefore, are the NPs most likely to denote new topics. On the other hand, if one were to assume that the unmarked position for NPs in A function were preverbal, then it would be difficult to explain why so many of these NPs appear postverbally. One possibility would be to say that there is some kind of inversion rule which permutes the order of the verb and the NP in A function; however, as was noted above, there seems to be little reason to suppose that there is such an inversion rule. It is true that NPs in A function must appear postverbally in questions; however, this can be easily accounted for by assuming that the basic position for

an NP in A function is postverbal and does not require an inversion rule. It should also be noted that one might be hard pressed to find some motivation for any kind of obligatory inversion in many of the VOA and VAO sentences that we have looked at since many of these are just simple declarative sentences. Thus it would appear that the simplest move to make would be to assume that the basic word order in Quiché is either VOA or VAO.<sup>9</sup> And either of these would be consistent with the fact that, as was argued above, the postverbal positions seem to be less pragmatically marked than the preverbal ones.

At this point it might be interesting to compare what we have seen concerning word order in Quiché with word order phenomena in a language like Spanish. Spanish, like Quiché, has variable word order. However, the basic word order in Spanish is often (though not always) taken to be SVO (i. e., AVO). According to Torrego (1984), there are two inversion rules in Spanish. One, which she calls Free Inversion, optionally moves the subject NP to the end of the verb phrase. This results in VOA order in a transitive clause. The other inversion rule, which she calls Obligatory Inversion, obligatorily adjoins the verb to the left of the S node under certain conditions (e. g., when certain constituents are moved into the preverbal COMP position). In some cases this will result in VAO order. If the NP in O function is moved into COMP, this will result in OVA order.

According to Rivero (1978, 1980) there are also Topicalization and Left Dislocation rules in Spanish which can move constituents into a preverbal Topic position. The difference between Topicalization and Left Dislocation is that the latter, but not the former, leaves a resumptive pronoun behind in the S(entence) constituent. When an NP in O function is Left Dislocated, the resumptive pronoun is manifested as a clitic pronoun before the finite verb. An NP in O function can be Left Dislocated only if it is definite, and it can only be Topicalized if it is indefinite. These two rules can derive sentences with OVA order. And in conjunction with a rule of Focus Movement, could also derive sentences with AOV and OAV orders, in which the first NP is Topicalized or Left Dislocated and the second is Focussed (i. e., contrastive). I assume that the constituents which undergo Focus Movement are moved into COMP. In some respects this resembles what we have seen in Quiché although there are some differences in detail. It should be noted, however, that this view of Spanish word order phenomena depends to some extent on the assumption that Spanish has an underlying AVO order. I have been arguing here that AVO is not the underlying order in Quiché. What I want to do now is demonstrate that whatever one might conclude about basic word order in Spanish and Quiché, they clearly must be different.



This can be seen by considering textual data of the type we have been looking at in Quiché. Bentivoglio (1983) presents a study of topic continuity in 45 pages of transcriptions of tape recorded spoken Spanish from Mexico City, Caracas, and Santiago de Chile. In Bentivoglio's sample (cf. Bentivoglio 1983:299) there were 211 clauses with lexical non-pronominal subject NPs. Of these, 170, or 81%, were preverbal while only 41, or 19%, were postverbal. Thus, the vast majority of subject NPs in this Spanish data were preverbal. In Quiché, however, it can be seen from the data in tables 1 and 2 that the majority of NPs in A function ( $39/71 = 55\%$ ) and the majority of NPs in S function ( $216/249 = 87\%$ ) were postverbal. Looking at NPs in O function, Bentivoglio (1983:299) found that all 113 lexical non-pronominal NPs in O function occurring in the data were postverbal. In Quiché, it can be seen in tables 1 and 2 that  $144/181 = 80\%$  of the lexical NPs in O function were postverbal while  $37/181 = 20\%$  were preverbal.

Thus it would appear that the unmarked position for NPs in O function is postverbal in both languages. But the unmarked position for subject NPs appears to be preverbal in Spanish and postverbal in Quiché. However, it can be seen that in Quiché I have considered NPs in A function and S function separately whereas Bentivoglio has lumped these together as subjects in Spanish. Furthermore, while Bentivoglio (1983:299) claims that 100% of the NPs in O

function were postverbal, she also says (1983:310, n. 8) that there were preverbal NPs in O function but these were analyzed separately as instances of Left Dislocation. Since she gives no data on Left Dislocation in this article, it is not known how many of these there were.

In order to correct for the above noted non-comparability of the data for the two languages, I made my own counts for two samples of written Spanish from two modern Latin American novels. Text 1 is from Vargas Llosa (1983:29-32), and Text 2 is from Cortázar (1982:101-5). I also calculated figures for "subjects" (= {A, S}) in Quiché. The results of this are shown in table 6. Here it can be seen that there were also no preverbal NPs in O function in the texts I examined, not even in Left Dislocation structures. Furthermore, it can also be seen that while there tended to be more postverbal subject NPs in the written Spanish texts I examined (especially in Text 1) than there were in Bentivoglio's spoken texts, it is still the case that in general, as in Bentivoglio's texts, there were significantly more preverbal subjects (68%) than postverbal subjects (32%) in Spanish Texts 1 and 2. In Quiché, on the other hand, postverbal subjects greatly outnumbered preverbal subjects 80% to 20%. Looking at NPs in A and O function separately, it can be seen that in both Spanish Text 1 and Spanish Text 2 preverbal NPs in A function

TABLE 6

	<u>Quiché</u>	<u>Span. 1</u>	<u>Span. 2</u>	<u>Span. 1+2</u>	<u>Span. (Ben.)</u>
AV:	32/71	9/16	28/33	37/49	
	=45%	=56%	=85%	=76%	
VA:	39/71	7/16	5/33	12/49	
	=55%	=44%	=15%	=24%	
OV:	37/181	0/24	0/36	0/60	0/113
	=20%	=0%	=0%	=0%	=0%
VO:	144/181	24/24	36/36	60/60	113/113
	=80%	=100%	=100%	=100%	=100%
SV:	33/249	8/18	24/34	32/52	
	=13%	=44%	=71%	=62%	
VS:	216/249	10/18	10/34	20/52	
	=87%	=56%	=29%	=38%	
SUBJ-V:	65/320	17/34	52/67	69/101	170/101
	=20%	=50%	=78%	=68%	=81%
V-SUBJ:	255/320	17/34	15/67	32/101	41/211
	=80%	=50%	=22%	=32%	=19%

outnumbered postverbal NPs in A function. This is the opposite of what was observed in Quiché. It can also be seen that in general preverbal NPs in S function in Spanish outnumbered postverbal NP's in S function 62% to 38%. Again, this is the opposite of what was observed in Quiché although Spanish Text 1 by itself seems to show a slight preference for postverbal NPs in S function.

Thus it seems clear that the unmarked position for NPs in O function is postverbal in both languages while the unmarked position for NPs in A function is preverbal in Spanish and postverbal in Quiché. All of this is consistent with the idea that the basic word order in Spanish is AVO. This is also consistent with the claim that the basic order in Quiché is verb initial. The data for NPs in S function is a little unclear. Certainly the unmarked position in Quiché is postverbal. In Spanish the unmarked position would appear to be preverbal although, as was mentioned previously, the data for Text 1 alone is somewhat problematical in this regard. Nevertheless, it can also be seen that there were only 18 lexical NPs in S function in this text, and it may be that a larger sample would have revealed a pattern more in accord with that seen in text 2.

Now the problem is to determine which of the two verb initial orders is the basic order. As we have already noted, many spontaneously produced VOA sentences are simple declarative transitive sentences with nothing at all special about them. Consider the example shown in (18) from Mondloch's (1978b:16) texts.



(b) la xuch'äy [ e ]  
 NP

Q s/he.hit.him/her (empty subj. position)

[ le uk'ulja [ le a Tun ] ]  
 NP NP

the his.neighbor the MALE Anthony

'Did s/he hit Anthony's neighbor?'

However, presenting the sentence in VAO order, as was shown in (15), avoids the ambiguity seen in (19). The situation in (14) is somewhat less clear. In this sentence the NP in O function is not complex, nor would this sentence have been ambiguous had it been presented in VOA order. However, as was mentioned previously, the NP in A function in (14) is an independent pronoun; and it would seem that the VAO probably has something to do with this. In any case, while I have seen a few examples of sentences like (14) with pronominal A and VAO order, I have never seen a sentence with independent pronominal A and VOA order.<sup>10</sup>

It seems that all of this makes sense if we assume that the basic word order is VOA and that there is a rule of Extraposition (a name which, under the circumstances, seems to be preferable to Heavy NP Shift). Normally a sentence will be presented in VOA order (barring Topicalization or Focussing); however, under certain circumstances (e. g., to avoid an ambiguity or to avoid producing a sentence that

would be too difficult to process) the NP in O function will be extraposed to the end of the clause resulting in VAO order. Note that if we were to assume that VAO is the basic order, it might be difficult to explain why it is that the basic order is only manifested in certain exceptional cases while the unexceptional cases exhibit the alternative VOA order. Note that I am not claiming that the rule of extraposition cannot apply to simple sentences. Fox's sentence (2a) and Mondloch's sentence (4), as well as some of the sentences that my own informants accepted, seem to indicate that simple sentences with an extraposed NP in O function are grammatical; however, the fact that such sentences never seem to be spontaneously produced suggests that Extraposition is pragmatically appropriate only under certain exceptional circumstances as we have seen.

As a final argument for VOA as the basic word order, I want to consider sentences which have constituents other than NPs in A or O function in the preverbal Topic or Focus Positions. Indirect arguments of a verb or non-verbal predicate, such as locatives, datives, instruments, and comitatives, generally follow the verb or non-verbal predicate and are marked by either prepositions or relational nouns. The examples in (20) illustrate a sentence with a locative phrase (20a) and a sentence with a comitative phrase (20b).

(20) (a) e7 k'oo masaat pa ri k'ache7laaj  
 3PL.B there.is deer in the forest  
 'There are deer in the forest.'

(b) x+Ø+b'ee ri ak'aal r-uk'  
 PERFV+3SG.B+go the child 3SG.A-with  
 ri u-naan  
 the 3SG.A-mother  
 'The child went with his mother.'

Such indirect arguments may appear before the verb or non-verbal predicate in Topic Position, as illustrated in (21).

(21) (a) pa ri k'ache7laaj, e7 k'oo masaat  
 in the forest 3PL.B there.is deer  
 '(Speaking of) in the forest, there are deer'

(b) ri u-naan, x+Ø+b'ee ri ak'aal  
 the 3SG.A-mother PERFV+3SG.B+go the child  
 r-uuk'  
 3SG.A-with  
 '(As for) his mother, the child went with  
 her.'

As can be seen in (21a), the entire prepositional phrase appears in Topic Position; however, as illustrated in (21b), a relational noun phrase cannot appear in Topic position. If the indirect argument is marked by a relational noun, only the possessor of the relational noun may appear in



Topic Position; the relational noun itself must remain following the verb or non-verbal predicate.

Such indirect arguments can also appear before the verb or non-verbal predicate in Focus Position; however, as can be seen in the examples in (22), there are some differences between this Focus construction and the Topicalization construction illustrated in (21).

(22) (a) pa ri k'ache7laaj e7 k'oo wi masaat  
 in the forest 3PL.B there.is PART deer  
 '(It is) IN THE FOREST (that) there are deer.'

(b) r-uk' ri u-naan x+Ø+b'ee  
 3SG.A-with the 3SG.A-mother PERFV+3SG.B+go  
 wi ri ak'aal  
 PART the child  
 '(It was) WITH HIS MOTHER (that) the child  
 went.'

As can be seen in (22b), an entire relational noun phrase can appear before the verb or non-verbal predicate if it is in Focus Position rather than Topic Position (cf. 21b). Also, as can be seen in both of the examples in (22), when an indirect argument appears in Focus Position, the particle *wii* must appear immediately after the verb or non-verbal predicate (see Chapter 9).

The interesting cases, for present purposes, are when an indirect argument is fronted in a transitive sentence with two full noun phrases as direct arguments. Example (23a) shows such a sentence with a focussed instrument phrase, and (23b) illustrates one with a focussed indirect object.

(23) (a) che jun mache7t x+Ø+uu-ket  
 to.it a machete PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-chop  
 wi ri chee7 ri achii  
 PART the tree the man  
 '(It was) WITH A MACHETE (that) the man  
 chopped the stick.'

(b) che ri ali x+Ø+uu-yaa wi  
 to.her the girl PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-give PART  
 jun kootz'i7j ri ala  
 one flower the boy  
 '(It was) TO THE GIRL (that) the boy gave a  
 flower.'

As can be seen in both of the examples in (23), the relative order of the verb and the two direct arguments is VOA; and this is the case with all such examples that I have seen (unless one of the direct arguments has also been fronted). This would seem to be rather strong evidence in favor of the hypothesis that the basic word order in Quiché is VOA: since the indirect argument in the sentences in (23) appears

in Focus Position, and since neither of the direct arguments in these sentences appears in Topic Position, and since both of the direct arguments in these sentences are simple non-pronominal noun phrases, and since there seems to be no real evidence for any kind of obligatory inversion rule in Quiché, then there seems to be no reason to believe that the direct arguments in sentences like those in (23) appear in any order other than the basic order. It is important to note here that this situation obtains even when the direct arguments do not conform to Norman's restrictions on VOA clauses. This is illustrated by the example in (24).

- (24) che     jun   chee7   x+Ø+uu-ch'ay                     wi  
       to.it   one   tree    PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit   PART  
       ri    tz'i7   ri    achii  
       the dog     the man  
       '(It was) WITH A STICK (that) the man hit the  
       dog.'

In this example the relative order of the verb and its direct arguments is, as it must be, VOA in spite of the fact that the NP in O function is both animate and definite and, thus, violates one of Norman's restrictions on simple VOA sentences.

In view of all of this, it would appear that Norman's original conclusions about basic word order in Quiché were

essentially correct and only need minor adjustment in order to account for the facts we have seen. To summarize, I would maintain, as did Norman, that the basic word order in Quiché is VOA and that the verb is preceded by a Focus Position which is in turn preceded by a Topic Position as was illustrated above in (8). Most of the alternative word orders result from putting the NP in A function and/or the NP in O function in one or the other of these two preverbal positions rather than in the basic postverbal position. It is also possible to have VAO order by extraposing the NP in O function to the end of the clause. It seems that the rule of Extraposition can, in principle, apply to any clause and, thus, at least some native speakers will often accept simple VAO sentences. However, as we have seen, this rule is not generally applied without a good reason, such as avoiding certain ambiguities or avoiding processing difficulties in sentences with complex NPs in O function. As for the restrictions that Norman observed on simple VOA sentences, I would maintain that sentences which violate these restrictions are not, strictly speaking, ungrammatical, but rather are pragmatically infelicitous. Note that at least some native speakers may accept sentences that violate Norman's restrictions as grammatical; however, simple transitive sentences which are spontaneously produced generally do conform to Norman's restrictions presumably because a native speaker would not, except perhaps under

extraordinary circumstances, spontaneously produce a sentence which was pragmatically infelicitous. Although the exact nature of such pragmatic conditions has yet to be thoroughly explored, I think evidence for the general correctness of this view can be seen in sentences like (24). Since an indirect argument appears in either Topic or Focus Position in such sentences, there is no pragmatic necessity for either of the direct arguments to appear in any position other than their basic ones regardless of factors like definiteness and animacy, which in other circumstances may dictate that one of the direct arguments should appear preverbally rather than in its basic position.

In spite of the plausibility of all of this, one might still sense a problem in the low frequency of VOA sentences. As was noted above in table 1, it seems that (with the exception of Mondloch's 1978b sample) VOA order is one of the least frequent orders observed in texts. This might seem strange in light of the claim that VOA is the basic word order. However, Brody (1984) makes some interesting observations which are highly relevant to this "problem".

Brody's study is an investigation of basic word order in Tojolabal, a Mayan language of the Greater Kanjobalan branch (Kaufman 1974:85) spoken in Mexico. Word order phenomena in Tojolabal are very similar, though not identical, to those we have seen in Quiché. Brody discusses

the various criteria that have been considered in the literature for determining basic word order and tests all of the observed word orders in Tojolabal against these criteria. In Tojolabal, unlike Quiché, all of the six logically possible orders of A, O, and V are found; but no one of them satisfies all of the criteria which have been proposed. Brody finds that the VOA order meets most of the criteria; however, she finds that sentences manifesting this order are extremely rare in discourse (as they are in my Quiché data; see table 1 above) and are also found to be difficult for native speakers to process and comprehend when presented in isolation. Sentences with AVO order are the most frequent in discourse (also as in my Quiché data; see table 1) but are pragmatically marked. However, Brody (1984:731) makes the following interesting observation about this:<sup>11</sup>

Discourse ... is never a series of neutral statements but rather a constant flow of introductions of new information and rementions of old information. It has been suggested (Matthew Dryer, personal communication) that VOS [i. e., VOA] is in fact more highly marked than the other orders in terms of discourse function, given that highlighting of some sort is most natural and least marked in terms of discourse; since the VOS order sentence in Tojolabal is neutral, it is thus

marked in the context of discourse by the lack of highlighting. However, it must be noted that each sentence order in Tojolabal has a particular discourse context to which its use is most appropriate, and each order is hence restricted in its occurrence, including the pragmatically neutral VOS.

Looking at it from this point of view, then, the rarity of the syntactically basic VOA order does not seem strange at all given that word order in Quiché is sensitive to discourse pragmatics and given that the VOA is pragmatically neutral besides being syntactically basic. The nature of information flow in discourse seems to be such that in transitive sentences one of the direct arguments generally denotes a highly topical referent while the other denotes a less topical referent, perhaps introducing new information. If this is so (and the data in table 3 above strongly suggest that it is), then it can be seen that the situations in which one might use the pragmatically unmarked word order, which presents a entire event as new information (see example 6a and the following discussion, would be relatively uncommon.

Before leaving the topic of word order, I would also like to say something about word order in intransitive sentences. In most studies of word order, all or most of

the attention is paid to the relative ordering of A, O, and V in transitive sentences while intransitive sentences are generally ignored. Apparently it is generally assumed that since NPs in S function, like NPs in A function, are subjects, any conclusions drawn about the ordering of NPs in A function will also apply to NPs in S function. However, in Quiché this assumption is not entirely correct. It is true that NPs in S function may appear both preverbally and postverbally, as can NPs in A function. However, it is interesting to consider the relative frequencies of preverbal and postverbal NPs in S function. Data on this from the same three texts that were considered above can be seen in table 7. As can be seen from these figures, the vast majority of overt S NPs are postverbal: 216 out of 249 or 87%. Thus, it seems clear that the unmarked position for

TABLE 7

	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Total
Number of Intransitive Clauses	265	75	161	501
Number with Empty S	147	32	73	252
Number with Overt S	118	43	88	249
Number with Preverbal S	18	7	8	33
Number with Postverbal S	100	36	80	216



NPs in S function is postverbal, which is the same conclusion that was reached for NPs in A function. However, we have already seen when considering the data in tables 1 and 2 that only 55% (39 out of 71) of the overt NPs in A function appear postverbally. If we look at the overt NPs in O function in tables 1 and 2, we find that 80% of them (144 out of 181) appear postverbally. Thus the figure of 87% that we find for postverbal overt NPs in S function is much closer to the 80% figure we see for overt postverbal NPs in O function than it is to the 55% figure seen for overt postverbal A NPs.

In this respect, then, NPs in S function seem to be much more like O NPs than like A NPs in spite of the fact that NPs in A and S functions are presumably both subjects. However, as was noted in section 5.2.1, Quiché is a morphologically ergative language. The data being considered here demonstrates that NPs in S function are syntactically more like NPs in O function than they are like NPs in A function in Quiché, and this suggests that Quiché may also be syntactically ergative.

However, given that, as we have seen, discourse pragmatics has such an important role to play in determining whether a noun phrase is empty or overt and in determining whether an overt noun phrase will appear preverbally or postverbally, such a conclusion about syntactic ergativity

may be somewhat premature. Du Bois (1987) has discussed such phenomena in Sacapultec, a Mayan language closely related to Quiché. In analyzing Sacapultec narratives, Du Bois found what he called a Preferred Argument Structure. On the structural level, the Preferred Argument Structure is manifested in a strong statistical tendency for clauses in narrative texts to consist of a verb and at most one lexical (i. e., overt) NP as a direct argument of the verb. Furthermore, Du Bois found that there was a strong statistical tendency for that one lexical NP in transitive clauses to be in O function rather than A function. Of course, the single lexical NP in an intransitive clause would be in S function. Note that we have also observed a similar phenomenon in Quiché. As was seen in table 1 above, sentences with two lexical NPs are relatively rare. Furthermore, as was seen in table 2, in the majority of transitive clauses with one lexical NP, the one lexical NP is in O function. Also, as was seen in table 6, there were nearly equal numbers of intransitive clauses with and without a lexical NP in S function. Du Bois observed that this Preferred Argument Structure defined an ergative/absolutive pattern: clauses with a single lexical NP in S or O function were very common while clauses with a lexical NP in A function were quite rare. Du Bois also found that the Preferred Argument structure was manifested on the level of discourse pragmatics. There was a strong

statistical tendency in his Sacapultec narratives for there to be at most a single new (as opposed to given) participant introduced per clause. And furthermore he found that there was a strong statistical tendency for new participants to be denoted by NPs in S or O function. New participants were rarely denoted by NPs in A function. Du Bois then noted the parallel between these syntactic facts and the facts of information flow: there was a strong statistical tendency for clauses in narratives to contain at most one lexical NP as a direct argument, there was a strong statistical tendency for such a lexical NP to be in either S or O function, and there was a strong statistical tendency for such a lexical NP to denote new information. NPs in A function, on the other hand, tended to be empty and to denote given information. Note that we have observed similar facts in Quiché.<sup>12</sup> As was seen in table 3, NPs in A function in Quiché measure much lower in Referential Distance than do NPs in O and S function; and at the same time NPs in A function measure higher in Persistence than do NPs in O and S function. Both of these measures indicate that NPs in A function are more highly topical than O and S NPs, and highly topical NPs are more likely to denote given information than are NPs of lower topicality.

Du Bois then went on to argue that the ergative patterning of the discourse pragmatic facts that he observed was the motivation for ergative patterning on the structural

level for those languages that manifest syntactic and/or morphological ergativity. This argument is bolstered by the fact that manifestations of the Preferred Argument Structure on the pragmatic level have also been observed in nominative/accusative languages. Thus these Preferred Argument Structure phenomena appear to be universal. But if this is true, then why are not all languages ergative? Du Bois argues that there is a competing functional motivation for linking S and A rather than S and O. Using data from the same Sacapultec narratives, Du Bois argues that there is a strong statistical tendency for NPs in A and S function to be human, agentive, and highly topical as opposed to NPs in O function. This nominative/accusative patterning on the pragmatic level competes with the ergative/absolute patterning discussed above. On the structural level in a given language, some or all morphological and syntactic phenomena may reflect either the ergative/absolute patterning of information flow or the nominative/accusative patterning of topic continuity. In Quiché we have seen from the data in table 3 that NPs in S function are generally less topical than NPs in A function but about equal in topicality with NPs in O function. However, looking at tables 4 and 5, it can be seen that empty S NPs actually measure slightly less than empty A NPs in Referential Distance; and similarly, overt preverbal S NPs also score slightly less than overt preverbal A NPs on the same

measure. Overt postverbal NPs in S function, on the other hand, score much higher on Referential Distance than do overt postverbal A NPs (or any other kind of A NP, for that matter) but score about equally with overt postverbal O NPs. This, then, suggests that some S NPs, namely empty and preverbal ones, are about equal in topicality with A NPs while postverbal NPs are much less topical than A NPs and more like O NPs. This seems to correlate well with what Du Bois says since one would expect highly topical S NPs patterning with A NPs to be generally empty while S NPs which pattern with O NPs in introducing new information must be overt and also, presumably, postverbal since an NP introducing new information would not ordinarily be in Topic Position. Thus, given that the Quiché data seems to be in accord with Du Bois' claims, it would be reasonable to assume that the syntactic patterning of overt NPs in S function, which we observed to be similar to the syntactic patterning of NPs in O function, is simply a reflection of the universal ergative patterning of the Preferred Argument Structure on the discourse pragmatic level and does not reflect anything special about Quiché syntax in comparison with the syntax of other languages.

## NOTES

1. Dixon (1979) uses the symbol "A" to mean "transitive subject", the symbol "O" to mean "direct object", and the symbol "S" to mean "intransitive subject". Since this terminology has become fairly standard in discussions of ergativity, it will also be adopted here.
2. See, for example, the annotations for a number of varieties of Quiché in Grimes (1984:59, 61).
3. While each of the answers to the questions in (6) may be the most appropriate ones of all possible answers involving two lexical NPs, there is a sense in which some of these answers are not appropriate. In Quiché the given participants would ordinarily not be denoted by lexical NPs in this way.
4. Note that Norman's claim that VAO is not a possible order is at variance with the claims of Fox and Mondloch discussed above. Furthermore, Norman's claim that VOA is unambiguous is at variance with Mondloch's claim to the contrary (see example 4 above). These points will be discussed further below.
5. Note that examples (10a) and (10b) do not conform to Mondloch's claim that the subject of a transitive sentence is practically always animate.



(iii) laa ix x+ix+chag'-ab'a-x  
 Q you.PL PERFV+2PL.B+wet-CAUS-PASS  
 r-umal lee jab'  
 3SG.A-by the rain  
 'Did you get wet from the rain?'

There are many other situations which will have to be investigated before the final word can be said about word order in Quiché. Norman's study mostly dealt with simple sentences containing simple noun phrases which either had a definite article, an indefinite article or no article. However, I have some data which suggests that the presence of demonstratives in the A and O NPs may have some influence on the word order possibilities. I also suspect that the presence of both the definite and indefinite article in the same noun phrase (see section 6.2.2) may also have an effect. Unfortunately, my data is insufficient to demonstrate anything conclusive about this yet.

7. Wallace Chafe informs me that the presence of subject and object agreement may be all that is needed for a language to have pragmatically based word order.
8. Actually, as will be seen below, the Topic position seems to be primarily for indicating a switch from one main topic to another. According to Mithun, new topics are newsworthy. However, it will also be seen below



that new information is usually introduced in a postverbal position. Thus, it still seems to be the case that there is no real progression from more newsworthy to less newsworthy in Quiché, and this is reflected in the low incidence of OVA order.

9. It may also be relevant to note that the basic word order in all other Mayan languages is either VOA or VAO and that in many, though not all, of these other languages the basic word order can be determined in a fairly straightforward manner. Thus, arguing that the basic word order in Quiché is either VOA or VAO, rather than AVO, is in perfect accord with the situation in the Mayan family as a whole.
  
10. Brody (1984:720), in her discussion of word order in another Mayan language, Tojolabal, notes that an animacy hierarchy plays a crucial role in the interpretation of different word orders in that language. Brody distinguishes four levels in this animacy hierarchy: Level 1 - proper names and independent pronouns, Level 2 - other human nouns (or anthropomorphized animals), Level 3 - other animate nouns, Level 4 - inanimate nouns. One of the ways this hierarchy is manifested in Tojolabal is that the orders AOV, VAO, OAV, and OVA are acceptable when the A is on Level 1 or 2 and the O is on Level 3 or 4. This

restriction does not, in general, apply in Quiché; however, it is tempting to think that some similar restriction might account for the fact that sentences with an independent pronoun in A function have been observed with VAO order but not with VOA order.

11. I assume that Brody's term "highlighting" refers to the phenomenon of presenting a participant as more "newsworthy" in Mithun's (1977) sense.
12. Similar facts were also observed for the Mayan language Aguacatec by Larsen (1981).

## CHAPTER 8

## SYNTAX II

In this chapter a number of the more important syntactic constructions of Quiché will be described. This will include a discussion of complex sentences, negation, reflexives and reciprocals, and voice.

## 8.1 Complex Sentences

In this section I will give a brief description of some of the major types of subordinate clauses in Quiché. We will first look at complement clauses and then consider other types of subordinate clauses. The discussion of relative clauses will be postponed until Chapter 9.

## 8.1.1 Complement Clauses

Some verbs take finite complements while others require non-finite complements. These two types of complements will be considered in turn.

## 8.1.1.1 Finite Complements

One verb which always takes a finite complement is the verb *-aaj* 'want'. The finite complement of *-aaj* generally is not introduced by any kind of complementizer. The verb *-aaj* in the main clause always takes the third person singular set B clitic, which presumably agrees with the finite complement clause functioning as the direct object.



It seems somewhat strange to think that the main verbs in (1) are in phrase-final position. As was discussed in sections 4.2.1.3 and 5.2.3, a verb is in phrase-final position when it is the last overt constituent of its clause. However, the finite complement clauses in (1) would seem to be constituents of the main clause and follow the main verb (cf. the discussion of the finite clausal subject of the intransitive verb *-tajin* in section 4.2.1.3). However, it can be seen in (2b) that when the main clause subject appears overtly in its postverbal position, it appears between the verb and the finite complement clause. Thus, sentence (2b) manifests VAO order. As was discussed in Chapter 7, the basic underlying order of constituents in Quiché is VOA; however, when the NP in O function is complex, it undergoes extraposition. Thus, in a sentence like (2b) the NP in O function is a clause and, therefore, is complex so it undergoes extraposition. Since this extraposed clause follows the NP in A function, which is in subject position, we have to assume that extraposition in Quiché adjoins the extraposed constituent to the right of the main S(entence) constituent, not to the right of the VP. If we assume that all finite complement clauses obligatorily undergo extraposition in this way, then it can be seen that finite complement clauses are not part of the main clause at s-structure; and, therefore, the main verb in sentences like those seen in (1) is in fact the last overt constituent in

its clause. Thus, these verbs are, in fact, in phrase-final position as defined previously; and this explains why the final vowel of *-aaj* is long in this context.

The subject of the finite complement clause need not be coreferential with the subject of *-aaj* as in was in (1) and (2); however, when the subject of the complement is overtly expressed by a noun phrase in preverbal position, the complement is obligatorily introduced by the complementizer *chi* (Santa María Chiquimula, *chu ~ chi*). Some examples are seen in (3).

(3) (a) *are7 x+Ø+r-aaj*

he PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-want

*x+Ø+in-b'an-o*

PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-do-PLAIN

'He wanted me to do it.'

(b) *k+Ø+w-aaj* *chi ri a*

IMPERF+3SG.B+1SG.A-want COMP the MALE

Xwaan *ka+Ø+b'ee-k*

John IMPERF+3SG.B+go-PLAIN

'I wanted John to go.'

Other verbs which take finite complements include *-choomaa7* 'think', *-rayiij* 'desire' (Santa María Chiquimula, *-riyiij ~ -riij*), and *-b'iij* 'say'. The complement of *-b'iij* is generally introduced by the

complementizer *chi*, as seen in (4).<sup>2</sup>

(4) (a) *ka+Ø+ki-b'iij* *chi*  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+3PL.A-say COMP  
*ku71* *pa wa semana*  
 /k#e7#ul/  
 IMPERF+3PL.B+arrive.here in the week  
 'They say that they will arrive this week.'

(b) *ri a Xwaan x+Ø+uu-b'iij* *chi*  
 the MALE John PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-say COMP  
*al Mari7y raj*  
 FEMALE Mary almost  
*x+Ø+chak-u-n* *kamiik*  
 PERFV+3SG.B+work-THEMATIC.V-ANTIPASS today  
 'John said that Mary was going to work today.'

(c) *ri ixoq x+Ø+uu-b'iij*  
 the woman PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-say  
*ch+w-e* *chi*  
 to+3SG.A-possession COMP  
*k+in+b'ee-k*  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+go-PLAIN  
 'The woman told me to leave.'

The verb *-choomaaj* takes finite complements introduced by *chi* as well as finite complements with no complementizer. In addition, this verb can take finite complements with the

complementizer we 'if, whether' (Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, wee). Some examples are seen in (5).

(5) (a) ri u-naan u-taat  
 the 3SG.A-mother 3SG.A-father  
 ka+Ø+ki-choomaj  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+3PL.A-think  
 ka+Ø+ki-tzukuj r-ixoqil  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-look.for 3SG.A-wife  
 'His parents are thinking of looking for a  
 wife for him'

(b) ri a Xwaan k+Ø+uu-choomaj  
 the MALE John IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-think  
 chi ri a Tuun  
 COMP the MALE Anthony  
 x+in+u-ch'ay-o  
 PERFV+1SG.B+3SG.A-hit-PLAIN  
 'John thinks that Anthony hit me.'

(c) ri a Xwaan tajin k+Ø+uu-choomaj  
 the MALE John PROG IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-think  
 we ka+Ø+b'ee-k o ma  
 whether IMPERF+3SG.B+go-PLAIN or NEG  
 ka+Ø+b'ee taj  
 IMPERF+3SG.B-go IRREALIS  
 'John is thinking whether or not he will go.'



The verb *-raylij* can also take finite complements introduced by *we*. In the example in (6), the complement clause is irrealis.

- (6) *k+Ø+in-raylij*                      *we ta*  
       IMPERF+3SG.B+1SG.A-desire    *if IRREALIS*  
       *k+at+tzaaq-ik*  
       IMPERF+2SG.B+fall-PLAIN  
       'I wish you would fall.'

#### 8.1.1.2 Non-finite Complements

Other verbs in Quiché require non-finite complement clauses. As will be seen, the analysis I present of these non-finite complements is quite tentative and incomplete. However, I hope to at least demonstrate that there are a number of issues yet to be resolved in the analysis of non-finite complements, the principal one being how to identify them and distinguish them from other similar constructions. It will be claimed that some nominalized verb forms in Quiché (i. e., those that were called Action Nominalizations in Chapters 4 and 5) can appear as non-finite verbs in complement clauses. These non-finite complement clauses bear some similarity to the so-called Gerundive Nominals of English (Chomsky 1970). These same Action Nominalizations may also appear as the heads of ordinary (i. e., non-clause-like) noun phrases. These constructions may be somewhat like the so-called "mixed nominals" of English (Chomsky

1970:214-5) in that they contain an Action Nominalization in Quiché (corresponding to the English Gerund) but they seem to be more NP-like than clause-like. There are also some types of Nominalization constructions in Quiché which contain nominalized verb forms other than one of the Action Nominalizations. These latter constructions are a lot like the so-called Derived Nominals in English in that they are not productive and have the internal structure of a noun phrase rather than a clause (Chomsky 1970).

The non-finite verb form that appears in non-finite complements is generally one of the Action Nominalizations that were discussed in sections 4.2.2 and 5.3. Again the verb in the main clause takes the third person singular set B clitic, which presumably agrees with the complement clause. Some examples are seen in (7). The various verbs used to mean 'to begin' (e. g., *-majijj* 'to take away rapidly', *-chap* 'to grab', *Cantel -chape7j* 'to begin') typically take such complements; but, as seen in (7e), some other verbs may also take them.

(7) (a)  $x+\emptyset+q\bar{a}-maj-i-j$

PERFV+3SG.B+1PL.A-remove.forcefully-TH.V-PLAIN

b'lin-eem pa ri b'ee

walk-NOM in the street

'We began to walk in the street.'



(e) wa achy-aab' ki+Ø+ki-b'an  
 the man-PL IMPERF+3SG.B+3PL.A-do  
 kun-a-n-ik pa taq jaa  
 ?-THEM.V-ANTIPASS-NOM in DIST.PL house  
 'The men do curing in the homes.'

Note that in (7a), (7b), and (7d) the final vowel of the derived verb stem *-majlij* is short before the non-finite complement clause. Furthermore, as seen in (7c) and (7e), the root transitive verbs *-chap* and *-b'an* do not take the phrase-final suffix before the non-finite complement clause. This is different from the situation that was seen previously (e.g., in 3a and in 5) with finite complements. It can be seen that in this respect at least, non-finite complement clauses are more like direct object NPs than they are like embedded clauses. This should perhaps not be so surprising if I am correct in identifying these Quiché non-finite complements with English Gerundive Nominals, which have sometimes been analyzed as being noun phrases rather than clauses (cf., e. g., Chomsky 1981:165).<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, though the differences may be slight, it will be seen below that there does seem to be good reason to distinguish between non-finite complement clauses and ordinary noun phrases which just happen to be headed by a deverbal noun. One of the principal differences is that non-finite complement clauses appear to contain an empty argument which is coreferential with the subject of the main clause.

Furthermore, non-finite complement constructions seem to be completely productive (as are Gerundive Nominals in English) whereas this is not always the case with ordinary noun phrases headed by deverbal nouns (i. e., Derived and Mixed Nominals).

In (7a) the non-finite verb form of the complement clause is an Intransitive Action Nominalization, while in (7b), and (7e) the non-finite verb form is an Absolutive Verbal Noun. As can be seen in these examples, the empty subject of the complement clause is coreferential with the main clause subject; and there is no subject marking on the non-finite verb of the complement.

In (7c) and (7d) the non-finite verb of the complement is a Passive Verbal Noun, which takes a set A prefix. This set A prefix indicates agreement with the patient or theme NP. The patient or theme NP is understood to be the subject of the passive verb form of the complement; however, it is formally the possessor of the nominalized verb form. Thus, the agreement is indicated by a set A prefix rather than by a set B clitic. The agent or experiencer argument in such complements is not overtly indicated; however, it is understood to be coreferential with the subject of the main clause. As indicated in (7d), the possessor of the Passive Verbal Noun must be disjoint in reference with the subject of the main clause. This, then, raises the question of how

one would say 'The man began to be cured.' From what we have seen, one might suppose that such a sentence would be expressed with an unpossessed Passive Verbal Noun in the complement clause. However, as shown in (8), such sentences are ungrammatical.

- (8) \*la achii  
 the man  
 x+∅+uu-maj-i-j  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-remove.forcefully-TH.V-PLAIN  
 kun-a-x-ik  
 ?-THEMATIC.VOWEL-PASSIVE-NOM

This should not be too surprising since, as noted above, the agent or experiencer argument must be coreferential with the main clause subject; therefore, the patient or theme argument could not also be coreferential with the main clause subject. The correct Quiché equivalent of such a sentence would have to be as shown in (9).

- (9) x+∅+maj-i-x  
 PERFV+3SG.B+remove.forcefully-THEM.V-PASSIVE  
 u-kun-a-x-ik                      la achii  
 3SG.A-?-TH.V-PASSIVE-NOM    the man  
 'The man began to be cured.' (lit., 'the man's  
 being cured was begun')

This, then, seems to demonstrate that the complements of the

transitive verbs meaning 'begin' in Quiché are not Raising constructions.

In light of the above discussion, we should now consider sentences like (10) from Mondloch (1978a:150) (Nahualá dialect).

- (10) lee alih majaa ka+Ø+r-eeta7maj  
 the girl still.not IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-learn  
 rii u-chap-an-iik  
 the 3SG.A-grab-ANTIPASSIVE-NOM  
 'The girl still has not learned her work.'  
 (lit., 'the girl, still hasn't learned her, grabbing')

The complement in (10) contains an Absolutive Verbal Noun; however, unlike the Absolutive Verbal Nouns seen in (7b) and (7e), the one in (10) has a set A prefix. This set A prefix seems to indicate agreement between the intransitive non-finite verb form and its agent argument. Since the agent NP is formally the possessor of the Absolutive Verbal Noun, the agreement is indicated by a set A prefix rather than by a set B clitic. It is not clear why the Absolutive Verbal Noun in (10) has a set A prefix, however, since the agent NP is coreferential with the main clause subject as it also is in (7b) and (7e), where there is no set A prefix. It seems likely that sentence (10) does not actually contain a non-

finite embedded complement clause as do (7b) and (7e). Rather, the direct object of the verb *-eeta7maaj* in (10) is just a simple noun phrase whose head noun *chapanik* 'grabbing; housework' just happens to be a deverbal noun. That is to say, the Absolutive Verbal Nouns in (7b) and (7e) function as the non-finite predicates of complement clauses whereas the Absolutive Verbal Noun in (10) seems just to be the head of a simple noun phrase. It may also be noteworthy that the Absolutive Verbal Noun in (10) is preceded by the definite article *rii*, and thus this nominalization appears to have the internal structure of a NP rather than a clause. Therefore, it may make sense to equate this type of nominalization in Quiché with nominalizations of the "mixed" type in English.

A similar situation can be seen in the use of the Action Nominalization as direct object of the verb *-b'iij* in (11) (also in the Nahualá dialect, from Mondloch 1978a:151).

- (11) *No7jimaal lee alah x+Ø+uu-b'iij*  
 slowly the boy PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-say  
*k'ul-an-eem chee lee alih*  
 married-STATIVE-NOM to the girl  
 'Slowly the boy proposed marriage to the girl.'  
 (lit., 'slowly the boy said getting-married to the girl')

Here the Intransitive Action Nominalization does not have a



set A prefix and, thus, looks superficially like the same situation seen in (7a). However, it will be remembered from section 8.1.1.1 that the verb *-b'ij* ordinarily takes a finite complement. And in (11) it seems quite clear that the Intransitive Action Nominalization *k'ulaneem* is to be taken simply as the noun meaning 'marriage' and not as the predicate of a non-finite complement clause. Note that it would not make too much sense to say that *k'ulaneem* in (11) has an empty subject which is coreferential with the subject of *xuub'ij*. Thus, this may be another case of the "mixed" type of nominalization.

There are a number of other constructions which also superficially seem to be non-finite complements but which probably are best treated as noun phrases headed by deverbal nouns, much like the Derived Nominals of English. One such example is seen in (12).

- (12) *x+Ø+aa-riq*                      *a-yaaj-(i)k-iil*  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-find 2SG.A-scold.PASS-NOM-ABSTR  
 'You were scolded.' (lit., 'you found your  
 scolding')

The sentence in (12) contains an apparent complement clause consisting of a Passive Verbal Noun derived from the transitive verb root *-yaj* 'scold'. This Passive Verbal Noun, however, is clearly different from the ones we have



clearly has the internal structure of a noun phrase.

Another non-productive nominalization is the Active Nominalization, which was discussed in 5.3. An example of the use of the Active Nominalization is seen in (14).

- (14) *tajin ki+Ø+ki-b'an ri q'at-ooj*  
 PROG IMPERF+3SG.B+3PL.A-do the cut-ACT.NOM  
 'They are harvesting the wheat.' (lit., 'they  
 are doing the wheat harvest')

Though the Active Nominalization frequently appears as the direct object of the verb *-b'an*, as in (14), there seems to be little reason to assume that the Active Nominalization functions as the non-finite verb of a complement clause in such sentences. It should be remembered that there are only a few examples of this unproductive derivation in most Quiché dialects; and their meanings, as illustrated in (14) are often not completely predictable from their component morphemes. Note further that, if the word *q'atooj* is understood, as it must be, to mean 'wheat harvest' rather than as 'cutting (wheat)', there does not seem to be any necessity to assume that the Active Nominalization in (14) has an empty argument coreferential with the subject of the main clause. Thus, these nominalizations also appear to be a type of Derived Nominal.

The situation is somewhat less clear with the "Verb

Phrase Compounds" that were discussed in sections 4.3 and 5.3. These compounds may also show up as the direct object of a verb which may take a non-finite complement. An example is seen in (15).

- (15) ri achii x+Ø+uu-chap ri  
 the man PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-grab the  
 jop-i-n triikoo  
 ?-THEMATIC.V-ANTIPASSIVE wheat  
 'The man began to sow wheat.' (lit., 'the man  
 began the wheat scattering')

It can be seen in (15) that the Verb Phrase Compound is preceded by a definite article, which might suggest that it is a simple noun phrase rather than a complement clause. Also, as was mentioned previously, such compounds do not seem to be freely formed although there does seem to be a fairly large number of them. On the other hand, while these compounds may not be freely formed with just any noun, this construction does seem to be the productive way of forming reflexive Action Nominalizations as will be seen in section 8.3. It can also be seen in (15) that it is certainly possible (though perhaps not absolutely necessary) to think that the Verb Phrase Compound has an empty argument coreferential with the subject of the main clause. It should be remembered that these verb phrase compounds can never take a set A prefix. In any case, it seems possible

to analyze verb phrase compounds in sentences like (15) as non-finite complement clauses; but it is not completely clear that this is correct.

Apparent non-finite clauses similar to the non-finite complements seen above are also found functioning as subjects of intransitive verbs and non-verbal predicates. The verb or non-verbal predicate always shows third person singular agreement with the non-finite clause. One example has already been seen in (9). Some additional examples are seen in (16).

- (16) (a) x+Ø+pee                      nu-war-aam  
 PERFV+3SG+come    1SG.A-sleep-NOM  
 'I am sleepy.' (lit., 'my sleeping came')
- (b) utz    r-iil-ik                      la7    la    juyub'  
 good    3SG.A-see.PASS-NOM    that    the    mountain  
 'That mountain looks nice.' (lit., 'that  
 mountain's being seen is good.')
- (c) utz    ri    u-nim-a-n-ik  
 good    the    3SG.A-big-THEM.V-ANTIPASS-NOM  
 ri    ala    chee    ri    u-taat  
 the    boy    to    the    3SG.A-father  
 'It is good that the boy obeys his father.'  
 (lit., 'the boy's obeying to his father is  
 good')

(d) ri r-elaq'-a-x-ik ri  
 the 3SG.A-robbery-THEM.V-PASS-NOM the  
 nu-rajil r-umal ri q'at-al tziij,  
 1SG.A-money 3SG.A-by the cut-AGT word  
 aree jun nim-a-laj maak-aaaj  
 FOCUS one big-ATTRIBUTIVE-very sin-ABSOL  
 'The stealing of my money by the mayor, that  
 is a great sin.'

(e) x+Ø+tan-i7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+suspend-INTRANS  
 u-ch'aay-ik la tz'i7  
 3SG.B-hit.PASS-NOM the dog  
 r-umal la achii  
 3SG.A-by the man  
 'The man stopped hitting the dog.' (lit., 'The  
 dog's being hit became suspended by the man.'

In all of the examples in (16), the non-finite verb forms have a set A prefix. In cases where such a prefix is not present, the empty subject of the non-finite clause is understood to have arbitrary reference. Some examples are seen in (17).

(17) (a) k'ax b'iin-eem pa taq juyub'  
 pain walk-NOM in DISTRIBUTIVE.PL mountain  
 'Walking in the mountains is difficult.'

- (b) k'ax ri tzuk-u-n-ik pa ri  
 pain the ?-THEM.V-ANTIPASS-NOM in the  
 k'ache7laaj  
 forest  
 'Hunting in the forest is difficult.' (lit.,  
 'the seeking in the forest is painful')

The following example (from Mondloch 1978a:146, Nahualá dialect) shows a transitive verb which seems to have a non-finite subject clause.

- (18) lee paq-al-eem k+Ø+uu-b'an  
 the upward-STATIVE-NOM IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-do  
 k'ax ch+q-eech  
 pain to+1PL.A-possession  
 'The climb does us harm.' (lit., 'the going up  
 does pain to us')

It is not clear whether the apparent non-finite subject clauses illustrated in (16-18) should actually be analyzed as non-finite embedded clauses or as ordinary noun phrases headed by deverbal nouns. It is difficult to determine whether there is a clearly principled way to distinguish between the two as there was in the case of complement clauses. The fact that certain kinds of clause-level constituents such as indirect objects (see 16c) and oblique agents (see 16d and e) sometimes show up in these apparent subject clauses suggests that at least some of these are

indeed non-finite embedded clauses rather than simple noun phrases. These types of constituents do not seem to show up in ordinary noun phrases in Quiché like they do in English. Thus it seems that (16c), (16d), and (16e) have the internal structure of clauses.

One fairly clear case of a simple subject noun phrase headed by a deverbal noun, on the other hand, can be seen in (19) where the head of the subject noun phrase is one of the non-productive Active Nomininalizations.

- (19) *tajin ka+Ø+b'aan u-q'at-ooj*  
 PROG IMPERF+3SG.B+do.PASSIVE 3SG.A-cut-NOM  
*ri a Maax*  
 the MALE Tom  
 'Tom's wheat harvest is being done.'

It also seems highly likely that the apparent subject clause of the transitive verb seen in (18) is best considered to be a simple noun phrase. Note that the Intransitive Action Nominalization *paqaleem* in this sentence does not have a set A prefix; however, unlike what we saw in (17), *paqaleem* cannot be understood as having an empty subject of arbitrary reference in this sentence.

It should also be noted that the Intransitive Action Nominalization in (18) is preceded by the definite article *lee*, which seems to indicate that this nominalization has



the internal structure of a noun phrase. It is beginning to seem quite unclear, however, how much significance should be attached to the presence of definite articles. Note that definite articles are also found in the nominalizations in (16c), (16d), and (16b), all of which were claimed above to be non-finite subject clauses. Furthermore, as will be seen in Chapter 9, relative clauses, which are clearly clauses and not simple noun phrases, are often introduced by a definite article. Note in particular that it was claimed above that the nominalizations in (16c) and (16d) must be non-finite clauses because they contain clause-level constituents.

In any case, there does seem to be reason to believe that there is no non-finite subject clause in sentences like (18). And if this is true, it may be the case that only intransitive verbs and non-verbal predicates may have true non-finite subject clauses. At the moment it may not be perfectly obvious that even this latter statement could be true. However, it will be seen presently that we will have to admit the possibility of the existence of non-finite subject clauses, at least for intransitive verbs and non-verbal predicates.

To see this, it should first be noted that nominalized verb forms like the ones we have been considering can also be used as non-verbal predicates. Some examples are seen in

(20).

(20) (a) ri nu-chaak, aree ri b'an-ow sii7  
 the 1SG.A-work FOCUS the do-FOCUS firewood  
 'My work, it is firewood making.'

(b) ri nu-maak, aree ri  
 the 1SG.A-sin FOCUS the  
 elaq'-a-n-ik  
 steal-THEMATIC.V-ANTIPASSIVE-NOM  
 'My sin, it is stealing'

In (20a) the non-verbal predicate is a Verb Phrase Compound while in (20b) it is an Absolutive Verbal Noun. It can be seen that both of the non-verbal predicates in (20) have definite articles and, thus, are clearly nouns rather than verbs since a main clause verb is never preceded by a definite article as a constituent of the verb phrase.

Special note should be taken of the example in (21). This is the usual way of saying 'it is necessary that ...' in Quiché.

(21) r-aj-aw-a-x-ik

3SG.A-want-FOCUS-TH.V-PASSIVE-NOM

(ch+w-e) k+in+b'ee

(to+1SG.A-possession) IMPERF+1SG.B+go

na pa tinimit

NECESSITATIVE in tinimit

'It is necessary (for me) to go to town.' (lit.,

'(that) I have to go to town is its necessity (to me)')

In sentences like (21) the non-verbal predicate is an irregularly formed Passive Verbal Noun of the transitive verb -aaj 'want'. This Passive Verbal Noun always has a third person singular set A prefix and is always followed by a finite clause. The subject of rajawaxik apparently must be the finite clause.

Note that the set A prefix on rajawaxik in (21) does not show agreement with the finite subject clause since subject agreement on non-verbal predicates is always indicated by a set B clitic. Therefore, the set A prefix seems to simply be some kind of dummy possessor; and for this reason, rajawaxik has been literally translated as 'its necessity' in (21). It is probably also significant that the finite subject clause in a sentence like (21) could also be preceded by a definite article. This, then, clearly seems to demonstrate that the presence or absence of a

definite article by itself does not distinguish between subject clauses and simple non-clausal subject noun phrases. It should also be noted that one also finds constructions like that shown in (22).

(22) r-aj-aw-a-x-ik

3SG.A-want-FOCUS-TH.V-PASSIVE-NOM

chi k+in+b'ee na pa tinimit

COMP IMPERF+1SG.B+go NECESSITATIVE in tinimit

'It is necessary that I go to town.' (lit., 'It is its necessity that I have to go to town')

It can be seen that (22) is identical to (21) except that the finite subject clause is introduced by the complementizer *chi*. As suggested by the literal translation of (22), I assume that the finite clause in this sentence is extraposed and that the subject position of the main clause is occupied by an empty dummy subject.

Example (21), then, constitutes an example of a non-verbal predicate with a finite subject clause. Another example of a finite subject clause, this time as the subject of the intransitive verb *-tajin* 'PROGRESSIVE', was seen previously in example (9) of section 4.2.1.2. This would seem to clearly indicate that subject clauses do indeed exist. Given, then, that finite subject clauses exist, it would seem reasonable to suppose that there also exist non-finite subject clauses although, as was seen above, these

are often difficult to distinguish from ordinary subject noun phrases headed by deverbal nouns.

### 8.1.2 Purpose Clauses

Purpose clauses in Quiché have a lot in common with non-finite complement clauses. The same types of nominalized verb forms that appear in non-finite complement clauses are also found in purpose clauses with similar syntactic characteristics. One of the principal differences between purpose clauses and non-finite complements is that purpose clauses are introduced by a preposition. Some examples are seen in (23-25).<sup>4</sup>

(23) k+e7+b'ee            pa    wi7-m  
       IMPERF+3PL.B+go    in    eat-NOM  
       'They are going to eat'

(24) x+Ø+eel            ub'i        ri  
       PERFV+3SG.B-leave    thither    the  
       r-aal                    pa  
       3SG.A-woman's.child    in  
       wa7-k-at-eem  
       upright-MOVEMENT-REPETITIVE-NOM  
       'Her son/daughter went out to take a walk.'

- (25) ka+Ø+b'ee            la    achii   pa  
       IMPERF+3SG.B+go   the   man    in  
       k'ay-i-n-ik  
       wares-THEMATIC.V-ANTIPASSIVE-NOM  
       'The man is going to sell.'

It can be seen in all of these examples that the purpose clause consists of an Action Nominalization preceded by the preposition *pa*. Thus, purpose clauses in Quiché have the form of prepositional phrases functioning as adjuncts of the main verb. In (23) and (24) the non-finite verb form in the purpose clause is an Intransitive Action Nominalization while in (25) the non-finite verb form is an Absolutive Verbal Noun. These same non-finite verb forms are found in non-finite complement clauses. It can also be seen in (23-25) that each of the purpose clauses must be understood to have an empty subject coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause. This was also claimed to be the case with non-finite complement clauses involving Intransitive Action Nominalizations or Absolutive Verbal Nouns.

Other non-finite complement clauses were seen to have a Passive Verbal Noun with a set A prefix obligatorily disjoint in reference with the subject of the matrix clause and with an empty agent argument obligatorily coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause. One also finds purpose clauses with similar characteristics, as seen in

(26-28).

(26) ri achii x+Ø+b'ee ch u-kun-a-x-ik  
 the man PERFV+3SG.B+go at 3SG.A-?-TH.V-PASS-NOM  
 ri ixoq  
 the woman  
 'The man went to cure the woman.'

(27) x+Ø+pee chi r-lll-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+come at 3Sg.A-see.PASSIVE-NOM  
 'S/he<sub>i</sub> came to see him/her/it<sub>j</sub>.'

(28) ri a Xwaan x+Ø+uu-taq b'i  
 the MALE John PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-order hither  
 ri a Lu7 ch u-kam-isa-x-ik  
 the MALE Peter at 3SG.A-die-CAUS-PASS-NOM  
 ri achii  
 the man  
 'John ordered Peter to go kill the man.'

It should be noticed in these examples that the preposition used is *chi* (Santa María Chiquimula, ~ *chu*) rather than *pa*. The vowel of the preposition *chi* is dropped before a vowel. In the Cantel dialect the Relational Noun *che* is used rather than the preposition *chi*. The vowel of the Relational Noun *che* may also drop before a vowel; however, this is not obligatory in the Cantel dialect. It should also be noticed in (28) that when the matrix verb is

transitive, the empty agent argument of the Passive Verbal Noun is coreferential with the matrix clause direct object rather than the matrix clause subject.<sup>5</sup>

There are some important ways, however, in which purposes clauses with Passive Verbal Nouns differ from the corresponding non-finite complements. As was seen above in (8), complement clauses with a Passive Verbal Noun lacking a set A prefix are ungrammatical. However, purpose clauses with a prefixless Passive Verbal Noun are quite acceptable, as seen in (29-30).

- (29) k+in+b'ee            pa    kun-a-x-ik  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+go    in    ?-TH.V-PASSIVE-NOM  
 chwe7q    pa    tinimit  
 tomorrow    in    town  
 'I am going to be cured tomorrow in town.'  
 (cf. Mondloch 1978a:147)

- (30) (a) x+Ø+in-k'is                            lee    chee7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-finsih    the    tree  
 pa    ram-i-x-ik  
 in    cut-TH.V-PASS-NOM  
 'I finished cutting the tree.' (lit., 'I  
 finished the tree in being cut. '; Mondloch  
 1981:143, Nahualá dialect)



(b) la tz'17 xaa k+Ø+uu-yaa  
 the dog just IMPERF+3SG.B+3Sg.A-give  
 r-iib' pa kam-isa-x-ik  
 3SG.A-REFLEXIVE in die-CAUSATIVE-PASSIVE-NOM  
 'The dog just gives itself up to be killed.'  
 (cf. Mondloch 1978a:147)

In these sentences the empty patient argument is obligatorily coreferential with the subject of a matrix clause intransitive verb or with the direct object of a matrix clause transitive verb. There is no understood agent argument in these sentences. It can also be seen in (29) and (29) that the preposition *pa* is used. Thus it appears that in purpose clauses the preposition *chi* (or the relational noun *che(e)*) is used if the non-finite verb form is a Passive verbal noun with a set A prefix. Otherwise, the preposition *pa* is used.

Another way in which purpose clauses differ from non-finite complements involves disjoint reference between the possessor of the Passive Verbal Noun and an argument of the verb in the matrix clause. As was illustrated above (7d), the possessor of the Passive Verbal Noun in a non-finite complement clause must necessarily be disjoint in reference with the matrix clause subject. As seen in example (27), this also seems to be true of purpose clauses. However, in purpose clauses the disjoint reference requirement holds

only when the possessor of the Passive Verbal Noun is third person. In other cases, coreference is possible, as illustrated in (31).

- (31) k+in+b'ee            chi nu-kun-a-x-ik  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+go    at    1SG.A?-TH.V-PASS-NOM  
 'I am going to be cured.'

Note also that in sentences like (31), the empty agent of the Passive Verbal Noun is understood to be disjoint in reference with the subject of the matrix clause. In sentences, like (27), on the other hand, the empty agent must be understood to be coreferential with the matrix clause subject.

As in the case of non-finite complements, there are constructions which superficially appear to be purpose clauses but which must be treated differently because the object of the preposition is not headed by a productive non-finite verb form. Some examples can be seen in (32-34).

- (32) x+Ø+b'ee            pa q'at-ooj  
 PERFV+3SG.B-go    in    cut-NOM  
 'S/he went to harvest wheat.' (lit., 'S/he went to  
 wheat harvest.')

(33) x+in+b'ee            pa    jop-i-n            triikoo  
 PERFV+1SG.B+go    in    ?-TH.V-ANTIPASS    wheat  
 'I went to sow wheat.' (lit., 'I went to wheat-  
 sowing.')

(34) x+in+b'ee            pa    awex  
 PERFV+1SG.B+go    in    corn.planting  
 'I went to plant corn.'

The apparent purpose clause in (32) contains an Active Verbal Noun while the one in (33) contains a Verb Phrase Compound. In (34) the object of the preposition *pa* is the simple noun *awex* (Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, *aweex*), which just happens to have a verbal meaning: 'corn planting'.

The construction illustrated in (35) also appears superficially to be like the purpose clause construction.

(35) (a) x+e7+koos            chee la    tak'-al-eem  
 PERFV+3PL.B+tire to    the standing-STATIVE-NOM  
 'They got tired from standing.'  
 (cf. Mondloch 1978a:146)

(b) x+Ø+q'i7taj                    la    ala    chee  
 PERFV+3SG.B+get.bored    the    boy    to  
 ri    tob'-an-ik  
 the    help-ABSOLUTIVE-NOM  
 'The boy got bored with helping.'  
 (cf. Mondloch 1978a:149)

Both of these sentences contain Action Nominalizations like true purpose clauses. However, they differ from purpose clauses in that the Relational Noun *chee* is used in all dialects rather than the preposition *chi* and in that the Action Nominalization is preceded by a definite article, which never occurs in a true purpose clause. It can also be seen that the semantics of the construction shown in (35) is different from that of purpose clauses. I would suggest that the objects of the Relational Noun phrases in (35) are ordinary noun phrases headed by deverbal nouns and are not non-finite clauses.

Purpose clauses are frequently used with the matrix verb *-ok* 'enter', which in this construction has the meaning 'begin'. Some examples are shown in (36-37).

(36) x+Ø+ook                    ri    achii  
 PERFV+3SG.B+enter    the    man  
 ch    u-gaa-sa-x-ik                    ri    chee7  
 at    3SG.A-descend-CAUS-PASS-NOM    the    tree  
 'The man began to chop down the tree.'



- (39) x+in+ul cha7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+arrive.here in.order.to  
 k+Ø+in-kunaj w-ib'  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+1SG.A-cure 1SG.A-REFLEXIVE  
 'I came here in order to cure myself.'

### 8.1.3 Temporal Clauses

Temporal clauses in Quiché are always finite and are introduced by a complementizer which can be translated as 'when'. The most common form of this complementizer is *aree taq* (Cantel *aree tāq*). An example from the Nahualá dialect is shown in (40a), and another example from the Cantel dialect is shown in (40b).

- (40) (a) *aree taq* x+oj+ok pa chaak  
 when PERFV+1PL.B+enter in work  
*jun tiir"* x+Ø+qa-b'an qa-q'ab'  
 one time PERFV+3SG.B+1PL.A-do 1PL.A-hand  
 'When we began to work, we all crossed ourselves.'
- (b) k+in+b'ix-o-n-ik aree tāq  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+song-TH.V-ABSOL-PLAIN when  
 k+in+kikot-ik  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+be.happy-PLAIN  
 'I sing when I am happy.'

In the Momostenango dialect the complementizer is

simply *aree (ri)*, as illustrated in (41).

- (41) *aree xtoj+ook pa chaak*  
 when PERFV+1PL.B+enter in work  
*jun tiir" x+Ø+qa-b'an qa-g'ab'*  
 one time PERFV+3SG.B+1PL.A-do 1PL.A-hand  
 'When we began to work, we all crossed  
 ourselves.'

For some speakers from Santa María Chiquimula, the complementizer in temporal clauses has the form *chiri7 (ri)*, as seen in (42). As was seen in section 6.2.2, *chiri7* is a demonstrative adverb.

- (42) (a) *ka+Ø+chuk-u-n-ik chiri7 ri*  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+work-TH.V-ABSOL-PLAIN when  
*x+in+ook oloq*  
 PERFV+1SG.B+enter hither  
 'S/he was working when I came in.'

- (b) *chiri7 ri k+∅+oopan ri*  
 when IMPERF+3SG.B+arrive.there the  
*ki-junaab' ko7k wa7*  
 /k#e7#ok/  
 3PL.A-year IMPERF+3PL.B+enter this  
*ch+u-kooj-ik*  
 at+1SG.A-use.PASSIVE-PLAIN  
 'When they reach old age, these begin to use  
 it.' (lit., 'when their years arrive there,  
 these enter to its being used.')

In Zunil both *are tag* and *chiri7* are used, as illustrated in (43).

- (43) (a) *k+in+wax-ik are tag*  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+sleep-PLAIN when  
*x+at+ul-ik*  
 PERFV+2SG.B+arrive.here-PLAIN  
 'I was sleeping when you arrived.'
- (b) *x+∅+k'a7n-ar-ik chiri7*  
 PERFV+3SG.B+angry-VERSIVE-PLAIN when  
*x+∅+in-ch'ay-o*  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-hit-PLAIN  
 'He got angry when I hit him.'

The speaker I consulted from Zunil claimed that there was a semantic difference between *are tag* and *chiri7*. Apparently,



as seen in (43a), *are taq* is used when an event takes place while some other situation obtains. As seen in (43b), on the other hand, *chiri7* is used when one event takes place immediately after, or as a result of, another event.

One speaker that I consulted from Santa María Chiquimula used three different forms of the temporal clause complementizer clauses in texts. These are *are taq*, *are (ri)*, and *are taq chiri7*. However, it is not clear what, if any, semantic differences there may be among these. Some examples are seen in (44-6).

- (44) (a) *are taq xaa ko7-1*  
 when just small-STATIVE  
*ko7panik,*  
 /k#e7#opan+ik/  
 IMPERF+3PL.B+arrive.there-PLAIN  
*ki+Ø+r-il r+i7xoq chi*  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-see the+woman that  
*puur" k'eche7laaj r+i7 k'oo wii*  
 pure forest the+3PL.B there.be LOC.FOC  
 'When they were about to arrive, the woman  
 could see that it was sheer forest where they  
 were.'

(b) yaa ka+Ø+b'is-o-n chik are taq  
 already IMPERF+3SG.B+sadness-TH.V-ABSOL  
 chik are taq xo7pan  
 /x#e7#opan/  
 already when PERFV+3PL.B+arrive.there  
 ri k'oo wi ri r-achooch  
 the there.be LOC.FOC the 3SG.A-house  
 r+a7chii  
 the+man  
 'The woman was sad when they arrived where the  
 man's house was.'

(c) are taq x+Ø+ook r+a7q'ob  
 when PERFV+3SG.B+enter the+night  
 x+i7+wax-ik r-uk'  
 PERFV+3PL.B+sleep-PLAIN 3SG.A-with  
 ki7kot-em-aal  
 be.happy-NOM-ABSTRACT  
 'When night fell, they went to sleep happily.'  
 (lit., 'When the night entered, they slept  
 with happiness.')

(45) (a) are ri x+Ø+k-il-o  
 when PERFV+3SG.B+3PL.A-see-PLAIN  
 xi+Ø+ki-xib'-i-j k-iib'  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3PL.A-?-TH.V-PLAIN 3PL.A-REFLEX  
 'When they saw it, they got scared.'

(b) are xe71 i loq  
 /x#e7#e1/  
 when PERFV+3PL.B+leave hither  
 puur" i saq chik  
 pure 3PL.B white already  
 'When they came out, they were all white.'

(46) (a) are taq chirí7 xe71 oloq,  
 /x+e7+e1/  
 when PERFV+3PL.B+leave hither  
 x+Ø+uu-tzij-o-oj si+r  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-word-TH.V-=PLAIN what+the  
 x+Ø+i7+r-il-a7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+go+3SG.A-see-DEP  
 'When they came out, s/he told what had  
 happened.' (lit., 'When they came out, s/he  
 told what s/he went to see.')

(b) jee x+Ø+uu-b'an-o are taq chirí7  
 thus PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do-PLAIN when  
 tajan k+Ø+atan-ik  
 PROG IMPERF+3SG.B+bathe-PLAIN  
 'That's what s/he did when s/he was bathing.'

#### 8.1.4 Conditional Clauses

Conditional clauses are introduced by the complementizer *we* 'if' (Nahualá and Santa Catarina

Ixtahuacán wee). An example is seen in (47).

- (47) we k'oo nu-pwaaq k+Ø+in-log'  
 if there.be 1SG.A-money IMPERF+3Sg.B+1SG.A-buy  
 nu-pwii7  
 1SG.A-hat  
 'If I have money, I will buy a hat.'

If the conditional clause is counterfactual, the Irrealis Particle *ta(j)* follows the complementizer.<sup>2</sup> If the main clause is also counterfactual, the Irrealis Particle will also appear after the predicate of that clause. Some examples are seen in (48).

- (48) (a) we ta k'oo nu-pwaaq  
 if IRR there.be 1SG.A-money  
 k+Ø+in-log' nu-pwii7  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+1SG.A-buy 1SG.A-hat  
 'If I had money, I would buy a hat.'

- (b) we ta k'oo nu-pwaaq  
 if IRR there.be 1SG.A-money  
 x+Ø+in-log' ta nu-pwii7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-buy IRR 1SG.A-hat  
 'If I had money, I would have bought a hat.'

As was seen in Chapter 4, example (20), the Potential form of the verb is used in both the conditional clause and the main clause if the conditional clause is in the future

tense. This example is repeated below in (49).

- (49) wee chi+Ø+peet-ik,            ch+Ø+in-toj-oh  
       if POT+3SG.B+come-PLAIN POT+3SG.B+1SG.A-pay-PLAIN  
       `If s/he should come, I would pay it.'

#### 8.1.5 Other Types of Subordinate Clauses

There are a number of other types of subordinate clauses in Quiché. Examples of two of these will be shown in this section; however, they will not be discussed in detail.

##### 4.2.5.1 Reason Clauses

Reason clauses are generally introduced by (xaa) rumaal (ri), where r-umaal 'by him/her/it' is the Agentive Relational Noun inflected for third person singular. An example is seen in (50).

- (50) ri    ak'aal    ma    ka+Ø+tzaaq            taj,  
       the child    NEG    IMPERF+3SG.B+fall    IRREALIS  
       (xaa) rumaal (ri)    Ø            r-eeta7-m  
       because                    3SG.B    3SG.A-know-PERFECT  
       chi            ka+Ø+b'iin            wa+kamiik  
       already    IMPERF+3SG.B+walk    the+today  
       `The child does not fall because s/he knows how to  
       walk now.'

In some dialects, such as Cantel, reason clauses are introduced by *rumaal (reech) chi*, where *r-eech* is the genitive Relational Noun inflected for third person singular. An example is seen in (51) (cf. Henne 1980:137).

- (51) *sib'lāj x+in+kos-ik rumal chi*  
 very PERFV+1SG.B+tire-PLAIN because  
*mān x+Ø+in-riq ta uloq*  
 NEG PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-find IRR hither  
*ri ch'ich'*  
 the metal  
 'I got very tired because I missed the bus.'

#### 8.1.5.2 Manner Adverbial Clauses

Some manner adverbial clauses in Quiché consist of a finite verb obligatorily inflected in the Imperfective and appearing immediately before the main verb. Very often the verb functioning as the manner adverb is one of the Affective Verbs mentioned in section 3.2. An example of this construction with an Affective Verb is shown in (52a) while (52b) is an example with a non-Affective Verb.

- (52) (a) *ri tz'ikin ka+Ø+rapap-ik*  
 the bird IMPERF+3SG.B+fly-PLAIN  
*x+Ø+ok'ow p+u-wi7 ri chee7*  
 PERF+3SG.B-pass in+3SG.A-hair the tree  
 'The bird passed flying over the tree.'

(b) ka+Ø+b'iin-ik                      x+Ø+b'ee  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+walk-PLAIN    PERFV+3SG.B+go  
 pa k'ache7laaj  
 in forest  
 'He went walking into the forest.'

## 8.2 Negation

Simple clausal negation in Quiché is indicated by placing the Negative particle *ma* before the predicate and the Irrealis particle *taj* after the predicate. In Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán the Negative particle has the form *na*; however, when compounded with other preceding particles, it has the form *mna*, as in *wemna* 'if not' (*wee* 'if'), *laamna* Negative Question (*laa* Yes/No Question particle), *pinemna* 'even though...not' (*pine* 'even though'), *jas chemna* 'why not?' (*jas chee* 'why?'), *wee nemna* 'perhaps not' (*wee ne* 'perhaps'). In Cantel the negative particle has the form *mān* ~ *m(a)*. The form *man* also sometimes occurs in the speech of some speakers from Momostenango; however, the form *ma* seems to be more general in that dialect. All of the examples of the form *man* which I have observed in the Momostenango dialect seem to occur in rather formal discourse; however, even in those contexts, the form *ma* seems to be more common.

Brasseur (1862:63) gives the forms *ma*, *man*, and *mana* for the negative particle. Though the form *mana* does not

occur in any of the modern dialects that I am familiar with, it seems likely that the forms (m)na and man, which do occur in modern dialects, may come from a form like mana, which bears a strong resemblance to the form mani7, which is the Negative particle in some dialects of Cakchiquel. This form in turn is apparently a compound of the simple negative morpheme ma and some other morpheme \*na or \*ni7, the identity of which is not certain.

Some examples of simple negated clauses are seen in (53).

(53) (a) ma ka+Ø+b'ee taj  
 NEG IMPERF+3SG.B+go IRR  
 's/he didn't go.'

(b) ma x+Ø+in-b'an taj  
 NEG PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-do IRR  
 'I didn't do it.'

(c) ri achii ma q'ab'areel taj  
 the man NEG drunkard IRR  
 'The man is not drunk.'

(d) ma in q'ab'areel taj  
 NEG 1SG.B drunkard IRR  
 'I am not drunk.'



(e) ri achii ma x+Ø+uu-choom-a-j  
 the man NEG PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-?-TH.V-PLAIN  
 taj chi x+in+a-ch'ay-o  
 IRR COMP PERFV+1SG.B+2SG.A-hit-PLAIN  
 'The man didn't think that you hit me.'

The Irrealis particle *taj*, like many particles in Quiché, it loses its final consonant in non phrase-final position. Some examples are seen in (54).

(54) (a) ma ka+Ø+b'ee ta ri ixog  
 NEG IMPERF+3SG.B+go IRR  
 'The woman didn't go.'

(b) ri a Xwaan ma x+Ø+uu-ch'ay  
 the MALE John NEG PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-hit  
 ta ri a Lu7  
 IRR the MALE Peter  
 'John didn't hit Peter.'

(c) ma q'ab'areel ta ri achii  
 NEG drunkard IRR the man  
 'The man is not drunk.'

(d) ma in q'ab'areel ta wakamiik  
 NEG 1SG.B drunkard IRR now  
 'I am not drunk now.'

(e) ma x+Ø+uu-choom-a-j ta ri  
 NEG PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-?-TH.V-PLAIN IRR the  
 achii chi x+inta-ch'ay-o  
 man COMP PERFV+1SG.B+2SG.A-hit-PLAIN  
 'The man didn't think that you hit me.'

(f) ri achii ma gas ta sib'alaj  
 the man NEG really IRR very  
 q'ab'areel  
 drunkard  
 'The man isn't really very drunk.'

In example (54f) it is an adverb that is being negated rather than the predicate q'ab'areel.

It should be noted that the Irrealis Particle *taj* is independent of the Negative Particle; that is to say, *ma ... taj* should not be considered a discontinuous negative morpheme. This can be seen by looking at sentences like (48a) and (48b) in section 8.1.4. In these sentences it can be seen that the Irrealis Particle appears without the Negative Particle and has irrealis, not negative, meaning. Another example of the use of the Irrealis Particle by itself can be seen in (55).

- (55) xaa pu q'ab'areel ta ri achi  
 just PARTICLE drunkard IRR the man  
 '(By chance) is the man drunk?'  
 (Spanish: 'Acaso está borracho el hombre?')

This sentence is not negative; thus there is no Negative Particle. However, this sentence does have an implicature that the man is, in fact, not drunk; thus, the Irrealis Particle appears.

There are also cases when the Negative Particle can appear without the Irrealis Particle. For example, in conditional clauses negation is effected solely by the Negative Particle without the accompanying Irrealis Particle, as illustrated in (56).

- (56) we ma k+Ø+aa-b'an-o,  
 if NEG IMPERF+3SG.B+2SG.A-do-PLAIN  
 k+at+ki-yaj-o  
 IMPERF+2SG.B+3SG.A-scold-PLAIN  
 'If you don't do it, they will scold you.'

As was discussed in section 8.1.4, the Irrealis Particle in a conditional clause makes that clause counterfactual. Negation in yes/no questions introduced by the Question Particle *laa* (Cantel and Zunil, a) is also effected without the use of the Irrealis Particle, as illustrated in (57).

(57) laa ma k+at+b'ee-k

Q NEG IMPERF+2SG.B+go-PLAIN

'Aren't you going?'

The Negative Particle is also used without *taj* following *we ne7* (Nahualá *wee ne7*) 'perhaps', *pu ne7* (Nahualá *pine7*) 'although, even though', and *jas chee* (Santa María Chiquimla *su chee*, Nahualá *jas cheh*, Cantel *jās che*) 'why'. Some examples are seen in (58).

(58) (a) we ne ma k+in+b'ee-k

perhaps NEG IMPERF+1SG.B+go-PLAIN

'Maybe I won't go.'

(b) pu ne ma ka+Ø+b'ee ri a

even.though NEG IMPERF+3SG.B+go the MALE

Xwaan, k+in+b'ee wi in pa tinimit

John IMPERF+1SG.B+go PARTICLE I in town

'Even though John isn't going, I'm still

going to town.'

(c) jas chee ma k+Ø+aa-b'an-o

why NEG IMPERF+3SG.B-2SG.A-do-PLAIN

'Why didn't you do it?'

Nevertheless, in many dialects of modern Quiché, the Negative Particle is optional in sentences like those seen in (53) and (54). Thus, for example, (53a) could be expressed as *kab'ee taj*; and (54c) could be expressed as

*q'ab'areel ta ri achii.* The forms using the Negative Particle, as illustrated in (53) and (54), seem to be the most common in texts, however. When the Negative Particle is not present in sentences like these, the negation is indicated entirely by the Irrealis Particle.

It seems that what may be going on here is something like the following. Negated declarative clauses like those in (53) and (54) denote events which are necessarily counterfactual. Therefore, the Irrealis Particle alone would be sufficient to convey the idea that the situation denoted by the non-negated clause does not, in fact, obtain. In the examples seen in (56-58), on the other hand, each of the initial particles denotes a different non-declarative epistemic modality; and within each of these modalities it is apparently possible to make a further real/unreal distinction (marked by the absence or presence of the Irrealis Particle) independently of the negative/non-negative distinction (marked by the presence or absence of the Negative Particle).<sup>7</sup> It is possible to make both of these distinctions in these non-declarative modalities because the negative/non-negative distinction is made with respect to the possible world evoked by the epistemic particle whereas the real/unreal distinction is made with respect to the real (or text) world. The possible world evoked by simple declarative clauses, however, is the real

world (or the text world). Thus, in this case, the two distinctions fall together in such a way that it is not always necessary to mark them both.

There are some other negative forms in Quiché besides the simple Negative Particle. One of these is *maja7* 'still not'. This is used with verbs in the Imperfective Aspect without the Irrealis Particle, as illustrated in (59).

- (59) *maja7 k+in+b'ee-k*  
 still.not IMPERF+1SG.B+go-PLAIN  
 'I still haven't gone; I haven't gone yet.'

This sentence should be compared with the one in (60b), with which there is a difference in meaning.

- (60) (a) *k+in+b'ee na*  
 IMPERF+1SG.B+go NECESSITATIVE  
 'I have to go; I will go.'
- (b) *ma k+in+b'ee ta na*  
 NEG IMPERF+1SG.B+go IRR NEC  
 'I am still not going; I am not going yet.'

Other negative forms include those meaning 'never'. Among these are *xaa te ne7* (Santa María Chiquimula), *ma wi jumul* (Cantel; *ju+mu(u)l* 'one time'), and *ma jeel ta jumul* (Chichicastenango, Henne 1980:114). These forms are also used without the Irrealis Particle.<sup>29</sup> An example is seen in

(61).

(61) ri achii xaa te ne x+Ø+uul-ik  
 the man never PERFV+3SG.B+arrive.here-PLAIN  
 'The man never arrived.'

### 8.3 Reflexives and Reciprocals

Reflexives in Quiché are indicated by the use of the Relational Noun *-iib'* with a transitive verb. The Relational Noun functions as the O NP of the transitive verb; and thus, the transitive verb always shows agreement with this Relational Noun by means of the third person singular set B clitic. The possessor of the Relational Noun must agree with the NP in S function in person and number. Some examples are seen in (62).

(62) (a) x+Ø+in-kun-a-j w-iib'  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A?-TH.V-PLAIN 1SG.A-REFLEXIVE  
 'I cured myself.'

(b) ri a Xwaan x+Ø+uu-kam-isa-j  
 the MALE John PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN  
 r-iib'  
 3SG.A-REFLEXIVE  
 'John killed himself.'

(c) x+Ø+uu-sok                      r-iib'              ri    ixoq  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut    3SG.A-REFLEX the woman  
 'The woman cut herself.'

When the NP in A function is plural, then the Reflexive Relational Noun, which will also show plural agreement, may be interpreted either as a reflexive or as a reciprocal, as seen in (63).

(63) ri    achy-aab'    x+Ø+ki-ch'ay                      k-iib'  
 the man-PL              PERFV+3SG.B+3PL.A-hit    3PL.A-REFLEX  
 'The men hit themselves.' or 'The men hit each other.'

In (62) and (63) it can be seen that the possessor of the Relational Noun is always obligatorily coreferential with the NP in A function. Thus, given the meaning of a reflexive sentence, it would seem like the possessor of the Relational Noun must be the patient of the verb. However, if the possessor of the Relational Noun is the patient, we might expect that the verb would agree with it since transitive verbs always show set B agreement with the NP in O function which is generally the patient. However, as seen in (62) and (63), the verb always shows third person singular agreement with the Relational Noun; it never shows any kind of agreement with the possessor of the relational noun. That is to say sentences like (64) are impossible.



- (64) (a) \*x+oj+qa-kuna-j (q-iib')  
 PERFV+1PL.B+1PL.A-cure-PLAIN (1PL.A-REFLEXIVE)  
 'We cured ourselves/each other.'
- (b) \*x+e7+qa-kuna-j q-iib'  
 PERFV+3PL.B+1PL.A-cure-PLAIN 1PL.A-REFLEXIVE  
 'We cured ourselves/each other.'

Thus, the Reflexive Relational Noun is clearly a singular noun which functions as the direct object of the transitive verb. This is necessarily the case anyway because the verb must assign case to the Relational Noun Phrase, otherwise this NP would be in violation of the Case Filter (Chomsky 1982:6), which states that every lexical NP must be assigned case. Since the Reflexive Relational Noun is not governed by a preposition, as are many other Relational Nouns (see section 3.4.4.2), it can only be assigned case by the verb. We have seen that NP's which are assigned case by transitive verbs (that is to say, NP's in O function) always show set B agreement with the verb, which is exactly what happens with the Reflexive Relational Noun. The possessor of the Relational Noun receives case within the Relational Noun Phrase, as evidenced by the set A prefix on the Relational Noun; therefore, the possessor also does not violate the case filter and does not need to be assigned case by the verb.

Furthermore, since transitive verbs generally assign

the patient role to the NP in O function, and not to the possessors of such NPs, one must assume that the patient of a reflexive transitive verb is the Reflexive Relational Noun Phrase in spite of the fact that this may seem a little counterintuitive. Again this conclusion is necessary because, since the Reflexive Relational Noun is not governed by a preposition, it must receive a  $\theta$ -role (i. e., a "thematic role" or "semantic role") from the verb, otherwise it will be in violation of the  $\theta$ -criterion (Chomsky 1981:36) which states that each argument bears one and only one  $\theta$ -role, and each  $\theta$ -role is assigned to one and only one argument.

In this respect, it is instructive to consider reflexive purpose clauses such as the one shown in (65).

- (65) x+in+b'ee            ch u-kuna-x-ik            w-1ib'  
 PERFV+1SG.B+go at 3SG.A-cure-PASS-NOM 1SG.A-REFLEX  
 'I went to cure myself.'

Since the non-finite verb form in (65) is a nominalization, the agreement is indicated, as usual, by a set A prefix, which, unlike the third person set B clitic, is a phonologically non-null morpheme.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the Reflexive Relational Noun in (65), not its possessor, is clearly a third person singular NP which agrees with the Passive Verbal Noun as would any other patient NP. It seems clear

that the Reflexive Verbal Noun, not its possessor, is the patient.

Another question to ask about reflexives in Quiché is whether it is the Relational Noun or its possessor which is the anaphor. In English, as in many other languages, reflexive forms (e. g., *myself, yourself, himself, herself, itself, ourselves, yourselves, themselves*) are anaphors, which, according to Chomsky (1982:20), must be bound in its governing category. The term "bound" means coindexed with a c-commanding category in an argument position (Chomsky 1982:20). The notion of c-command is defined as in (66) (Chomsky 1986:8).

(66)  $\alpha$  c-commands  $\beta$  iff  $\alpha$  does not dominate  $\beta$  and every  $\gamma$  that dominates  $\alpha$  dominates  $\beta$ .

The governing category of an anaphor is the smallest S or NP which contains the anaphor and its governor. The notion of government is defined in (67) (Chomsky 1986:9).

(67)  $\alpha$  governs  $\beta$  iff  $\alpha$  m-commands  $\beta$  and there is no  $\gamma$ ,  $\gamma$  a barrier for  $\beta$ , such that  $\gamma$  excludes  $\alpha$ .

The notion of "m-command" is identical to the notion of c-command defined in (66) if  $\gamma$  in (66) is restricted to maximal projections (i. e., the double bar categories of X-bar theory: CP (= S'), IP (= S), VP, NP, PP, AP, etc.). A "barrier" can generally be taken to be one of these maximal

projections (under certain conditions; see Chomsky 1986).  
The notion of "exclusion" is defined in (68).

(68)  $\alpha$  excludes  $\beta$  if no segment of  $\alpha$  dominates  $\beta$ .

Thus, in the simple English sentence shown in (69), the anaphor (= *himself*) must be bound to a NP (= *John*) in its governing category (= S, which is the minimal S or NP which contains *himself* and a governor of *himself* = the verb *cured*).

(69) [ [ John<sub>i</sub> ] [ cured [ himself<sub>i</sub> ] ] ]  
S NP VP NP

It can also be seen in (69) that the NP *John* is in an argument position (since it is the subject of the verb *cured*) and that it c-commands the NP *himself* because *John* does not dominate *himself* and every  $\gamma$  (=S) which dominates *John* also dominates *himself*.

The Quiché translation of the sentence in (69) would be as shown in (70), where *e* is the empty possessor NP of the Reflexive Relational Noun.

(70) [ [ x+ $\emptyset$ +uu-kuna-j [ r-iib' [ e ] ] ] [ ri a Xwaan ] ]  
S VP NP NP NP

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cure-PLAIN 3SG.A-REFLEX the MALE John

'John cured himself.'

It can be seen in (70) that either *riib'* or the empty

possessor of *riib'* could be bound to the argument *ri a Xwaan* since they are both c-commanded by that argument in the governing category (= S) of *riib'* (which is governed by *xuukunaaj*). Thus, this does not help us determine whether *riib'* or its possessor is the anaphor.

There may be some evidence, however, that the Reflexive Relational Noun, not its possessor, is the anaphor. This can be seen by looking at sentences like (30b) above, which is repeated here as (71).

- (71) *la tz'i7 xaa k+Ø+uu-yaa*  
 the dog just IMPERF+3SG.B+3Sg.A-give  
*r-iib' pa kam-isa-x-ik*  
 3SG.A-REFLEXIVE in die-CAUSATIVE-PASSIVE-NOM  
 'The dog just gives itself up to be killed.'

As was discussed above, the empty subject of the purpose clause *pa kamisaxik* is obligatorily understood in such a sentence to be coreferential with the NP in O function in the main clause. As we have seen, the Passive Verbal Noun in a purpose clause often has a set A prefix indicating agreement with its subject (i. e., its possessor). I will assume here that the set A agreement on possessed nouns is licensed by an AGR(reement) feature in an INFL(ection) constituent in the noun phrase much in the same way that verb agreement is generally assumed to be effected by AGR in INFL in the clause (Chomsky 1981:52). The subject position

in the clause is said to be governed by INFL if it contains AGR. I will assume, in the same way, that the INFL constituent in the Quiché noun phrase also governs the possessor NP position if INFL contains AGR.

The Passive Verbal Noun in sentences like (70), however, does not have a set A prefix. Therefore, INFL in such a purpose clause does not contain AGR and, therefore, does not govern the empty possessor NP position. Thus, we can conclude that the empty category in the possessor NP position in the purpose clause of (70) must be PRO, the empty pronominal anaphor, since this is the only empty category which, according to the empty category principle (ECP), can appear in ungoverned positions (Chomsky 1981:274-5).

It was claimed in section 8.1.2 that PRO in purpose clauses like that in (70) is obligatorily coindexed with (i. e., controlled by) an NP which is in either S function or O function in the matrix clause. Thus, the sentence in (70) manifests what is sometimes called "obligatory control". In English, obligatory control requires that PRO in an embedded clause be controlled by either a subject or a direct object in the matrix clause, as illustrated in (72). As seen in (72c), PRO cannot be controlled by a NP which is not a subject or direct object.

(72) (a) John<sub>i</sub> tried [ PRO<sub>i</sub> to leave ]

(b) John forced Bill<sub>i</sub> [ PRO<sub>i</sub> to leave ]

(c) Bill<sub>i</sub> was forced by John<sub>j</sub> [ PRO<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub> to leave ]

Since control in Quiché seems to operate under similar circumstances, we could conclude that PRO in (70) must be controlled by *riib'*, which is the direct object, rather than by the empty possessor of *riib'*, which is neither the subject nor the direct object of the main clause. However, PRO in (70) is also understood to be coreferential with *ri tz'i7* (since it is the dog that will be killed); therefore, it would appear that *ri tz'i7*, *riib'*, and PRO must all be coindexed, as illustrated in (73).

(73) [ *ri tz'i7* ]<sub>i</sub> *xuuyaa* [ *r-iib'* [ *e* ] ]<sub>i</sub> [ *pa*  
[ *kamisaxik* PRO<sub>i</sub> ] ]

Thus, it appears that it is the entire Relational Noun phrase, rather than the possessor of *riib'*, which is the anaphor.

Nevertheless, it is still the case that the possessor of *riib'* must always agree in person and number with the subject of the transitive verb. This suggests that the empty possessor of *riib'* in (73) must also be coindexed with *ri tz'i7*, *riib'*, and PRO. This would be quite strange, however, since it would mean that both *riib'* and its possessor are coreferential. Furthermore, this would mean





the verb. The subject in this sentence is an empty nonreferential pronominal functioning much like the expletive pronominal subject *it* in English sentences like *It is raining* and *It seems that John is a fool*. A transitive verb in Quiché always shows third person singular agreement with such an expletive subject. The only NP position in this construction that is not fixed is the possessor of *-wach*.

There is another similar idiom which is reflexive, an example of which is seen in (75).

- (75)  $k+\emptyset+uu-k'am$                        $r-iib'$                        $ki-wach$   
 IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-bring/take 3SG.A-REFLEX 3PL.A-face  
 'They are congenial with each other.' (Spanish: 'Se congenian'; Lit., 'It brings their faces' self.')

Superficially this appears to be an ordinary reflexive sentence with *kiwach* as the subject. However, this is clearly not the case. This sentence was taken from a text produced by a speaker from Santa María Chiquimula. A speaker that I consulted from Cantel preferred to have the third person plural set A prefix on the Reflexive Relational Noun:  $xuk'am kib' kiwäch$ . The possessor of *-wach* is clearly human and plural. Therefore, *-wach* is probably also plural since the people would not all have a single "face". Usually plurality in Quiché is indicated obligatorily for



This makes sense because, as has been seen, when the Reflexive Relational Noun has an empty possessor, that empty possessor NP must be coreferential with the subject. However, in a sentence like (75) there is no referential subject NP for the possessor of the Relational Noun to be coreferential with. Therefore, the relational noun in a sentence with an expletive subject could not have an empty possessor NP.<sup>10</sup>

Given these facts, I will make the following tentative conclusions about reflexives in Quiché:

- (a) The Reflexive Relational Noun is a third person singular noun which functions as the head of the direct object NP in a transitive sentence.
- (b) A transitive verb assigns a patient or theme role to the Relational Noun Phrase like it would to any other NP in O function.
- (c) The Reflexive Relational Noun is obligatorily possessed.
- (d) If the transitive verb has a referential NP in A function, then the possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun must be empty and must be bound to the NP in A function. Thus, the empty possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun is an anaphor.

(Presumably a non-anaphoric possessor could be ruled out by the semantic interpretation of *-iib'* although this is not entirely clear.)

- (e) If the NP in A function is non-referential, then an anaphoric possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun would be ruled out. Therefore, the only possibility in this case would be for the Relational Noun to have a non-anaphoric possessor.

If the tentative conclusion in (d) above is correct, then we still have problems with the analysis of sentences like (70). Two possibilities suggest themselves. One is that perhaps when the NP in O function is the Reflexive Relational Noun, then PRO in a purpose clause will be controlled by the NP in A function rather than the NP in O function. This will avoid the problems with coindexing discussed above; however, whether or not this is correct will depend on how a theory of control in Quiché is eventually worked out. Another possible solution is to say that PRO is coindexed with the NP in O function as usual, but not with the NP in A function. That is to say, that (70) would be analyzed as in (77) just as if the NP in O function were not a Reflexive Relational Noun phrase.

(77) [ ri tz'i7 ], xuuyaa [ riib' [ e. ] ], [ pa  
[ kamisaxik PRO, ] ]

Then at another level of the grammar (Logical Form?) the empty possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun would be erased and the indexes j would be changed to i. It is not clear at this point, however, how this hypothesis could be worked out either.

With respect to tentative conclusion (c) above. We should also briefly look at constructions like the one shown in (78).<sup>11</sup>

- (78) (a) tzaq-ow    iib'  
           lose-FOCUS    REFLEXIVE  
           'losing oneself; getting lost'
- (b) jach-ow        iib'  
           divide-FOCUS    REFLEX  
           'dividing one another; getting divorced'
- (c) mul-i-n                            iib'  
           gather-TH.V-ANTIPASSIVE    REFLEX  
           'meeting (one another); (a) meeting'
- (d) xib'-i-n        iib'  
           ?-TH.V-ANTIPASS    REFLEX  
           'scaring oneself; getting scared'

An example of the use of one of these constructions in a sentence is seen in (79).

(79) chwe7q ka+Ø+b'aan jun  
 tomorrow IMPERFV+3SG.B+do.PASS one  
 mul-i-n iib ' pa q'at-b'al tziij  
 gather-TH.V-ANTIPASS REFLEX in cut-LOC word  
 'Tomorrow there will be a meeting in the town  
 hall.' (lit., 'Tomorrow a meeting-one-another is  
 done in the word cutting place.')

These are examples of the kind of Verb Phrase Compound that was discussed previously in sections 3.4.3, 5.3, and 8.1.1.2., only in this case the "direct object" noun is the Reflexive Relational Noun rather than one of the more ordinary types of nouns that were seen previously in this construction. It was pointed out before that the Verb Phrase Compound did not seem to be entirely productive in modern Quiché; nevertheless, in some, if not all, Quiché dialects this construction apparently is productive if the "direct object" noun is the Reflexive Relational Noun. Thus, in at least some dialects, this seems to be a productive way of deriving nominalized forms of reflexive verbs.

It can be seen in (78) that the Relational Noun does not have a possessive prefix. This would seem to contradict tentative conclusion (c) above. However, it will be remembered that Verb Phrase Compounds are never possessed. Since they are never possessed, they have no "subject" (=

the possessor NP). If the Reflexive Relational Noun in (78) did have a possessive prefix, it would mean that it had an empty possessor NP, which, according to tentative conclusion (d) above, would have to be an anaphor. An anaphor must be bound in the domain of a subject; however, if the entire Verb Phrase Compound cannot be possessed, then it has no subject; and thus, the anaphor would be unbound in the domain of a subject and would violate the binding condition on anaphors. Therefore, it appears that tentative conclusion (c) should be revised to say that the Reflexive Relational Noun is obligatorily possessed except when it appears in a construction which lacks a subject. However, another way to approach this is to leave conclusion (c) in its original form and say that the Reflexive Relational Noun in a Verb Phrase Compound is possessed, but that the possessor NP position is occupied by the empty pronominal anaphor PRO. Since PRO must be ungoverned, the INFL constituent in the Reflexive Relational Noun phrase must not contain AGR; and, therefore, no set A prefix may appear on the Relational Noun. PRO in the possessor position could have arbitrary reference, and this correlates with the semantics of these Reflexive Verb Phrase Compounds, which generally seem to have 'oneself' or 'one another' as part of their meaning.

According to Mondloch (1981:262-4), there is a construction in which a Verb Phrase Compound involves a

possessed Reflexive Relational Noun. However, it is still the case that the construction does not have a subject. Thus, the possessor or the Reflexive Relational Noun is not an anaphor and a lexical NP may appear in that position. This construction is used as a kind of "urgent imperative". The second person agent/addressee may optionally be expressed by the Agentive Relational Noun. An example is shown in (80) (Nahualá dialect).

(80) *tij-ow r-iib' lee a-waa (aw-umaal)*  
*eat-FOC 3SG.A-REFLEX the 2SG.A-food (2SG.A-by)*  
 'Eat your food quickly!'

The verb form in the construction often has the Celeritive suffix (see section 5.3), which explicitly adds the meaning 'quickly' to the construction. With this suffix, the example seen in (80) would have the form *tij-(i)lo7-n r-iib' lee a-waa (aw-umaal)*.

There are some other subjectless constructions in Quiché which involve Reflexive Relational Nouns with no possessive prefix. Some of these involve Intransitive Action Nominalizations, as in (81a) while some others involve Perfect Passive Participles as in (81b).

(81) (a) *tzaaq-em iib'*  
*lose/fall.PASSIVE-NOM REFLEX*  
 'letting oneself fall'



- (b) sut-i-m            iib'  
 ?-TH.V-PERFECT REFLEX  
 '(for oneself to be) turned around'  
 (sut-i- 'to turn (something) around')

I have very few examples of the constructions shown in (81), and it is not entirely clear to me how they are used. It is also possible to use the Reflexive Relational Noun after a Locative/Instrumental Noun. As was discussed in section 5.3, a Locative/Instrumental Noun derived from a transitive verb root or base by means of the suffix *-b'al* may be followed by a "direct object" noun (see example 80 of Chapter 5). This direct object noun may be the Reflexive Relational Noun in either its possessed or unpossessed form (cf. Mondloch 1981:322). Thus, from the transitive verb root *-tzuq* 'to feed' one can derive the phrasal compound *tzuq-b'al q-iib'* 'instrument for feeding ourselves'. From the transitive verb root *-kol* 'defend', one can derive the phrasal compound *kol-b'al iib'* 'instrument for defending oneself'. As can be seen, the possessors of such relational nouns can not be anaphoric because such constructions have no subject.

#### 8.4 Voice

Voice is a grammatical category which has to do with the syntactic relations between a transitive verb stem and its arguments. The unmarked voice has traditionally been

called the Active voice. The Active voice involves a transitive verb stem in a transitive clause in which the verb has at least two arguments realized in the clause: a subject (i. e., an NP in A function) and a direct object (an NP in O function).<sup>12</sup> In addition to the Active voice, there are three additional basic voice categories in Quiché. These are the Passive, Antipassive, and Instrumental voices. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

#### 8.4.1 Passive

Traditionally the Passive voice is manifested in a clause involving a special intransitive verb form derived from a transitive verb stem. The patient or theme argument, which would appear as the direct object in the Active voice, appears as the subject (i. e., the NP in S function) in the Passive voice. The argument which appears as the subject in the Active voice is either not realized in the Passive voice or appears in an oblique case.

In Quiché the special intransitivized verb form which appears in the Passive voice is one of the two Passive verb forms that were discussed in section 5.3. These are the Simple Passive form illustrated in (82) and the Completive Passive form illustrated in (83).



(84) (a) x+Ø+ch'aay ri achii r-umal ri ak'aal  
 3SG.A-by the child

'The man was hit by the child.'

(b) k+at+kun-a-x k-umaal

3PL.A-by

'You will be cured by them.'

(85) (a) x+in+ch'ay-ataj r-umal ri achii  
 3SG.A-by the man

'I got hit by the man.'

(b) k+Ø+kun-a-taj ri ixoq w-umaal

1SG.A-by

'The woman will get cured by me.'

One important difference between the two Passives is that while both types may have agent phrases, as seen in (84) and (85), only the Completive Passive may have non-third person agent phrases (see 85b). While the Simple Passive may take a third person agent, as in (84), non-third person agents are ungrammatical in the Simple Passive, as illustrated in (86).

(86) (a) \*x+Ø+ch'aay ri achii aw-umaal

2SG.A-by

'The man was hit by you.'

(b) \*k+at+kun-a-x q-umaal

1PL.A-by

'You will be cured by us.'

The Simple Passive can, however, take a non-third person form of -umaal if it appears in the preverbal Topic position.<sup>13</sup> It happens, though, that in this type of construction, -umaal does not indicate an agent, but rather the person because of whom, or through whose intervention, the event takes place. An example is seen in (87).

(87) q-umal oj k+at+kun-a-x-ik

1PL.A-by we IMPERF+2SG.B+?-TH.V-PASS-PLAIN

'Because of us, you will be cured (by someone else); through our intervention, you will be cured (by someone else).'

It was mentioned above that generally in the world's languages an agent in a Passive clause appears in an oblique case. That is to say that the agent NP is marked by some kind of oblique case marker (e. g., a case affix or adposition). In Quiché, however, the agent in a Passive clause appears as the possessor of a Relational Noun. The Agentive Relational Noun -umaal, like the Reflexive Relational Noun, is not governed by a preposition. Therefore, some of the same types of questions that arose with the Reflexive Relational Noun also arise with the Agentive Relational Noun: (a) Is the agent role assigned to

the Relational Noun or its possessor? (b) What constituent assigns the agent role? (c) How does the Case Filter apply to Agentive Relational Noun Phrases?

In English the oblique agent of a passive clause is marked by the preposition *by*. The agent NP is presumably casemarked by this preposition and also is assigned the agent  $\theta$ -role by this same preposition. One might assume that, in a parallel way, the oblique agent in a Quiché Passive clause is the possessor of the Agentive Relational Noun and is assigned case and a  $\theta$ -role by that Relational Noun.

It is true that the possessor of the Relational Noun is assigned case by the Relational Noun as can be seen by the fact that the Relational Noun has a set A prefix. There is evidence, however, that the Relational Noun does not assign the the agent role to its possessor. Consider again sentences such as those in (88) containing a Passive Verbal Noun as a non-finite predicate.

- (88) (a)  $x+\emptyset+in-chap$                        $u-kuna-x-ik$   
           PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-grab    3SG.A-cure-PASS-NOM  
           'I began to cure him/her.'
- (b)  $x+in+b'ee$                        $ch\ u-kuna-x-ik$   
           PERFV+1SG.B+go    at    3SG.A-cure-PASS-NOM  
           'I went to cure him/her.'

In both of the non-finite clauses in (88), the non-finite verb form has passive morphology. Also as was discussed previously, in both of these non-finite passive clauses, there is an empty agent which is understood to be coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause; that is to say, in both (88a) and (88b) "I" am understood to be the one who cured him or her. However, in neither of these non-finite passive clauses does the Agentive Relational Noun appear. Thus, the empty agent NP must be PRO because it is ungoverned; and, as can be seen, PRO is obligatorily controlled by the matrix clause subject in these sentences. Since PRO must be ungoverned, it is not assigned case. Thus, the Agentive Relational Noun does not appear in the passive clause. Nevertheless, PRO must be assigned the agent role since in both of these sentences the controller of PRO is understood to be the agent of the passive clause. This agent role cannot be assigned by *-umaa1* since this Relational Noun does not appear. Therefore, the agent role must be assigned by another constituent; and the only possibility seems to be the predicate, or more specifically, by the Passive morphology in the predicate.

Thus, I would claim that in passive clauses like those in (84) and (85) the agent role is assigned by the passive morphology in the verb, not to the possessor of the Relational Noun, but rather to the Relational Noun Phrase. Notice that if the Relational Noun Phrase did not receive a

$\theta$ -role in this way, it would be in violation of the  $\theta$ -criterion.

But now a question arises as to how the Relational Noun Phrase is assigned case as it must be in order not to violate the Case Filter. One obvious possibility would be to say that the Relational Noun Phrase is assigned case by the same passive morphology that assigns its  $\theta$ -role. However, there is a potential problem with this in that if the passive morpheme assigns case in sentences like those in (84) and (85), it must also assign case in sentences like those in (88), which seems to be problematical since, as was argued above, the agent NP in (88) is PRO, which cannot be case marked since it must be ungoverned. However, a very clear difference between the passive clauses in (84) and (85) and the passive clauses in (88) is that the former are finite while the latter are not. Thus, I will tentatively assume that passive morphology can only assign case in finite clauses. Later I will show why this is and present a more satisfying account of these differences.

For the moment I will tentatively conclude that in finite passive clauses the patient role is assigned by the transitive verb root or base to the NP in S function, as in English; however, unlike English, the agent role is assigned, not by a preposition or other case marker, but rather by the passive morphology on the verb to the



Relational Noun Phrase. Furthermore, this same passive morphology assigns case to the relational noun phrase (although the passive morphemes do not assign case in non-finite clauses).<sup>14</sup>

#### 8.4.2 Antipassive

Quiché, like many other ergative languages, also has an Antipassive voice. The term "antipassive" was originally coined by Michael Silverstein around 1968 (Dixon 1979:119, fn. 85; see also Silverstein 1976) to refer to a syntactic construction which is in some sense the converse of a passive construction. In a passive construction the NP in S function corresponds to the NP in O function in the active voice. In an antipassive construction the NP in S function corresponds to the NP in A function in the active voice. The NP which corresponds to the NP in A function in the active voice either does not appear in the passive voice or appears in an oblique case. The NP which corresponds to the NP in O function in the active voice is either not present or appears in an oblique case in the antipassive voice. The verb in an antipassive construction, like the verb in a passive construction, is intransitive.

In Quiché there are two so-called Antipassive forms. Using terminology originally coined by Smith-Stark (see, e. g., Smith-Stark 1978), these two constructions are often

referred to as the Absolutive Antipassive and the Focus (or Agentive) Antipassive. In this section the Absolutive Antipassive construction will be discussed. The discussion of the Focus Antipassive will be postponed until Chapter 9.

The verb form that appears in the Absolutive Antipassive construction is the Absolutive Antipassive form that was discussed in section 5.3. Some examples of the Absolutive Antipassive construction with the corresponding Active construction are shown in (89-91).

(89) (a) k+∅+uu-nim-a-aj

IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-big-TH.V-PLAIN

'S/he obeys him/her/it.'

(b) ka+∅+nim-a-n-ik

IMPERF+3SG.B+big-TH.V-ANTIPASSIVE-PLAIN

'S/he obeys.'

(90) (a) k+at+in-log'-o-oj

IMPERF+2SG.B+1SG.A-esteemed-TH.V-PLAIN

'I esteem you; I love you.'

(b) k+in+log'-o-n-ik

IMPERF+1SG.B+esteemed-TH.V-ANTIPASSIVE-PLAIN

'I esteem; I love.'

(91) (a) ri a Xwaan k+Ø+uu-ch'ay ri  
 the MALE John IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit the  
 a Lu7  
 MALE Peter  
 'John hits Peter.'

(b) k+Ø+ch'ay-an ri a Xwaan  
 IMPERF+3Sg.B+hit-ANTIPASSIVE the MALE John  
 'John hits; John fights.'

It can be seen from each of these pairs of sentences that the NP in A function in the Active sentence in (a) corresponds to the NP in S function in the Antipassive sentence in (b). It can also be seen that there is no NP in the (b) sentences corresponding to the NP in O function in the (a) sentences. When such an NP does appear in an Absolutive Antipassive construction, it appears as the possessor of the Dative Relational Noun *che(e)(ch)* (Santa María Chiquimula *chire(ech)*).<sup>15</sup> Some examples are seen in (92).

(92) (a) ka+Ø+nim-a-n ch+Ø-ee  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+big-TH.V-ANTIPASS at+3SG.A-poss  
 'S/he obeys him/her.'

(b) k+in+log'-o-n

IMPERF+1SG.B+esteemed-TH.V-ANTIPASS

ch+aw-e

at+2SG.A-possession

'I esteem you; I love you.'

(c) ri a Xwaan x+Ø+ch'ay-an

the MALE John PERFV+3SG.B+hit-ANTIPASSIVE

ch+Ø-ee ri a Lu7

at+3SG.A-poss the MALE Peter

'John hits (at) Peter; John fights with Peter.'

Since the Dative Relational Noun is preceded by the preposition *ch(i)*, it can be seen that it is this preposition that assigns case and a  $\theta$ -role to the Relational Noun Phrase that it governs.

As was mentioned previously in section 5.3, the Absolutive Antipassive form of some verbs is not used. Mondloch (1978a:67) mentions the transitive verbs *-ee-sa-aj* 'to take out' and *-oq'-e-ej* 'to cry over' as ones which cannot appropriately be used in the Absolutive Antipassive voice. Among those which are used, not all can be appropriately used with a Dative NP. When the Dative NP is used, the Absolutive Antipassive construction has a somewhat different meaning from the corresponding Active transitive sentence. Usually the Absolutive Antipassive construction denotes a repeated or habitual activity or experience, or it



### 8.4.3 Instrumental Voice

The Instrumental Voice in Quiché is manifested in a sentence involving a special form of a transitive verb where an instrument NP appears in O function and the patient or theme NP, if it appears at all, is in an oblique case. As will be seen, there is a certain amount of dialectal variation in the syntax of this voice category in Quiché.

Probably the most straightforward examples of Instrumental Voice can be found in the Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialect. A fairly thorough treatment of the Instrumental Voice in this dialect is provided in Norman (1978),<sup>16</sup> so I will only summarize his discussion briefly here.

In Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Instrument NP's appear as possessors of the Dative Relational noun *chee(ch)*, as seen in (94).

(94) x+Ø+u-ram-i-j

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut.with.one.blow-TH.V-PLAIN

lee chee7 lee achih ch+Ø-ee            jun ch'iich'

the tree the man at+3SG.A-poss one iron

'The man cut the tree with a machete.'

The Instrumental Voice is marked on the transitive verb by means of the suffix *-b'e*. When this suffix is used, the instrument NP appears in O function. Since the instrument NP







simultaneously in the Passive and Instrumental Voice. In this respect, then, the Instrumental Voice is quite different from the other voice categories of Quiché since other pairs of voice categories (e. g., Passive and Antipassive) are mutually exclusive.

The Instrumental Voice, in addition to being used when when an instrument NP appears in Focus position, is also used when an instrument NP is questioned, as in (98a), or relativized, as in (98b).

(98) (a) jas x+Ø+u-ram-i-b'e-j  
 what PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut-TH.V-INST-PLAIN  
 lee achih r-ee lee chee7  
 the man 3SG.A-possession the tree  
 'What did the man cut the tree with?'

(b) x+Ø+inw-elag'-a-j lee  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-robbery-TH.V-PLAIN the  
 ch'iich' [ x+Ø+u-ram-i-b'e-j  
 iron PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut-TH.V-INST-PLAIN  
 lee achih r-ee lee chee7 ]  
 the man 3SG.A-possession the tree  
 'I stole the machete that the man cut the  
 tree with.'

In Chapter 9 it will be argued that Focus involves WH-movement just like WH-question formation and relativization.

Thus, it could be said that the Instrumental Voice is used when an instrument NP must undergo WH-movement.

According to Mondloch (1981:277-326), the Instrumental Voice in the Nahualá dialect is nearly identical to that just described for the Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialect. The only difference is seen in sentences where the patient NP is expressed as a full non-pronominal NP. In this situation the Genitive Relational Noun is optional in Nahualá. An example is shown in (99).

- (99) b'iix k+Ø+uu-war-tisa-b'e-j  
 song IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-sleep-CAUS-INST-PLAIN/DEP  
 (k-ee)                      rii nee7-aab'  
 3PL.A-possession the baby-PL  
 'It was with song that s/he puts the babies to  
 sleep.'

The Instrumental Voice also exists in the Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula dialects; however, in certain details the Instrumental Voice in these two dialects differs from the relatively straightforward situation seen above in Nahualá and Santa María Chiquimula. In all of these dialects the Instrumental Voice is marked by the suffix *-b'e* and is used when an instrument NP undergoes WH-movement. The dialectal differences have to do with under what conditions the instrument NP is or is not in O function and

under what conditions the patient NP is or is not in an oblique case.

In Momostenango, instrument NP's are generally marked either by the Dative Relational Noun *chee*, as was seen in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, or by the Comitative Relational Noun *-uuk'*. Some examples are seen in (100).

(100) (a) *ri achii x+Ø+uu-ket*  
 the man PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut.thin.stick  
*ri chee7 ch+Ø+ee jun mache7t*  
 the stick at+3SG.A-possession one machete  
 'The man cut the stick with a machete.'

(b) *x+at+in-sok r-uk'*  
 PERFV+2SG.B+1SG.A-wound 3SG.A-with  
*jun nawanxax*  
 one pocket.knife  
 'I wounded you with a pocket knife.'

When the instrument NP is focussed, questioned, or relativized, the verb takes the expected Instrumental Voice suffix, as illustrated in (101) and (102).

(101) (a) ?(ch+Ø-ee)                    jun   mache7t  
 at+3SG.A-possession   one   machete  
 x+Ø+uu-ket-b'e-j  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut-INST-PLAIN  
 r-ee                                    ri   chee7   ri   achii  
 3SG.A-possession   the   stick   the   man  
 'It was with a machete that the man cut the  
 stick.'

(b) ch+Ø-ee                    jun   mache7t  
 at+3SG.A-poss   one   machete  
 x+Ø+uu-ket-b'e-j                                    ri   chee7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut-INST-PLAIN the stick  
 ri achii  
 the man  
 'It was with a machete that the man cut the  
 stick.'

(102) (a) (?r-uk')                    jun   nawanxax  
 3SG.A-with   one   pocket.knife  
 x+Ø+in-sok-b'e-j                                    aw-ee  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-wound-INST-PLAIN 2SG.A-poss  
 'It was with a pocket knife that I wounded you.'



instrument NP has undergone WH-movement and does not indicate anything about grammatical relations which differs from what is found in the Active voice.

When the patient NP is not third person singular, as in (102), the situation is reversed. The preferred form is the one shown in (102a) where the patient NP is marked by the Genitive Relational Noun and does not show agreement with the verb. Again, however, the Relational Noun may optionally appear with the instrument NP. Again this is rather curious. The verb clearly does not agree with the patient NP; therefore, the third person singular set B clitic should indicate agreement with the instrument NP. However, if the verb agrees with the instrument NP, it must be the NP in O function and should not have a Relational Noun. Nevertheless, some speakers seem to use the Relational Noun in this situation although some other speakers may reject such sentences and prefer not to use the Relational Noun. Some speakers may use the form shown in (102b), in which it is clearly the patient NP which is in O function. Other speakers reject such sentences however.<sup>17</sup>

Though the use of the Relational Noun with the instrument NP in sentences like (101a) and (102a) may seem rather strange, there may be some evidence that the instrument NP in such sentences is, in fact, in O function in spite of the presence of the Relational Noun. This can

be seen by looking at Passive sentences, such as the one in (103), in which the the patient NP clearly could not be in S function.

- (103) ch+Ø-ee            jun    chee7  
 at+3SG.A-poss    one    stick  
 x+Ø+ch'ay-b'e-x                    wi            w-ee  
 PERFV+3SG.B+hit-INST-PASS LOC.FOC 1SG.A-poss  
 k-umaal  
 3PL.A-by  
 'It was with a stick that I was hit by them.'

In this sentence the patient NP is first person singular, and the agent NP is third person plural. Furthermore, both of these are indicated by Relational Nouns. The verb, on the other hand, shows third person singular agreement and, therefore, can only be agreeing with the instrument NP. Thus, the instrument NP must be in S function in spite of the fact that it is also marked by a Relational Noun. The only alternative to this conclusion would be to say that the instrument NP is merely part of an oblique phrase in focus position and the the verb is agreeing with a dummy NP in S function. Though such an analysis may not be impossible, there seems to be little reason to believe that it is correct.

When the instrument NP is questioned, a Relational Noun

may also optionally appear as part of the WH-phrase. Some examples of the preferred WH-question constructions are shown in (104).

(104) (a) jasa (r-uuk')

what 3SG.A-with

x+Ø+uu-ket-b'e-j

ri chee7

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut-IMST-PLAIN the stick

ri achii

the man

'What did the man cut the stick with?'

(b) jasa (r-uuk')

what 3SG.A-with

x+Ø+uu-sok-b'e-j

aw-ee

PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-wound-INST-PLAIN 2SG.A-poss

'What did he wound you with?'

Some speakers, however, never use the relational noun in cases like (104b) where the instrument NP must be in O function.

In the Santa María Chiquimula dialect instrument NP's are marked by the preposition *chi* ~ *chu*, as seen in (105).



(105) (a) ri achii x+Ø+uu-ram  
 the man PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut.with.one.blow  
 ri chee7 chu jun machet  
 the stick at one machete  
 'The man cut the stick with a machete.'

(b) x+at+in-sok chu jun machet  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-wound at one machete  
 'I wounded you with a machete.'

The situation with the Instrumental Voice in Santa María Chiquimula is the converse of the preferred situation seen in Momostenango. In this dialect the Genitive Relational Noun is used only with third person singular patient NPs. In other cases the patient NP is clearly in O function because there is no Relational Noun and the verb agrees with the patient NP rather than the instrument NP. Some examples are seen in (106).

(106) (a) (chu) jun machet  
 at one machete  
 x+Ø+uu-ram-b'e-j  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut-INST-PLAIN  
 ri achii r-ee ri chee7  
 the man 3SG.A-possession the stick  
 'It was with a machete that the man cut the stick.'

(b) chu jun machet  
 at one machete  
 x+at+in-sok-b'e-j  
 PERFV+2SG.B+1SG.A-wound-INST-PLAIN  
 'It was with a machete that I wounded you.'

(c) sa x+Ø+aa-ram-b'e-j  
 what PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-cut-INST-PLAIN  
 r-ee  
 3SG.A-possession  
 'What did you cut it with?'

(d) sa x+in+ki-sok-b'e-j  
 what PERFV+1SG.B+3PL.A-wound-INST-PLAIN  
 'What did they wound me with'

As can be seen in (106c) and (106d), no preposition or Relational Noun appears in the WH-phrase in this dialect; however, as can be seen in (106a), the preposition may optionally appear with the focussed instrument NP even though it is apparently in O function.

Sometimes the Genitive Relational Noun is omitted before a third person singular patient NP by some speakers of the Santa María Chiquimula dialect although this seems to be much less common than among speakers from Momostenango. When the Genitive Relational Noun is omitted, the preposition is obligatory before the instrument NP. There

is, however, one situation in which all speakers of the Santa María Chiquimula dialect apparently omit this Relational Noun before a third person singular patient: this is when the NP in O function is part of a verb-object idiom. An example of this is seen in (107). In this sentence, the construction *-b'an k'ax* (literally, 'to do pain') is an idiom meaning 'to hurt'.

- (107) *chu jun machet x+Ø+aa-b'am-b'e-j*  
 at one machete PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-do-INST-PLAIN  
*k'ax ch+w-ee*  
 pain at+1SG.A-possession  
 'It was with a machete that you hurt me.'

In (107) the preposition is obligatory, and it is ungrammatical to use *r-ee* before the word *k'ax*.

It has been claimed that the Instrumental Voice is used whenever an instrument NP undergoes WH-movement, that is, whenever an instrument NP is focussed, questioned, or relativized. However, there is an alternative strategy for focussing an instrument NP in all Quiché dialects. This involves fronting the instrument NP directly without using the Instrumental Voice but instead leaving the Locative Focus particle *wii* after the predicate. This is the same strategy used for focussing locative NP's. An example of an instrument NP focussed in this way is shown in (108a), and an example of a focussed locative NP is shown in (108b).

(108) (a) chu jun machet x+Ø+uu-ram wi  
 at one machete PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut LOC.FOC  
 ri chee7 ri achii  
 the stick the man  
 'It was with a machete that the man cut the  
 stick.'

(b) pa k'ache7laaj x+Ø+uu-ram wi  
 in forest PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-cut LOC.FOC  
 ri chee7 ri achii  
 the stick the man  
 'It was in the forest that the man cut the  
 stick.'

Locative NP's can also be questioned and relativized using this same strategy; however, this is not possible with instrument NP's. Nevertheless, at least some speakers seem to use the Locative Focus particle *wii* at times together with the Instrumental Voice when instrument NP's are focussed, questioned, or relativized. An example of this was seen above in (103). This is true regardless of whether or not the preposition or Relational Noun appears with the instrument NP.

The Instrumental Voice suffix *-b'e* can also be suffixed to intransitive verb stems and Positional Adjectives. In this situation the suffix is generally preceded by a vowel and derives a transitive verb. These transitive verbs take

a locative, temporal, or circumstantial phrase as direct object. Thus, for example, from the intransitive verb root *-war* 'to sleep' one can derive a transitive verb stem *-war-(a)b'e-ej* 'to sleep in (some place or time)'. Or as another example, from the Positional Adjective *tak'-al* 'standing', one can derive the transitive verb stem *-tak'-al-eb'e-ej* 'to be standing in (some place or time)'. Some examples of the use of such forms can be seen in (109) (from Kaufman 1986a, Nahualá dialect).

(109) (a) *k+Ø+in-b'iin-ib'e-j*

IMPERF+3SG.B+1SG.A-walk-INST-PLAIN

*a-ch'aa-b'e-x-iik*

2SG.A-talk-INST-PASS-NOM

'I walked along (while) talking to you.'

(lit., 'I walked in your being talked to.')

(b) *k+Ø+u-b'iin-ib'e-j*

*lee*

IMPERF+3SG.B+3SG.A-walk-INST-PLAIN the

*u-yaab'*

3SG.A-sickness

'He walks in spite of his sickness.'

(lit., he walks in his sickness.)

(c) Ø+tak'-al            lee achih chwa jah,  
 3SG.B+stand-POS the man before house  
 x+Ø+r-ok-ib'e-j                            lee tz'i7  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-enter-INST-PLAIN the dog  
 pa jah  
 in house

'While the man was standing in front of the house,  
 the dog entered into the house.' (lit., 'The man  
 was standing in front of the house, the dog  
 entered in it into the house.'

(d) lee achih u-g'ab' k+Ø+u-war-ab'e-ej

'The man sleeps on his arm.' (lit., 'The man, it  
 is his arm that he sleeps on.'

(e) lee achih lee b'oolaaɟ

the man the log  
 x+Ø+u-t'uy-ul-ib'e-ej  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-sit-POS-INST-PLAIN

'The man sat on the log.' (lit., 'The man, it  
 was the log that he was sitting on.')

The sentence in (109a) contains the word *ach'aab'exiik*, which is the Passive Verbal Noun corresponding to the transitive verb stem *-ch'aa-be-ej* 'to talk to', which is apparently derived from a transitive verb root *\*-ch'ah*, which also appears in the intransitive verb *-ch'aaw* 'to talk' (from /ch'ah+ow/). It can be seen that the derivation



## NOTES

1. Note that the particle *raj* 'soon, almost, DESIDERATIVE' seen below in (4b) (*rāj* in Cantel, *raj* ~ *kraj* in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, *kraj* ~ *laj* in Santa María Chiquimula) is historically derived from the verb *-aaj* 'want' in the Imperfective aspect and with third person singular arguments. Its use in examples such as the following suggest that the complement of *-aaj* did not always require the same tense/aspect/mood clitic as the main verb:

(i) (k)raj x+in+b'ee-k  
 almost PERFV+1SG.B+go-PLAIN  
 'I almost went; I was going to go'

(ii) (k)raj ch+in+b'ee-k  
 soon POT+1SG.B+go-PLAIN  
 'I am going soon'

When (k)raj is used with a verb in the Imperfective, it may also be understood to have a desiderative meaning, thus betraying its origin in the verb *-aaj*:

(iii) (k)raj k+in+b'ee-k  
 DESID IMPERF+1SG.B+go-PLAIN  
 'I want to go; maybe I will go'

2. In (4c) it can be seen that the vowel of the verb *-b'iij* unexpectedly does not shorten in non phrase-



final position. This is presumably because this verb comes from something like \*-b'ih-i-ij. Note that in some Cakchiquel dialects this verb has the form -biyij (?< -b'ih-i-ij) while in some others it has the form -b'i7j (?< \*-b'i7-i-ij). In Santa María Chiquimula, however, this verb has apparently been assimilated in form to other verbs which end in Vj, and the vowel does shorten in sentences like (4c) in that dialect.

3. Chomsky (1986:84) suggests that Gerunds may have the structure of an NP dominating a clause.
4. The Intransitive Action Nominalization wi7m 'eating' in (23), derived from the intransitive verb root -wa7 'to eat', is the form found in the Momostenango dialect. It is derived from the underlying form /wa7+iim/ by the phonological rule /CV<sub>1</sub>7V<sub>2</sub>/ > CyV<sub>2</sub>7 discussed in section 2.1.3. In other dialects this phonological rule does not apply to this word; and, thus, this word has the expected form wa7i(i)m in these other dialects.
5. I am not aware of any transitive verb in Quiché which is like the English verb *promise* in (i), where the agent argument of the embedded clause is coreferential with the matrix subject rather than the matrix direct object.

(1) John promised Peter to kill the man.

6. The final consonant of the particle *taj* is dropped in non phrase-final position.

7. The distinctions being discussed could perhaps be illustrated by the following examples:

(i) laa k+at+b'ee-k  
 Q IMPERF+2SG.B+go-PLAIN  
 'Are you going?' (non-negative, real)

(ii) laa ma k+at+b'ee-k  
 NEG  
 'Aren't you going?' (negative, real)

(iii) laa k+at+b'ee taj  
 IRREALIS  
 'Would you go?' (non-negative, unreal)

(iv) laa ma k+at+b'ee taj  
 'Wouldn't you go?' (negative, unreal)

It must be pointed out, however, that I have not yet been able to check all of the above sentences with a native speaker.

8. This statement is made under the assumption that *te* in *xaa te nee* is the particle *te*<sup>7</sup> 'suddenly'. There is a good possibility, however, considering the semantics of

the form, that this is in fact the Irrealis Particle *ta* after having undergone vowel harmony. If the latter is correct, then of course the Irrealis Particle is used with this negative form. Even so, however, it is still the case that the Irrealis Particle is never used following the predicate with any of the forms meaning 'never'.

9. The same phenomenon can also be seen in reflexive/reciprocal non-finite complements like the one shown in (i).

(i)  $x+\emptyset+ki$ -chap                      u-kuna-x-ik  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-grab    3SG.A-cure-PASS-NOM  
 k-iib'  
 1SG.A-REFLEX  
 'They went to cure each other.'

10. Ayres (1980) argues that in all Mayan reflexive constructions the direct object NP consists of the Reflexive Relational Noun plus its (not necessarily empty) possessor NP and that the subject NP is "deleted under identity" with the possessor of the Relational Noun. Ayres' resulting structure would be quite similar to what is being proposed here as the structure of sentences like (75). However, this type of structure would be clearly impossible for ordinary

reflexive sentences with non-expletive subjects because this would violate the binding conditions on referential noun phrases: Ayres' theory would result in a lexical NP possessor of the Relational Noun being bound to an empty NP which c-commanded the lexical NP; however, this is impossible since lexical NPs must be free (= not bound) everywhere (Chomsky 1982:20).

11. As with other Verb Phrase Compounds, the Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán dialects prefer to use the Active Verbal Noun in *-ooj* when forming this construction from a transitive verb root. Thus, in these dialects the form seen in (78a) would preferably appear as seen in (i).

(i) *tzaq-oj iib'* 'getting lost'

12. In the Active voice in Quiché, a transitive verb always has exactly two arguments. There are no ditransitive verbs in Quiché. Even the verb *-ya7* 'to give' has only two obligatory arguments. The indirect object is always optional and, if present, is always introduced by a Relational Noun. When the indirect object is not present, the verb *-ya7* is usually best translated as 'to put, to place, to leave (something)' rather than 'to give'.
13. It is not perfectly clear whether the fronted

Relational Noun is in the Topic Position or the Focus Position. The fact that my informant consistently provided examples of such sentences with an independent pronoun in the Relational Noun phrase might suggest that the Relational Noun phrase is in the Focus Position. However, the meaning of these sentences does not seem to involve any kind of contrastive focus, which one would expect if the Relational Noun phrase were in the Focus Position. Therefore, I assume that it is in fact in the Topic Position.

14. In section 3.4.4.2 it was noted that some Relational Nouns are preceded by prepositions while others are not. When a preposition does precede a Relational Noun, it is presumably that preposition that assigns case and a  $\theta$ -role to the Relational Noun phrase. Two of the Relational Nouns that are not preceded by prepositions are *-iib'* and *-umaal*. In this section and in section 8.3 I tried to show how these two Relational Nouns were assigned case and a  $\theta$ -role. Two other Relational Nouns without prepositions are the Genitive Relational Noun *-ee(ch)* and the Comitative Relational Noun *-uuk'*. A Genitive Relational Noun Phrase presumably receives case within the NP of which it is a part. It is not clear what happens with the Comitative phrase, however. One possibility may be that Comitative Relational Noun Phrases function as locative

adverbs in the clause and, thus, are exempt from the Case Filter and the  $\theta$ -criterion.

15. Given that the patient NP in the Absolutive Antipassive construction is in the dative case and thus appears as an indirect object, it may be the case that this construction would be best treated as an example of "2 to 3 Retreat" (Postal 1976, Davies 1984) in the theory of Relational Grammar rather than as an Antipassive.
16. Norman (1978:472) also discusses two examples from the Santa María Chiquimula dialect, which I gave to him. There is some question, however, as to whether the second of these examples is correct.
17. From what I was told by a native speaker of the Nahualá dialect, it would appear that cases of a Relational Noun being used with an instrument NP in the Instrumental Voice are not entirely unknown in Nahualá either although it is apparently omitted in the preferred form.

## CHAPTER 9

## SYNTAX III: WH-MOVEMENT

The principal goal of this chapter will be to present an account of WH-movement in Quiché. In order to do this, it will be necessary to provide a syntactic analysis of the so-called Focus Antipassive construction, which was postponed in section 8.4.2.

The Focus (or Agentive) Antipassive construction is not, strictly speaking, an Antipassive if that term is taken to mean, as it often is, a construction involving an intransitivized verb form, an agent or experiencer NP in S function and an optional patient or theme NP in an oblique case. Such a definition of Antipassive does fit the Absolutive Antipassive construction discussed in 8.4.2; however, in the Focus Antipassive neither the agent nor the patient/theme is optional or in an oblique case.

Nevertheless the name, originally proposed by Smith-Stark (cf. Smith-Stark 1978), is not entirely unappropriate since the verb form used in the Focus Antipassive is in some cases the same as that used in the Absolutive Antipassive. As was discussed in section 5.3, the Absolutive Antipassive verb form is derived by means of the suffix *-an* ~ *-on* ~ *-un* on root transitive verbs and the suffix *-n* on derived transitive verb bases. The verb form used in the Focus Antipassive is also derived by means of the suffix *-n* on





The same is also true of WH-phrases which are non-nuclear arguments of the clause. As was mentioned in section 8.4.3, when a WH-phrase is locative, the Locative Focus particle must follow the verb. This is also true of other types of WH-phrases such as sources, goals and comitatives. Notice that all of these can be considered locatives in a broad sense. Some examples are seen in (2).

(2) (a) ja+wi+chi7            k+at+b'ee            wii  
           WH+LOC.FOC+here IMPERF+2SG.B-go LOC.FOC  
           'Where are you going?'

(b) ja k+at+b'ee            wi            chi7  
       WH IMPERF+2SG.B-go LOC.FOC here  
       'Where are you going?'

(c) jachin r-ee  
       who            3SG.A-possession  
       x+Ø+aa-riq                            wii  
       PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-find LOC.FOC  
       'Who did you get it from?' (lit., 'Of whom  
       did you find it?')

(d) jachin (ch+Ø-ee)  
       who            at+3SG.B-possession  
       x+Ø+aa-yaa                            wii  
       PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-give LOC.FOC  
       'Who did you give it to?'

- (d) jachin r-uuk'  
 who 3SG.A-with  
 x+Ø+aa-b'an wii  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do LOC.FOC  
 'Who did you do it with?'

The form of the locative question shown in (2a) is fairly general in Quiché (except possibly for the form of the WH-phrase meaning 'where?'; see section 6.2.4). In Momostenango, however, an alternative form is possible, which is illustrated in (2b).

As was discussed in section 8.4.3, instrumental questions require the Instrumental Voice; and for some speakers, these may also have the Locative Focus particle. Most other types of WH-questions, such as those with reason or temporal WH-phrases, do not require the Locative Focus particle, as seen in (3).

- (3) (a) jas ch+Ø-ee x+Ø+aa-b'an-o  
 what at+3SG.A-poss PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-do-PLAIN  
 'Why did you do it?'

- (b) jampa7 x+Ø+b'ee Kelaju7  
 when PERFV+3SG.B+go Quezaltenango  
 'When did he go to Quezaltenango.'

When the WH-phrase is in A function, however, the situation is quite different from what we have seen so far.

A WH-phrase in A function appears to be in COMP just like any other WH-phrase, but in this case the Focus Antipassive form of the verb must be used, as seen in (4).

- (4) jachin x+Ø+paq'-ow ri sii7  
 who PERFV+3SG.B+split-FOC the firewood  
 'Who split the firewood?'

Sentence (4) is an example of the Focus Antipassive construction.

Many of the properties of WH-questions that we have just seen also apply to relative clauses. This should not be surprising since relative clauses in many languages also involve WH-movement. In Quiché relative clauses there often is no overt WH-phrase although they may optionally be introduced by one of the definite articles. Nevertheless, the Locative Focus particle and the Focus Antipassive construction are used in relative clauses under the same conditions that they are used in WH-questions. Some examples are seen in (5).

- (5) (a) x+Ø+inw-il ri aag [ (ri)  
 PERFV+3SG.B+1SG.A-see the pig the  
 x+Ø+uu-kam-isa-j ri achii ]  
 PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-die-CAUS-PLAIN the man  
 'I saw the pig that the man killed.'



8.4.3, the Instrumental Voice must be used when an instrument NP is relativized.

The same facts that we have seen in WH-questions and in relative clauses also apply to sentences with Focussed NP's. Some examples can be seen in (6).

(6) (a) aree ri achii x+Ø+aa-ch'ay-o

FOCUS the man PERFV+3SG.B+2SG.A-hit-PLAIN

'It was the man that you hit.'

(b) aree ri achii x+Ø+q'ab'ar-ik

FOCUS the man PERFV+3SG.B+get.drunk-PLAIN

'It was the man who got drunk.'

(c) pa tinimit x+Ø+uu-log' wii

in town PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-buy LOC.FOC

'It was in town that he bought it.'

(d) aree ri at x+at+ch'ay-ow ri achii

FOCUS the you PERFV+2SG.B+hit-FOC the man

'You were the one who hit the man.'

It can be seen that in each of these sentences there is a constituent in preverbal position just as there is in WH-questions. In (6c) it can be seen that the Locative Focus particle is used when an locative phrase is focussed. Again it can be seen in (6a) and (6d) that when and NP in A function is focussed, but not an NP in O function, the Focus

Antipassive construction must be used. As was discussed in 8.4.3, the Instrumental Voice must be used when an instrument NP is focussed. Given that sentences with Focussed NP's have the same characteristics as WH-questions and relative clauses, I will assume that sentences with focussed constituents also involve WH-movement. This hypothesis will be discussed in greater detail below.

First, however, I will discuss in greater detail the characteristics of the focus antipassive construction. One curious fact about this construction is that while sentences like (4), (5d), and (6d) seem to be transitive, the Focus Antipassive verb form that appears in these sentences is intransitive. This can be seen from the fact that it has no set A prefix and from the fact, illustrated in (7), that this verb form takes the Plain Status phrase final suffix *-ik*.

- (7) aree ri at x+at+ch'ay-ow-ik  
 FOCUS the you PERFV+2SG.B+hit-FOC-PLAIN  
 'You were the one who hit him/her.'

However, as can be seen in (6d), the patient NP is not marked by a preposition or Relational Noun in spite of the fact that the verb does not agree with this NP either.

It is not always the case that the Focus Antipassive construction is used when an NP in A function is focussed.

There is a restriction on the Focus Antipassive construction such that (roughly) either the underlying A or the underlying O or both must be third person. This is not a problem for WH-questions or relative clauses; however, one can easily construct clefts which involve two non-third person NP's; and in such cases an ordinary transitive verb is used as shown in (8).<sup>1</sup>

- (8) aree ri at x+in+a-ch'ay-o  
 FOCUS the you PERFV+1SG.B+2SG.A-hit-PLAIN  
 'You were the one who hit me.'

Furthermore, even in cases where the Focus Antipassive construction is permissible, it is sometimes not used in cases, like the one shown in (9), where no ambiguity results.

- (9) jachin x+at+u-ch'ay-o  
 who PERFV+2SG.B+3SG.A-hit-PLAIN  
 'Who hit you?'

Some speakers, however, may have a lower tolerance than others for sentences like (9).

Another curious fact about the Focus Antipassive construction is that the verb does not always agree with the NP in "underlying A function" (i. e., the agent or experiencer NP). Thus, if the Focus Antipassive

construction is used in the expression of the question shown in (9), it will appear as in (10) where the verb agrees with the NP in "underlying O function" (i. e., the patient or theme NP).

- (10) jachin x+at+ch'ay-ow-ik  
 who PERFV+2SG.B+hit-FOCUS-PLAIN  
 'Who hit you?'

Some speakers who have a high tolerance for sentences like (9) may actually prefer (9) to (10). Those who have a low tolerance for sentences like (9) will prefer (10). However, all speakers will accept (10) as grammatical.

The actual verb agreement rule for the Focus Antipassive construction is that the verb agrees with that NP (either the underlying A or the underlying O) which is highest on the hierarchy shown in (11).

- (11) non-third person > 3PL > 3SG

Some additional examples illustrating this are shown in (12).

- (12) (a) aree ri achy-aab' x+e7+ch'ay-ow-ik  
 FOCUS the man-PL PERFV+3PL.B+hit-FOC-PLAIN  
 'It was the men who hit him.'



(b) aree ri achy-aab' x+in+ch'ay-ow-ik  
 FOCUS the man-PL PERFV+1SG.B+hit-FOC-PLAIN  
 'It was the men who hit me.'

This kind of situation makes it somewhat difficult to say which NP, the underlying A or the underlying O, is actually in S function in the Focus Antipassive construction.

I will now turn to a more detailed syntactic analysis of these phenomena. It is a fairly simple matter to show that Quiché has a VP constituent which includes the verb and the NP in O function. This can be done by considering the "weak crossover" phenomenon as illustrated in (13).

(13) jachin<sub>i</sub> x+Ø+uu-ch'ay ri  
 who PERFV+3SG.B+3SG.A-hit the  
 r<sub>j</sub>-achalaal  
 3SG.A-relative  
 'Who<sub>i</sub> did his/her<sub>j</sub> relative hit.'

In this Quiché sentence, as in its English translation, the WH-phrase cannot be coreferential with the possessor of the head of the NP in A function. This is easily accounted for if we assume that the structure of this sentence is as shown in (14).

(14) [ [ jachin<sub>i</sub> ] [ [ INFL [ [ x+Ø+uu-ch'ay ]  
 S' COMP S I' VP V  
 [ e<sub>i</sub> ] ] ] [ [ ri ] [ r-achalaal ] [ e<sub>j</sub> ] ] ] ]  
 NP NP DET N NP

The empty NP dominated by VP is the trace of the movement of the WH-phrase *which* into COMP. Such WH-traces are variables and, hence, subject to clause C of the "binding conditions" in (15) (cf. Chomsky 1982:20).

- (15) A. An anaphor is locally A-bound in its governing category.
- B. A pronominal is locally A-free in its governing category.
- C. An R-expression (i. e., a name or a variable) is locally A-free.

As discussed previously, "bound" means coindexed with a c-commanding constituent. The term "free" means 'not bound'. A constituent is said to be "A-bound" if it is bound to a constituent in an "argument (or "A-") position". If X is "locally bound" to Y, then there is no constituent Z which also binds X and is itself bound to Y. A variable is defined as a category which is "locally  $\bar{A}$ -bound", i. e. locally bound by an operator in a non-argument position such as COMP. The notion of governing category has been defined in a number of ways; however, for present purposes, the simple definition given in (16) (Chomsky 1982:20) will suffice.

- (16) The governing category of X is the minimal S or NP which contains X and a governor of X.

The notion of government was defined in (67) of Chapter 8. In (14) the WH-trace, which is governed by the verb, is locally A-free in its governing category, namely, S; and it is locally  $\bar{A}$ -bound by its antecedent, the WH-phrase in COMP. Therefore, the WH-trace is a variable. Empty categories such as WH-trace are also subject to the "Empty Category Principle" (ECP), which states that non-pronominal empty categories must be properly governed (Chomsky 1986:17). Proper government is defined in (17) (Chomsky 1986:17).

(17)  $\alpha$  properly governs  $\beta$  iff  $\alpha$   $\theta$ -governs or antecedent-governs  $\beta$ .

Antecedent-government holds of a link ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) of a chain where  $\alpha$  governs  $\beta$ . The chain relation is expressed by coindexing. The notion of  $\theta$ -government is defined as in (18) (Chomsky 1986:19).

(18)  $\alpha$   $\theta$ -governs  $\beta$  iff  $\alpha$  is a zero-level category (i. e. a zero-bar category of X-bar theory: V, N, A, P, etc.) that  $\theta$ -marks  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  are sisters.

The WH-trace in (14) is properly governed by the verb since the verb both governs and assigns a  $\theta$ -role to the direct object position.

Like Spanish, and unlike English, Quiché is a "pro-drop" (or "null-subject") language since the subject position in a tensed clause can be occupied by an empty

category. This empty category is usually taken, following Chomsky (1982:78-89), to be a pronominal empty category called "pro", subject to clause B of the binding conditions. The presence of pro in subject position is licensed in languages like Spanish and Quiché by a relatively rich set of subject agreement (or SAGR) features in a tensed INFL. Since English does not have such a rich set of SAGR features, pro is not licensed in subject position. Thus, English does not have null subjects in tensed clauses. In Quiché the SAGR features show up at s-structure as the set A prefix on a transitive verb.

Since transitive verbs in Quiché also agree with the NP in O function by means of the set B clitics, and since the "pro-drop" phenomenon also applies to NP's in O function in Quiché, I assume that pro may also appear in direct object position and that the INFL node includes object agreement features (OAGR). SAGR governs the subject position and assigns case to that position. OAGR, however, does not govern the direct object position. In many languages it is assumed that a transitive verb assigns case to the direct object position that it governs. However, in Quiché, as will be seen presently, it seems that the verb itself does not assign case to the direct object position. Rather, following Safir (1985:172-269), I assume that OAGR in INFL may assign case to a set B clitic on the verb if INFL

governs the VP. Since the set B clitic is part of the verb word, it governs the direct object position and transmits its case to that position. This is quite similar to Safir's analysis of the free inversion phenomenon in certain Romance languages in which a subject clitic appears on the verb when the subject NP undergoes inversion and is adjoined to the verb phrase. Safir argues that if INFL governs the VP, it may assign case to a subject clitic base generated on the verb. This subject clitic can then transmit its case to the subject NP adjoined to the VP.

The other empty category in (14) is the pronominal possessor of the head of the NP in A function, *rachalaal*. This empty category must also be *pro*: it must be free in its governing category (here, the NP in A function), therefore it must be pronominal; however, it cannot be *PRO* since, as can be seen by the set A prefix on *rachalaal*, it is case marked and, therefore, governed. As discussed previously, I assume that a possessor NP is governed and assigned case by possessor agreement (PAGR), which is manifested at s-structure by the set A prefixed on the head noun.

Suppose now that the two empty categories in (14) were coindexed. In this case they would both be locally  $\bar{A}$ -bound by the WH-phrase in COMP. But such a situation generally seems to be ruled out in languages of the world. One way of

talking about this has been to say that this would violate the "bijection principle" (Koopman and Sportisch 1982), which stipulates a one-to-one correspondence between operators (such as WH-phrases) and variables (such as WH-traces) and, thus, accounts for the weak crossover phenomenon.<sup>2</sup> If the two empty categories in (14) were in any other configuration, that is, if the WH-trace were immediately dominated by S, and if the NP in A function were either immediately dominated by S or dominated by VP, then there would be no weak crossover effect if the empty categories were coindexed: the WH-trace would c-command the other empty category so only the WH-trace would be locally  $\bar{A}$ -bound. Thus, this situation would not be ruled out by the bijection principle. However, since in fact the WH-phrase and the possessor of the head of the NP in A function in (13) must be disjoint in reference, the structure must be that shown in (14).

I now want to consider the structure of sentences like (4) and (10). As noted previously, this type of sentence is unusual in a number of ways. Such sentences appear to be transitive, but the verb is clearly intransitive. Furthermore, this intransitive verb agrees with the NP in underlying O function; thus it is this NP which appears to be in derived S function. The grammatical function of the WH-phrase, however, which would appear to be the NP in underlying A function, is not overtly indicated by verb

agreement, preposition, or relational noun. One further fact should be noticed about the Focus Antipassive verb form: it can only be used in WH-questions like (4) and (10), relative clauses like (5d), and Focus constructions like (6d) and (7). This verb form can never be used in any simple declarative transitive or intransitive main clause (except in the special case to be discussed below). All of these facts will have to be accounted for in some way.

The fact that the verb in (10) does not agree with the WH-phrase calls to mind the formation of WH-questions in Palauan as discussed by Georgopolous (1985). Palauan, like Quiché, is a VOA language. Transitive verbs in Palauan, as in Quiché, show both subject and object agreement; however, in Palauan, when a WH-phrase that appears in a preverbal  $\bar{A}$ -position is the subject of a transitive verb, the verb lacks a subject agreement prefix. Georgopolous does not consider why this is the case, but let's assume for the moment that this type of WH-question in Quiché has a structure similar to that seen in Palauan. Quiché and other Mayan languages, however, unlike some languages, have a very rigid distinction between morphologically transitive and intransitive verbs. One cannot simply leave the subject agreement prefix off of a transitive verb in Quiché as appears to be done in Palauan. I will for the moment, then, assume that the structure of sentences like (4) and

(10) is exactly what would be expected for a transitive sentence whose subject had undergone WH-movement except that there is no set A prefix on the verb, which entails that the verb is morphologically intransitive. This is shown in (19) (cf. 4).

(19) [ jachin<sub>i</sub> [ [ INFL [ x+Ø+paq'-ow  
           S'          S  I'          VP  
   [ ri sii7 ] ] ] [ e<sub>i</sub> ] ] ]  
   NP                                  NP

I assume that INFL in (19) includes OAGR features but no SAGR. OAGR assigns case to the set B clitic, which in turn transmits its case to the NP in direct object position. Since there is no SAGR there is no set A prefix; hence the verb form is intransitive. We do have to assume, however, that the Focus Antipassive verb form, though intransitive, does assign two  $\theta$ -roles like a transitive verb: an agent-type role to the subject position and a patient/theme type role to the direct object position. Otherwise there would be a violation of the  $\theta$ -criterion. We have already seen a similar situation with Passives in section 8.4.1. The empty category in (19) is properly governed by the conindexed WH-phrase in COMP; thus there is no ECP violation. However, since there is no SAGR, the subject is not casemarked. This latter point has one very desirable consequence and at the same time another consequence which would seem to be disastrous for the hypothesis being considered here. The



desirable consequence is that this could explain why the Focus Antipassive verb form only appears in structures involving WH-movement: if a non-empty NP appeared in subject position, it would not be casemarked, which would be a violation of the Case Filter; and if any empty category besides WH-trace appeared in subject position, it would not be properly governed. Thus there would be a violation of the ECP. The disastrous consequence, however, is that the structure (19) cannot possibly be correct since WH-trace must be casemarked (Chomsky 1981:175-83).

There is a way of getting around this difficulty, however. First of all, let's reconsider Focus constructions like the ones seen in (6d) and (7). At first glance it might be assumed that focussed constituents are simply moved into COMP as are WH-phrases. However, there is some evidence that the clefted constituent is in fact in a higher clause. To see this, we have to reconsider negation. As was discussed in section 8.2, simple negation in Quiché is indicated by the Negative Particle before the predicate and the Irrealis Particle *taj* after the predicate. We have also seen that the Irrealis Particle loses its final consonant in non phrase-final position. Now consider Focus constructions like the one in (20).

(20) are7 x+Ø+ch'ay-ow ri achii  
 s/he PERFV+3SG.B+hit-FOCUS the man  
 'S/he was the one who hit the man.'

In such a sentence the focussed constituent may be negated; and when it is, the Irrealis Particle, if it appears directly before the verb as it does in (21), must have its phrase-final form *taj*.

(21) ma are7 taj/\*ta x+Ø+ch'ay-ow ri achii  
 NEG s/he IRR PERFV++3SG.B-hit-FOCUS the man  
 'S/he was not the one who hit the man.'

This suggests that the Focussed constituent is actually a non-verbal predicate and that there is a clause boundary immediately before the Focus Antipassive verb form.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, the structure of Focus constructions in Quiché is similar to that of relative clauses like (5d). It is also not unlike the structure of cleft constructions in English. I would like to suggest that the structure of WH-questions like (10) is also like that of Focus constructions and relative clauses; that is to say, the WH-phrase in (10) is not simply moved to COMP as was suggested in (19), but rather is in a higher clause as is the Focussed (or clefted) constituent in (21). I would also suggest that the Focus Antipassive construction still involves WH-movement, but that it is PRO that undergoes WH-movement rather than a non-



case to the subject position. Thus, let's assume that the structure of (10) is not (19), but rather something more like (24).

(24) [jachin<sub>i</sub> [ [INFL [x+at+ch'ay-ow [ e<sub>j</sub> ] ] ] [ e<sub>i</sub> ] ] ]  
           S'          S I'        VP                  NP        NP

PRO cannot stay in subject position in (24) because it is governed by a tensed INFL, so it must move into COMP where it is ungoverned and where it is coindexed with jachin by principles of control. The trace in subject position is properly governed by the coindexed PRO in COMP; however, since there is no SAGR in INFL, the subject is not a casemarked position. Therefore, the only thing that can occupy this position is a trace left by the movement of PRO to COMP. This, then, accounts for the fact that the Focus Antipassive verb form can only appear in the three types of constructions we have seen which involve WH-movement: since the subject position is not casemarked, there would be a violation of the Case Filter if anything other than the trace of a WH-moved PRO occupied that position.

There still seems to be a problem, however, with the analysis illustrated in (24). This can be seen by considering the sentence in (25).

(25) jachin<sub>i</sub> x+Ø+ch'ay-ow                  ri r<sub>j</sub>-achalaal  
       who          PERFV+3SG.B+hit-FOCUS the 3SG.A-relative  
       'Who<sub>i</sub> hit his/her<sub>j</sub> relative.'

Here the WH-phrase cannot be coreferential with the possessor of the head of the NP in direct object position (cf. 13). But it is not clear why this should be since, given the structure in (24), the WH-trace would c-command the possessor NP, so coreference should be possible as it is in English. One might consider the possibility that the NP's in subject and direct object position in (24) should be reversed so that neither the WH-trace nor the possessor NP will c-command the other. Though this would solve the coreference problem, it would introduce at least one new problem: the Focus Antipassive verb form would have to assign an agent/experiencer-type role to the direct object position and a patient/theme-type role to the subject position. This is the opposite of what we have in (13) where the transitive verb assigns the agent/experiencer-type role to the subject position and the patient/theme type role to the direct object position. But there is evidence that the Focus Antipassive verb form must assign a theme/patient role to a sister NP just like a transitive verb does. This can be seen by considering again the kind of Verb Phrase Compounds that were discussed in sections 3.4.2.4 and 3.4.3, an example of which is shown in (26).

- (26) [ b'an-ow sii7 ]  
 NP  
 do-FOCUS firewood  
 'firewood making'

The Focus Antipassive verb stem in (26) clearly must be assigned a patient role to *sii7*; and *sii7* clearly must be a sister to the verb stem. It could not be in any kind of "subject" position because if it were, it would be ungoverned since there is no set A prefix in this construction. If the verb stem in (26) assigns a patient/theme-type role to a sister NP, then it must do likewise in (24).

There is a way around this dilemma, however. First of all, let's reconsider the idiomatic construction *xuuk'am awach* 'you got accustomed' that was discussed in section 8.3 (see example 74). As discussed previously, *a-wach* 'your face' is the direct object of the transitive verb *-k'am* 'to bring/take' in this construction while the subject is a nonreferential empty pronominal much like expletive *it* in English, which is a nonreferential lexical pronominal. Expletive *it* in English can only show up as the subject of a verb like *seem* or of "weather verbs" like *rain* which assign case but do not assign a  $\theta$ -role to subject position. It can be seen that the empty expletive pronominal in the Quiché idiom is casemarked as indicated by the third person set A prefix *uu-* on the verb. It would also seem reasonable to assume that this empty expletive does not receive a  $\theta$ -role. However, this is somewhat problematical because the transitive verb *-k'am* in this idiom is an ordinary transitive verb which usually assigns an agent role to its







second person singular and plural respectively. As was discussed in that section, these clitics can, among other things, appear after a transitive verb to mark a agreement with a formal second person NP in A function. An example of this is shown in (30).

- (30) [ [ [ INFL [ [ x+Ø+paq'+laa [ e ] ] ] ] ] ]  
       S' S I'       VP VP                   NP  
   PERFV+3SG.B+split+2SG.FORMAL  
   [ ri   sii7 ] ] [ e ] ] ]  
   NP                   NP  
   the   firewood  
   'You (sg. formal) split the firewood.'

As was discussed previously, there is no set A prefix in sentences like (30). The person and number of the NP in A function is indicated solely by the clitic *laa* which appears in its special position after the verb. Furthermore, no non-empty NP can appear in subject position in such a sentence, not even the independent pronoun. A way to account for this would be to say that in sentences like (30), the person, number, and case features in SAGR are not assigned to the subject position, but rather are assigned to the clitic *laa*. As discussed previously, AGR features in INFL can be assigned to a clitic on the verb if INFL governs the VP. For this reason SAGR does not surface as a set A prefix. Furthermore, since the case features of SAGR are assigned to the clitic, the subject position is not



with *jachin* in the higher clause. Since there is no SAGR in INFL, the verb is intransitive (there is no set A prefix); and the subject position is not casemarked, so no lexical NP can appear there. However, the subject position is governed by a tensed INFL, so the subject position is not an option for movement of PRO. Since there is no casemarked subject clitic to transfer case to the leftmost NP position, no lexical NP can appear there either. OAGR in INFL assigns its case to the set B clitic, which transmits this to the direct object position. The important new feature to note in (31) is that the leftmost NP and the possessor of the head of the direct object NP do not c-command each other. Thus, these two NP's cannot be coreferential, as was observed in (25). If these two NP's were coreferential, they would both be locally  $\bar{A}$ -bound by the same operator (PRO in COMP), which would be a violation of the Bijection Principle.

One feature of the Focus Antipassive construction that has yet to be accounted for is the variable verb agreement pattern. It was claimed above that at least one of the two arguments in the Focus Antipassive construction must be third person and that the verb agrees with that NP which is higher on the hierarchy shown in (11).<sup>4</sup> Actually, however, this is not quite correct. It is possible to have two non-third person NP's if one of them is a formal second person

NP. An example of this is shown in (32).

- (32) laal                    x+in+ch'ay-ow+laa  
       you.SG.FORMAL    PERFV+1SG.B+hit-FOCUS+2SG.FORMAL  
       'You (sg. formal) were the one who hit me.'

This demonstrates that in the Focus Antipassive construction there are two clitic positions just as there is in an Active transitive clause. There is a problem here, however, in that we have to assume that the postverbal clitic in (32) somehow does not assign case to the VP-internal NP position that is assigned the agent role. If it did, we would expect, contrary to fact, that a lexical NP could appear in this position. However, if the clitic laa did transmit case to the NP position it governs, it would have to receive the case features from SAGR in INFL. It has been claimed that INFL in the Focus Antipassive construction does not have SAGR features; therefore, case cannot be assigned to laa in (32) and no case features can be transmitted to the NP position governed by laa. But there is still a problem in explaining the presence of laa in a sentence like (32) if there is no SAGR. I will assume that in fact INFL in the Focus Antipassive construction does contain the person and number features of SAGR but merely lacks the case features of SAGR. If this is true, then we can still account for the fact that there is no set A prefix in this construction and for the fact that the NP position which is assigned the

agent/experiencer role cannot contain a lexical NP. We can also account for the presence of the clitic *laa* in (32) by assuming that this is licensed by the person and number features of SAGR. This may make sense given that the Focus Antipassive verb form assigns two  $\theta$ -roles.

With this in mind, we are now in a position to account for the verb agreement pattern of the Focus Antipassive construction. We have seen that, like a transitive verb, the Focus Antipassive verb form has two clitic positions: the normal preverbal set B position and another postverbal position which may be occupied by *laa* or *alag*. I will further assume that the third person singular set B clitic, which is phonologically null, may appear in either of these two clitic positions.<sup>25</sup> Since INFL in the Focus Antipassive construction has case features only in OAGR, not in SAGR, only one NP position in the VP can be casemarked. However, it is possible to mark the person and number features of both of the VP-internal NP positions. Thus in a sentence like (6d), OAGR assigns case only to the direct object NP *ri achii* via the null postverbal clitic. However, there are two NP positions here: the direct object position, which is assigned the patient role, and the non-casemarked position occupied by the WH-trace, which is assigned the agent role. Both of these positions are governed by the verb, which includes the two clitic positions. Thus, the two clitic positions also govern both of the NP positions. The direct

object position is occupied by a third person singular NP, and the clitic agreeing with its person and number features (and which transmits its case) is in the postverbal clitic position. Since the WH-trace is coindexed with PRO, which is coindexed with the second person singular pronoun in the higher clause, the clitic which agrees with its person and number features appears in the preverbal set B clitic position.

The non-null set B clitics can only appear in the preverbal clitic position. Thus, in a sentence like (10), the second person set B clitic still appears in the preverbal set B position even though in this case the set B clitic marks agreement with the patient/theme NP rather than with the agent/experiencer NP like it does in (6d). In a sentence like (12b) it can be seen that the set B clitic position is occupied by the first person singular clitic. This only leaves the postverbal position available for a clitic agreeing with the third person plural NP. However, the third person plural set B clitic may not occupy this position; only the third person singular and the second person formal clitics may appear here. Nevertheless, sentence (12b), with a null third person singular clitic agreeing with the third person plural NP, is still acceptable since plurality is clearly marked in the NP, and plural verb agreement is often optional in the third person

anyway. When a third person plural NP cooccurs with a third person singular NP as in (12a) the third person singular clitic may appear in the postverbal position thus leaving the preverbal position available for the third person plural set B clitic.

Thus the verb agreement pattern of the Focus Antipassive construction follows automatically from the kind of structure I have argued for in this construction. Furthermore, we can now account for the fact that at least one of the NPs in the Focus Antipassive construction must be either third person or formal second person. The reason is quite simply that if both of the arguments were non-third person and non-formal, then both of them would have to show non-null set B agreement. However, there is only one clitic position that can be occupied by a non-null set B clitic. It would be impossible to have two non-null set B clitics in the same clause. Thus, two non-third person non-formal NP's would be impossible in the Focus Antipassive construction.

The Focus Antipassive verb form is used in one other construction that has not yet been discussed. This is a noun incorporation construction in which a simple unmodified patient or theme noun immediately follows a Focus Antipassive verb form, and an agent or experiencer NP follows the incorporated patient or theme noun (unless the agent or experiencer NP is put into the preverbal Topic





(e) junaam k+ee+ket-ow                      ajiiij  
 same        IMPERF+3PL.B+cut-FOC    sugar.cane  
 la7    lee    oxib'    achij-aab'  
 that    the    three    man-PL  
 'Those three men sugar cane-cut in the same  
 way.'

According to Mondloch (1981:254), the incorporated noun can also be the Reflexive Relational Noun, as illustrated in (34). This is the only case in which the incorporated noun can be possessed.

(34) b'alaj    utz    k+at+ch'aj-ow                      aw-iib'  
 very        good    IMPERF+2SG.B+wash-FOC    2SG.A-REFLEX  
 'You self-wash very well.'

The example in (35), from Henne (1980:17) is presumably from the Cantel dialect.

(35) ri al Chi7l xa tajin  
 the FEMALE Cecilia just PROG  
 k+Ø+qa-sa-n q'ij  
 IMPERF+3SG.B+descend-CAUS-ANTIPASS day  
 r-uk' ri u-mya7l ri  
 3SG.A-with the 3SG.A-man's.daughter the  
 a Xwan ch+u-chi7 ri pila  
 MALE John at+3SG.A-mouth the wash.basin  
 'Cecilia is just passing time with John's daughter  
 near the wash basin.'

This appears to be a case of a noun incorporation construction which has become lexicalized as a compound intransitive verb (cf. Mondloch 1981:256-7).

From the examples in (33) it can be seen that the verb agreement pattern in the noun incorporation construction is the same as that observed in the Focus Antipassive construction. The incorporated noun will always be third person, thus satisfying the requirement that at least one of the arguments of the Focus Antipassive verb form be third person. The verb will then agree with a non-third person argument if there is one, as in (33a). If there is no non-third person argument, the verb will show third person plural agreement with whichever argument is third person plural, as illustrated in (33c) and (33e). As illustrated in (33d), the verb will also agree with a second person

formal argument by means of a second person formal enclitic in addition to the usual set B agreement.

In spite of these similarities with the Focus Antipassive construction, the noun incorporation construction appears superficially to be quite different from the Focus Antipassive construction. The main difference is that the agent or experiencer NP does not have to undergo WH-movement.

Baker (1988:76-146) develops a theory of noun incorporation within GB theory according to which noun incorporation is a syntactic operation. Baker argues that an incorporated noun must appear in a normal argument position in D structure in order to be assigned a  $\theta$ -role. However, in s-structure the incorporated noun appears adjoined to a zero-bar constituent which governs it; and a coindexed trace appears in its d-structure position. Baker (1988:106-124) also argues that an incorporated noun need not be assigned case. As long as the incorporating constituent governs the d-structure position of the incorporated noun, there will be no violation of the Case Filter.

With this in mind, it can be easily demonstrated that the analysis of the Focus Antipassive construction argued for above is entirely consistent with the facts of noun incorporation in Quiché. Consider a noun incorporation

construction like (33b). The relevant parts of the structure of such a sentence are shown in (36).

(36) [ [ [ [ ka+Ø+b'iin-isa-n ] [ ch'iich' ]<sub>i</sub> ]  
 VP VP V V N  
 [ la achii ] ] [ [ e<sub>i</sub> ] ] ]  
 NP NP N

The agent and theme  $\theta$ -roles are assigned to the two VP-internal NP positions as usual. The head noun *ch'iich'* of the theme NP is adjoined to the verb leaving behind a coindexed trace. Since the NP position which is assigned the theme role is governed by the verb with the incorporated noun, this position does not need to be assigned case. The features of SAGR in INFL are transmitted to one of the two clitic positions on the verb. These case features would then ordinarily be transmitted to the theme NP, which is governed by the verb. However, since the theme NP does not need to be assigned case in (36), the clitic is free to transmit the case features to the agent NP, which is also governed by the verb. This, then, explains why a lexical NP can appear in the agent position in this construction without having to undergo WH-movement. In the Focus Antipassive construction, as was seen above, the agent position is not a casemarked position. Therefore, only the trace of PRO to COMP may appear in that position in the Focus Antipassive construction.

It should also be noted that the possibility of incorporating the Reflexive Relational noun is also accounted for by this same analysis. The Focus Antipassive construction can not be used when the patient or theme NP is the Reflexive Relational Noun. In a Reflexive sentence the possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun must be coreferential with the agent or experiencer NP. However, in the Focus Antipassive construction such a sentence would be ruled out in the same way that a sentence like (25) would be ruled out if the possessor of the patient NP were coreferential with the agent NP. Thus, when an agent or experiencer NP undergoes WH-movement in a reflexive clause, the normal active form of the transitive verb must be used rather than the Focus Antipassive form. In a noun incorporation construction, however, the Reflexive Relational Noun is adjoined to the verb. In this position the possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun is c-commanded by the agent or experiencer NP. Thus, coreference is possible (indeed, necessary since the possessor is an anaphor) between the possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun and the agent or experiencer NP.

## NOTES

1. According to Mondloch (1981:223-5), it is possible to use the Focus Antipassive construction with two non-third person NP's if the patient or theme NP is marked by the Genitive Relational Noun. Thus, sentences like the one shown in (i) are said to be possible (Nahualá dialect).

(i) in x+in+ch'ay-ow aw-eh  
 I PERFV+1SG.B+hit-FOCUS 2SG.A-possession  
 'I was the one who hit you.'

This construction can also be used even when one of the NP's is third person, as illustrated in (ii) and (iii).

(ii) aree x+Ø+ch'ay-ow q-eh  
 s/he PERFV+3SG.B+hit-FOCUS 1PL.A-possession  
 'S/he was the one who hit us.'

(iii) ix x+ix+ch'ay-ow r-ee  
 you.PL PERFV+2PL.B+hit-FOCUS 3SG.A-possession  
 lee achih  
 the man  
 'You (pl.) were the ones who hit the man.'

It can be seen that the construction illustrated in (i-iii), involving the Focus Antipassive verb form, appears to be a true antipassive construction with an

intransitive verb form, an agent NP in S function, and a patient NP in an oblique case. I have never encountered constructions like these in any of the Quiché dialects I have worked with, and at least some Cantel speakers have been reported to reject such sentences (Enrique Sam Colop, personal communication). I have, however, encountered them in the closely related Cakchiquel language, and they have also been reported in Tzutujil (Dayley 1985:350-351). There are also some Quiché examples of this type of construction in Brasseur (1862:73). I suspect that this construction may be a feature of older varieties of Quiché which has disappeared in many, but perhaps not all, modern dialects.

2. The Bijection Principle is not without its problems. See, for example Safir (1984). However, it seems to work well enough in simple cases such as the one being discussed here, so such problems need not concern us at this point.
3. Another similar argument can be seen in sentences like the examples in footnote 7 of Chapter 2 (repeated below in i).

(i) (a) cho                    jaah    k'oo                    wiih  
           in.front.of house be.someplace LOC.FOC  
           'It was at home that s/he was.'

(b) cho                    jaah    k'oo                    wi  
       in.front.of house be.someplace LOC.FOC  
       chwe7q  
       tomorrow

'It is at home that s/he will be tomorrow.'

As was discussed in section 2.1.2, word-final /h/ is dropped in non clause-final position in Momostenango and Santa María Chiquimula. However, as shown above in (i), the /h/ is present in the word *jaa* (i. e., /jaah/) when the word appears at the end of a focussed constituent. Thus, this too seems to suggest that there is in general a clause boundary after focussed constituents.

4. In those dialects which permit the construction discussed in footnote 1, this restriction on the Focus Antipassive construction can be circumvented, in a manner of speaking, by having the second non-third person argument appear as the possessor of the Genitive Relational Noun. These constructions actually conform to the restriction against two non-third person arguments, however. Since the Relational Noun phrase itself is a third person singular noun phrase, it can appear in direct object position in the Focus Antipassive construction in accordance with the



restriction even when the agent/experiencer NP is non-third person.

5. Alternatively, one could consider the possibility that there is no third person singular clitic and that AGR features are transmitted directly to a third person singular NP in some way. It is not clear how this could be done, though; and I will not pursue this possibility here.

## CHAPTER 10

## CONCLUSION: ERGATIVITY IN QUICHÉ SYNTAX

We have seen in section 5.2.1 that Quiché is a morphologically ergative language since it has an ergative/absolutive verb agreement system. Both NPs in O function and NPs in S function are crossreferenced on verbs by means of set B clitics. NPs in A function, on the other hand are crossreferenced by means of set A prefixes. Thus, as far as verb agreement is concerned, NPs in O function are treated like NPs in S function while NPs in A function are treated differently. This then is a manifestation of ergativity on the morphological level.

We also saw in Chapter 7 some of the ways in which ergativity is manifested in Quiché discourse. When we observed the patterns of overt vs. empty NPs and observed the patterns of the ordering of overt NPs with respect to the verb, it was found that NPs in S function pattern much more like NPs in O function than they do like NPs in A function. This again is an ergative/absolutive pattern. It was argued, following DuBois (1987), that this is a reflection of universal patterns in discourse pragmatics.

In this chapter I want to consider whether or not there are ergative patterns in Quiché syntactic structure.<sup>4</sup> It will be shown, based on the results of the preceding section, that ergativity is manifested in Quiché syntax in a

very fundamental way that has not been previously recognized. First, however, I will review some of the major theories of syntactic ergativity that have been proposed.

Dixon, in his comprehensive study of ergativity (Dixon 1979), introduces the notions of A, O, and S as universal syntactic-semantic primitives. In deep structure, Dixon claims that syntactic rules operate in terms of a universal syntactic category called "Subject", defined as {A,S}. Dixon recognizes another level of syntactic structure, called "shallow structure", derived from deep structure by the operation of optional "singular transformations" (Chomsky 1957) such as "passive" and "antipassive". At shallow structure other syntactic operations ("generalized transformations" in the sense of Chomsky 1957) such as coordination and subordination take place in the derivation of surface structure. In most languages, including some which are morphologically ergative, these latter operations continue to equate A and S as is done in deep structure. Such languages are said to operate in terms of an "S/A pivot". However, some languages operate in terms of an "S/O pivot", which is to say, syntactic rules operating on shallow structures equate S and O. Such languages are said to be syntactically ergative. The function of rules like passive and antipassive is often to put NPs which are in A (or O) function in deep structure into derived S function in

shallow structure so that they are accessible to rules operating in terms of the S/O (or S/A) pivot. Ergativity, then, may be manifested at two levels: at the level of surface morphology and at the syntactic level of shallow structure. All languages which are syntactically ergative exhibit at least partial morphological ergativity. However, not all languages with ergative morphology have ergative syntax.

A rather different notion of syntactic ergativity is presented by Marantz (1984), who proposes a theory of grammatical relations within a development of Government-Binding theory. Marantz recognizes three levels of syntactic structure: "logico-semantic ( or "l-s") structure", "syntactic (or "s") structure", and "surface structure". L-s structure is a representation of the logico-semantic relations among the constituents of a sentence such as the relation between subject and predicate and the relations between a verb and the constituents to which it assigns semantic roles. S structure is a representation of the grammatical relations among the constituents of a sentence such as the relation between the verb phrase and its subject or between a verb and its object. The mapping between l-s structure and s structure is determined not by transformations, but rather by lexical properties of the constituents and a very general mapping principle (Marantz 1984:52-57). Surface structure is a

representation of the surface phrase structure configurations of the constituents of a sentence. The mapping between s structure and surface structure is also constrained by a general principle which states, roughly, that every s structure relation must have its counterpart in surface structure. The surface structure counterparts of s structure relations may be manifested as either structural relations, casemarking, or agreement phenomena depending on the language.

In his discussion of l-s structure, Marantz (1984:32-35) notes that in languages like English, semantic roles of the agent type are generally assigned by predicates to their logical subjects, while semantic roles of the theme or patient types are assigned by verbs to their logical objects. However, this generalization is entirely arbitrary. There is no a priori reason to suppose that no language makes the opposite generalization of agent roles being assigned by verbs to their logical objects and theme or patient roles being assigned by predicates to their logical subjects. Marantz (1984:196-221) argues that there are languages which do make the latter generalization. That is, there are languages, called "nominative-accusative" languages, which choose the generalization in (1a), and there are other languages, called "ergative" languages, which choose the generalization in (1b).

**(1) (a) Nominative-accusative languages**

agent role - assigned by predicate to  
logical subject

theme/patient role - assigned by verb to  
logical object

**(b) Ergative languages**

agent role - assigned by verb to logical  
object

theme/patient role - assigned by predicate to  
logical subject

There are some languages which have been called ergative languages but which in fact are not by Marantz's criteria. These are the languages which are only morphologically ergative, which Marantz calls nominative-accusative languages with "type B" casemarking. For Marantz the only real ergative languages are those that choose the generalization in (1b). Thus, Marantz's notion of ergativity is a kind of syntactic ergativity since it is based on the way semantic roles are paired with grammatical relations. However, it should be noted that this conception of (syntactic) ergativity is not exactly the same as Dixon's notion of syntactic ergativity.

Marantz's theory predicts some crucial differences between ergative languages (by his criteria) and nominative-accusative languages. One prediction involves the

distribution of PRO in control constructions. Since the s structure subject in a control construction must be PRO, PRO will be assigned the agent role in a transitive control construction in a nominative accusative language, as can be seen in the English example (2) (Marantz 1984:199).

(2) Elmer persuaded Hortense<sub>i</sub> [ PRO<sub>i</sub> to buy a green  
porcupine ]

In an ergative language the theory predicts that PRO in a transitive control construction must be assigned a theme or patient role. Another prediction made by the theory involves dative shift, where an argument bearing a semantic role other than theme or patient is expressed in the way that themes and patients are usually expressed in the language. In a nominative-accusative language this means that a non-theme/patient appears as an s structure object, as illustrated for English in (3).

(3) John gave Mary a book.

In (3) the constituent bearing the semantic role of goal, namely *Mary*, appears as the object of the verb *gave* which is the way theme/patients are ordinarily expressed in English. In an ergative language the theory predicts that the non-theme/patient argument will appear as an s structure subject since that is the way theme/patients are ordinarily expressed in such languages. A third prediction involves

lexical reflexives. Marantz (1984:152-65) shows how the theory predicts homophony between the reflexive and passive forms of a verb. Thus, if a nominative-accusative language has a lexically reflexive verb form meaning 'he washes himself', then the same form should be interpretable as 'he is washed'. However, in an ergative language it is the agent of a transitive verb which shows up as the subject of the passive form. Therefore, the theory predicts that in an ergative language a lexical reflexive meaning 'he washes himself' should also be interpretable as 'he washes (something)'. It should be noted in connection with this last point that for Marantz the passive in an ergative language is equivalent to what other people have called the antipassive. Similarly what Marantz calls the antipassive is, in an ergative language, equivalent to what other people would call the passive. In this dissertation I have been following the "traditional" usage of the terms 'passive' and 'antipassive' rather than Marantz's.

Marantz is unable to find clear cases of control constructions in any language which he suspects is (syntactically) ergative; therefore, he is unable to test his prediction about the distribution of PRO. However, he argues that his predictions about dative shift and lexical reflexives are borne out in Dyirbal and Central Arctic Eskimo. This demonstrates, he claims, that these two



languages are indeed (syntactically) ergative (by his criteria) and, therefore, that such languages do exist.

Turning now to Quiché, it would appear that one could claim, based on what was seen in the last chapter, that Quiché is syntactically ergative by Dixon's criteria. The syntactic rules which form WH-questions, relative clauses, and cleft (or Focus) constructions operate in a straightforward way on NPs in S and O function, but not on NPs in A function. In order for such rules to apply to an NP in A function, the Focus Antipassive construction must be used. Since the Focus Antipassive construction involves an intransitive verb, one could argue that the function of the Focus Antipassive construction is to put an NP in underlying A function into derived S function so that it will be accessible to the rules which form WH-questions, relative clauses, and clefts. Thus, it might appear that such rules operate on an S/O pivot in Quiché, which is the defining characteristic of syntactically ergative languages according to Dixon.

However, it is not entirely clear that such rules really do operate on an S/O pivot. It was seen in examples like (8) and (9) that it is not always necessary to use the Focus Antipassive construction in WH-questions, relative clauses, and clefts. Furthermore, even when the Focus antipassive construction is used, it is not absolutely clear

that the underlying A NP is put into derived S function. It was seen that the set B clitic on the Focus Antipassive verb form sometimes indicated agreement with the agent/experiencer NP and other times indicated agreement with the patient/theme NP. This makes it somewhat difficult to say which of the two NPs is actually in S function. Also, given the kind of structure that I argued for in the Focus Antipassive construction, it can be seen that neither of the two NPs ever actually occupies the subject position. This might lead one to claim that there is no NP in S function in this construction if S is taken to mean 'subject of an intransitive verb'. Thus, it is not absolutely clear that Quiché is syntactically ergative by Dixon's criteria.

It is also not clear whether Quiché is syntactically ergative by Marantz's criteria. Quiché does not have lexical reflexives. As was mentioned in 5.3, a few Absolutive Antipassive verb forms have a middle or reflexive meaning. This is not, however, an example of the kind of phenomenon Marantz is referring to. These verb forms are not lexical reflexives with alternative antipassive (or "passive" in Marantz's terminology) interpretations. Rather they are intransitive verbs with an agent or experiencer NP in S function, only a small minority of which have alternative reflexive or middle interpretations. As was seen in section 8.3, true reflexives have a quite different form in Quiché. There is also no rule of dative shift in

Quiché. Thus, it is impossible to test Marantz's predictions about lexical reflexives and dative shift in Quiché since these do not exist. Quiché does have control constructions. These are the kinds of non-finite complements and non-finite purpose clauses that were discussed in sections 8.1.1.2 and 8.1.2. However, as was seen all of these involve nominalizations of either lexically intransitive verbs or nominalizations of intransitivized (i. e., passivized or antipassivized) forms of transitive verbs. There are no transitive control constructions in Quiché; thus there is no way to test Marantz's predictions about the distribution of PRO. It can be seen, then, that it is impossible to determine by means of these tests whether or not Quiché is (syntactically) ergative in Marantz's sense.

Given the analysis that was proposed in the previous chapter, however, it is not clear that Quiché is either nominative-accusative or ergative by Marantz's criteria. It was argued that a transitive verb (and also a Focus Antipassive verb form) assigns both an agent/experiencer-type role and a patient/theme-type role to NPs in the verb phrase. If this is true, one could claim that Quiché does not conform to either (1a) or (1b). On the other hand, the fact that the NP which is assigned the agent/experiencer role moves into the subject position in a simple transitive

sentence could be taken to mean that Quiché in fact conforms to (1a) and, therefore, is nominative-accusative.

But if the analysis of the preceding chapter is correct, a rather unexpected conclusion can be drawn from it. I have argued that both agent/experiencer type roles and patient/theme type roles are assigned by verbs to NP positions within the VP in Quiché. Furthermore, I have argued that some of the unusual properties of the Focus Antipassive construction, which involves an intransitive verb, follow from the fact that there are no case features of SAGR in INFL which could assign case to the subject position in this construction. One consequence of this was claimed to be the fact that there is no set A prefix on the Focus Antipassive verb form. But if all of this is true, it suggests that in Quiché all NPs in S function, that is to say all "intransitive subjects", are not in fact syntactic subjects because they are dominated by VP rather than by S. Consider, for example, the simple intransitive sentence in (4).

(4) [ [ [INFL [ x+Ø+b'iin [ ri achii ] ] ] [ e ] ] ]  
       S' S I'       VP                   NP                   NP

PERFV+3SG.B+walk the man

'The man walked.'

The verb in (4) assigns an agent role to the NP inside the VP. OAGR in INFL assigns case to the set B clitic, which

transmits its case to the agent NP. Thus the NP *ri achii* is in a casemarked position inside the VP and there will be no violation of the Case Filter in this position. Since there is no set A prefix, it must be the case that there is no SAGR in INFL. Hence, the subject position in (4) cannot be a casemarked position and, therefore, no lexical NP may appear there. Thus, the "NP in S function" in an intransitive sentence like (4) is dominated by VP at s-structure; it cannot move to subject position. The structure illustrated in (4) for intransitive clauses in Quiché is thus similar to the structure of the kind of impersonal construction with a dummy subject seen in some other languages. However, as can be seen by the example in (4), this structure also applies to intransitive sentences in Quiché which have agent (or experiencer) "subjects". In those languages which have impersonal constructions the non-expletive argument of the verb can generally only be of the theme/patient type.

The only way around this would be to assume that in intransitive sentences there was SAGR but that it was manifested not as set A agreement as it would in a transitive sentence, but rather as set B agreement. This would, however, effectively dismantle the analysis of the Focus Antipassive construction that was argued for in the previous section. Since that analysis afforded an explanation for all of the unusual characteristics of the

construction, that would be a pretty heavy price to pay.

In any case, there is additional evidence for the analysis of intransitive clauses illustrated in (4). In section 8.3 we discussed idiomatic constructions like the one in (7.2), which is repeated below as (5).

(5) [ [ [ [k+Ø+uu-kam [r-iib' [ki-wach [e]]]]][e]] ]  
 S' S I' VP NP NP NP NP

'They are congenial with each other.'

The subject position is occupied by an empty pronominal expletive which is casemarked by SAGR (hence, the set A prefix) but does not receive a  $\theta$ -role. OAGR assigns case to the NP in direct object position (riib' kiwach) via the set B clitic. The verb assigns a theme-type role to the direct object NP. The agent-type role is presumably assigned to the possessor of -wach just as it was in example (20) of Chapter 9. It was claimed in section 8.3 that the Reflexive Relational Noun could have a lexical NP as possessor just in case the NP in subject position was an expletive, i. e. an NP which is not assigned a  $\theta$ -role.

Now consider the sentence in (6).<sup>2</sup>

(6) x+Ø+ch'aj-taj                      r-iib'                      ri      achih  
 PERFV+3SG.B+wash-C.PASS      3SG.A-REFLEX      the      man  
 'The man washed himself.' (lit., 'The man's self  
 got washed.')

Note first of all that the man is understood to be the agent in this sentence. One would expect the agent of a passive clause to show up as the possessor of the Agentive Relational Noun *-umaał*, as was discussed in section 8.4.1. However, it can be seen in (6) that there is no Agentive Relational Noun; and furthermore it is ungrammatical for there to be one, as shown in (7).<sup>2</sup>

(7) \**xch'ajtaj riib' rumal ri achii*.

Thus, we have to assume that the agent role in (6) is assigned directly to *ri achii* as the possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun. This is similar to what was seen in (5). However, in (5) it was claimed that the Reflexive Relational Noun could only have a lexical NP possessor if the subject NP were expletive. But this is exactly what we have in (6) if the analysis of intransitive clauses illustrated in (4) is correct. It must be the case that the "NP in S function" *riib' ri achii* in (6) is dominated by VP and receives the patient role from the verb. It is also casemarked by OAGR via the set B clitic. Since there is no SAGR in INFL, there can be no set A prefix on the verb; and the subject position is not casemarked. Therefore, no lexical NP can appear there. Furthermore, the subject position does not receive a  $\theta$ -role. The agent role is assigned to the possessor of the Relational Noun. Since the possessor is in a casemarked position (as evidenced by the

set A prefix on the Relational Noun), there is no violation of the Case Filter. Also since the subject position does not receive a  $\theta$ -role, this licenses the presence of a lexical NP possessor of the Reflexive Relational Noun.

This, then, constitutes additional evidence for the correctness of (4). Note, however, that if, as I have argued, (4) does represent the correct analysis of intransitive sentences in Quiché, then it can be concluded that Quiché is in fact syntactically ergative, but in a way that has not been previously recognized in studies of ergativity: NPs in S function in Quiché are syntactically like NPs in O function for the simple reason that they are both dominated by VP at s-structure. NPs in A function are treated differently syntactically because they are dominated by S at s-structure. This defines an ergative/absolute pattern in Quiché clause structure, which could conceivably be another reflection of the universal ergative patterning in discourse pragmatics of NPs in A, S, and O function.



## NOTES

1. Some of the ideas discussed in this chapter have been discussed previously in Larsen (1987).
2. This sentence was elicited by Glenn Ayres from a Speaker from Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán and is discussed in Ayres (1980:56). A speaker from Cantel that I consulted did not accept such sentences. Mondloch (1981:141, 148) claims that reflexive simple passive sentences like that shown in (i) also exist, in which the Reflexive Relational Noun is unpossessed.

(i) utz ka+Ø+loq'-o-x iib'  
 good IMPERF+3SG.B+?-TH.V-PASS REFLEX  
 'It is good that they (indefinite) love each other; it is good to love one another.'

In (i) it appears that the finite passive clause is the "subject" of the adjectival predicate utz. Such passive clauses with unpossessed Reflexive Relational Nouns apparently correspond to those non-reflexive passives where the agent  $\theta$ -role is not assigned (i. e., simple passive clauses with no *-umaal* phrase).

3. Example (7) was judged ungrammatical by Ayres' (1980) Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán informant. Mondloch (1981:162), however, claims that sentences like (i) below are grammatical in the Nahualá dialect (although



preferred third person plural agreement on the Reflexive Relational Noun in (5). It would be interesting to know what kind of agreement there would be in sentences like (5) with a non-third person possessor of -wach.

## REFERENCES

- Alcalá, Pedro de. 1505. *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga*. Granada.
- Aissen, Judith L. 1987. *Tzotzil clause structure*. (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory.) Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Alvarado López, Dr. Miguel. 1975. *Léxico Médico Quiché-Español*. (Publicación especial del Instituto Indigenista Nacional.) Guatemala.
- Ayres, Glenn. 1980. A note on Mayan reflexives. *Journal of Mayan linguistics* 2, no. 1:53-9.
- Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation, a theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bentivoglio, Paola. 1983. Topic continuity and discontinuity in discourse: a study of spoken Latin-American Spanish. in Givón 1983b:255-311.
- Brasseur de Bourbourg, Charles Etienne. 1861. *Popol vuh: le livre sacré et les mythes de l'antiquité américaine*. (Collection de Documents dans les Langues Indigenes de l'Amérique Ancienne, 1.) Paris: Arthus Bertrand.

Brasseur de Bourbourg, Charles Etienne. 1862. *Grammaire de la Langue Quiché*. (Collection de Documents dans les Langues Indigenes de l'Amérique Ancienne, 2, pt. 1.) Paris: Arthus Bertzand.

Brody, Jill. 1984. Some problems with the concept of basic word order. *Linguistics* 22.711-36.

Campbell, Lyle. 1977. *Quichean linguistic prehistory*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 81.) Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carbonell Pastor, Fernando. 1973. *Gramática Quiché*. (Publicación especial del Instituto Indigenista Nacional.) Guatemala.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. in *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1980. Consequential verbs in the Northern Iroquoian languages and elsewhere. *American Indian and Indoeuropean studies, papers in honor of Madison S. Beeler*, ed. by K. Klar, M. Langdon, and S. Silver, 43-49. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Chávez, Adrián Inés. (no date) *Kí-chè ʔib, escritura kí-chè y otros temas*.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. in *Readings in English transformational grammar*, ed. by Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum, 184-221. Waltham: Ginn and Company.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *Wh*-movement, in *Formal syntax*, ed. by P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding*. (Linguistic Inquiry monograph 6.) Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 13.) Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect, an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Reprinted with corrections, 1978].
- Cortázar, Julio. 1982. *62 / modelo para armar*. Barcelona: Editorial Bruguera, S. A. (First published in 1968.)

- Croft, William. no date. Cross-reference, ergativity and categoriality in Quiché. Unpublished MS.
- Davies, William. 1984. Antipassive: Choctaw evidence for a universal characterization. in *Studies in relational grammar 2*, ed. by David M. Perlmutter and Carol G. Rosen, 331-76. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dayley, Jon P. 1981. Voice and ergativity in Mayan languages. *Journal of Mayan linguistics* 2, no.2.3-82.
- Dayley, Jon P. 1985. *Tzutujil grammar*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 107.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55:59-138.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1987, ed. *Studies in ergativity*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. [Also published as *Lingua* 71.]
- Du Bois, John W. 1981. *The Sacapultec language*. Berkeley: University of California. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation.
- Du Bois, John W. 1985. Mayan morpheme structure and the final vowel question in Quichean. *Journal of Mayan linguistics* 5, no. 1.1-71.

- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Language* 63.805-55.
- Edmonson, Munro. 1965. *Quiché-English dictionary*. (Middle American Research Institute, Publication 30.) New Orleans: Tulane University.
- Edmonson, Munro. 1967. Classical Quiché. in *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, ed. by Robert Wauchope, vol. 5, Linguistics, ed. by Norman A. McQuown, 249-67. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Edmonson, Munro S. 1971. *The book of counsel: the popol vuh of the Quiché Maya of Guatemala*. (Middle American Research Institute, Publication 35.) New Orleans: Tulane University.
- England, Nora C. 1983. *A grammar of Mam, a Mayan language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- England, Nora C. and Stephen R. Elliot. to appear, (eds.) *Lecturas sobre la lingüística maya*.
- Fox, David. 1965. *Lecciones elementales en quiché*. Guatemala: Ministerio de Educación Pública.
- Fox, David. 1968. Review of *Quiché-English dictionary*, by Munro Edmonson. *Language* 44.190-6.



- Georgopolous, Carol. 1985. Variables in Palauan syntax. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 3.59-94.
- Givón, T. 1983a. Topic continuity in discourse: an introduction. in Givón 1983b:5-41.
- Givón, T. 1983b. *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study.* (Typological Studies in Language, Vol. 3.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grimes, Barbara F. 1984, ed. *Languages of the world, Ethnologue*, 10th edition. Dallas: Wycliffe Bible Translators.
- Henne, David. 1980. *Diccionario Quiché-Español.* Guatemala: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Instituto Indigenista Nacional. 1977. *Alfabeto de las lenguas mayances.* Guatemala: Editorial Universitaria.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1971. *Tzeltal phonology and morphology.* (University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 61.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1974. *Idiomas de mesoamérica.* (Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, Publicación no. 33.) Guatemala: Ministerio de Educación, Editorial José de Pineda Ibarra.

- Kaufman, Terrence. 1976a. *Proyecto de alfabetos y ortografías para escribir las lenguas mayances.* (Ediciones idiomas guatemaltecos.) Guatemala: Ministerio de Educación.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1976b. New Mayan languages in Guatemala: Sacapultec, Sipacapa, and others. in *Mayan linguistics, volume I*, ed. by Marlys McClaran, 67-89. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1986a. Some structural characteristics of Mayan languages with especial reference to Quiché. Unpublished MS. (to appear in Spanish translation in England and Elliot.)
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1986b. Outline of comparative Mayan grammar I: morphology and particles. Unpublished MS.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche. 1982. Variables and the bijection principle. *The linguistic review* 2.135-70.
- Larsen, Thomas W. 1981. Functional correlates of ergativity in Aguacatec. *BLS* 7.136-53.
- Larsen, Thomas W. 1987. The syntactic status of ergativity in Quiché. in Dixon 1987:33-59.
- Levin, Beth. 1987. The middle construction and ergativity. in Dixon 1987:17-31.

- Marantz, Alec P. 1984. *On the nature of grammatical relations.* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 10.) Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1987. Is basic word order universal? in *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, ed. by Russell S. Tomlin, (Typological Studies in Language, vol. 11,) 281-328. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mondloch, James L. 1978a. *Basic Quiché grammar.* (Institute for Mesoamerican Studies Publication No. 2.) Albany: State University of New York at Albany.
- Mondloch, James L. 1978b. Disambiguating subjects and objects in Quiché. *Journal of Mayan linguistics* 1, no. 1.3-19.
- Mondloch, James L. 1981. *Voice in Quiché-Maya.* Albany: State University of New York. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation.
- Nebrija, Elio Antonio de. 1523. *De litteris hebraicis.* Alcalá.
- Norman, William. 1973. Positional and transitive verb roots in Quiché. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

- Norman, William. 1976. Quiché text. in *Mayan text I*, ed. by Louanna Furbee-Losee. (*International Journal of American Linguistics, Native American Texts Series, Vol. I, No. 1,*) 40-60. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Norman, William. 1978. Advancement rules and syntactic change: the loss of instrumental voice in Mayan. *BLS* 4.458-476.
- Norman, William. 1980. Grammatical parallelism in Quiché ritual language. *BLS* 6. 387-399.
- Postal, Paul M. 1977. The antipassive in French. in *Proceedings of the seventh annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. Cambridge: M. I. T. (Reprinted in *Linguisticae Investigationes* 1:333-74.
- Recinos, Adrián. 1957. *Crónicas indígenas de Guatemala*. Guatemala: Editorial Universitaria.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 1978. Topicalization and *Wh* movement in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9.513-17.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 1980. On left-dislocation and topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11.363-95.

- Robertson, John S. 1980. *The structure of pronoun incorporation in the Mayan verbal complex*. New York: Garland.
- Safir, Kenneth J. 1984. Multiple variable binding. *Linguistic inquiry* 15.603-38.
- Safir, Kenneth J. 1985. *Syntactic chains*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 40.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salazar Tetzagüic, Manuel de Jesús. 1978. *Características de la Literatura indígena cakchiquel*. Thesis presented to the Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad Rafael Landívar, Guatemala.
- Sam Colop, Luis Enrique. 1983. *Hacia una propuesta de ley de educación bilingüe*. Thesis presented to the Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales, Universidad Rafael Landívar, Guatemala.
- Sam Colop, Luis Enrique. to appear. *Bosquejo de la gramática Quiché*. in England and Elliot.
- Schultze Jena, Leonhard. 1933. *Leben, Glaube und Sprache der Quiché von Guatemala*. (Indiana I.) Verlag von Gustav Fischer in Jena.

- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. in *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, ed by R. M. W. Dixon, 112-71. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Smith-Stark, Thomas C. 1978. The Mayan antipassive: some facts and fictions. In *Papers in Mayan linguistics*, ed. by Nora C. England, 169-187. *Studies in Mayan Linguistics* no. 2. (University of Missouri Miscellaneous Publications in Anthropology no. 6.) Columbia: University of Missouri.
- Tedlock, Dennis. 1985. *Popol Vuh, the definitive edition of the Mayan book of the dawn of life and the glories of gods and kings*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Torrego, Esther. 1984. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.103-29.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario. 1983. *La tía Julia y el escribidor*. Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral, S. A.
- Wick, Stanley A. and Remigio Cochojil-González. 1966-9. *Spoken Quiché (Maya)*. 3 vols. Chicago: Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English n't. *Language* 59.502-13.