

# A taxonomy of Q'anjob'al fronting constructions \*

Meaghan Fowlie  
mfowlie@ucla.edu

UCLA AIS  
March 5, 2013

## 1 Overview

## 2 Basics

- **Language family:** Mayan
- **Region:** Northern Guatemala, as well as a refugee and immigrant population in the US, especially Los Angeles
- **Status:** 77 700 speakers in Guatemala (1998) (Ethnologue)

### 2.1 Grammar overview

- **VSO**
- **Ergative**
- **Case marked on the verb**, and not on DPs
- Aspect-marking (not tense-marking)
- **pro-drop** – argument agreement/encoding/clitic pronouns on the verb

---

\*I am very grateful to our consultant Alejandra Francisco, who has been not only a valuable resource as a native speaker, but also a cheerful partner in our research into Q'anjob'al. I would also like to thank Professor Pam Munro for her guidance, and my classmates Mel Bervoets, Niki Foster, Laura Kalin, Jianjing Kuang, Laura McPherson, Kathleen O'Flynn Denis Peperno, Craig Sailor, Michael Tseng, Kaeli Ward, and David Wemhener for their work which is absolutely essential to this project.

- 3rd person DP usually overt, except for subject-dropping

**Verbal template:**<sup>1</sup>

Aspect- -ABS(“class B”) ERG(“class A”)- <b>VERB</b> -suffixes
---

- (1) ch-            -ach            w-            och            -ej  
**aspect(ic)- -abs(2sB) erg(1sA)- V(like) -affixes(-ej)**  
‘I like you’ (40:3)

**Case markers:**

- Mayanist tradition: Ergative = class A, Absolutive = class B (**Caution! It’s the opposite of what you expect: Absolutive is class B!**)
- Vary according to whether following segment is a consonant or vowel.
- 3p: our consultant almost always uses  $\emptyset$ , not *s-*, except with extended reflexives (reflexive possession), when *s-* is required.
- **Possessed NPs** are marked with Ergative (A) case

**Classifiers:** Nouns usually require classifiers. Classifiers can also **stand alone** and are interpreted as **pronouns**. I take no stand on their theoretical status, though I have glossed them all as CL.

<sup>1</sup>All data unless otherwise indicated is from our class database of elicitations from our (amazing!) consultant Alejandra Fransisco (Bervoets et al. 2011). Numbers (xxx:yy) mean page xxx, number yy; Initials with numbers are for entries to the database without page numbers. The initials are those of the linguist and the numbers the date and number, e.g. (MF 2011-06-08:20) is example 20 from my June 8 elicitation. (MT ex.XX) is from Mateo Toledo (2008), example XX.

**Abbreviations:**

1/2/3 = 1st/2nd/3rd person, c = completive aspect, ic- = incompletive aspect, s/p = singular/plural, A/B = ergative (class A)/absolutive (class B), AF= agent focus, C = complementiser, CL= classifier, CL<sub>an/plant/etc</sub> = classifier (animals/plants/etc.), m/f = masculine/feminine, DEP= dependent clause marker (which might actually be AF), DIR1/2/3 = directionals (three classes), DUB= dubitative, excl = exclusive, FOC= focus particle, PAS= passive, REC= reciprocal, REFL= reflexive, tr = transitivity marker, XA= contrastive particle

Person	Ergatives (A)				Absolutives (B)	
	Singular		Plural		Singular	Plural
	Pre-C	Pre-V	Pre-C	Pre-V		
1	hin	w-	ku-	j-	-in	-on
2	ha	∅	he	hey	ach	ex
3	∅-	y-	∅-	y-		∅
poss. 3	∅/s-	y-	∅/s-	y-		

Table 1: Forms

**Possessed NP:** uses Ergative (A) marker

- (2) hin na  
 1sA house  
 ‘my house’ (20:2)

**Third person:** marker *s-* is usually optional. Occasionally *s-* and *y-* occur together. Possessed noun is followed by the possessor NP:

- (3) s- y- aq’ [naq Xhun]<sub>possessor</sub>  
 3A- 3A- tongue CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun  
 ‘Xhun’s tongue’

### 3 Transitivity

Q’anjob’al cares around transitivity for some constructions

- e.g.: AF only for ergative subjects

#### 3.1 Hopper and Thompson

Hopper and Thompson (1980)’s **theory of transitivity**:

- Transitivity is a spectrum; property of whole clause
- factors include:
  - *individuation* of object: more individuated, more able to be affected by action, more transitive. E.g. reflexive has object not individuated from subject.
- Less transitive subjects may pattern with intransitive subjects which in turn may pattern with objects, obliques.

### 3.2 Aissen

Aissen (1997): transitivity related to **how far apart** Subject and Object are on a scale of *proximity*, combining factors of *definiteness*, *individuation*, and *animacy*

- Definite > indefinite
- individuated > unindividuated
- 1p > 2p > human > animal > plant > inanimate (Foster 2013)

(4) I kicked a ball > The boy kicked a ball > The ball hit me in the head

- Q'anjob'al example: \*(Inanimate subject, Animate object): fix with passive ((b), reversing S and O) or Agent Focus ((c), reducing transitivity of clause)

- (5)
- a. \*x- y- a' taj q'a no' txay  
c- 3A- CAUSE cook fire CL<sub>animal</sub> fish  
Intended: 'The fire cooked the fish' (Niki: last week's handout)
  - b. x- a' -lay taj no' txay y- uj q'a  
c- CAUSE cook -pass fire CL<sub>animal</sub> fish 3A- by fire  
'The fish was cooked by the fire'
  - c. Q'a x- a' -on taj no' txay  
fire c- CAUSE AF cook CL<sub>animal</sub> fish  
'The fire cooked the fish' (Topic or perhaps just ordinary reading)

- **Agent focus form**: verb **loses its ergative** marker and takes the **suffix -on/-n**. If it has a transitive suffix it loses that as well, and for some verbs the intransitive suffix *-i* is added.
- Constraint seems to be something like: the more transitive the clause, the farther apart S and O need to be on the proximity scale, with S > O
  - Fix: change the clause to make it less transitive
- Common constraint in Q'anjob'al: \*extraction of highly transitive subject
  - Solution: make the clause less transitive with AF or passive

## 4 Fronting Constructions

Commonly used pre-verbal position:

\_\_\_\_\_ V ...

## 4.1 In the Grammar

Baquiáx Barreno and et al. (Comunidad Lingüística Q'anjob'al) list 4 fronting constructions:

1. Wh-questions
2. Topic
  - (a) Subject
  - (b) Oblique
3. Focus

I claim there are 7:

1. Wh questions
2. Focus
  - (a) A-focus
  - (b) Intonation focus
3. Topic
  - (a) Resumptive (syntactic subject only)
  - (b) Gap (all)
4. Topic/Focus hybrid (reflexives, possessors only)
5. Quantifier fronting

## 4.2 Wh questions

[wh phrase] V ... [gap] ...
-----------------------------

- Objects (6-a), intransitive subjects (6-b), and Relational Noun phrases (6-c) are questioned freely.

- (6)
- a. Tzetal yetal x- lo' naq  
what c- eat 3m  
'What did he eat?'
  - b. Maktxel s- tsew -i  
who c- laugh -intr  
'Who laughed?'

*Object*

*Intransitive subject*

- c. [Maktxel y- etoq] x- y- a' taj ix no' txay?  
 [who 3A- with] c- 3A- CAUSE cook CL<sub>f</sub> CL<sub>animal</sub> fish  
 'With whom did she cook fish?' *Relational Noun*

- Questioning an **ergative subject** requires that the verb be in agent focus (AF) (or antipassive) form.

- (7) a. Maktxel x- ach 'il -on -i  
 who c- 2sB see -AF -intr  
 'Who saw you?' (504:1) *Ergative subject: AF form*
- b. \*Maktxel x- ach y- il -a'  
 who c- 2sB 3A- see -tr  
 intended: 'Who saw you?' (504:4)

#### 4.2.1 Agent Focus disparity

Even though they are ergative, **Reflexives** and **Reflexive possessives** do not allow AF for wh-questions.:

- (8) a. Maktxel x- y- il Ø- b'a  
 who c- 3A- see 3A- REFL  
 'Who saw him/herself?' (504:5-6) *- Reflexive*
- b. \*Maktxel x- 'il -on Ø- b'a  
 who c- see AF 3A- REFL  
 Intended: 'Who saw him/herself?'
- (9) a. Maktxel x- Ø- b'on s- na  
 who c- 3A- paint 3A- house  
 'Who painted his own house?' *- Reflexive Possessive*
- b. \*Maktxel x- Ø- b'on -on s- na  
 who c- 3B- paint AF 3A- house  
 Intended: 'Who painted his own house?'

#### 4.2.2 Possessee Stranding

**Absolutive** arguments optionally allow **possessor fronting**, stranding the possessee.

- (10) a. Maktxel s-txi' x- 'elaj -oq  
 whose 3A-dog c- run.away -sm  
 'Whose dog ran away?' *Possessor of intransitive subject*
- b. Maktxel x- 'elaj s-txi'  
 whose c- run.away 3A-dog  
 'Whose dog ran away?'

- c. **Maktxel** x- b'on naq s- na?  
**who** c- paint CL<sub>m</sub> **3A- house**  
 'Whose<sub>i</sub> house did he<sub>j</sub> paint?' (PM:2011-04-05:22) *Possessor of Object*

Also works for RNs:

- (11) [**Maktxel**] x- y- a' taj ix no' txay y- etoq?  
 [who] c- 3A- CAUSE cook CL<sub>f</sub> CL<sub>animal</sub> fish **3A- with**  
 'Who did she cook fish with?' *"Possessor" of RN*

And for reflexives:

- (12) **Maktxel** x- y- il ∅- b'a  
**who** c- 3A- see 3A- REFL  
 'Who saw him/herself?' (504:5-6) *Reflexive*

**Not possible for ergative arguments:**

- (13) a. **Maktxel txitx** x- -ach ∅- chi -on -i?  
 Who rabbit c- -2sB 3A- bite -AF -intr  
 'Whose rabbit bit you?' (153-2) *\*Possessor of transitive subject*  
 b. *\*Maktxel* x- -ach ∅- chi -on s- txitx?  
**Who** c- -2sB 3A- bite -AF 3A- **rabbit**  
 Intended: 'Whose rabbit bit you?' (MF-2012-02-27:11)

**Conclusion:** availability of possessee stranding dependent on transitivity: absolutes and obliques can strand, and ergatives only in less transitive clauses (reflexives)

#### 4.2.3 Pied Piping with inversion

- Q'anjob'al has *pied piping with inversion*
- *with whom* (pied piping) vs. *who with* (pied piping with inversion)
- As we just saw, normal **possessed ergative subjects** require pied piping.
- **Normal objects** are optionally pied piped.
- For **reflexive possessives**, it's the object that is possessed, but pied piping is not possible: you get disjoint reference.

- (14) a. [**Maktxel** s- na] x- b'on naq  
 [who 3A- house] c- paint CL<sub>m</sub>  
 'Whose<sub>i</sub> house did he<sub>j/\*i</sub> paint?' (MF:2012-01-23) *\*Reflexive Possessive*

If we take **reflexives** to be possessive subjects, pied piping is not allowed.

- (15) \*Maktxel s- b'a x- y- il naq?  
 who 3A- REFL c- 3A- see CL<sub>m</sub>  
 Intended: 'Whose self did he see?'/ 'Who saw himself?' **\*Reflexive**

- (If we take reflexives to be bare objects, there is no possessor to question, just the subject.)
- We also saw that RNs are normally pied piped (6-c)

### 4.3 A-Focus

Meaning: *It's Xhun who sang (not Yakin)*, or answer to Q: *Who sang?* A: *It's Xhun that sang.*

A [focused phrase] V ... [gap] ...

- Focus as defined in Baquiaux Barreno and et al. (Comunidad Lingüística Q'anjob'al)
  - Very similar to wh-movement
  - Focused phrase preceded by focus particle *a*
  - Gap in canonical position of focused phrase
  - Subjects ((16-b), (17)), objects (16-a), adjuncts/obliques (16-c), and some possessors can all be focused.
  - All but subjects of fully transitive clauses (ergative arguments) can be freely focused.
- (16) a. [A jun saqchyob'al]<sub>Obj</sub> ch- ∅ -in tek' -a' \_\_\_  
 [FOC one toy]<sub>O</sub> ic- 3B -1sA kick -tr *t<sub>obj</sub>*  
 'It's *the toy* that I kick.' (490:37) **Object**
- b. [A no' wakax]<sub>Subj</sub> max ∅- kam -i \_\_\_  
 FOC CL<sub>animal</sub> cow c 3B- die -intr *t<sub>subj</sub>*  
 'It's *the cow* that died' (389:84) **Intrans. subject**
- c. [A y- etoq ix Malin]<sub>Obl</sub> x- -ach b'itn -i \_\_\_  
 [FOC 3A- with CL<sub>f</sub> Malin]<sub>Obl</sub> c- 2sB sing -intr *t<sub>obl</sub>*  
 'It's *with Malin* that you sang' **Oblique**
- d. [A naq Curt]<sub>Poss</sub> x- tz'ai q'a'  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Curt]<sub>Poss</sub> c- go.out fire  
 'It's *Curt* whose fire went out.' (MF 2012-08-20) **Possessor (of inanimate, intransitive subject)**

- e. [A naq Xhun]<sub>Subj</sub> ch- y- och -ej b'a  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun]<sub>Subj</sub> ic- 3A- like -tr REFL  
 'It's *Xhun* who likes himself.' (MF 2012-10-22) *Reflexive*

- Focusing an **ergative subject** requires that the verb be in agent focus (AF) (or antipassive) form. i.e. **Make the clause less transitive**

- (17) a. Max- ∅ s- tayene -j [naq unin]<sub>S</sub> [te' na]<sub>O</sub>  
 c- -3B **3A-** take.care.of -tr [CL<sub>m</sub> child]<sub>S</sub> [CL<sub>plant</sub> house]<sub>O</sub>  
 'The child took care of the house' (MT, ex.76)
- b. [A naq unin]<sub>S</sub> max- ∅ tayene -n \_\_\_ te' na  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> child]<sub>S</sub> c- **-3B** take-care-of AF *t<sub>S</sub>* CL<sub>plant</sub> house  
 'It was the child who took care of the house' (MT, ex.76)
- c. # [A naq unin]<sub>Object!</sub> max- ∅ s- tayene -j te' na \_\_\_  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> child]<sub>Object!</sub> c- -3B **3A-** take-care-of -tr CL<sub>plant</sub> house *t<sub>O</sub>*  
 'It was the house that took care of the child' (MT, ex.76)

- AF optional for **reflexives**, which already render the clause less transitive

- (18) a. [A ix Malin]<sub>Focus</sub> ch- y- och -ej b'a \_\_\_  
 [FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Malin]<sub>Focus</sub> ic- 3A- like -tr REFL \_\_\_  
 'It's *Malin* who likes herself.' (438:42) ✓ *No AF*
- b. [A ix Malin]<sub>Focus</sub> ch- 'och -on b'a \_\_\_  
 [FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Malin]<sub>Focus</sub> ic- like -AF REFL \_\_\_  
 'It's *Malin* who likes herself.' ✓ *AF*

#### 4.3.1 Possessor fronting

##### Intransitive Subjects:

Possible for inanimate possesses only:

- (19) a. A ix Meaghan x- 'el telnaj tz'ib'al  
 FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Meaghan c- DIR2 fall book  
 'It's Meaghan's book that fell (off a table)' *Inanimate possessee*
- b. \*A ix Meaghan x- 'el telnaj (s) nuej  
 FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Meaghan c- DIR2 fall (3A-) sister  
 Intended: 'It's Meaghan's sister that fell (off a cliff)' \**Animate possessee*

Inanimate possessors are fine:

- (20) A biblioteca x- il q'otnaq ch'an y- un  
 FOC library c- DIR2 fall CL<sub>wood</sub> 3A- book  
 'It's the library whose book fell' (MF 2012-08-20) *Inanimate possessor and possessee*

**Impossible for transitive subjects(?):** (I’m so sure this is bad, but I can’t seem to find it in my notes!)

(21) \* $\dot{\iota}$ A ix Niki x- -in chi -on s- txitx  
 FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Niki c- -1B bite -AF 3A- rabbit  
 ‘It’s Niki’s rabbit that bit me.’ *\*Possessor of transitive subject*

**Missing data: objects** Prediction: Because objects are absolutive arguments, I expect them to pattern with intransitive subjects; i.e. (22) should be good:

(22)  $\dot{\iota}$ A naq Xhun x- lo -ay -toq ix Malin te’ s- mansan  
 FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun c- eat -DIR2 -DIR3 CL<sub>f</sub> Malin 3A- apple  
 ‘It’s Xhun whose apple Malin ate’  $\dot{\iota}$ ( $\checkmark$ ?) *Possessor of inanimate object*

### 4.3.2 Interim summary 1: wh-mvt and A-focus

	wh-mvt	A-focus
Transitive Subject	AF	AF
Intransitive subject	*AF	*AF
Object	*AF	*AF
Oblique	*AF	*AF
Subj. of reflexive	*AF	*AF
Possessor of transitive subject	*	*?
Possessor of <b>animate</b> intrans. subj.	$\checkmark$	*
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> intrans. subj.	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Possessor of <b>animate</b> object	?	?
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> object	$\checkmark$	?

Table 2: wh and focus

### Conclusion:

- AF pattern is identical: AF required for subjects of fully transitive clauses, disallowed otherwise
- **wh**: Possessor fronting dependent only on transitivity of clause (only available for absolutives)
- **fo**: Possessor fronting also dependent on “transitivity” of possessive phrase: inanimate “object” (possessee) makes it less transitive since inanimate O is less individuated (Hopper and Thompson)

– But! low animacy is associated with *high* transitivity for Aissen!

- However, note that Possessor’s (S’s) animacy not relevant.
- Also, note that other observations are all of this form:
- *Problem with S/O proximity or extraction?* → *Make clause less transitive.*
- Here we have *Problem with S/O extraction?* → *Only if proximity of O is high.*
- In other words, all the other situations involve a **problem describable in Aissen’s terms** with a **solution in Hopper & Thompson’s terms**.
- If we interpret this last one **just in Aissen’s terms**, we get the **opposite pattern** that we’ve seen so far.
- If we interpret it, like the others, with the problem in Aissen’s terms and the solution in Hopper & Thompson’s terms, the pattern is consistent.
- i.e. *Problem with S/O extraction?* → *Make the clause less transitive by choosing an inanimate object.*
- It is also worth noting that in a real clause there are a lot of factors that can affect transitivity (participants, case, transitivity markers, other morphemes like AF), but in a DP, only the participants are available, perhaps bringing animacy to the forefront in the Hopper & Thompson model.

#### 4.4 Intonation Focus

*focus* V ... [gap]...

Q’anjob’al, like English, can use intonation for focus interpretation

- (23) a. Alexia saw *Damien*  
 b. [Naq *Damien*] x- y- il ix Alexia  
 [CL<sub>m</sub> *Damien*] c- 3A- see CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia  
 ‘It’s *Damien* who Alexia saw (not another boy)’

*In situ* is sometimes ok, but I think it’s only when there is no other alternative. e.g.:

- (24) [Y- *unon* b’a naq Ringo] x- -in maq’ -on -i  
 [3A- on.purpose REFL CL<sub>m</sub> Ringo] c- -1B hit -AF -intr  
 ‘Ringo hit me *on purpose!*’

Interesting construction for us: **Just like A-focus, except stress instead of a particle**

- (25) a. [A ix Malin] ch- ’och -on naq Xhun  
 FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Malin ic- like -AF CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun  
 b. [Ix *Malin*] ch- ’och -on naq Xhun  
 [CL<sub>f</sub> Malin] ic- like -AF CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun  
 ‘It’s *Malin* who likes Xhun’

*Transitive Subject*

- (26) a. [A ix Alexia] x- kanalw -i  
 [FOC CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia] c- dance -intr  
 b. [Ix *Alexia*] x- kanalw -i  
 [CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia] c- dance -intr  
 ‘It’s *Alexia* who danced.’ *Intransitive subject*
- (27) a. [A naq Damien] x- y- il ix Alexia  
 FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Damien c- 3A- see CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia  
 b. [Naq *Damien*] x- y- il ix Alexia  
 [CL<sub>m</sub> Damien] c- 3A- see CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia  
 ‘It’s *Damien* who Alexia saw (not another boy)’ *Object*
- (28) a. [A b’ay naq Damien] x- y- a’ ix Alexia ch’an un  
 [FOC to CL<sub>m</sub> Damien] c- 3A- give CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia CL<sub>wood</sub> book  
 b. [*B’ay* naq Damien] x- y- a’ ix Alexia ch’an un  
 [to CL<sub>m</sub> Damien] c- 3A- give CL<sub>f</sub> Alexia CL<sub>wood</sub> book  
 ‘It’s *Damien* that Alexia gave the book to’ *Oblique*
- (29) a. [A naq Curt]<sub>POSS</sub> x- tz’ai q’a’  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Curt]<sub>POSS</sub> c- go.out fire  
 b. [Naq *Curt*]<sub>POSS</sub> x- tz’ai q’a’  
 [CL<sub>m</sub> Curt]<sub>POSS</sub> c- go.out fire  
 ‘It’s *Curt* whose fire went out.’ *Possessor of inanimate, intrans. subject*
- (30) Other possessors: not clear yet
- (31) a. [A naq Xhun]<sub>Subj</sub> ch- y- och -ej b’a  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun]<sub>Subj</sub> ic- 3A- like -tr REFL  
 b. [Naq *Xhun*]<sub>Subj</sub> ch- y- och -ej b’a  
 [CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun]<sub>Subj</sub> ic- 3A- like -tr REFL  
 ‘It’s *Xhun* who likes himself.’ (MF 2012-10-22) *Reflexive*

#### 4.4.1 Interim Summary 2: Wh-mvt and Focus

	wh-mvt	A-focus	Inton. Foc.
Transitive Subject	AF	AF	AF
Intransitive subject	*AF	*AF	*AF
Object	*AF	*AF	*AF
Oblique	*AF	*AF	*AF
Subj. of reflexive	*AF	*AF	*AF
Possessor of transitive subject	*	*?	*?
Possessor of <b>animate</b> intrans. subj.	✓	*	*
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> intrans. subj.	✓	✓	✓
Possessor of <b>animate</b> object	?	?	?
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> object	✓	?	?

Table 3: wh and focus

**Conclusion:** The two focus types seem to pattern together exactly.

#### 4.5 Resumptive Topic

topic PAUSE V ... [resumptive]...

- Topic as defined in Baquix Barreno and et al. (Comunidad Lingüística Q'anjob'al)
- Syntactic subjects only
- No AF

- (32) a. [naq Xhun], // x- lo -ay -toq **naq** te' tzoyol  
 [CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun], // c- eat- -DIR2 DIR3 **CL<sub>m</sub> CL<sub>plant</sub>** chayote  
 'Xhun, he ate chayote' (387:62) *Transitive Subject*
- b. [Ix Malin], // s- b'itni **ix**  
 [CL<sub>f</sub> Malin], // ic- sing CL<sub>f</sub>  
 'Malin, she sings' *Intransitive subject*
- c. [naq Xhun], // ch- y- och -ej ∅- b'a] naq  
 [CL<sub>m</sub> Xhun]textbf, // ic- 3A- like -tr 3sA- REFL CL<sub>m</sub>  
 'Xhun, he likes himself' *Reflexive*
- d. [Ix Malin], // x- ∅ 'ay yuchnaj s- na **ix**  
 [CL<sub>f</sub> Malin], // c- -3B collapse 3A- house CL<sub>f</sub>  
 'Malin, her house collapsed' **Possessor of *inanimate* intransitive**
- e. \*Ix Malin, // x- way s- nuej ix  
 CL<sub>f</sub> Malin, // c- sleep 3A- sister CL<sub>f</sub>  
 Intended: 'Malin, her sister slept' (MF 2012-08-13) **\*Possessor of *animate* intransitive**

## 4.6 Gap Topic

topic V ... [gap]...
----------------------

- All but transitive subjects topicalise freely
- Transitive subject requires AF
- Reading: topic-comment.
- Possibly also just ordinary base-position reading. I don't know yet if there's a difference.

- (33)
- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| a. | [Ix Malin] ch- 'och -on naq Xhun<br>[CL <sub>f</sub> Malin] ic- like -AF CL <sub>m</sub> Xhun<br>'Malin, she likes Xhun'   | <i>Transitive Subject</i>                       |
| b. | [Ix Alexia] x- kanalw -i<br>[CL <sub>f</sub> Alexia] c- dance -intr<br>'Alexia, she danced.'   | <i>Animate intransitive subject</i>             |
| c. | x- ∅ 'ay yuchnaj te' na<br>c- -3B collapse CL <sub>plant</sub> house<br>'The house collapsed'  | <i>Inanimate intransitive subject</i>           |
| d. | [Te' mansan] <sub>Topic</sub> x- ∅- ∅- lo -ay -toq ix Malin ___<br>[CL <sub>plant</sub> apple] <sub>Topic</sub> c- 3B- 3A- eat -DIR2 DIR3 CL <sub>f</sub> Malin <i>t<sub>Obj</sub></i><br>'The apple, Malin ate it.' (MF 2012-08-06) | <i>Object</i>                                   |
| e. | [b'ay ix Margarita] hoq hey- i -toq jun ab'en ti' ___<br>[to CL <sub>f</sub> Malkal] pot 2pA- take -DIR3 one package this ___<br>'You guys are going to take this package to Margarita.'   | <i>Oblique</i>                                  |
| f. | [naq Xhun] ch- y- och -ej ∅- b'a]<br>[CL <sub>m</sub> Xhun] ic- 3A- like -tr 3sA- REFL<br>'Xhun, he likes himself' (MF 2013-01-07)   | <i>Reflexive</i>                                |
| g. | *Ix Malin x- -'el telnaq s- nuej<br>CL <sub>f</sub> Malin c- DIR2 fall 3A- sister<br>Intended: 'Malin, her sister fell'  | <i>*Possessor of animate intrans. subject</i>   |
| h. | [Naq Curt] <sub>Poss</sub> x- tz'ai q'a'<br>[CL <sub>m</sub> Curt] <sub>Poss</sub> c- go.out fire<br>'Curt, his fire went out.'  | <i>Possessor of inanimate, intrans. subject</i> |

### 4.6.1 Subject Drop

Q'anjob'al allows subject drop when the subject is clear from context. **Requires object topicalisation.**

- (34) a. X- lo -ay -toq ix te' mango  
 c- eat -DIR2 DIR3 CL<sub>f</sub> CL<sub>plant</sub> mango  
 'She ate the mango' *Base position*
- b. te' mango x- lo -ay -toq ix  
 CL<sub>plant</sub> mango c- eat -DIR2 DIR3 CL<sub>f</sub>  
 'The mango, she ate it' *Object topicalisation*
- c. te' mango x- lo -ay -toq  
 CL<sub>plant</sub> mango c- eat -DIR2 DIR3  
 '(Salient individual) ate the mango' (MF 2012-10-22) *Subject drop*
- d. \*X- lo -ay -toq te' mango  
 c- eat -DIR2 DIR3 CL<sub>plant</sub> mango  
 Intended: '(Salient individual) ate the mango' *\*Base position object with subject drop*

#### 4.6.2 Interim Summary 3: Topics

	Resumptive	Gap
Transitive Subject	✓(*AF)	✓(AF)
Intransitive subject	✓(*AF)	✓(*AF)
Object	*	✓(*AF)
Oblique	*	✓(*AF)
Subj. of reflexive	✓(*AF)	✓(*AF)
Possessor of transitive subject	*?	*?
Possessor of <b>animate</b> intrans. subj.	*	*
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> intrans. subj.	✓	✓
Possessor of <b>animate</b> object	?	?
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> object	?	?

Table 4: Topics

#### 4.7 Quantifier fronting

[quantifier phrase] V ... [gap?]

Quantifiers are often fronted in Q'anjob'al

- (35) a. K'am maktxel x- w- il -a'  
 Neg who c- 1sA- see -tr  
 'I saw no one'
- b. \*x- w- il k'am maktxel  
 c- 1sA- see neg who  
 Intended: 'I saw no one' (MF 2013-02-04)

- c. [jujon heb' naq winaq unin] ch- -∅ y- och -ej s- txutx naq  
 [every 3p 3m man child] ic- -3B 3A- love -tr 3A- mother CL<sub>m</sub>  
 'Every boy<sub>i</sub> loves his<sub>\*i/j</sub> mother'

But not always:

- (36) a. masanil x- w- il -a'  
 everything c- 1sA- see -tr  
 b. x- w- il masanil  
 c- 1sA- see -tr everything  
 'I saw everything' or 'I saw *everything!*' (MF 2013-02-04)

A-Focus and resumptive topic are impossible:

- (37) a. X- w- il masnil heb'  
 c- 1sA- see -tr everyone 3pl  
 'I saw everyone'  
 b. \*A masanil (heb') x- w- il -a'  
 FOC everything (3pl) c- 1sA- see -tr  
 Intended: 'I saw *everything!*' (compare (36) above)  
 c. \*Masanil heb', // x- w- il heb'  
 everyone 3pl, // c- 1sA- see 3pl  
 Intended: 'I saw everyone'

That's about all I know about quantifier fronting, but I wanted to include it for completeness.

## 4.8 Topic/Focus hybrid

[A focused phrase], // V ... [resumptive]...

For reflexives, possessors of inanimate intransitive subjects only

- (38) a. \*A naq Ringo, // x- -in y- il **naq**  
 FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Ringo, // [c- -1B 3A- see]<sub>v</sub> CL<sub>m</sub>  
 Intended: 'It was *Ringo* who saw me' *Transitive Subj*  
 b. A heb' Beatles, // x- ∅ waj b'a **heb'** b'ay kampo  
 (FOC) 3p Beatles, // c- 3A- gather REFL **3p** in park  
 'It was *The Beatles* who gathered in the park.' *Refl*  
 c. A naq Ringo, // x- -∅ 'uq -i s-y-a'ej **naq**  
 [FOC CL<sub>m</sub> Ringo], // c- -3B boil -intr 3A-3A-water CL<sub>m</sub>  
 'It's *Ringo's* water that boiled' *Intrans Inanimate Poss*  
 d. \*A heb' Beatles, // x- ∅- b'on s- na **heb'**  
 FOC 3p Beatles, // c- 3A- paint 3A- house **3p**  
 Intended: 'It's *the Beatles* who painted their own house.' *Refl. Possessive*

## 5 Summary

wh-mvt:		wh phrase	V	...	gap	...	
A-focus:	A	focused phrase	V	...	gap	...	
Intonation focus:		<i>focused phrase</i>	V	...	gap	...	
Gap topic:		topic	V	...	gap	...	
Quantifier:		quantifier	V	...	gap?	...	
Resumptive topic:		topic	//	V	...	resumptive	...
Topic/focus hybrid:	A	focused phrase	//	V	...	resumptive	...

Table 5: Constructions

	wh	A-foc	Inton Foc	Res Top	Gap Top	Hybr	Q
Transitive Subject	AF	AF	AF	*AF	AF	*	*AF
Intransitive subject	*AF	*AF	*AF	*AF	*AF	*	*AF
Object	*AF	*AF	*AF	*	*AF	*	*AF
Oblique	*AF	*AF	*AF	*	*AF	*	?
Subj. of reflexive	*AF	*AF	*AF	*AF	*AF	AF	*AF
Possessor of transitive subject	*	*?	*?	*?	*?	*	?
Possessor of <b>animate</b> intrans. subj.	✓	*	*	*	*	*	?
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> intrans. subj.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Possessor of <b>animate</b> object	?	?	?	?	?	*	?
Possessor of <b>inanimate</b> object	✓	?	?	?	?	*	?

Table 6: Summary

## References

- Aissen, Judith. 1997. On the syntax of obviation. *Language* 705–750.
- Baquiáx Barreno, Modesto Cresencio, and Rigoberto Juárez Mateo et al. (Comunidad Lingüística Q’anjob’al). 2005. *Yaq’b’anil stxolilal ti’ Q’anjob’al (Gramática descriptiva Q’anjob’al)*. Guatemala City: Academia de Lenguas Mayas de Guatemala, Comunidad Lingüística Q’anjob’al.

- Bervoets, Mel, Niki Foster, Meaghan Fowlie, Laura Kalin, Jianjing Kuang, Laura McPherson, Pamela Munro, Kathleen O’Flynn, Denis Paperno, Michael Tseng, Kaeli Ward, David Wemhaner, and Craig Sailor. 2011. Notes on Q’anjob’al as spoken by Alejandra Francisco. Database.
- Foster, Niki. 2013. Factors in the choice of voice morphology in Q’anjob’al. Handout, AIS, February 26 2013.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56:251–299.
- Mateo Toledo, Eladio. 2008. The family of complex predicates in Q’anjob’al; their syntax and meaning. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.