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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:\footnote{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_an/plant/etc = 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}

\begin{equation}
\text{Aspect-} \text{ -ABS(“class B”) ERG(“class A”) - VERB - suffixes}
\end{equation}

(1) \begin{align*}
\text{ch-} & \quad \text{ach} \\
\text{w-} & \quad \text{och} \\
\text{aspect(ic)-} & \quad \text{-abs(2sB) erg(1sA)- V(like)- affixes(-ej)}
\end{align*}

‘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.
### Table 1: Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Ergatives (A)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutives (B)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>w-</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>j-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>hey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>y-</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>y-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss. 3</td>
<td>∅/s-</td>
<td>y-</td>
<td>∅/s-</td>
<td>y-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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]possessor
    3A- 3A- tongue cLm 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  
  \[(\text{Foster 2013})\]

(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_{animal} 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_{animal} 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_{animal} 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

Baquiax 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

\[
\text{[wh phrase]} \ V \ldots \ [\text{gap}] \ldots
\]

- 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?’
   \text{Object}

b. Maktxel s- tsew -i
   who c- laugh -intr
   ‘Who laughed?’
   \text{Intransitive subject}
c. [Maktxel y- etoq] x- y- a’ taj ix no’ txay?
   [who 3A- with] c- 3A- cause cook CLf CLanimal fish
   ‘With whom did she cook fish?’

   • 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)

   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)

   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?’

   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?’

   b. Maktxel x- ’elaj s-txi’
      whose c- run.away 3A-dog
      ‘Whose dog ran away?’

   Relational Noun
c. **Maktxel** x- b’on naq s- na?  
**who** c- paint **CLm** **3A- house**  
‘Whose house did he 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 CLf** **CLanimal** 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- REFN  
‘Who saw him/herself?’ (504:5-6)  
*Reflexive*

Not possible for ergative arguments:

(13) a. **Maktxel** txitx x- ach ∅- chi -on -i?  
Who 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  

**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 **CLm**  
‘Whose house did he 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 CLm
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.

\[ A \{focused \text{ phrase}\} \, V \ldots \{\text{gap}\} \ldots \]

• Focus as defined in Baquiax Barreno and et al. (Comunidad Linguística 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. \[ A \{jun saqchyob’al\}{\text{Obj}} \, \text{ch- } \emptyset \, -\text{in } \text{tek’ -a’} \]
\[ \{\text{FOC one toy}\}{\text{O}} \, \text{ic- } 3B \, -1sA \, \text{kick -tr } \text{t}_{\text{obj}} \]
‘It’s \text{the toy that I kick.}’ (490:37)

b. \[ A \, \text{no’ wakax}{\text{Subj}} \, \text{max } \emptyset \, -\text{kam -i} \]
\[ \{\text{FOC Cl}_{\text{animal}} \text{cow}\}{\text{c}} \, \text{3B- die -intr } \text{t}_{\text{subj}} \]
‘It’s \text{the cow that died}’ (389:84)

\[ \text{Intrans. subject} \]

c. \[ A \, \text{y- etoq ix Malin}{\text{Obl}} \, \text{x- -ach b’itn -i} \]
\[ \{\text{FOC 3A- with CLf Malin}{\text{Obl}} \, \text{c- 2sB sing -intr } \text{t}_{\text{obl}} \]
‘It’s \text{with Malin that you sang}’

\[ \text{Oblique} \]

d. \[ A \, \text{naq Curt}{\text{Poss}} \, \text{x- tz’ai q’a’} \]
\[ \{\text{FOC CLm Curt}{\text{Poss}} \, \text{c- go.out fire} \]
‘It’s Curt whose fire went out.’ (MF 2012-08-20)

\[ \text{Possessor (of inanimate, intransitive subject)} \]
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]\_S [te’ na]\_O
c- -3B 3A- take.care.of -tr [Cl\_m child]\_S [Cl\_plant house]\_O
   ‘The child took care of the house’ (MT, ex.76)
b. [A naq unin]\_S max-∅ tayene -n _ te’ na
c- -3B take-care-of AF t\_S Cl\_plant house
   ‘It was the child who took care of the house’ (MT, ex.76)
c. #[A naq unin]\_Object max-∅ s- tayene -j _ te’ na
[c- -3B 3A- take-care-of -tr Cl\_plant house t\_O
   ‘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]\_Focus ch- y- och -ej b’a __
c- -3B 3A- like -tr REFL __
   ‘It’s Malin who likes herself.’ (438:42) ✓ No AF
b. [A ix Malin]\_Focus ch- och -on b’a __
c- -3B 3A- like -AF REFL __
   ‘It’s Malin who likes herself.’ ✓ AF

### 4.3.1 Possessor fronting

**Intransitive Subjects:**

Possible for inanimate possessees only:

(19) a. A ix Meaghan x- ’el telnaj tz’ib’al
   FOC Cl\_f Meaghan c- DIR2 fall book
   ‘It’s Meaghan’s book that fell (off a table)’

Intended: ‘It’s Meaghan’s sister that fell (off a cliff)’

*Animate possessee

b. *A ix Meaghan x- ’el telnaj (s-) nuer
   FOC Cl\_f Meaghan c- DIR2 fall (3A-) sister
   ‘It’s Meaghan’s sister that fell (off a cliff)’

Inanimate possessors are fine:

(20) A biblioteca x- il q’otnaq ch’an x- un
   FOC library c- DIR2 fall Cl\_wood 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) *¿A  ix Niki x- in chi -on s-  txitx
    FOC  CLₜ 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) ¿A  naq  Xhun x- lo -ay -toq  ix Malin te’ s-  mansan
    FOC  CLₐₐ Xhun c- eat -DIR2  -DIR3  CLₜ Malin 3A- apple
    ‘It’s Xhun whose apple Malin ate’

Possessor of inanimate object

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wh-mvt</th>
<th>A-focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive Subject</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive subject</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. of reflexive</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of transitive subject</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of animate intrans. subj.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of inanimate intrans. subj.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of animate object</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of inanimate object</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 absolutes)

- foc: 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

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

(23) a. Alexia saw Damien
    b. [Naq Damien] x- y- il ix Alexia
       [Clm Damien] c- 3A- see Clf 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- union b’a naq Ringo] x- in maq’-on -i
    [3A- on.purpose REFL Clm 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 Clf Malin ic- like -AF Clm Xhun
b. [Ix Malin] ch- ‘och -on naq Xhun
    [Clf Malin] ic- like -AF Clm Xhun
    ‘It’s Malin who likes Xhun’

Transitive Subject
(26) a. [A ix Alexia x- kanalw -i  
[FOC Clf Alexia] c- dance -intr
b. [Ix Alexia x- kanalw -i  
[Clf Alexia] c- dance -intr
‘It’s Alexia who danced.’

Intransitive subject

(27) a. [A naq Damien x- y- il ix Alexia  
FOC Clm Damien c- 3A- see Clf Alexia
b. [Naq Damien x- y- il ix Alexia  
[Clm Damien] c- 3A- see Clf 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 Clm Damien] c- 3A- give Clf Alexia Clwood book
b. [B’ay naq Damien x- y- a’ ix Alexia ch’an un  
[to Clm Damien] c- 3A- give Clf Alexia Clwood book
‘It’s Damien that Alexia gave the book to’

Oblique

(29) a. [A naq Curt]Poss x- tz’ai q’a’  
[FOC Clm Curt]Poss c- go.out fire
b. [Naq Curt]Poss x- tz’ai q’a’  
[Clm Curt]Poss 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]Subj ch- y- och -ej b’a  
[FOC Clm Xhun]Subj ic- 3A- like -tr REFL
b. [Naq Xhun]Subj ch- y- och -ej b’a  
[Clm Xhun]Subj 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

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

Table 3: wh and focus

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

4.5 Resumptive Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic pause V ... [resumptive]...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Topic as defined in Baquiax Barreno and et al. (Comunidad Linguística Q’anjob’al)
- Syntactic subjects only
- No AF

(32) a. [naq Xhun], // x- lo -ay -toq naq te’ tzoyol
[Clₘ Xhun], // c- eat- -DIR2 DIR3 CLₘ CLₚ plant chayote
‘Xhun, he ate chayote’ (387:62)

Transitive Subject

b. [Ix Malin], // s- b’itni ix
[Clᵦ Malin], // ic- sing CLᵦ
‘Malin, she sings’

Intransitive subject

c. [naq Xhun], // ch- y- och -ej ∅- b’a] naq
[Clₘ Xhun]textbf, // ic- 3A- like -tr 3sA- REFL CLₘ
‘Xhun, he likes himself’

Reflexive

d. [Ix Malin], // x- ∅ ’ay yuchnaj s- na ix
[Clᵦ Malin], // c- -3B collapse 3A- house CLᵦ
‘Malin, her house collapsed’

Possessor of inanimate intransitive

e. *Ix Malin, // x- way s- nuej ix
CLᵦ Malin, // c- sleep 3A- sister CLᵦ
Intended: ‘Malin, her sister slept’ (MF 2012-08-13) *Possessor of animate intransitive
4.6 Gap Topic

- 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
    [CLf Malin] ic- like -AF CLm Xhun
    ‘Malin, she likes Xhun’
    Transitive Subject

b. [Ix Alexia] x- kanalw -i
    [CLf Alexia] c- dance -intr
    ‘Alexia, she danced.’
    Animate intransitive subject

c. x-∅ ‘ay yuchnaj te’ na
    c- -3B collapse CLplant house
    ‘The house collapsed’
    Inanimate intransitive subject

d. [Te’ mansan] [Topic x-∅ -∅ lo -ay -toq ix Malin __
    [CLplant apple] [Topic c- 3B- 3A- eat -DIR2 DIR3 CLf Malin tObj
    ‘The apple, Malin ate it.’ (MF 2012-08-06)
    Object

e. [b’ay ix Margarita] hoq hey- i -toq jun ab’en ti’ __
    [to CLf Malkal] pot 2pA- take -DIR3 one package this __
    ‘You guys are going to take this package to Margarita.’
    Oblique

f. [naq Xhun] ch- y- och -ej ∅ b’a]
    [CLm Xhun] ic- 3A- like -TR 3sA- REFLEX
    ‘Xhun, he likes himself’ (MF 2013-01-07)
    Reflexive

g. *Ix Malin x- ’el telnaq s- nuej
    CLf Malin c- DIR2 fall 3A- sister
    Intended: ‘Malin, her sister fell’
    *Possessor of animate intrans. subject

h. [Naq Curt] [Poss x- tz’ai q’a’]
    [CLm Curt] [Poss c- go.out fire
    ‘Curt, his fire went out.’
    Possessor of inanimate, intrans. subject

4.6.1 Subject Drop

Q’anjob’al allows subject drop when the subject is clear from context. Requires object topicalisation.
4.6.2 Interim Summary 3: Topics

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

Table 4: Topics

4.7 Quantifier fronting

\[
\text{[quantifier phrase]} \ V \ ... \ [\text{gap}]?... \\
\]

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 clₘ
    ‘Every boyᵢ loves hisₛᵢ/j mother’

But not always:

(36)  a. masanil x- w- il -a’
    everything c- 1sA- see -tr
    ‘I saw everyone’

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 masanil 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 clₘ Ringo, // [c- -1B 3A- see]ᵥ clₘ
    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 clₘ Ringo], // c- -3B boil -intr 3A-3A-water clₘ
   ‘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: focused phrase 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wh</th>
<th>A-foc</th>
<th>Inton Foc</th>
<th>Res Top</th>
<th>Gap Top</th>
<th>Hybr</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive Subject</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive subject</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. of reflexive</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>*AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of animate intrans. subj.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor of inanimate intrans. subj.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Summary

References


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.


Mateo Toledo, Eladio. 2008. The family of complex predicates in Q’anjob’al; their syntax and meaning. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.