

PAPERS IN MAYAN LINGUISTICS

EDITED BY

NORA C. ENGLAND

Copyright

The Curators of the University of Missouri

1978

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS IN ANTHROPOLOGY # 6

STUDIES IN MAYAN LINGUISTICS # 2

ISBN # 0-913134-87-2

*Printed with non-appropriated funds by
the Museum of Anthropology
104 Swallow Hall
University of Missouri - Columbia
Columbia, Missouri 65201*

than the conventional Spanish orthography in which they were published.

11 The phrase sa? xun cik kutan seems to be proposed for contrastive reasons.

Bibliography

- Freeze, Ray A., "Possession in K'ekchi (Maya)", *IJAL*, 42, No. 2, 1976.
- Maxwell, Judie, "San Mateo Chuj: A VOS Language That's Paid the Price", *PLFM*, 1975.
- Stone, Robert, "K'ekchi Kwa:nk, the Genitive, and Oblique Cases", *Studies in K'ekchi*, Texas Linguistic Forum 3, University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

THE MAYAN ANTIPASSIVE: SOME FACTS AND FICTIONS

Thom Smith-Stark
Tulane University

1. Introduction. I hereby declare the Mayan antipassive dead and buried¹. Whether or not a resurrection is possible will depend on one's religious and/or philosophical convictions as well as on one's ability to explain some of the data which I will present herein.

Elsewhere, I have described the notion of antipassive² in some detail and applied the results to an analysis of Pocomam (Smith-Stark 1976a). The results were reasonably successful. Optimistically, I have urged and encouraged others to apply the same model to other Mayan languages, hoping that an analysis in terms of the antipassive would prove enlightening throughout the family. In one sense, I think, my optimism was well founded; attempts to apply the antipassive model defined certain kinds of questions to ask, questions which seem to have uncovered a lot of interesting data at the core of Mayan syntax. However, in many cases, perhaps the majority, the interesting data did not conform to the predictions made by the model. In this paper, I will present some of the problems encountered. My data comes primarily from Pocomam, Quiche, Kekchi, Ixil, and Jacaltec since those are the languages on which I have the most data available. It also turns out that an interesting variety of data is thereby accumulated. I will also add fragmentary data from other languages to the extent that I can.

I will show that what amount to different uses of the antipassive in some languages (Pocomam and Ixil, for example) correspond to completely different verb forms in others (Quiche and Jacaltec, for example). I will introduce terminology which will enable one to differentiate these various functions and forms. I will also show that there are significant differences across the family in the formal characteristics of the antipassive when appearing in its agent promotion function. The degree to which it resembles an intransitive verb and the method by which it receives person marking vary in interesting ways.

Finally, I will turn to the implications of this data for comparative Mayan. Despite the anomalies and variation, a great number of similarities will be seen across the family. A good deal more knowledge and analysis is undoubtedly necessary before the whole picture for proto-Mayan can be outlined. Nevertheless, I will propose two hypotheses concerning the nature of antipassive-like phenomena in proto-Mayan.

2. Terminology. The opening sentence of this paper was more for dramatic content than for anything else. I will continue using the term antipassive in its well-established meaning. However, in order to make sense out of the data, and in order to speak more precisely

about the data, it is essential to introduce a number of additional terms³. A uniform terminology among Mayanists would facilitate comparison of related data from different languages (cf. such useful terms as relational noun, set A, set B, positional, which are becoming more and more general among Mayanists). However, I realize that a terminology cannot be dictated but must earn acceptance by proving valuable to the people working in the field.

In some of the Mayan languages, the antipassive seems to have two quite distinct functions. First, it is found when there is no mentioned or implied patient of transitive verbs. Mayan languages generally use a special verb form, derived from the transitive stem, for this purpose. I will call this the absolute function and the verb form used the absolute voice. This is the basic and defining feature of the antipassive voice. It happens that in several Mayan languages a form related to the absolute voice is also used in a number of related contexts which usually include the following:

- a. Information questions formed on the agent of transitive verbs (WH-Q)
- b. Focus of the agent (FOC)
- c. Relativization of the agent (REL)

I will refer to the special marking of the above three contexts as the agent promotion function, and I will call the associated verb form the agentive voice if it is distinctive. The agentive voice sometimes, but not always, is identical to or overlaps with the absolute voice. For this reason, I usually discuss agent promotion together with absolutes when I describe antipassives. I have also tended to call whatever is used as agentive voice the antipassive. In all respects, I have been a bit sloppy in my thinking and urge others to avoid my mistakes by being more precise. Finally, in some languages, there is a special verb form used with a restricted class of direct object noun phrases, and which has the effect of incorporating the object into the verb. I will call this the incorporative function and the verb form employed the incorporative voice⁴.

3. Data. In this section, I will describe the patterning of the above mentioned functions and voices in some Mayan languages.

3.1. Pocomam. The source for this discussion is Smith-Stark 1976a, where the antipassive in the Jilotepequeño dialect of Pocomam is discussed in great detail. In Pocomam the absolute function is performed by a verb derived from the transitive stem as follows (T= a radical transitive stem; t= a derived transitive stem):

absolute voice stem: T + -w t + -in

The absolute voice stem is inflected exactly like any other intransitive stem. No patient can be expressed, either directly or obliquely.

Agent promotional functions are recognized in Pocomam and are

rather complex, but the agentive voice is identical to the absolute voice in form. Briefly, the conditions of use are as follows:

- a. The verb in an information question on the agent is put into agentive voice obligatorily if the patient is third person.
- b. The verb in a relative clause based on the agent is optionally put into the agentive voice if the patient is third person.
- c. The verb in a sentence where an agent has been fronted for focus can optionally be put into agentive voice if both arguments are third person.
- d. When the agent is a negative indefinite pronoun (NIP), the verb may optionally be put into the agentive if the patient is third person.

In all cases, the agentivized verb is intransitive in form with a third person singular subject marker. Since both agent and patient are third person, it is not clear which is being cross-referenced, though I have always thought of it as the agent. The patient NP can either be left unmodified or dative (that is, put into a reh phrase, based on the relational noun -eh, which is also used to express the indirect object).

3.2. Quiche. The source for this discussion is Mondloch and Hruska 1975. Quiche has an absolute voice formed as follows:

absolute voice T: CV₁C + -V_an t: t + -n
stem CV₁? + -n

$$\frac{V_1-}{u} \quad \frac{V_a-}{u}$$

$$a \quad a$$

$$e,i,o \quad o$$

The patient can still be expressed as either a genitive (chec phrase) or dative (che phrase) which are constructed on the relational nouns -ech and -e respectively, along with the preposition chi. However, some of the absolute forms do not have active meaning as I would predict, but rather middle meaning⁵. Compare quincämisanic 'I kill' which has active meaning, with quïnrakinic 'I break open' which has middle meaning. Furthermore, not all verbs are acceptable in the absolute voice form, at times because there is a corresponding intransitive form already.

For radical transitive stems, Quiche has a distinct agentive voice form, but the agentive is identical to the absolute for derived transitive stems. The forms are as follows:

agentive voice T: CV₁C + -V_{ow} t: t + -n
stem T CV₁? + -V_bw

$\frac{V_1}{u} \quad \frac{V_o}{u}$	$\frac{V_1}{i} \quad \frac{V_b}{o}$	
a, e, o, i o	a, (e), o, u ∅	If $V_1=a$, then V_1 becomes o

Agentive voice is used in the following contexts:

- a. To emphasize the agent. F.e., "I am the one who..."
- b. With interrogative jachin 'who'.
- c. Yes/No question on subject.
- d. With maj 'no hay'.

It is not clear from these descriptions to what extent the function of the Quiche agentive voice overlaps with those listed above as agent promotion functions. However, it is clear that there is at least some overlap (f.e., with respect to focusing).

One of the most interesting features of the Quiche agentive is the manner of determining the cross-reference marker which the agentive verb takes. To begin with, the agentive will only be used if either the subject or object is either third person or second person polite. The agentive voice verb will agree with either the agent or the patient, depending on which is higher on the following hierarchy:

in, ät, üj, 'ix	'first person, second person familiar'
e	'third person plural'
∅	'third person singular, second person polite'

Note that this hierarchy is not stateable in terms of person. It seems to be in terms of phonological form more than anything else, and could be rewritten as follows: $\check{V}C > V > \emptyset$. At any rate, the agentive voice is intransitive in form, but cannot be said to consistently mark either agent or patient.

Here in the Quiche data, several points are difficult to understand from the viewpoint of a model based on the antipassive. First, why should certain verbs formed like antipassives have middle meaning? Second, why should the subject of the antipassive form agree with the patient instead of the agent? Third, there is no obvious explanation of why the antipassive should include agent promotion functions.

3.3. Ixil. My data on Ixil comes from conversations with Tom Lengyel drawing on data from his field notes (see also Lengyel 1976). Ixil has an absolutive voice formed as follows:

absolutive voice stem	T + -on	t + -n
-----------------------	---------	--------

These are inflected like regular intransitives. A patient may be present, and is expressed obliquely in a dative steh phrase (based on the relational noun -eh ?).

Ixil also has an agentive voice which is formed identically

to the absolutive. It occurs under the following conditions:

- a. Questioning agent or instrument
- b. Focusing agent or instrument
- c. Relativizing on agent or instrument

When the instrument is promoted, the agent is put into an instrumental ta'n phrase and the patient is expressed without modification. Agreement marking is complex. In the durative aspect (which is inflected along a nominative-accusative pattern) the agentive is inflected like a derived transitive, with both agent and patient cross-referenced. In the punctual (which is normally inflected along an ergative-absolutive pattern) aspect, the agentive is inflected like an intransitive which cross-references the patient (however, it does not take the expected -ih suffix in the third person singular, as do most intransitive verbs). This could be described as a derived transitive, as in the durative, but with the set A cross-reference pronoun deleted (this analysis was suggested by Lengyel). In Ixil then, we see at least two areas in which the standard view of an antipassive does not seem adequate to explain the data. First, the antipassive verb forms functioning to promote agents (and instruments) are either transitive, or not clearly transitive or intransitive. Second, the actual cross-reference pronoun that occurs sometimes refers to the patient. Third, the same verb form is also used for instrument promotion. While a special instrumental voice is used for this function in some Mayan languages (for example, Quiche), this has not previously been identified as a possible function of the antipassive (but see section 3.4 on Jacaltec).

3.4. Jacaltec. The data for Jacaltec is taken from Craig (1975), from Day (1973), and from personal communications with Colette Craig. Jacaltec has an absolutive voice. It is formed by adding the suffix -wa to the transitive stem. Jacaltec also has an incorporative voice which is formed by adding -w to the transitive stem; a simple object noun must follow. Furthermore, there is a separate agentive voice formed using the suffix -n. It is used in a number of cases, including

- a. Questioning of an agent or instrument
- b. Emphasizing an agent or instrument
- c. Relativizing an agent or instrument

(Notice that as in Ixil, the agentive voice is also employed to mark promotion of instruments.) The agentive verbs are formally intransitive. Apparently, use of the agentive voice is restricted to those cases where the agent is third person. Cases where the patient is not third person reveal that the agentive voice verb cross-references the patient. Use of the agentive is obligatory in simple sentences (with a couple of exceptions⁶), but is optional in complement sentences, unless semantics do not disambiguate, in which case it is obligatory. Here we see that the facts of agent promotion are completely independent of the antipassive.

3.5. Kekchi. Data for Kekchi comes from Pinkerton (1976a), especially Freund (1976) and Bacon (1976) and Pinkerton (1976b).

Kekchi has an absolutive voice, at least for a subset of the transitive verbs. It is formed as follows (t_v = vowel final stem; t_c = consonant final stem):

absolutive voice	T + -V _o	t_v + -n
stem		t_c + -an

However, there are some transitive verbs (Vb_x) which simply use the transitive stem intransitively, without special affixes⁷.

Kekchi also has an agentive voice, which is formed exactly like the absolutive. However, those verbs which do not change form in the absolutive function do take the appropriate suffixes for absolutive voice when they are fulfilling the agent promotion function. The agentive voice is used as follows:

- a. Focus on agents
- b. Relativize on agents

However, the conditions on its use are quite complex. Focusing of the agent along with the verb in the agentive voice is obligatory if the agent is non-specific. Both are optional if the agent and patient are both specific. In relative clauses, it is employed whenever the agent is relativized. When the verb occurs in agentive voice, the patient is expressed in a re phrase (dative).

Kekchi also seems to have an incorporative voice which is identical in form to the agentive. It occurs with a non-specific patient (bare noun?), which immediately follows the verb. No re is used, and the agent does not necessarily have to be fronted.

3.6. Chuj. The data here is from Maxwell (1975, 1976). Chuj has an absolutive voice marked by the suffix -wj. Patients can still be expressed, but they must be introduced by ha, which is also the dative marker. Chuj also has an agentive voice marked by the suffix -n. It is used, at least, in the focusing of agents. Chuj also has an incorporative voice, marked by the suffix -w. The type of noun which can follow the verb in this voice is limited, but more than a simple noun is allowed. Types of noun phrases which are disallowed are those which have an article, possessor, noun classifier, or numeral. However adjectives and relative clauses are allowed to some degree, depending on the dialect.

3.7. Tzotzil. Data for Tzotzil comes from Craig and Robertson (1971) and from Cowan (1969). Tzotzil seems to have an absolutive voice formed by adding the suffix -van to radical and derived transitive stems (Huixtan dialect).

Tzotzil (Zinacantan dialect) also has an agentive voice which is formed by means of the suffix -on. It is used at least in the relativization and questioning of agents. The patient occurs unmodi-

fied. In the agentive voice, the patient cannot be first or second person⁸.

3.8. Yucatec. This data is based on personal communication with Vicki Bricker. Yucatec seems to have an absolutive voice which differs in form depending on whether one is expressing incomplete or complete aspect. In the incomplete, one may actually be dealing with an active intransitive since the transitive stem is simply treated as an intransitive stem. However, this may be accompanied by modification of the stem vowel, suggesting derivation by internal modification. In the complete, the suffix -n is added to the transitive stem, along with possible stem vowel modification, to form the absolutive voice.

The agent promotion function is fulfilled at least in part by the subjunctive verb form rather than by a special agentive voice form.

3.9. Mam. Mam data is from Craig and Robertson (1971) and from England (1975). Mam has an incorporative voice. If the patient is non-specific, the verb can take a suffix, -n, and be marked intransitively.

Mam also has an agentive voice, which also is formed by means of the suffix -n. The patient is put into a te phrase (dative, based on the relational noun -e).

3.10. Quichean. Brown and Norman (1975) give the following suffixes as antipassives in Quichean languages:

	Quichean Proper	Pocomchi	Uspantec	Comalapa
T	-ow	-w	-Vw	Cakchiquel
t	-n	-V ₁ n	-n	-on, -n, -an, -o ² n

3.11. Aguacatec. Tom Larsen (personal communication) has provided me with evidence for an agentive in Aguacatec formed by the suffix -:n.

3.12. Tzeltal. Kaufman (1971) describes a Tzeltal absolutive (his term) desinence -(a)wan which derives intransitive verb stems from transitive verb stems.

4. Synthesis. I have tried to summarize the data presented in section 3 in Table 1, in a way which will enable quick spotting of both the similarities as well as the major parameters of difference.

A look at the data suggests that there are primarily two groups of suffixes involved. One group involves the consonant n and sometimes a preceding vowel. The other involves the consonant w and sometimes a preceding vowel. Tentatively then, I will reconstruct two proto-Mayan suffixes, *-(V)n and *-(V)w. The value and/or exis-

tence of the vowels is a problem which I will not tackle any further in this paper, since I feel that its ultimate solution depends crucially on research in other areas, such as vowel harmony, stem shape, and the suffixal system as a whole.

If one attempts to reconstruct function rather than form, which I feel is a legitimate endeavor, it seems safe to say that both the absolutive and agentive functions were marked by special suffixes on transitive verbs in proto-Mayan. In some languages, the same suffix serves both functions; in others, there is an overt distinction. This is summarized in the following table for those languages where I have enough information available.

Table 2: A comparison of languages in the Mayan family based on whether they exhibit formally different absolutive and agentive voices or not

Same	Different
Pocomam	Quiche (T's)
Quiche (t's)	Jacaltec
Ixil	Chuj
Kekchi (Vb _z) ⁹	Tzotzil
	Kekchi (Vb _x)

The languages which do not formally distinguish the two voices represent two subbranches of the family, Quichean and Mamean, which are geographically contiguous. Those which distinguish the two voices formally represent three subbranches, Quichean, Kanjobalan, and Tzeltalan, which are not contiguous. This distribution, as well as the fact that it is easier to explain the loss of a distinction in several languages than to explain the independent gain of the same distinction in several languages, argues I would claim for the distinction of the two functions formally at the proto-Mayan level.

Now, in those languages which have two distinct forms, there are three patterns, as follows (I employ simply the letters w or n to indicate which of the two suffixes have which function):

Language	Quiche (T)	Jacaltec	Chuj	Tzotzil	Kekchi (Vb _x)
absolutive	n	w	w	w ¹⁰	∅
agentive	w	n	n	n	n, w ¹¹

Notice that Quiche shows a pattern which is just the reverse of Jacaltec, Chuj and Tzotzil. However, note that all languages consistently show n for derived transitive agentive voice. This suggests that the original proto-Mayan system was as follows:

absolutive: *-(V)_w
agentive: *-(V)_n¹²

Table 1: Summary of Data on the Antipassive in Mayan Languages¹³

Language	Agentive Voice	Absolutive Voice	Incorporative Voice
Yucatec		{stem chop} / incmp. {ablaut}	
		-n + {stem chop} / cmp. {ablaut}	
Tzotzil	-on +WH-Q ag. +REL ag. +x → 3 ⁸ -oblique	-van ⁸	
Tzeltal		-(a)wan	
Chuj	-n +FOC ag.	-wj ±patient +ha (dative)	-w +N(Adj)(RelCl)
Jacaltec	-n +WH-Q ag., instr. +REL ag., instr. +FOC ag., instr. +3 → x (in dependent clauses, both must be possible subjects of verb or use of agentive becomes optional) +c.r. pat. -oblique +intrans.	-wa	-w +N
Mam	-n +oblique +te (dative)		-n +NP [-specific]
Aguacatec	-:n +REL ag.		
Ixil	-on / T -n / t +REL ag., instr. +FOC ag., instr. +WH-Q ag., instr. +x → x	-on / T -n / t ±pat. +steh (dative)	

the two categories, and producing

absolutive/agentive: $*(V)_w / T _$
 $*(V)_n / t _$

This gives the current situation in Pocomam. It also seems to describe the situation in Kekchi for those verbs which use the same form for both functions, assuming the Kekchi suffix with roots (-o/-u) is cognate with $*(V)_w$.

- c. The derived form is generalized in the absolutive in Quiche, yielding the present system in that language, and resulting in a virtual reversal of the original values of the suffixes.

Something like the above scenario seems necessary if one assumes that my reconstructions are valid. However, the various changes I have assumed for Quichean appear quite mysterious, since I can offer no sensible motivation for such changes.

For each of the functions I am discussing, there are several parameters over which they can vary. A complete description of these functions in any of the languages should contain data on at least these parameters (there are surely others of which I am not aware). Also, any attempted reconstruction should attempt to specify the values of each parameter for PM (proto-Mayan).

For incorporative voice, there seems to be one major parameter:

1. Are there any limitations on the type of NP which can be incorporated?

Various languages differ as to what kind of NP they will allow to be incorporated. Since I have not yet made any statements concerning incorporative voice in proto-Mayan, let me take a position here. Currently, I do not think that there was a special incorporative voice in PM. However, the absolutive could be used with limited kinds of expressed objects for this purpose. I should also comment on the fact that actual incorporation of nouns into verbs has been reported for Yucatec (V. Bricker, personal communication), Kanjobal and Acatec (Dakin, 1976), Chontal (Smailus, 1975, p. 192). I have not yet investigated the possibility of this being a feature of PM.

For the absolutive voice, there seem to be at least two major parameters of variation:

1. Can the patient be optionally expressed? (I identified this parameter with the feature $\pm pat.$ in Table 1)
2. If the patient can be optionally expressed, how is this done (obliquely or not)? The answer to this may depend on the formal and semantic properties of the object NP and it is in this respect that the absolutive may take on the features of an incorporative voice.

With respect to the first of these, I see no clear answer for PM. I will suggest that the patient was expressible with no special marker

if it were non-specific. Essentially, I am saying that the absolutive voice served both absolutive and incorporative functions in PM. This is consistent with the fact that in all cases for which I have data, the incorporative voice is either identical with or similar to the absolutive voice in form. Furthermore, there is no general pattern to the ways in which the incorporative voice can differ from the absolutive when there is a formal difference, suggesting that these are later independent developments.⁴ As for the second parameter, all languages which allow the expression of the patient employ the same means as is used to express dative objects (assuming that the patient is not being incorporated), though the actual form used may vary somewhat (che, steh, ha). I feel this is a good example of being able to reconstruct a pattern although one may be unable to discover the actual form involved. I will assume then that in PM, patients could be optionally expressed in the absolutive, by putting them into a dative phrase. Whether it was possible (or is) to distinguish between non-specific patients which are or are not incorporated, I do not know, but I will assume that it was not possible, since nothing of the kind has been reported to my knowledge.

There are substantially more parameters of variation for the agentive voice:

1. What syntactic environments utilize the agentive?
2. Are there any limitations on the possible subjects and objects of agentive voice verbs?
3. How is person cross-referenced on the agentive verb?
4. Is the patient put into an oblique relation and if so, which one?
5. Is the agentive transitive or intransitive (or indeterminate) in form?

With respect to the first parameter, there is fairly general agreement that questioning, relativizing, or focusing on the agent requires the presence of agentive voice, at least under certain conditions. The inclusion of instruments in Ixil and Jacaltec is probably an innovation. However, it will undoubtedly be of great interest to investigate what happens to instruments in other languages. In fact, the syntactic behavior of all oblique NP's in Mayan languages, such as locatives, datives, and instrumentals will probably reveal interesting phenomena (such as the instrumental voice of Quichean, the dative voice of Tzeltal, Tzotzil, and Chontal, and special pro-forms found in Quichean). Also, the domain of use of the agentive includes several additional functions in a number of languages (such as Pocomam, Jacaltec) which means that the use of it may also have included more functions in PM.

On the second parameter, the languages show little agreement. They range from Ixil, where there seems to be no restriction, to Jacaltec, where one of the subject or object have to be third person, to Kekchi, where both must be third person. The restrictions may

also vary depending on clause independence, specificity, selectional restrictions, etc. I will assume that the restriction in PM was that at least one of the arguments had to be third person, though I have no arguments in favor of this possibility. It does appear to be the case that the restriction was at least this tight, for of all the attested examples, only is Ixil more lax.

Concerning the third point, there is little agreement. All languages excepting Ixil, only mark the agentive for one person, and this was undoubtedly true of PM. However, for many of the languages, it is not clear whether the agent or patient is being cross-referenced since both are third person (f.e., Pocomam). When it is possible to distinguish, it can be the patient (Ixil), agent (Kekchi ?), or either (Quiche). I will assume, however, that in PM the agent was cross-referenced, until I have more conclusive data. It may seem strange that it is so difficult to establish the basis for marking the agentive voice for person, until one realizes that disambiguation seems to be one of the principal functions of these forms. In effect, the person marking is irrelevant since it is the agentive voice suffix which accomplishes the disambiguating function. In order to explain the rather frequent movement between the agentive and absolutive forms, as well as the fact that the agentive does not show homonymity with passives in any of the languages for which I have data, I assume that the agentive originally cross-referenced the agent¹⁵.

On the fourth point, data is again varied. Some languages put the patient in the dative, some optionally put the patient in the dative, still others leave it unchanged. I will assume that in PM, it was unmarked, but since it was not cross-referenced on the verb, there was a tendency to mark it as overtly oblique, in which case, the dative was invariably chosen, probably on analogy with the absolutive.

There is overwhelming agreement that the agentive is intransitive in form. Not only is it marked for only one person, but it often takes suffixes which are uniquely intransitive. Ixil is the only exception I know of.

5. Reconstruction¹⁶. The various suggestions I have made in the preceding section concerning PM are summed up in the following two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: PM had an agentive voice suffix, *-(V)n, which could be added to transitive stems to form an intransitive stem. The agentive voice was employed whenever the agent was questioned, relativized, or focused, as long as at least one of the arguments was third person. The agentive voice verb cross-referenced the agent, though the patient is still expressed or implied with no overt modification.

Hypothesis 2: PM had an absolutive voice suffix, *-(V)w, which could be added to transitive stems forming a semantically active intransitive stem. Specific patients could still be expressed in a phrase, as if they were indirect objects. Non-specific patients could be expressed with no modification, but with the effect of incorporating them into the verb.

6. Conclusion. In this paper, I have attempted to summarize the current state of knowledge of antipassive-like phenomena in Mayan languages. I have specifically avoided giving any of the data on which these conclusions are based. This has led me to refine my thinking on the utility of the antipassive as an explanatory model in Mayan syntax, and to refine a previous attempt at reconstructing PM (cf. Smith-Stark 1976b, p. 56, hypothesis 12). However, this summary is in itself preliminary in that the data available to me is scanty for many languages and in that I have ignored several aspects of the antipassive which will eventually have to be considered, such as use in nominalizations. In order to clarify some of the concepts involved in antipassive-like phenomena, I have introduced some (is anything) new terminology. Finally, I have identified at least some of the parameters of variation which any description of these matters should include. I think that this clearly illustrates that one of the great values of attempting reconstruction is that it helps identify important questions to ask when doing synchronic description.

Any study such as this which attempts to gather a lot of data from a large number of sources which are often fragmentary or written with other questions and goals in mind, is bound to misrepresent or misinterpret some sources. I hope readers will inform me of points where I may have made such mistakes. I also would appreciate it if those who have access to data which will challenge my conclusions, or fill in some of the blanks which I have left, will write to me and help me fill in the holes.

Footnotes

1. I was first warned about the problems I would encounter applying the antipassive model throughout Mayan by Colette Craig, who tenaciously refused to accept my views of the Jacalteco data. The overwhelming problems became obvious to me while preparing and participating in the session on the antipassive at the Mayanist workshop which was held at the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquín, Antigua, Guatemala, in August of 1975. The problems I encountered there and subsequent discussions with Tom Lengyel at the 1976 CLS meetings were the motivation for this paper. I want to thank everyone who has attempted to "show me the light".

2. The basic concept of antipassive is well-developed by Jacobsen (1969). The term itself is due to Michael Silverstein, I think. Perhaps the best known example is the -*gay* transformation in Dyirbal (Dixon, 1972). Briefly, the antipassive is a transformation of a normally transitive construction which yields an intransitive construction, with the agent of the transitive construction surviving as subject of the intransitive construction. The former patient may, in some languages, still be expressible, though usually obliquely. There seems to be a special connection between antipassives and ergative languages. In fact, the name is due to the fact that in many respects, the antipassive seems to be the ergative analogue to the passive. Other names sometimes used to refer to the antipassive are semitransitive, absolutive, agentive.

3. The problems of terminology were particularly stressed at the 1976 AAA meeting in Washington, D. C. I sensed there that many people found my terminology confusing rather than clarifying. I will continue to employ it however, until I feel that there is a reasonable alternative.

4. I should explain why I refer to such verb forms as voice categories, since this usage may seem unmotivated to some readers. For me, voice categories are used to mark the alteration of the normal relations between a verb and its arguments. This usually affects the verb's transitivity, but not necessarily. Thus, the passive in English is a voice since it changes the normal relations of a verb with both the agent (normally the subject) and the patient (normally the object). This sense of voice is the only one which I know of which makes it a coherent linguistic category while at the same time conforming to most traditional uses of the term. Another way of saying this, using the terminology of generative grammar is that
Voice is the relationship between a verb's subcategorization feature and the realization of this feature in the surface structure of the sentence. (Babby and Brecht, 1975, p. 364)

5. If I understand him correctly, Will Norman (personal communication) feels that voice is an inappropriate term in this case since, although the normal relations between the verb and its arguments are altered, no new relationship is explicitly provided. However, I am still comfortable referring to this as a voice category, though clearly different from what I have called absolutive voice. I refer to the Quiche form as absolutive voice for comparative purposes and since I am not sure of the extent to which it deviates from a standard absolutive. To my knowledge, there is no adequate descriptive statement of this aspect of Quiche.

6. Actually, the exceptions are of considerable importance. Craig's data suggest at least two types of transitive sentences which need special attention with respect to facts of agentive function:

- i) reflexive/reciprocal verbs
- ii) subject or object is coreferential with the possessor of the other. F.e., I kicked my dog; My father helped me.

7. I call this an active intransitive. Such a strategy for fulfilling the absolutive function is very familiar to us for it is the method used by English and many other modern European languages. Cf.,

- i) I am painting the house.
- ii) I am painting.

8. Vicki Bricker has provided me with a somewhat different description of Tzotzil. First of all, -van apparently implies a human object (and thus resembles the tē- prefix of Classical Nahuatl in meaning). Second, -on is limited to situations where both subject and object are third person.

9. I introduce here the symbol Vb_z to refer to those Kekchi verbs which add an overt absolutive suffix (cf. section 3.5).

10. I interpret the -van as basically the w with another suffix later added on. However, this point deserves greater study than I have allotted it.

11. I interpret the -o/-u suffix of Kekchi as a development of earlier *-ow/-uw. However, this development cannot be accounted for on the basis of regular sound change, to my knowledge, and must be considered a weakness in my theory.

12. It seems inevitable to recall here the n_w morphophonemic alternation in the first person singular set A pronouns, reconstructed by Kaufman (1962) as *in-/w-. Could the difference between the absolutive and agentive suffixes which I am reconstructing reflect the same old morphophonemic alternation?

13. Abbreviations and notations used in Table 1:

Adj	adjective	pat.	patient
ag.	agent	punc.	punctual aspect
cmp.	completive aspect	Rel Cl	relative clause
c.r.	cross-reference	spec.	specific
dur.	durative aspect	stem chop	stem is shortened
incmp.	incompletive	t	derived trans. stem
intrans.	intransitive	T	radical trans. stem
N	noun	trans.	transitive
NP	noun phrase	x→y	this is meant to display person restrictions on agentive

14. Actually, it is unreasonable to consider them independent since the examples in question are both geographically near one another and in the same subbranch of Mayan (Kanjobalan).

15. It is also more consistent with an analysis which assumes the relevance of some sort of accessibility hierarchy. In this approach agentive voice should make agents more accessible, which would mean the subject of an intransitive verb in this case. In many of the attested Mayan languages, however, an analysis in terms of accessibility is not satisfying since it is not clear that the agent is being promoted to anything (cf. Quiche, Jacaltepec).

16. My general views on the goals and methods of reconstruction are set forth in Smith-Stark 1976b. I might repeat here what I consider two fundamental aspects of my approach:

- a) Reconstructions are hypotheses whose original motivation is unimportant. They can and should be evaluated within a specific linguistic theory of language change with respect to their conformity with the observed facts.
- b) A hypothesis should be accompanied by the relevant facts which it attempts to explain as well as a detailed description of how those facts fit into the hypothesis.

In my view, the hypotheses are relatively easy to come up with. The burden of demonstration then falls on explaining the facts within the hypothesis. I feel that it is important to support any claims of PM structure with a model detailing the progressive changes needed to get from the proposed original structure to the attested forms.

Bibliography

- Babby, Leonard H., and Richard D. Brecht. 1975. The syntax of voice in Russian. *Lg.* 51.342-367.
- Bacon, Marlys. 1976. K'ekchi clause structure. Pinkerton, 1976a, 77-93.
- Brown, Linda, and Will Norman. 1975. Handout prepared for the Antigua Mayanist workshop, August, 1975.
- Cowan, Marion M. 1969. Tzotzil Grammar. Summer Institute of Linguistics: Mexico.
- Craig, Colette G. 1975. Jacaltepec syntax: a study of complex sentences. Harvard University dissertation.
- _____, and John S. Robertson. 1971. Pronominal distribution in Mayan. Unpublished paper.
- Dakin, Karen. 1976. Verb Phrases as morphological bases in Kanjobal and Acatec. McClaren, 1976, 161-167.
- Day, Christopher. 1973. The Jacaltepec language. Indiana University Publications: Bloomington.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. The Dyirbal language of North Queensland. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, England.

- England, Nora. 1975. Mam grammar in outline. University of Florida dissertation.
- Freund, Robert. 1976. A sketch of K'ekchi verb morphology. Pinkerton, 1976a, 26-46.
- Jacobsen, William H., Jr. 1969. The analog of the passive transformation in ergative-type languages. Unpublished paper.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1962. Linguistic materials for a study of the internal and external relations of the Mayan language family. Unpublished paper.
- _____. Tzeltal phonology and morphology. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Lengyel, Thomas E. 1976. Ergativity, aspect and related perplexities of Ixil-Maya. Unpublished paper.
- Maxwell, Judie. 1975. Handout prepared for the Antigua Mayanist workshop, August, 1975.
- _____. 1976. Chuj intransitives: or when can an intransitive verb take an object. McClaren, 1976, 128-140.
- McClaran, Marlys (ed.). 1976. Mayan linguistics, volume 1. American Indian Studies Center: Los Angeles.
- Mondloch, James L., and Eugene P. Hruska. 1975. Basic Quiche grammar; 38 lessons. Guatemala.
- Pinkerton, Sandra (ed.). 1976a. Studies in K'ekchi. Department of Linguistics, University of Texas at Austin, Texas.
- _____. 1976b. Ergativity and word order. Pinkerton 1976a, 48-66.
- Smailus, Ortwin. 1975. El Maya-Chontal de Acalan: análisis lingüístico de un documento de los años 1610-12. Centro de Estudios Mayas, U.N.A.M.: Mexico.
- Smith-Stark, Thomas C. 1976a. The antipassive in Jilotepequeño Pocomam. Unpublished paper.
- _____. 1976b. Some hypotheses on syntactic and morphological aspects of Proto-Mayan (*PM). McClaran, 1976, 44-66.