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The Itza Maya language is a member of the lowland Maya Yucatecan family, which includes the closely related dialects Itza, Mopan, Lacandon, and Yucatec. Itza Maya is spoken in towns and settlements around Lake Peten-Itza in the Department of Peten, Guatemala (see Map 1, p. viii). (For ethnohistorical information regarding the Itza and bibliography of sources see Bricker (1981a), Edmonson (1982), and Jones, Rice, and Rice (1981).)

The linguistic data utilized in this study were gathered in San Jose, Peten, a town on the shore of Lake Peten-Itza which has the largest concentration of Itza Maya speaking inhabitants and where the Itza language has been least influenced by contact with Yucatec Maya (Schwmann 1971). Although San Jose has a larger number of Itza speakers than found elsewhere, that number is quite small, perhaps a hundred, and steadily diminishing. As a result of external socio-cultural pressures, there are very few Itza speakers under fifty years of age. Virtually all of them are also fluent in Spanish.

Standard linguistic field methods were employed in gathering data, but greater attention was given to eliciting discourse context than is usually the case. Rather than simply eliciting isolated sentences, chunks of discourse of two to five sentences were elicited so that sentences could be analysed in relation to the discourse that preceded and followed them. Both
conversational and narrative discourse chunks were recorded in addition to longer narrative texts.

With the exceptions of Schumann's (1971) description of phonology, morphology, and lexicon, and Fisher (1975) who utilized Schumann's work, Itza Maya has not been previously described or analyzed. For this reason, and due to the probability that the Itza Maya language will soon disappear, I have felt doubly compelled to be generous with examples of linguistic data for future researchers.

As the other dialects of the Yucatecan Maya language (Yucatec, Nopan, and Lacandon) have been studied more extensively than Itza, the present work fills a gap in the study of Yucatecan Maya and provides data for comparative and historical analyses. Such historical work might in turn lead to valuable insights regarding the language recorded in the Mayan hieroglyphs.

The transcription in this study is phonemic and standard symbols are employed with the following exceptions: /x/ represents a voiceless alveopalatal fricative; /¿/ represents a mid-high central unrounded vowel; /b/ represents a glottalized (or imploded) voiced bilabial stop; word-initial vowels are preceded by a glottal stop. Word stress ordinarily occurs on syllables with lengthened vowels or, if there are none, on the final syllable. See Schumann (1971) and Fisher (1973) for further information on Itza phonology.
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1. THE THEORETICAL ORIENTATION OF THE PRESENT WORK
INCLUDING A BRIEF HISTORY OF ITS DEVELOPMENT

An understanding of the relationship of language to
the individual, his thought, society and culture has been
a subject of increasing interest to philosophers,
literary scholars and social scientists during the
twentieth century.¹ This question has stimulated
extensive research and discussion within a number of
disciplines and also some fruitful interdisciplinary
communication.² Recent changes and developments in
linguistic theory since the attention given to syntax
stimulated by Harris (1952, 1957, 1959, 1963) and Chomsky
(1957) in the 1950's³, reflect these concerns and the
increasing ability of social scientists to deal with
them.

In the present work I provide an indepth analysis of
the Itza Maya language from the perspective of discourse
analysis. This study reflects a new synthesis of
linguistic analysis derived from the above mentioned
disciplines which have greatly influenced linguistic
theory and methodology during the past decade.

Prior to the emphasis on syntax initiated by
transformational grammar (TG), American linguistics was
largely devoted to the analysis of the phonological and
morphological systems of language (Joos, ed. 1957).⁴ At
these levels the principles of simultaneity and
sequentiaity (or the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic) in the linguistic code were reasonably well understood within the context of the word (M. P. Durbin 1975). Sentence and even inter-sentence relations were also sometimes considered, particularly with regard to juncture phenomena (Stockwell, Bowen, and Silva-Fuenzalida 1957). However, after the Sapir period (ending approximately in 1935), there was little interaction between linguists and other social sciences or students of the humanities, as there appeared to be little common ground. The relationship between phonological and morphological structures and more general questions of meaning, identity, truth, and humankind's culturally constituted universe was not clear (Hoijer, ed. 1954). Linguists rarely ventured into the semantic domain or the organization of meaningful elements in speech (syntax) and others, whose primary interest in language was at the level of meaning, found little of interest in linguistics.  

Interestingly, it was structural principles applicable to the phonological level of language that were borrowed from linguistics for applications in other fields. Structural concepts such as complementary and contrastive distribution were adopted, although often incompletely understood, for application to such diverse areas of human behavior as cultural systems (Levi-Strauss 1963; Hymes 1964, Hymes, ed. 1964), archaeology (Deetz 1967), kinesics (Hall 1959; Birdwhistell 1952, 1970).
history (Foucault 1965), psychology (Lacan 1968) and literary analysis (Barthes 1968, 1977). A review of much of this work has been given by M. A. Durbin (1972).

In linguistics in the 1950's, new emphasis began to be placed on syntax and semantics. Transformational grammar developed with an emphasis on abstract rules of sequential structures (Chomsky 1957; Harris 1952, 1957). At the same time, componential analysis evolved with an emphasis on simultaneous features for semantic analysis of the word (Lounsbury 1956; Tyler, ed. 1969). Sociolinguistics, with its emphasis on the social functions of language use was also developing during this period (Fishman 1968; Gumperz 1971; Gumperz and Hymes, eds. 1972). Through the sixties and into the seventies there was a blossoming of many schools concerned with language from a multitude of aspects, but there was little communication among the diverse groups and few attempts at synthesis.

**Structuralism**

Outside of linguistics proper, there were investigations of meaning and the structure of relations of meaningful units in texts, often literary or mythical texts, by students of structuralism and semiology (Barthes 1968; Levi-Strauss 1963, 1966). Non-linguistic structures such as art and ritual were also considered (Levi-Strauss 1966). The structures investigated were of a very different type from those being discussed in
syntax and were largely based on relations between semantic features, particularly semantic oppositions. These endeavors were largely influenced by the linguistic work of Roman Jakobson who was interested in structures (both paradigmatic and syntagmatic) at all levels of language ranging from the phonological to the poetic (Jakobson 1965, 1978).

The model utilized by and large by structuralists and semiologists is largely derived from phonological models and particularly from the principle of contrast or opposition. Although the structures were simple in comparison with structures discussed by linguists investigating syntax and semantics, structuralists were attempting to gain an understanding of texts by means of their structures, and these structures were often claimed to represent mental processes (Levi-Strauss 1966). It should also be noted, that in addition to the linguistic origins of their structural models, Saussure’s concept of the arbitrariness of the sign played a prominent role in structuralism and semiology, often at the expense of functional explanation (Barthes 1968), although as Friedrich (1979) notes, Levi-Strauss did attend to some types of function. Texts, and by extension human thoughts and cultures were often considered to be understandable and meaningful in their own terms but generally neutral with regard to function at other levels (Keesing 1974:78). The level where generalizations were made outside of a particular culture, was the level of
the human mind, presumed to operate on such principles as opposition and the mediation of oppositions.

Although the goal of structuralists to provide an outline of universal mental properties has since been largely ignored, text analysis and interpretation remains a focus of investigation by structuralists and their successors, particularly Derrida (1978) and Ricoeur (1974) both of whom have challenged the reductionistic tendencies of structuralism. In moving away from structure, however, one often finds it difficult to determine the relationship of meaning to speech in any precise way.

**Transformational Grammar and Ethnoscience**

A similar concern with mental structures was evident in American linguistics and anthropology in the 1960's, where two major areas of investigation were syntactic structures, primarily at the sentence level, and lexical semantics. In both areas, investigators were interested in universals, often thought to be based on innate human cognitive processes (Chomsky 1968; Berlin and Kay 1969). Not surprisingly, given the different foci of investigation, the types of structures posited by each group were also quite different. In Transformational Grammar (TG), with its emphasis on syntax, phrase structure diagrams were developed, focusing on differences in sequential arrangements of grammatical categories (Chomsky 1957, 1965). In ethnoscience, with
its emphasis on lexical semantics, items (primarily nouns) were characterized by a number of primitive simultaneous semantic features and the relationships between lexical items were also described on this basis according to numbers of features shared (Hammel, ed. 1965; Tyler, ed. 1969; M. E. Durbin 1974). Thus, semantically very similar lexical items shared many semantic features and types of relationships among lexical items could be diagrammed paradigmatically or taxonomically (Durbin 1975). Binarism of features, also standard in structuralism, was a convention frequently employed in these diagrams. In addition, rules applying to semantic features to account for actual distributions of lexical items were sometimes constructed (Lounsbury 1969).

By the late 1960's there was growing dissatisfaction among investigators working in both syntax (TG) and lexical semantics (ethnoscience or cognitive anthropology). The difficulties facing investigators in lexical semantics included doubts about the psychological reality of their analyses and difficulties in reducing meaning to a set of features (Burling 1969; Keesing 1972; Sperber 1975; Wallace 1965). A primary cause of disillusionment with the method was the realization that the analyses largely ignored the linguistic and cultural contexts of the lexical items considered (Schneider 1980; Keesing 1972, 1974). It was recognized that lexical items could assume a large number of features not
inherently associated with them according to their context (linguistic and socio-cultural) and the personal experience of the speaker (Sperber 1975). These types of semantic features were not easily incorporated into the current lexical semantic models.

In syntax two related problems were the level of abstraction and power of structural generalizations, and the nature of the relationship between syntax and semantics (Givon 1979). Transformational grammar was one of the first attempts in modern American linguistics to deal with linguistic structures above the level of the word.6 TG's primary emphasis was on characterizing the syntactic (structural) relationships between words in sentences with relatively little attention given to semantic content (Postal 1964).7 This was coupled with an interest in abstractness based on logico-mathematical models and the belief that language was a reflection of universal mental processes (Chomsky 1968). Since these processes were universal, it was believed that they could most easily be discovered by means of the investigator's intuition of his own language. As a result of the fact that the vast majority of TG syntacticians were from the United States, their analyses of and reflections about the structure of English tended to be considered as representative of the underlying structures of human language in general. The difficulties of such a position might have been more quickly detected were it not for the level of abstractness at which TG operated.
Transformations are such a powerful structure-changing device that any surface structure could be derived from the posited underlying structure (usually based on English) given enough steps. Consequently, analyses of languages with syntactic structures dissimilar to English required a number of additional, often obligatory, transformational steps (Chomsky 1965).

Besides the difficulties of TG with non-Indo-European languages there were increasing difficulties with TG even for English as it attempted to account for a wider range of English sentences (Bach and Harms, eds. 1968). Higher levels of abstractness including Cyclic rules and other refinements in rule ordering were attempted but eventually failed to provide a grammatical account satisfactory to many of its practitioners (Givon 1979). As increasing difficulties with the TG structural model became apparent, linguists turned in other directions, particularly to semantics.

**Generative Semantics**

As syntacticians began to investigate semantics, a variety of theories developed differing in the relationship proposed between semantics and syntax and the kinds of semantic information considered. A number of concepts developed by philosophers of language such as presuppositions, speech acts, conversational postulates, felicity conditions, and pragmatics were considered by linguists in their analyses (Bach and Harms, eds. 1968;
Grice 1975; Searle 1969; Stalnaker 1970; Steinberg and Jacobovits, eds. 1971; Fillmore and Langendoen, eds. 1971; Strawson 1950; Cole and Morgan, eds. 1975; Seuren, ed. 1974; Katz 1971; McCawley 1978). This resulted in the early efforts in Generative Semantics, Interpretive Semantics, and Semantic Syntax which attempted to demonstrate that sentences could not be explained solely on the basis of their formal structural characteristics, but that the semantics of the words and the speech situation must also be considered. In these analyses, some kinds of linguistic function were also considered, especially speech acts (Cole and Morgan, eds. 1975).

Interestingly, the kinds of semantics considered were often quite different from those included in the lexicological studies of cognitive anthropologists. A typical analysis in the generative semantics tradition included underlying propositions related to a word or sentence (Lakoff 1971; McCawley 1968, 1974) rather than sets of semantic features proposed by the former (Tyler, ed. 1969). Often, in generative semantics, semantic structure was diagrammed much like sentence structure (e.g., 'to kill' equals 'to cause to die' (McCawley 1974)), and the semantics underlying case marking received particular attention (J. Anderson 1971; Fillmore 1968, 1977). By and large, these studies, like TG were restricted to the sentence level and operated at a high level of formal abstraction (Givon 1979: 1-44). They did mark a noted change in direction from formal syntactic
structure characteristic of TG to semantics and the knowledge that speakers share. This in turn led to an interest in linguistic function and the text, rather than the sentence as the unit of analysis, an interest that became increasingly prominent in the 1970's.

Functionalism

Functionalism (Grossman, San, and Vance, eds. 1975; Dik 1978, 1980; Kuno 1972, 1975, 1976a, 1976b, 1978) in contrast to Transformational Grammar focused on syntactic functions in particular languages and had more conservative, empirically oriented goals. There was a shift from the discussion of universal structures of abstract grammatical categories such as NP and VP to a discussion of the various syntactic functions they may serve (i.e., Subject, Direct Object etc.,) in particular languages, with attention to morphosyntax, and universally. Relational grammar is an example of a similar approach (Perlmutter 1980; Cole and Saddock 1977). Two important results of linguistic investigations with this orientation were the attention brought to a wealth of data from a wide variety of languages indicating the great diversity existing among languages at the morphosyntactic level, and a renewed interest in empirically based language universals and typology.

The work of Joseph Greenberg (1966a, 1966b) developed a decade earlier regarding word order
universals and language typology received special attention. Greenberg (1966a) found a correlation between the ordering of Subject (S), Verb (V), and Object (O) in 'basic' declarative sentences and the ordering of other morphosyntactic categories such as Adjective-Noun and Adposition-Noun, some of which were absolute universals, and others which were statistical probabilities. Greenberg's schema was reanalyzed and simplified by Vennemann (1975) to indicate a more generalized functional relationship between modifier-modified (operator-operand). Word order still remains an important focus of investigation (Derbyshire 1977, 1979a; Durbin and Ojeda 1978a; Li, ed. 1975; Givon 1977; Lehmann, ed. 1978a; Comrie 1981b).

As mentioned above, a functional approach to language at the level of morphosyntactic marking has also led to an increased appreciation of the diversity of functional types evident in human languages. A prime example of this focus is the extensive attention ergativity has received in the last decade. Although the phenomenon of ergativity had been recognized previously (Plank, ed. 1979:vii), it received relatively little attention until the 1970's (Anderson 1976; Silverstein 1977; Comrie 1973, 1978, 1979; Dixon 1972, 1979; Plank, ed. 1979). The classification of ergative-absolutive languages as opposed to nominative-accusative languages is based primarily on how the basic arguments of verbs (transitive and intransitive) are marked.
Attention to the syntactic functional roles of noun phrases (NP$s) and their underlying propositional semantic roles brought out this distinction. Increased attention to a wide variety of languages revealed that ergativity is a widespread phenomenon with a number of subtypes (S. Anderson 1976; Comrie 1978; Dik 1980:113-126; Dixon 1979). Questions were raised regarding the nature of subjects and the syntactic significance of the different marking systems (Craig 1976; Keenan 1976a, 1976b). Is the patient (P) in an ergative system a subject? Should syntactically ergative constructions be analysed as passives? Are ergative systems just a peculiarity of morphosyntax or do they mark some more fundamental difference in linguistic systems? In general, the ergative-absolutive versus nominative-accusative dichotomy was considered to be an important typological feature and languages were classified on this basis, just as they were classified according to basic word order.

Marking

Renewed interest in syntactic functions, particularly at the level of morphosyntax, also stimulated discussion about marking systems in general and the significance of marking (Comrie 1976:111-122; Greenberg 1966a, 1974; Givon 1979:45-83; Lyons 1977:305-311; Silverstein 1977). Marking was generally discussed at a purely structural level (Givon...
Greenberg (1966a), for example, in his discussion of word order universals, was solely concerned with the ordering of markers, although function entered to some degree in the categorization of the markers. How one determined a basic order, and how its function differed from other marked orders received little attention initially (Givon 1979). A description of correlations of structural arrangements expected to be found in languages was offered but little attempt was made at explanation of the various types. While the limitations of Greenberg's work are apparent in hindsight, it was a distinct advance with regard to the linguistic climate of the times (ca. 1960) in that he considered syntax as well as morphology and proposed empirically based language universals.

Basic Word Order is discussed in more detail in the next chapter but is briefly considered here in relation to the concepts of the marked and unmarked in general. A 'basic' order or structure is one said to be unmarked and more natural or expected than others with which it contrasts. In terms of morphosyntax, or any structural properties, the unmarked state is generally less complex than the marked state(s) and also of higher frequency (Givon 1979:51ff.). In syntax, unmarked constituents generally have greater syntactic freedom or wider distribution. Clearly, part of the function of marking systems is to distinguish members of contrastive sets (Trubetszkoy 1971), i.e., to distinguish the unmarked
from the marked and the different kinds of marked forms from one another, but the question often goes unanswered as to what the function of having distinguishable forms is. For example, what is the function of having marked word orders? If, in a given language, eighty percent of the adjectives follow the noun they modify, why do twenty percent precede it? Structural descriptions of marking systems indicate what forms are distinguished but do not explain why they are distinguished. It became evident that in order to explain marking systems one must look in other directions, or investigate other linguistic levels than the structural level at which the marking system applies. A description of the ordering possibilities of morphosyntactic units cannot pretend to be an explanation but must provoke interest in finding one. Similarly, a description of an ergative or accusative marking system does not explain the system but merely indicates differences in 'marking, although semantic considerations are implicit in such distinctions.

In considerations of the marked and unmarked it is crucial to distinguish linguistic level and relevant features of context. In discussing word order, for example, determination of the unmarked or 'basic' constructions often involves semantic considerations when on formal grounds there are no decisive criteria for choosing one construction as more basic than another (Durbin and Ojeda 1978a). Also, what may be unmarked in
one context, or in most contexts, may be a marked form in another context depending on the level of contrast. For example, in response to a Yes-No question, an affirmative response is unmarked in contrast to a negative response and not particularly marked at the level of discourse. However, an affirmative statement contradicting prior discourse is marked as contrastive at the discourse level.

**Promotion and Demotion**

Promotion and demotion are concepts closely related to marking and dependent on the determination of unmarked forms at a given level. Both promoted and demoted forms are marked. In a passive in a nominative-accusative language, for example, the semantic agent is no longer a subject, its unmarked status, but demoted to the status of an oblique object or deleted, while the semantic patient is no longer an object, its unmarked status, but is promoted to the status of subject. It is clear from this example, that semantic considerations are relevant to marking in syntax. It should also be noted that marking is primarily a means of describing structure changes and the distributions of different forms and not in itself explanatory of such changes.

The NP Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) is one of the most significant results of the functional approach to language and the possibilities of promotion of NPs with reference to
relative clauses. It was found that the acceptability of relative clauses was dependent on the grammatical function of the head noun of the relative clause (i.e., Subject (S), Direct Object (DO), Indirect Object (IO), etc.) and that there was a hierarchy of functions such that if a noun with a given function (e.g., IO) could be relativized, nouns with functions above it in the hierarchy could also be relativized (i.e., S and DO). While the cut off point of which functions allowed relativization and which functions did not varied from language to language, the same hierarchy was always in evidence. This hierarchy was the basis for the postulation of absolute universals. An explanation offered for the hierarchy is that it reflects psychological ease of comprehension (Keenan and Comrie 1977:88).

Functional studies typically include a blend of propositional semantics and syntactic function and raise questions regarding the definition of syntactic categories (e.g., subject (Keenan 1976b)) and how much semantic information to include in the analysis of syntactic structures. When explanation is offered, it tends to be of a general psychological nature (e.g., Kuno 1976b; Keenan and Comrie 1977).
Text Analysis

At the same time that the investigation of morphosyntax and grammatical function at the sentence level was becoming a focus of linguistic research, work was being carried out on the analysis of larger pieces of discourse or texts. Although TG was initially concerned with discourse analysis (Harris 1952, 1963), as it developed, the basic unit of analysis was the sentence. In text studies, the linguistic units analysed are generally larger than the sentence. In both Europe (Dressler, ed. 1978; Halliday 1970, 1977; Hasan 1968, 1978; van Dijk 1972, 1976, 1977; van Dijk and Petofi, eds. 1977; Petofi and Rieser, eds. 1973; Beaugrande 1980; Beaugrande and Dressler 1980) and the United States (Longacre 1976, 1979; Grimes 1975, Grimes, ed. 1978; Chafe 1970; 1976, 1979; Chafe, ed. 1980; Pike 1967) as textual analysis progressed the relevance of inter-sentential relations was clarified and structures of discourse above the sentence level were posited. A major topic of this research is how information is organized in language to communicate long and often complex messages. The speaker, with a given message he wishes to communicate, is confronted with the task of linguistically encoding it in such a way that it is both intelligible and coherent to his audience and ideally also interesting and relevant. According to the various inclinations of different investigators, this research has had several foci: thematic structures of texts.
(Halliday 1970), text cohesion and efficiency (Hasan 1968; Halliday and Hasan 1976; Beaugrande 1980), and the different registers of language (i.e., narrative, formal etc., Halliday 1977) are some of the areas which have been examined. In general, text analysts have concentrated on high level structures and inter-sentential semantic relations. The process of 'discourse analysis', as understood here, is closely related to the types of text analysis just mentioned, but places greater emphasis on the analysis of morphosyntactic marking than is common in text studies and is thus, something of a synthesis of text grammar and functional or relational grammar.

**Discourse Analysis**

In discourse analysis (as in text grammar) a primary distinction is made between old (or given, shared) information and new information (Chafe 1976) and this appears to be a distinction which is universally marked linguistically. In discourse, the speaker confronted with the general task of encoding a message, must make decisions as to what information he shares with his audience if he wishes his communication to be appropriate. The speaker may err by either providing too much or too little new information. If he provides too much, the hearer is unable to comprehend, if too little, the hearer quickly loses interest. The speaker must constantly plan his discourse in such a way that the
hearer has sufficient context (old information) to interpret the new information he wishes to convey. There is a wide margin for individual choice in how much new information to convey. The socio-cultural context of discourse is one important constraint, ranging from contexts where new information or innovation in communication is inappropriate, as in ritual contexts and other situations involving phatic communion (Malinowski 1923), to instructional situations where the communicative goal is to convey as much new information as possible in the shortest time. Generally, in conversational or narrative discourse, there is a considerable degree of freedom on the part of the speaker regarding the message content and the manner in which he encodes it linguistically.

Shared information may be any information the speaker assumes his audience to know, be it general socio-cultural information, knowledge of a common linguistic code, information relevant to the setting of the discourse (physical and socio-cultural), or particular information previously mentioned in the discourse or otherwise thought to be known by the hearer. Generally, new information is information the speaker assumes the hearer does not know but is interested in and able to understand given a proper context or means of relating it to information that he does know (Chafe 1976).

The speaker must structure his discourse in such a
way that sufficient old information is present as context for the new information he wishes to convey, using a variety of linguistic conventions. Typically the speaker introduces some item of information about which he wishes to communicate and then elaborates upon it, providing more information relevant to it, some of which may be old information offered to provide a context for the hearer, and some of which is new information about the topic the speaker wishes to discuss. The resulting form and content of a discourse is largely dependent on what the speaker wishes to highlight as the focus of communication and what he wishes to background.\(^1^*\)

**Highlighting, Backgrounding, and Cohesion**

Highlighting and backgrounding are considered here as general cognitive principles, relevant not only to linguistic communication but also to other forms of human communication. To highlight is to make an element particularly salient in a given context, in which case the contextual elements are backgrounded. The highlighted element is salient in contrast to the backgrounded context. In a painting, for example, highlighted elements may be salient due to such features as their relative size, position, shape, or color in contrast to other elements. In a portrait, the primary figure is often highlighted by means of its central position and size. By whatever means, a highlighted element is perceived as salient and a focus of attention.
Highlighting is a context dependent phenomenon, and the same element may have different levels of salience depending on different contexts. In a drama as a whole, for example, the primary characters are highlighted while the minor characters are background; but in a particular scene the reverse may occur.

In language, a highly structured, complex, conventional means of communication, highlighted elements are marked explicitly in distinct ways according to the level of context, and there is interaction and contrast of highlighted and backgrounded forms at different contextual levels. Linguistic marking systems may reflect the highlighting and backgrounding of information and whether it is new or old information in addition to marking inherent semantic features.

In discourse, the speaker wishes to highlight certain pieces of information in an ever changing context as the discourse progresses, as prior discourse becomes a part of present context. In addition to highlighting certain elements by elaborating upon them with additional information, the speaker must relate the present information to shared information in order to maintain cohesion and is generally constrained to do so economically, avoiding unnecessary repetition and redundancy (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Beaugrande 1980).

Redundancy is the repetition of information already known to the hearer, either general socio-cultural information or particular information known from prior
experience including an ongoing discourse. Redundancy may be reduced in language by means of anaphoric, deictic or elliptical mechanisms.

A distinction has been made between deixis (or indexical signs) and anaphora (Silverstein 1975, 1977) such that the features characteristically deleted in anaphora are dependent for their interpretation on the context of prior discourse, e.g., third person pronouns, while deictics are speech situation dependent, including extra-linguistic context, e.g., first and second person pronouns. Although this distinction appears to be a valid one, the close relationship between anaphora and deixis should be recognized. In anaphora as in deixis, there is a reduction of semantic features that the speaker assumes to be recoverable by the hearer, although according to different contexts. While such contextual differences are linguistically encoded, it is not always a matter of mutually exclusive categorical distinctions. Generally anaphoric forms (or categories) such as third person pronouns may depend for their interpretation on the actual speech situation, and deictic categories may require reference to prior discourse for their interpretation, reported speech being an obvious example.

There is no standard term whose meaning includes both deixis and anaphora and I use deixis in the more general sense, to refer to cases of prior discourse and general contextual relations because I consider context, both speech situational and linguistic, to be
fundamentally present to the speaker and not a matter of reference to past events.

A distinction may also be made between deixis and anaphora on the one hand, and ellipsis. In deixis and anaphora, an element with some but not all of the semantic features of something previously mentioned or known is substituted for it, as in pronominalization. In ellipsis there is deletion of old information (or zero substitution, zero anaphora) as in NP-equi deletion or gapping. The information deleted in anaphora and ellipsis must be recoverable for a discourse to cohere, and thus a degree of redundancy is essential. If the speaker is too redundant he bores his audience but if there is not sufficient redundancy, he loses his audience. Redundancy relations apply only to elements of old information.

Ordinarily a speaker wishes to convey some new information, although it must bear some relation to information previously known. Without such a relationship, new information would be unintelligible to the speaker's audience. In the sense that all information must relate to known information, no information is entirely new. The speaker must constantly make judgements of what knowledge is shared by his audience and at what level of consciousness, in order for new information to be understood. Even information known to be shared must be repeated explicitly as a discourse progresses in order to avoid ambiguity (Halliday and
Hasan 1976).

The many linguistic presuppositions and cultural assumptions that underly any discourse also reflect the pervasiveness and importance of shared information in text efficiency and coherence (Givon 1979; M. A. Durbin and Hofling 1978). Presuppositional information may be signalled in language to varying degrees according to its relevance to an actual utterance and the speaker's own awareness and judgement of the hearer's awareness of it. If the speaker is doubtful that the hearer shares certain presuppositions, he may state them explicitly. The range and types of presuppositional information and their relationships to discourse context are reflected by a diverse array of linguistic structures.

**Linguistic Levels and Discourse Structures**

In language there are formal means of indicating the relationships between pieces of information according to the speaker's point of view. There are universal, language specific, culture specific, and individual constraints on what may be communicated linguistically and the manner in which it is communicated. While all levels of language interact in a given discourse, reflecting the individual's thought and his cultural knowledge as well as basic universal properties of language, certain levels of linguistic coding are more easily related to the individual, others to the speaker's culture, and others to general properties of human
communication. Lexical semantics, for example, functions to encode specific socio-cultural information, and lexical systems vary from one culture to another. The extensive work of cognitive anthropologists in the areas of native classification of body parts, colors, plants, animals, etc., provide ample evidence that cultural classificatory distinctions are often encoded linguistically in the lexicon (Tyler, ed. 1969; Hammel, ed. 1965).

There are also universals associated with lexical semantics in both the organizational principles of lexical systems and in features that are encoded in lexical items (Berlin and Kay 1969). In all languages there are taxonomies such as classifications of plant types, partonomies such as the classification of body parts (Witowski and Brown 1978), antonymies and synonymies. Particular features such as animacy and shape are also universally encoded. The individual, although limited by his knowledge of lexical items, considerations of the knowledge of the hearer, and general syntactic and discourse constraints, nevertheless has great freedom in his choice of lexical items.

Propositional semantics reflects individual and cultural differences as well as universal categorization processes. In all languages there are semantic distinctions between agents and patients as well as such relational categories as locatives, benefactives, experiencers, and recipients; and transitivity is a
universal feature of verbs. The linguistic encoding, or lines of demarcation of such categories vary from language to language and according to individual perception and communicative intent. Differences in propositional semantics are often reflected at the level of morphosyntax (e.g., the semantic constraints on what is a subject).

Causation, for example, is a semantic feature that is particularly salient in the structure of some languages but not in others, and which the individual speaker may mark or omit according to his perception and communicative intent. Causation is also intricately involved with a speaker's judgement of actor's roles as well as lexical semantics. By and large, inanimate entities are not encoded as causative agents. For animate categories, causative marking may entail volitional activity (H. A. Durbin 1979a). The same event may be reported by different speakers in a variety of ways, indicating their differences in perception and communicative intent (e.g., 'he was murdered' vs. 'he was killed' vs. 'he died').

Although the speaker has considerable freedom to manipulate propositional structure and content, there are basic universal and language-specific constraints on the structures available to him. In any linguistic expression of a propositional structure there are semantic limitations on its arguments and the types of relations that are possible between them. A blade of
grass is ordinarily incapable of being a causative agent
in any language. However, the exact level of animacy and
volition required of a causative agent varies from one
language to another.

While lexical and propositional semantics are
reflected syntactically, they alone do not account for
the diversity of structures found in natural languages.
In addition to inherent semantic features and relations
are other discourse structures, which are the focus of
this study. To analyse discourse structures, one must
consider highlighting and the processing of new and old
information in addition to lexical and propositional
semantics.

A common means of highlighting old information is
topicalization, which marks a constituent as salient old
information about which the speaker wishes to elaborate
(Li, ed. 1976). The marking mechanism for
topicalization varies from language to language (Li and
Thompson 1976) but often involves ordering, with the
topicalized element typically in sentence-initial
position, and discrete morphosyntactic marking. In
English, for example, topicalized elements are typically
in sentence-initial position but there is no single
formalized morphosyntactic marker, rather, a variety of
constructions may be employed with the topicalizing
function as the following example indicates.
Speaker A I saw John Smith yesterday.

Speaker B Speaking of John, he just bought a car.
    or As for John, he just bought a car.

The topicalized elements are in fronted constructions with the referent referred to a second time anaphorically in the main clause.

Topicalization is a discourse phenomenon and cannot totally be explained at the level of propositional semantics or sentential syntax, because various arguments of the verb may be topicalized (Subject, Direct Object, etc.,) and a crucial feature of the topicalization process is that the constituent be old information (Chafe 1976). Topicalization is a highlighting mechanism which is not directly dependent on propositional or lexical semantics and which does not affect such semantic relations. There is no change in propositional or lexical semantic relations between a sentence which has a topicalized patient and one which does not if they are identical in other respects. On the other hand, semantic considerations such as case relations and animacy interact with topicalization to varying degrees in different languages such that there may be restrictions on what can be topicalized based on such factors as animacy or underlying case relations (Li and Thompson 1976). There is a general correlation between topicalization and subjects of high animacy cross-linguistically (Givon 1976; 1979), but considerable variation as well; and what discourse and semantic...
features are relevant to account for topicalization in a given language must be specifically determined.

New information may also be highlighted but in a distinct fashion. The highlighting of new information typically involves contrastive focus (Chafe 1976), which serves a very different discourse function from that of topicalization. While the function of topicalization is largely cohesive, carrying over old information by repetition, the highlighting of new information serves a contrastive and often emphatic function. As mentioned above, new information is rarely entirely new, but adds information about something already known. In contrastive focus, new information relevant to some shared information is highlighted as in the following example:

It's John (not Mary or anyone else) that I saw eat the cake last night.

In this example, the hearer knows the identity of both John and Mary and that someone ate the cake. The new information that the speaker conveys and highlights is that it was John, and no one else, who ate the cake. Like topicalization, contrastive focus may be marked by the ordering of constituents (in this case the focused element is fronted) often in a cleft construction, and by morphosyntactic marking. Unlike topicalization, which highlights shared information, contrastive focus highlights some feature of new information, which often
receives emphasis.

*Emphasis is a wide-ranging highlighting mechanism often marked solely by stress or intonation, with no discrete morphosyntactic marking* (Bolinger 1961). It may be applied to any basic grammatical category (i.e., noun, verb, adjective, adverb etc.) and need not involve any reordering or other structural marking. It is generally contrastive. Thus emphasis often functions like contrastive focus or in conjunction with it, but its function is more diffuse and on occasion applicable to old information, as in rhetorical contexts. Its lack of grammatical formalization makes it the more flexible and gives the speaker an unusual degree of freedom from structural constraints.

Topicalization, contrastive focus and emphasis are three important types of highlighting (there are several more) applicable to noun phrases, although as just mentioned, emphasis may also apply to other grammatical categories. In addition to these basic highlighting processes, there is a wide range of other specificity markers that function to contextualize NPs including relative clauses, definite markers and deictics. In using specifiers, the speaker aids the hearer in identifying an NP's referent, often by relating it to prior shared information, a process that aids cohesion.

Transitivity is another discourse concept which is marked sententially involving the verb and its principal arguments (*S, A, P*). According to Hopper and Thompson
(1980) there is a range from the most transitive two argument sentences to the least transitive one argument sentences, and a complex interaction of nominal and verbal semantics with syntax was proposed. Among the discourse functions of lowering transitivity is the highlighting of one of the verb's basic arguments. Passives, for example, are the result of the promotion of the patient (P) noun from object to subject status, with the agent (A) noun demoted to an oblique case relation or deleted. The so called antipassive, on the other hand, reflects the demotion of the P noun and a corresponding highlighting of the A noun and verb.

In the case of transitivity relationships, the degree of highlighting or backgrounding of an NP is reflected syntactically, particularly in syntactic restrictions. In the passive, the P noun is promoted (has more syntactic power) than in a simple transitive sentence and the A noun has less. As Hopper and Thompson (1980) have indicated, there is a complex interaction between semantic features, both lexical and propositional, and discourse features such as highlighting, contextualization, and cohesion all of which are often reflected in morphosyntactic marking.

Finally, beginning at the level of the simple sentence, one must also consider such syntactic processes as interrogation and negation and their discourse relations. Interrogation and negation may involve a wide range of sentential constituents from the most primitive
grammatical categories to the largest units of discourse. Any piece of information may be questioned or negated. In interrogation, the speaker is ordinarily requesting new information from the hearer and by means of morphosyntactic marking may indicate the range of information he is interested in. Similarly, in negation the speaker is providing some new information to the hearer and has mechanisms at his disposal to indicate the range or scope of his negation. Scope refers to the delimitation of the boundaries of a constituent that is being questioned, negated, specified etc. It is often marked by stress and morphosyntactic markers. Consider the following:

It's not John who's leaving the party. (it's Peter)
John is not leaving the party. (he's arriving)
John is leaving the room but not the party.
Is Mary coming to the party?
Is Mary coming to the party?
Is Mary coming to the party?

Two essential elements of scope are contrast and the delimitation of that contrast. Scope often interacts with contrastive focus and emphasis, is applicable to a wide range of grammatical categories, and is often formalized morphosyntactically. Negation and interrogation appear to be two processes that universally involve scoping phenomena. As a contrastive mechanism,
scope serves a cohesive function in discourse by relating to shared information. In Itza Maya, scope is often marked morphosyntactically by trapping particles with one particle appearing at the beginning and the other at the end of the scoped constituent.

The discourse processes and structures described above are a major focus of the description of Itza Maya which follows. In Chapter 2, word order in Itza is examined, with particular attention to the discourse functions served by the various orders. In Chapter 3, the specificity markers of Itza and their functions are examined. Chapter 4 is devoted to verbal morphosyntax with reference to transitivity, ergativity, and discourse functions. Trapping particles are discussed in Chapter 3 with reference to NP specificity, briefly in Chapter 4 regarding aspectual marking, and in Chapter 5 with regard to interrogation, negation, location, and other adverbial sentence types.
Footnotes

1. In philosophy, the subfield of Philosophy of Language has gained prominence since the early part of the century when such major figures as Bertrand Russell and Ludwig Wittgenstein addressed the philosophical problems of language. Structuralism, an approach derived from linguistic models, has had a pervasive effect on literary criticism and the social sciences, particularly in Europe, and has stimulated other approaches to the study of the relationship of language to man.

2. The rise of such disciplines as psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, neurolinguistics, language acquisition, sociolinguistics, and anthropological linguistics evidence increased research in language from a variety of perspectives and increased interdisciplinary communication, as do interdisciplinary symposia (e.g., Hoijer, ed. 1954; Northrop, ed. 1964).

3. As Chomsky explains (1966, 1968), his conception of language and the shift to syntax were stimulated by Descartes and the succeeding philosophical and linguistic tradition including Humboldt. Chomsky's position is in opposition to the behaviorist model current in the first half of the twentieth century typified by B.F. Skinner (1957) and structural linguistics (particularly Bloomfield (1933)).

4. Joos (1957) explicitly excludes most kinds of semantics from linguistic analysis indicating that the linguist's task is a matter of discrete analysis, breaking down phrases to words, words to morphemes, and morphemes to phonemes.

5. Exceptions to this general trend were Sapir (Mandelbaum, ed. 1949) and Whorf, (Carrol, ed, 1956) whose hypothesis that language structure affected and reflected mental processes stimulated discussion of the relationships of language, culture, and mind in a number of disciplines (Hoijer, ed. 1954). The tradition of anthropological linguistics to which they belong was interested in the relationship of language and culture. They were a distinct minority, however, and mainstream linguistics was Bloomfieldian and not concerned with such questions (Bloomfield 1933).

6. Tagmemics offered another approach to syntax at this time (Pike 1958, 1967).

7. Initially the relationships between sentences in larger pieces of discourse were also structurally analysed (Harris 1952, 1963) but emphasis rapidly shifted
to the sentence as the unit of analysis.

8. This functionalism was not of the radical kind proposed by Malinowski (1923) which suggests that language sprang directly from human thoughts and desires.

9. Linguistic function has been considered at all levels including the phonological (Bruck, Fox, and Lagaly, eds. 1974; M. E. Durbin 1973), and the degree of arbitrariness of the linguistic sign has been questioned (M. E. Durbin 1972, 1973; Friedrich 1979).

10. The term 'basic' word order is problematic (Givon 1979) and a point I discuss in more detail in Chapter 2.

11. In a nominative-accusative system, the subject of an intransitive verb (S) and the subject of a transitive verb (A), usually the semantic agent, are marked alike morphosyntactically, while the object of a transitive verb (P), usually the semantic patient, is marked differently. In an ergative-absolutive language, however, the subject of an intransitive verb (S) is marked in the same way as the object of a transitive verb (P), and it is the subject of a transitive verb (A) that receives distinct morphosyntactic marking.

12. The NP Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) is the following: Subject - Direct Object - Indirect Object - Oblique - Genitive - Object of Comparison.

13. The media transformations of writing, print, and electronic communication have also expanded the limits of new information that may be encoded in discourse and how information is encoded generally (Ong 1977).

14. The concept of highlighting is closely related to foregrounding or forefronting a concept developed by the Prague Linguistic Circle and Russian formalists (Jakobson 1960). The term highlighting is adopted here as it refers specifically to cognition and not to linguistic structure. In addition, the terms foregrounding and backgrounding have been used in a different sense from that employed here when referring to the thematic structure of discourse with foregrounding referring to the most important part of a message or topic of discourse and backgrounding to the background information about the topic (Hopper 1979). Topic-comment and theme-rheme are terms that have also been used in discussions of thematic structure (Halliday 1970). Highlighting and backgrounding, as the terms are used here, may be used in the discussion of thematic structure, but are also applicable at lower levels, as noted in the text.
15. The terms topic and topicalization, as employed here, are not identical to the term topic in describing thematic topic-comment structures (Halliday 1970). Topicalization refers to explicit morphosyntactic marking of highlighted old information, which is not always the same as thematic function.

16. Cleft constructions involve both the fronting of a constituent and morphosyntactic marking, typically including relative marking on the succeeding clause (Prince 1978; Gundell 1977; Schachter 1973) and commonly mark contrastive focus (Schachter 1973). Contrastive focus may also be marked by other means such as stress or simply order with no morphosyntactic marking.

17. The antipassive (Silverstein 1977:140) is the reverse of the passive construction with regard to the promotion and demotion of the A and P noun phrases. In the antipassive the P noun does not appear as a direct object, its unmarked status, nor is it promoted to subject status as in passives. Rather, it is demoted, often by means of deletion or incorporation into the verb. The A noun, on the other hand, gains prominence as the P noun loses it.

18. Trapping particles (Langacker 1968) are particles that appear in pairs, one in front of a given constituent and the other following it. Often, if one appears the other is obligatory.
2. WORD ORDER

There are two basic foci in considerations of word order. The first is Basic Word Order, which is primarily of significance for language typology and language universals, and the second is the different discourse functions that the various word orders may serve in a given language. As regards Basic Word Order, the work of Greenberg (1966a) and the later analyses of Vennemann (1975) and Lehmann (1978) suggest that the crucial relationship of word order is the order of the verb (V) and the object (O) - VO vs. OV. On the basis of the basic verb-object order, a number of other word order relationships may be predicted according to the word order hypothesis (i.e., prepositions vs. postpositions; noun-adjective vs. adjective-noun; possessed-possessor vs. possessor-possessed).

The study of the discourse functions of word order has received less attention (exceptions being Durbin and Ojeda 1978a; Derbyshire 1979a, 1979b; Kuno 1978; Li and Thompson 1975) and no typological classifications or universals have been proposed to relate order and function with the possible exception that highlighted constituents tend to be fronted. Rather, non-basic word orders have been analyzed as serving discourse functions that may be demonstrated in a given language and
contrasted to Basic Word Order constructions in that language.

Word order and the specification of NPs often interact to highlight and background information (Li and Thompson 1975). New information, that is, information which is not assumed by the speaker to be shared by the other participants in the discourse, may be introduced with relatively little marking. For example, in the English sentence: "I saw a man in the park", the NP marking new information "a man" is in post-verbal position, the usual position for objects in English, and is marked as new information by the indefinite article. New information may also be marked contrastively, as in the sentence: "It's a man I saw in the park" where the new information "a man" is clefted with the "it's" marker which indicates focus, contrasting it to other possible agents or beings.

Likewise, old information, which is assumed to be shared among the participants in a discourse, may also receive a number of types and degrees of marking depending upon the speaker's intentions to highlight or background it. It may receive little marking as in the sentence: "I saw the man in the park", where the NP "the man" is old information marked by the definite article and occurs in usual post verbal object position. It may also be highlighted as in the following sentence, "As for the man, I saw him in the park", where the old
information is topicalized, a highlighting mechanism that makes the NP more prominent by fronting it and marking it with the introductory "as for". The treatment of new and old information serves both to maintain continuity and to hold the hearers interest. Continuity is maintained by carrying over some old information from sentence to sentence and interest is stimulated by the introduction of new information.

In English, the Basic Word Order is SVO and other orders are either very highly marked morphosyntactically, such as the O-initial orders noted above, or anomalous, such as V-initial orders (e.g., *(He) saw the man the dog). In Itza Maya, on the other hand, all six possible word orders (SVO, SOV, OSV, OVS, VOS, VSO) occur, and morphosyntactic marking is not always a clear indicator of semantically marked word orders. Basic Word Order in Itza Maya is now considered followed by a discussion of the discourse functions of the various orders.

2.1. Basic Word Order in Itza Maya

The following criteria for determining Basic Word Order were proposed by Durbin and Ojeda (1978a:69) and are adopted here:

1. Sentences which are simple as opposed to complex.

2. Sentences which are transitive where both subject and object are marked either by the presence of nouns or independent pronouns.
3. Sentences whose verbs and nouns are least morphologically marked for syntactic features such as mood, voice, aspect (for verbs) and specificity and plurality (for nouns).

4. Sentences which provide a statement or an explanation of an event but are not semantically marked for a specific context such as topicalization, focus, or emphasis, e.g., John hit Bill (explanatory), but not John hit Bill!! (contrastive for the situation).

5. Sentences which are not ambiguous outside their context, or which do not require additional information to be disambiguated.

6. Sentences containing nouns which can reciprocally affect each other, e.g., Men kill jaguars; Jaguars kill men; but not Men buy beans.

It should be noted that criterion (6) is a rather difficult one to meet completely, as there are very few totally equally valenced nouns in respect to the feature of affectivity. This is a distinct problem from that of choosing nouns of different rank in the noun phrase hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) or the animacy hierarchy proposed by Silverstein (1977). In the case of these hierarchies, differences in rank are reflected by absolute constraints in syntactic processes, i.e., relativization or subjecthood. No such constraints appear in simple sentences in Itza such that an NP of lower animacy cannot occur as the subject of a transitive verb. Of course, there are cases where the semantic features of the verb add constraints to NPs that may appear in subject position, e.g., the verb "to buy" requires a human subject ordinarily, but this has little syntactic significance for Basic Word Order and is
eliminated by criterion (6) with regard to reciprocity. On the other hand, while differences in the feature of affectivity do not appear to have significant syntactic ramifications in the paradigm of unmarked simple transitive sentences, they do affect the interpretation of potentially ambiguous sentences, such that the NP of higher affectivity will tend to be interpreted as subject in these cases. For example, when winik 'man' and balum 'jaguar' are the two NPs of a transitive sentence which is ambiguous on structural grounds, winik is more likely to be interpreted as the subject. Of course, sentences that are ambiguous in isolation are often perfectly clear in their discourse context for pragmatic reasons.

Of the criteria above, numbers (4) and (5) are the most important in judging Basic Word Order in Itza and only two of the six possible word orders are both unambiguous and unmarked semantically. Certain examples of all of the remaining four word orders meet the other criteria. SVO and VOS are the two word orders that meet all of the criteria. SVO will be considered first.

In the SVO sentence type that may be considered as a Basic Word Order, the S must be specific as in the following example:

(1) A—winik—eh k—u—kin—s—ik (a')—balum—(eh). det—M—top asp—Dpr—V—caus—PM (det)—N—(top) the—man inc—3—die (the)—jaguar

The man kills (the) jaguar.
Even the most basic sentences require some specificity marking (see Criterion 3 above). If the first NP is not specified, or is less specified than the second, a verb-medial sentence is ambiguous as may be seen in the following examples.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S/O & V & O/S \\
(2) & Winik & k--u--kin--s--ik balum. \\
 & N & asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM N \\
 & man & inc-3--die \\
& & jaguar \\
\end{array}
\]

a. S[foc]VO \textbf{Man} \textit{kills} jaguars,  
or b. O[foc]VS Jaguars \textit{kills} man.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S/O & V & O/S \\
(3) & (A')--winik & k--u--kin-s--ik a'-balum--eh. \\
 & (det)--N & asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det--N--top \\
 & (the)--man & inc-3--die \\
& & the-jaguar \\
\end{array}
\]

a. S[foc]VO (The) \textbf{man} \textit{kills} the jaguar,  
or b. O[foc]VS The jaguar \textit{kills} (the) \textbf{man}.

In the examples of ambiguous sentences (2) and (3) the first NP is contrastively focused, a highlighting mechanism of new information. Example (3) is also evidence that ambiguity results when the first NP is less specific than the second.²

As in verb-medial word orders, if both NPs of a verb-initial sentence are unspecified, ambiguity results. On the other hand, if the final NP is topocalized or more highly specified than the first NP, an unambiguous VOS reading results and, in fact, there is a tendency for a VOS interpretation for all verb-initial transitive sentences with NP arguments. Thus in both verb-medial and verb-initial word orders, the preferred word order
interpretation (SVO in the case of verb-medial sentences and VOS in the case of verb-initial sentences) coincides with the unambiguous readings of both word order types when the subject is topicalized or specified at least as highly as the object. The following examples are evidence of this parallel.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O & S \\
(5) & K-u-kin-s-ik & balum a'-winik-eh, \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM} & N \\
& \text{inc-3--die} & \text{jaguar the--man} \\
\end{array}
\]

The man kills jaguars.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O/S & S/O \\
(6) & K-u-kin-s-ik & balum winik, \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM} & N \\
& \text{inc-3--die} & \text{jaguar man} \\
\end{array}
\]

a. VOS Man kills jaguars.

or b. VSO Jaguars kill man.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O \\
(7) & K-u-kin-s-ik a'-balum-(he'-lo') \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM} & \text{det--N--(dem-dist)} \\
& \text{inc-3--die} & \text{the-jaguar} \\
\end{array}
\]

a'-winik-(he'-lo')-eh, \\
\text{det--N--(dem-dist)--top} \\
\text{the-man}

The (/that) man kills the (/that) jaguar.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O/S & S/O \\
(8) & K-u-kin-s-ik & a'-balum-eh a'-winik-eh, \\
& \text{det--N--top} & \text{det--N--top} \\
& \text{the-jaguar} & \text{the--man} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O/S & S/O \\
(9) & K-u-kin-s-ik & a'-balum-he'-lo' a'-winik, \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM} & \text{det--N--dem-dist det--N} \\
& \text{inc-3--die} & \text{the-jaguar the--man} \\
\end{array}
\]

a. VOS The man kills that jaguar.

or b. VSO That jaguar kills the man.
Example (5) is an example of the least marked verb-initial word order type that is unambiguously VOS, with the subject topicalized and the object unspecified. If neither NP is specified as in (6), the sentence is ambiguous. On the other hand, even if both NPs are equally specified by demonstratives as in (7), but the second is also topicalized, the sentence is unambiguously VOS. Example (9) indicates that when the first NP is more highly specified than the second, ambiguity results, just as when the second NP is more highly marked in verb-medial sentences. Sentence (8) is evidence of a difference in the possibilities of specification of NPs in verb-initial and verb-medial orders. The first NP (0) in a verb-medial sentence cannot be topicalized, unlike the object NP in SVO ordered sentences. This constraint on the object NP in VOS order suggests that it functions to introduce new object information, but not contrastively focused information as in (2) and (3).

Consider the following:

(10) A. T--u--kin--s--ah keeh a'--winik--eh.
    asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM N det--W--top
    com-3 deer the--man
    The man killed a deer.

B. Ba'ax keeh--il--i'ih?
    inter N--pos--partit
    what deer
    Which of the deer was it?

A. A'--k--u--hok'--ol ich a kol--eh.
    det-asp-Dpr-V--intr prep Ppr N--rel
    inc-3-leave in 2 milpa
The one that was going into your milpa.

It is clear from Speaker B's question, that the O was new but not contrastive information.

We are confronted with two sentence types, SVO and VOS, as candidates for Basic Word Orders in Itza. All other word order types (SOV, VSO, OVS, and OSV) are ambiguous out of context, thus failing a primary condition of Basic Word Order. The marking on the verb in the SVO and VOS examples given above is identical and the least possible for fully transitive verbs (and may occur in other word orders as well). In both basic SVO and VOS orders, the S must be specified while the O need not be and, as was noted above, the object cannot be topicalized in basic VOS order. All of the criteria of Basic Word Order are met by both SVO and VOS sentences. The communality in the order of both is that the O immediately follows the verb. Because the relationship of the V to the O is the crucial one for typological considerations of word order (Lehmann 1978), a major goal of determining Basic Word Order, predictions of word order relationships are the same for both SVO and VOS. It is clear that Itza is a VO and not an OV language. It also appears that there is a stronger bond between the verb and the object, which remain in the same relationship in the unmarked state, than between the verb and the subject, which is free to appear initially or finally.
Thus it appears that there are two basic word orders in Itza. In the case of Itza, where both are VO, this does not conflict with word order typology or universals.

There are some possible explanations for why Itza has two Basic Word Orders. One of these orders is verb-initial, a very infrequent word order type in the languages of the world, but common among Mayan languages. VOS is also of much lower frequency than the SVO word order type in Itza. Subject-initial word order types account for the vast majority of languages in the world, a fact that may perhaps be explained by the principle of speakers empathy for the subject (Kuno 1976b). Initial position, a position of high cognitive salience, appears to be a more natural place for the NP argument receiving greater speaker empathy. It may be hypothesized that verb-initial word order is the older Basic Word Order and that Itza is now in the final stages of a process of word order change from VOS to SVO. Keenan (1978) has noted that SVO is commonly an alternate order for VOS languages, facilitating such a change. In addition to the possible cognitive reasons for such a change, the close language contact with Spanish, an SVO language, may be an influencing factor in this change. A further possible contribution to a change from VOS to SVO might be topicalization processes. In general, topics tend to occur at the beginning of sentences, and subjects rather
than objects tend to be topics (Givon 1976). The combination of these tendencies results in a high frequency of sentences with topicalized subjects in initial position. As a result, initial position might come to be interpreted as the unmarked S position, and eventually, the topic marker might evolve into a subject marker.

In summary, there are two word orders, SVO and VOS which may be considered as Basic Word Orders in Itza, though the former is more frequent. As both are VO, the predictions for other word order relationships are the same. That there are two Basic Word Orders may be the result of a shift from VOS to SVO order.

2.2. Other Word Orders

Of the six possible word orders, only subtypes of two of them have been considered above. While none of the other types is relevant to the language universals studies in the way that Basic Word Order is, their discourse functions are of interest. An explanation for the existence of such a wide variety of possibilities was sought in this direction.

2.2.1. Verb-medial Word Orders

While SVO with the S specified was posited as one of the Basic Word Orders in Itza, it was noted above (2.1.) that there are verb-medial word orders that serve to
highlight new information and in which the first NP is less marked for specificity than the second. In cases where the first NP is unmarked for specificity or less marked than the second NP (and not topicalized) it is generally semantically marked as contrastive new information. (2) and (3) are repeated here with another example of contrastive focus.

In example (2), where the first NP is unspecified, it is in contrastive focus whether or not the second NP is specified, contrasted to all other semantically possible NP arguments (i.e., it's man and not any other agency that kills jaguars). The contrast is generic, opposing one type to all others. When the first NP is specified by a determiner as in (3) contrastive focus is
still apparent, but the scope of the contrast is more limited. First, it refers to definite information, which presupposes that it is in some sense old/shared information; and second, it generally contrasts with old information. Definite information does not contrast with all other classes but rather with specific members of some other classes that are old information. With the added specificity of a demonstrative on the first NP as in (11) an additional SVO interpretation is possible with no implication of contrastive focus. If the first NP is contrastively focused and modified by a demonstrative, the scope of the contrast is still more narrow than in the case of definite NPs as in (11). When a noun is modified by a demonstrative, it generally contrasts with members of its own class (e.g., it's that man and not some other man who did it). The following examples are evidence of the differences in discourse functions of the unspecified initial NP and the specified (but not topicalized) initial NP.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O & S \\
(12) & & \\
A. & K--u--kin--s--ik & keeh & a'--winik--eh? \\
& asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM & N & det--N--top \\
& inc-3--die & deer & the--man \\
\end{array}
\]

Did the man kill deer?

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
O & V & S \\
B. & & \\
& neg & N & asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM & det--N--top \\
& no & jaguar & inc-3--die & the--man \\
\end{array}
\]

No, the man killed jaguar. (O focus).
In (12), Speaker B's response clearly contrasts the object NP balum 'jaguar' to keeh 'deer' (and indirectly to all other possible objects). (13), however, does not suggest that the subject of (13A) is being contrastively focused but the subject is clearly new information as indicated by Speaker B's question. (14) is an example where the degree of contrastiveness lies between (12) and (13). By the nature of Speaker A's question in (14), Speaker B's response provides new and contrastive information, but the contrast is not so strong as in
That sentences of the type given in (11), where the first NP is modified by a demonstrative and the second topicalized, may have the interpretation of OVS requires further explanation in light of my previous generalization that when the first NP of a verb-medial sentence is specific and the second NP is less or equally specific, the sentence is unambiguously SVO. Example (11) indicates that the demonstratives and topic markers are not equally important in determining word order interpretations. If the first noun were topicalized, whether or not it was modified by a demonstrative, the sentence would be unambiguously SVO. Topicalization of the first noun marks it unambiguously as subject, and - without topicalization of the first noun, even though it may have other specifiers - the sentence may be ambiguous, especially if the second noun is topicalized. Topic markers are more strongly associated with subjects than other specifiers such as demonstratives.

In all of the examples of verb-medial sentences in which the first NP is not topicalized, it is new information. Outside of context, there is a marked tendency to interpret them as SVO, which increases with the specificity of the first NP. The high degree of ambiguity in verb-medial sentences other than Basic Word Order types, indicates the importance of discourse context in the decoding of messages. (14) is an example
where speaker B's response would be ambiguous in isolation but is not at all ambiguous in context.

2.2.2. Verb-initial Word Orders

There is a general tendency to interpret all V-initial sentences as VOS, one of the Basic Word Orders. Ambiguity may enter if the first NP is as marked or more marked than the second, reflecting an expectation that subjects are more specific, old information. Like VOS, VSO word order is of low frequency, and usually occurs when the semantics of the verb and NPs or verb agreement leave no room for doubt. The first NP in such cases is ordinarily new but not focused information. Out of context, if the first NP is topicalized, the sentence is considered at best ambiguous and often anomalous.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & S & O \\
(15) & \text{K--a--} & \text{in--tech} \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM} & \text{emp-Ipr} \\
& \text{inc-2--die} & 2sg \\
\text{You kill cows.} & & \text{wakax.} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & O/S & S/O \\
(16) & \text{?K--u--} & \text{a'--lo'--eh} \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det-dist-top} & \text{det-}N\text{-}top \\
& \text{inc-3--die} & \text{the man} \\
\text{a. VOS ??The man kills that one} \\
\text{b. VSO ??That one kills the man.} & & \text{a'--winik--eh.} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & S/O & O/S \\
(17) & \text{T--u--} & \text{a'--winik} \\
& \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM} & \text{det-}N\text{-}top \\
& \text{com-3--die} & \text{the--man the--deer} \\
\text{a. VSO The man kills the deer.} \\
\text{or} & & \text{b. VOS??The deer kills the man.} \\
\end{array}
\]
In example (15) the second person dependent and independent pronouns remove ambiguity, giving a VSO reading. In (16) the topic marker on the first NP makes the sentence ambiguous out of context if acceptable at all. In (17) the semantics of the NPs and verb favor a VSO reading, although the specificity marking on the nouns suggests a VOS reading.

In summary, non-basic verb-initial sentences are marginal and often ambiguous, though semantics, verb-agreement, and discourse context may serve as disambiguating factors. They usually function to introduce new but not focused information, which appears immediately following the verb.

2.2.3. Verb-final Word Orders

In all cases, verb-final sentences, whether or not they meet the other criteria of Basic Word Order, are ambiguous outside of their discourse context, unlike verb-initial and verb-final word order types. However, the SOV interpretation of this word order type appears to be preferred. This order is also frequently used in contrastive focus constructions. If the second noun is not topicalized, it may be contrastively focused. Contrastive focus is particularly clear when the first noun is topicalized.
(18) A'--balum--eh winik k--u--kin--s--ik.
det--M--top N asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
the jaguar man inc-3--die

a. S[O][foc]V As for the jaguar, it kills men.
or b. O[S][foc]V As for the jaguar, man kills it.

(19) A'--winik--eh a'--balum--he'--lo' k--u--kin--s--ik.
det--M--top det--M--top asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
the--man the--jaguar inc-3--die

a. S[O][foc]V As for the man, he kills that jaguar.
or b. O[S][foc]V As for the man, that jaguar kills him.

(20) A'--balum--eh a'--winik--eh k--u--kin--s--ik.
det--M--top det--M--top asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
the--jaguar the--man inc-3--die


(21) Balum winik k--u--kin--s--ik.
jaguar man inc-3--die N

or b. O[S][foc]V Man kills jaguar.

(22) A' Ba'ax a'--k--u--kin--s--ik a'--balum--eh?
inter det asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det--M--top/rel
what inc-3--die the--jaguar

What is it that the jaguar kills?

(23) A' T--u--kin--s--ah keeh a'--winik--eh?
asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM N det--M--top
com-3--die deer the--man

Did the man kill deer?
No. As for the man, he killed jaguar.

(24) a. *Wakax in-tech-eh k--a--kin--s--ik.
   N emp-Ipr-top asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
cow 2sg inc-2--die

b. A'--wakax--eh in--tech k--a--kin--s--ik,
   det---N----top emp-Ipr asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
the-cow 2sg inc-2--die

As for the cattle, you kill them.

c. In--tech-(eh) wakax k--a--kin--s--ik.
   emp--Ipr--(top)  N asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
2sg cow inc-2--die

As for you, you kill cattle.

In the examples given above, it may be seen that a primary function of this word order is to focus contrastively the second NP. In the most usual form, the first NP is subject and old information, which may be seen in (22) and (23) in context. If the second NP is topicalized as in (20) there is no contrastive focus and the OSV interpretation is the more likely. If neither NP is marked by specifiers, as in (21), the sentence is of questionable grammaticality, but if acceptable, the second NP is focused. Example (24) indicates the strong tendency to topicalize the first NP in verb-final word orders. As may be seen in (24a), if the first NP is unspecified, the second cannot be topicalized regardless
of the disambiguation of the dependent pronouns. The first NP, however, may be topicalized whether it is subject or object as in (24b) and (24c). With the tendency for SOV readings, the first NP tends to be interpreted as subject just as in verb-medial constructions. Also, as in verb-medial sentences, focused information occurs immediately in front of the verb. The high degree of ambiguity in verb-final sentences, and their use in contrastive focus, suggest high markedness of OV constructions and the need for discourse context for disambiguation.

2.3. Word Order for Transitive Sentences: Conclusions

In review, a large number of word order types, each with distinct discourse functions, occur in Itza Maya. The Basic Word Order types, SVO and VOS, have in common the features of specificity of the subject NP and VO order. The differences between these two types being that in SVO order, the subject is in a more prominent position and the object may be old information. To focus the subject, SVO or OSV orders may be used. SVO is more frequently used for this function, with the subject in prominent sentence-initial position. OSV also occurs, but less frequently, and generally appears to highlight the object as old information in initial position as well as focusing the S.

A complementary relationship occurs in sentence
types functioning to focus contrastively the object (OVS and SOV). SOV is the more commonly used order, which also usually highlights the S as old information. OVS, on the other hand, adds further prominence to the focused O by its initial position. In all focus constructions, the focused constituents occur immediately before the verb. In both verb-medial and verb-final constructions there is a general tendency to interpret the first NP as subject, which is strengthened if it is topicalized.

Finally, non-basic verb-initial constructions (i.e., VSO) do not appear to highlight either subject or object through order. It is an ambiguous sentence type that may introduce new subject or object MPs, but does not focus them; or it may convey old topicalized information but give it no particular prominence.

It has frequently been mentioned above that all but Basic Word Orders are ambiguous outside their discourse contexts. This is evidence of the importance of discourse context in decoding messages and also suggests that word order is an extremely flexible system in Itza, allowing in this flux of ordering and specificity possibilities, a vast array of semantic shadings, only the more prominent of which have been considered here. It may also indicate that the Itza system is undergoing change in word order functions. In any case, one may make the generalization that highlighted information occurs before and not after the verb.
2.4. **Intransitive Sentences**

Unlike the transitive sentences discussed above, there is little possible ambiguity as to which NP is the subject in intransitives. Intransitive verbs are morphosyntactically marked distinctively from transitive verbs, removing ambiguity as to whether an NP is a subject or object. The relationship of verb to object noted above for transitive sentences has no predictive value for subject-verb relationships in intransitive sentences. Generally, it is to be expected that the unmarked order of subject and verb in intransitive sentences will correspond to the subject-verb order in basic transitive sentences. However, in Itza, where VOS and SVO are both Basic Word Orders, there is little basis for such expectations. In the case of Itza, there do not appear to be any clear criteria by which to judge SV or VS as more or less marked. Both orders occur and the subject nouns may be specified before or after the verb. It appears that VS order is of higher frequency, however.

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{S} & \text{V} \\
(25) & A'-\text{winik}--\text{he'}--\text{loh} \quad \text{tan}--\text{u}--\text{tal} \quad \text{ba'}--\text{he'}--\text{lah}.\\
\text{det}--\text{N}--\text{dem-dist} & \text{asp-Dpr}--\text{V} \quad \text{adv}--\text{dem-prox} \\
\text{the--man} & \text{dur}--\text{3--come now} \\
\text{That man is coming now.}
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
(26) & \text{Kap--een} \quad \text{in--k'at--eh} \quad \text{wa} \quad \text{ma'} \quad \text{u--yoh--el--oo'}. \\
\text{V}--\text{Dpr} & \text{Dpr}--\text{V}--\text{SPM} \quad \text{cond} \quad \text{neg} \quad \text{Dpr}--\text{V}--\text{intr-3pl} \\
\text{begin-1sg} & \text{1sg-as}k \quad \text{if not} \quad \text{3--know}
\end{array}\]
I began to ask if they knew. No one, no one knew.

(27) A. Tech--eh k--a--bel.
Ipr-top asp-Dpr-V
2sg inc-2--go

As for you, you are going.

B. Max--i'ih?
inter-scope
who

Who is?

(28) You have to go.

(29) Te' bin--ih a'--winik--eh.
loc V--Dpr det---N---top
there go---3 the--man

The man went there.

(30) A man slept here.

As may be seen from examples (27) and (28), topicalized MPs may appear before or after the verb. The
more prominent position preceding the verb appears to be of greater frequency for topicalized NPs. Specific but not topicalized NPs can likewise appear on either side of an intransitive verb (SV - (25), (27); VS - (30)). Contrastively focused MPs, however, occur only in front of the verb (26), (27), just as in transitive sentences. Nominal information that is not highlighted tends to follow the verb (29), (30).

2.5. Prepositions

Itza is a prepositional language, in accordance with typological predictions for a VO language (Venneman 1975:287).

(31) a. etel ha'  b. t--a' noh beh--eh
    prep  N       prep-det adj  N--top
    with water    to the big road

c. ich kol  d. yalam a'--che'--eh
    prep  N       prep  det--N--top
    in the milpa  below the tree

e. ti kah  f. yok' im bik'
    prep  N       prep  Ppr  N
    to town      over my meat

g. chumuk ha'--eh
    prep  N-top
    in the middle of the lake

There are, however, a number of expressions where the positional element is nominalized and preceded by a possessive pronoun giving something of the appearance of
postpositions.

(32) a. t—the in wet—el
   prep—Ppr prep—nom
   to—in prep—Ppr
   with me
   (‘at my witness’)  
   b. t—the in pach
   prep—Ppr prep—nom
   to—in prep—Ppr
   behind me
   (‘at my back’)

Though these phrases are still prepositional phrases with the preposition t(i), there is a postposed positional element.?

2.6. Noun - Demonstrative

Demonstrative adjectives follow the modified noun in the unmarked state (no definite predictions were made by Greenberg (1966a:86)). There are, however, cases of semantically marked expressions where the demonstrative precedes the noun it modifies.

(33) a. ah mis—he’t—1a’(-eh)  b. a’—balum—he’t—lo’
masc—M—dem—prox(-top)  det—M—dem—dist
   cat                                     jaguar
   this cat                                that jaguar
   c. He’t—lo’ a’—winik—eh  d. He’t—lo’—eh a’—winik—eh.
dem—dist det—M—top     dem—dist—top det—M—top
   man                                     man

There (/That) is the man.

Demonstrative adjectives are always composed of two elements in Itza, the demonstrative marker he’t- and either the proximal marker -la’ or the distal marker -lo’. They generally modify definite nouns and follow them as in (33a) and (33b) above.
The demonstrative may precede the noun when its referent is present, adding emphasis and a sense of ostensibility as in (33c). A discourse function of this construction is to highlight the referent’s position. The demonstrative cannot be topicalized when it appears preceding the noun it modifies (33d).

2.7 Possessed - Possessor

In Itza two NPs in a possessed-possessor relationship occur in the order possessed-possessor in the unmarked state, which is also by far the more frequent order, as predicted for a VO language (Lehmann 1978:17).

(34) a. u chi' a'-ha'-eh b. u k'ay ix Maria
    Ppr N  det--N--top  Ppr N  fem PN
    3 shore the-water  3 song
    the shore of the lake    the song of Maria

c. u k'ek'en-il k'aax d. u yich in ha'as-eh
    Ppr  N----pos  N  Ppr  N  Ppr  N--top
    3  pig  forest  3  fruit  1sg plantain
    the pig of the forest    the fruit of my banana tree

As may be seen from the examples above, the ordinary form is third person possessive pronoun u - possessed NP- (possessive suffix -il) - possessor NP.

More examples of the possessive suffix -il are presented below.
(35) a. u kim--en--il in k'ek'en--oo'--eh
    Ppr V--nom-pos Ppr M--3pl--top
    3 corpse 1sg pig
    the dead one of my pigs

b. u yum--il a'--meyah-eh c. u tso'ts-el u pol
    Ppr N--pos det--W--top Ppr N--pos Ppr W
    3 owner the-work 3 hair 3 head
    the boss of the work the hair of his head

d. t--u bak'-el u yit
    loc-Ppr N--pos Ppr N
    to-3 flesh 3 rump
    to the flesh of his rump

(35b-c) are examples of a noun class of body parts that take the -el suffix rather than the -il, termed inalienable nouns by Blair for Yucatec Maya (1964:52), suggesting the strong connection of the possessed NPs to their possessors. In (35a-b) as in (34c) the possessed NPs have no inherent implication of a possessed-possessor relationship, unlike the other examples, which may be the semantic basis for the additional marking of the -il suffix. (35b) is an interesting example where the semantic order and the syntactic order conflict. Semantically the order is possessor-possessed but syntactically it is the reverse, which is also evident in the English translation.

2.8. Adjective - Noun

It is difficult to determine the extent to which Itza Maya conforms to the typological universals proposed by Greenberg (1966a) on this point, as VOS languages were
not considered and the universals that were presented do not allow clear predictions for Itza. SVO word order was considered in his study but no universals regarding Adj-W order applied, the results of his survey being fairly mixed. Consider the following Itza examples:

A. Adjective - Noun

(36) a. hun p'e monok chem
    num class adj   N
    one inam small canoe
    a small canoe

    b. a'-nohoch winik
    det-adj   N
    the-big man

    c. ah box tsimin--eh
    masc adj   N----top
    black horse
    the black horse

    d. me(he)n pek'--oo'
    adj   M----3pl
    small dog

    e. ah (pin-)pin chem
    adj   N
    the (very) wide canoe

    f. ah chi-chich che'
    adj   N
    the very hard wood

B. Noun - Adjective

(37) a. A'-haab tu'umben
    det---N adj
    the-year new
    the new year

    b. a'-ha' yek
    det-N adj
    the-water strong

    c. hun p'e chem pim
    num class N adj
    one inam canoe wide

    d. che' chich
    adj   N adj
    wood hard

    e. a'-pek' nohoch
    det---N adj
    the-dog big

    the big dog

As may be seen in the examples above, both adj-N (36) and N-adj (37) orders occur. While adj-N appears to
be more frequent, it may also be the more highly marked
morphologically and semantically, either by reduplication
of the adjective (36d-e), or by the agentive ah (36c) or
both (36d-e). Reduplication of the adjective, which
occurs only when it precedes the modified noun, is an
intensifying marker, and thus highlights the adjective.
This admixture of N-adj orders may be the result of
Spanish influence, which is predominantly N-adj. It is
not found in the other languages of the Yucatecan family
which are overwhelmingly Adj-N ordered.
1. The criterion of ambiguity outside of context (Criterion 5) is somewhat problematic in that, of course, all sentences do occur in context. It is conceivable that some sentence type would be ambiguous outside of context but unambiguous and of high frequency in discourse. However, this is not the case in Itza.

2. Elaborations of the relationships between specifiers and word order will be examined below but it may be mentioned here, that whenever the first NP of a verb-medial sentence is topicalized, the sentence is interpreted as SVO, as may be seen from the following example where the object, a topicalized demonstrative pronoun is more highly specified than the subject.

```
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & V & O \\
A'\rightarrow\text{winik}--\text{eh} & k\rightarrow\text{u}--\text{kin}--\text{ik} & a'\rightarrow\text{he}'--\text{lo}--\text{eh}, \\
\text{det}---\text{M}--\text{top} & \text{asp-Dpr-V-caus-PB} & \text{det}--\text{dem-dist-top} \\
\text{the--man} & \text{inc}-3--\text{die} \\
\end{array}
\]
```

The man kills that one.

3. If the first NP of a verb-initial sentence is topicalized, it is usually considered anomalous. However, if there is a long pause between the first and second NPs, as in afterthought phenomena, it might be accepted as ambiguous. In neither case can it be considered as a Basic Word Order sentence.

4. If, on the other hand, one were VO and the other OV, universals could not even apply, as all orders would be in agreement with one or the other. It would, in fact, run contrary to the sizeable body of evidence in language universals which indicates that one or the other Basic Word Order type occurs in all languages and would require a very complete demonstration that there were actually two basic word orders.

5. Verb-initial sentences with the first NP topicalized can occur as the following example indicates:

```
A. Ts'\text{on}--ah--e'\text{ex} & \text{etel} & a'\rightarrow\text{winik}--\text{eh}, \\
V\rightarrow\text{diat}--\text{Dpr} & \text{prep} & \text{det}---\text{M}--\text{top} \\
\text{shoot} & \text{2pl} & \text{with the--man}
```
You hunted with the man. Did you bring meat?

No, the man killed a jaguar. (Jaguar is considered to be inedible)

Although exceedingly rare, the VSO sentences above is interpretable because of the discourse context. In the example above, the topicalization of the first NP appears to reflect afterthought phenomena.

6. Note that the question is in the form of a typical VOS sentence and that the O is new information as expected.

7. It is interesting to note that a number of positional elements derive from body part terms such as ich which may mean 'eye' or 'in'; tin pach which means 'at my back' or behind me; and taanil which means in front of, front being the front of the body.

8. Possessive pronouns always precede their possessed nouns but are not relevant to this discussion because they are not NPs. It should also be noted that a possessor NP may precede the possessed NP when the former is topicalized, its fronted position giving it added prominence as in the following example.

As for the tree, it's trunk...

This order is quite rare, however, and may be explained by its discourse context and function, which serve to highlight the possessor NP by fronting it, denoting the following possessed NP which follows as in afterthought phenomena.

9. Greenberg's (1966a:111) predictions for adjectives are the following:

(17) With overwhelmingly more than chance frequency, languages with dominant order VSO have the adjective
after the noun.

(18) When the descriptive adjective precedes the noun, the demonstrative and the numeral, with overwhelmingly more than chance frequency, do likewise.

(19) When the general rule is that the descriptive adjective follows, there may be a minority of adjectives which usually precede, but when the general rule is that descriptive adjectives precede, there are no exceptions.

The mixture of adjective-noun and noun-adjective orders which appear in Itza appears to violate Greenberg’s Universal (19).

10. See Tozzer (1977:95) and Blair (1964) with regard to the adj-N order of Yucatec Maya; see Ulrich and Ulrich (1976:10) for information regarding Nopan; and see Bruce (1968) for information on Lacandon.
3. NOUN PHRASE SPECIFICITY

In the discussion of word order, it was noted that the specification of NPs affects word order interpretations. In unfocused Basic Word Order constructions (i.e., SVO, VOS), for example, the subject tends to be specified. In this chapter, I consider the specificity system in general.

Aspects of what I am terming specificity have been discussed by various authors under such rubrics as definiteness, reference, relatives, articles, demonstratives and deixis (Ahlgren 1946; Dubois 1980; Christopherson 1939; Hawkins 1978; Hewson 1972; Jesperson 1940, vol. 7:403ff.; Van der Auwera 1980; Yotusukura 1970). Specificity, as conceived here, is a broad category involving the presence or absence of NP modifiers that serve a contrastive or identifying function, that is, those that serve to contrast a modified NP with NPs of its own genus as well as contrasting it with NPs of other genera and thus provide an NP with a context.

3.1. Discourse and Specificity

In discourse, one of the primary tasks for the speaker is to put information in a context that is intelligible to the hearer but not overly redundant. In
this chapter I consider the various contextualizing processes associated with NPs in discourse. The speaker must determine the manner in which to introduce information, how much to elaborate on a particular piece of information, how long to keep it in a discourse and at what level of elaboration, and when to drop it. In these processes the speaker reflects both what he considers to be important about a piece of information and his considerations of hearer comprehension by providing sufficient context. Ideally, the speaker is in constant interaction with the hearer, elaborating on points that are unclear or of particular interest and stopping references which the hearer might find overly repetitious or tedious.

Putting an NP in context is a sorting process in which an NP is selected and contrasted to other NPs in a fashion that the hearer can understand. The ways in which an NP is modified, put into context and contrasted to others are considered here as the specificity system and vary in predictable ways as a discourse progresses.

Whenever an NP occurs it is contrastive with other NPs at the lexical level. For example, generics that are not modified in any way are still contrastive at the lexical level - one genus is contrasted with other genera. If one says: "Birds have feathers", there is an implicit contrast of the generic NP birds and other NPs such as cats, lizards, etc. The context in this case is
the most general possible for NPs, the lexicon or a substantial subset of the lexicon. When speaker and hearer share knowledge of the same language no finer distinctions of contrastiveness and context are needed to make such general statements. However, the speaker/hearer usually wants to communicate/understand more particular kinds of information and to do this they make finer distinctions in contrastiveness and context. There is a continuum from least specified (with most general context) to most specified (with most narrow context) NPs ranging from the most general unspecified information (generics) to highly specific shared information about particular NPs in particular contexts.

There are a number of possible ways of narrowing the context of a noun phrase in discourse. The simplest distinction that can be made is that of number: singular vs. plural. By this distinction, one may narrow the context from the general lexical level to the generic as one refers to one member of a genus (singular) or a subgroup of a genus (plural) without adding further information about the member(s) other than genus. For example, in the sentence: "I saw a bird", nothing more than number is marked and understood about the object NP. There is a difference between these usages and the generic in that number is distinguished and they are referential, a particular referent is known to the speaker. Generics do not indicate such a distinction,
although overt morphology is sometimes misleading. The singular/plural contrast is basically a generic subcategorization distinction - one member or group of members of a particular lexical class are referred to and no other contextualizing features are marked on the NP.

For greater specificity (providing a narrower context) one must elaborate on the relations of a noun phrase (or its referent) to elements outside of its class (genus). Relative clauses, adjectives, and prepositional phrases are typical means for such elaboration. A relative clause may relate the NP it modifies to other NPs, add qualities to it (e.g., via adjectives), locate it in space and time (e.g., via prepositional phrases), in short, add information about the head NP and by doing so clarify its context, contrasting it to NPs (or referents) which do not have these qualities. This elaboration may be at the level of the linguistic code, as generics are, but it often includes pragmatic elements relating it to the discourse context. An example of the more general usage, without pragmatic relations to the discourse context, is the following: "Birds that have lost their feathers are pitiful". The relative clause (that have lost their feathers) provides information about the head noun "birds", and thus contrasts birds with the given characteristics to other kinds of birds as well as other genera.

Contextualization of NPs without reference to
discourse context is a very limited mode of communication. It takes no account of the relationship between the information one wishes to contextualize to the participants in the discourse or to information previously given in the discourse. A basic task for speakers is to make the information they communicate relevant to the hearers, which may be done by indicating the relation of the information to the participants and to information previously given, that is, including the participants in the discourse in the context of the information presented. Particular references must be related to the discourse context (including its participants). Several, though not all, of the ways of relating information to the discourse context are indicating spatial relations, indicating temporal relations (including prior mention), and drawing on shared information. Mechanisms which indicate these relations have been traditionally categorized as deixis and anaphora in grammar.²

Deixis is a broad category referring to grammatical elements that relate to the participants of a discourse pragmatically and whose meaning is determined by the actual speech situation (Silverstein 1975). Several major grammatical categories may be treated in this way, verb and adverb as well as NP. Tense (and some aspect) distinctions, for example, are dependent in their meanings upon the time of the discourse. The future,
present, and past are relative to the time of the actual
discourse, the past being prior to the time of the
discourse, the present at approximately the same time and
the future referring to a time after the discourse.
Likewise there are several adverbials whose meaning
depends on the actual discourse situation such as
'now/then'; 'here/there'. The meaning of such adverbials
is determined by relative proximity (temporal in the case
of 'now/then'; spatial in the case of 'here/there') to
the speakers. In other words, the actual speech situation
is the context for the other elements.

As noted above, deictics relating NPs to discourse
and its participants are specifiers. First and second
person pronouns are a striking example of discourse
context dependency as their meaning depends on who is
speaking and who is being addressed. The first person
refers to the speaker, the second person to the
addressee. However, in discussing specificity, I will
concentrate on the elaboration of deictics which relate
third person NPs to their discourse context. There is a
wide range of possibilities for specifying NPs with
deictics, all of which serve to contextualize particular
NP referents. Demonstratives (this/that) are
transparently deictic specifiers that contextualize NPs
along a proximal/distal axis in relation to the
participants in a discourse, most notably the speaker.
'This bird' refers to a bird relatively close to the
speaker while 'that bird' refers to one relatively
distant. Note that when demonstratives are used the NP
has a particular reference identifiable to the speaker
and ideally to the hearer as well.

Although cases where the distal/proximal distinction
is transparently spatial are the easiest to interpret, it
also operates along temporal/cognitive lines and this is
especially important when the reference relates to the
discourse itself rather than directly to the participants
(Halliday and Hasan 1976). For example, once a noun
phrase has been mentioned (in any but the generic sense)
it can later be referred to by a deictic that relates it
to the participants in a discourse as the particular NP
previously mentioned, as may be seen in the following
dialogue:

Speaker A. I saw a man swimming in the river yesterday.
Speaker B. That (or the) man (the man whom you just
mentioned) must have been crazy.

One may even use deictics to refer to particular NPs that
have not been recently mentioned but which the speaker
assumes the hearer knows about and can readily recall and
contextualize. If there is some doubt about the hearer's
ability to do so, the speaker might prompt him as in:
"Remember that (or the) man I saw, he was crazy".
Finally, anaphoric pronouns may be used to refer to
specific NPs just as the other deictics mentioned. In
the sentence quoted above, the anaphoric pronoun 'he'
refers to a particular referent, 'that man'.

I have given a broad sketch of the ways that deictics may specify a noun phrase by relating it to the discourse context, and in all cases the modified NP is a particular contrasted with members of its own class as well as other genera. There is also the question of differences between the various specifiers in terms of discourse functions, that is, when and why do speakers use one specifier rather than another.

In determining the appropriate level of specificity, the speaker must consider distinct requirements. His primary purpose is to specify a given noun to a degree that reflects all the information he intends to communicate and that is intelligible to the speaker. For intelligibility, when using a noun phrase the speaker must make a judgement as to how much information the hearers share regarding the subject he wishes to communicate. As mentioned above, reference to particulars occurs only when there are relations to the discourse situation, and, ideally, the hearer is aware of those relations. If the hearer is unaware of the NP referent to which the speaker wishes to refer, the speaker must provide a context for the hearer. This entails beginning in general terms and then making the reference more specific. When the speaker wishes to begin communication concerning a particular referent about which he cannot assume hearers' awareness, he
typically begins not with deictics, but with indefinite modifiers as in the sentence: "I saw a man in the park yesterday". In this sentence, the speaker is aware of a particular man but the hearer is not and thus the reference is specific to the speaker but not to the hearer. The existential presentative is another typical mechanism for introducing information about which one wishes to elaborate in narrative discourse as in "Once there was a man..." After the introduction of a referential NP, however, it is by that very fact given a discourse context and is thus specific by virtue of its being mentioned in the discourse and all future references to it must be specific. NPs can gain specificity but not lose it in the discourse process. Which specifier (deictic) to use after an NP has become specific remains to be discussed.

The choice of deictics depends on speakers intentions, consideration for the hearer, efficiency of communication, and discourse context. If one wishes to make a proximal/distal distinction, the demonstratives are the obvious choice, although the same distinction could be made more circuitously via relative clauses or prepositional phrases (e.g., 'that man' vs. 'the man who is there' vs. 'the man in the chair'). Moreover, demonstratives mark a direct relation to the speaker, specifying the relative distance of a given NP's referent to the speaker. Again, this can also be done via a
relative clause (e.g., 'that man' vs. 'the man who is far from me'). However, if the relation of the NP to the speaker is less direct, as is often the case when the discourse itself is the context, he may employ topic markers and definite articles. This is in some ways a distancing mechanism, removing the NP from direct relationship to the speaker.

Another major consideration in the selection of deictics is the avoidance of unnecessary repetition. Once a distinction has been made, it need not be continuously repeated, and anaphoric devices come into play. After an NP has been modified by deictics, their specificity function is redundant and the NP may be replaced by anaphoric pronouns or topicalized. The reappearance of demonstratives may then serve such highlighting functions as emphasis and contrastive focus.

All deictic processes may be considered to be anaphoric. Anaphora is characterized by the absence of representation of certain features of shared information. In other words, a noun phrase may be represented by a grammatical unit that does not encode all of the information understood about a particular referent. Pronominalization, for example, may encode person and number but no other salient aspects of a noun phrase and is a formalized grammatical process that serves to carry over old information. Other deictics indicate different kinds of grammatical formalization. For example,
demonstratives may draw upon spatial semantic relations (but not person and number).

There is a range of specifiers differing in both degree of specificity and manner of specificity. Indefinites specify number, are referential, and serve as introductory markers for fuller specification but do not mark a noun phrase as a particular for the hearer. Demonstratives may make a noun phrase specific by marking spatio-temporal relations to the speaker. Determiners and topic markers specify by relating a noun phrase to its discourse context or to shared information. Anaphoric pronouns may replace an NP once it has been specified. In addition, various of these deictics can combine with each other.

I have presented a broad outline of specifiers with respect to a number of their discourse functions. In the following sections I discuss the specificity system of Itza Maya. Unspecified NPs are considered first with regard to their functions and the syntactic constructions into which they enter.

3.2. Unspecified NPs.

NPs without any overt modifiers (morphological or lexical) are considered to be unspecific when used in a generic sense. Unmodified NPs are not always used in this sense, however, and interestingly, it is often the referents most familiar to participants in a discourse,
about which they share many presuppositions and which are
cognitively very specific, that receive no overt
marking.* Such uses are examined in more detail below but
first the generic use of unspecified NPs will be
considered.

It was noted in Chapter 2 that transitive sentences
with unspecified NPs are often ambiguous. For example,
if the first NP of a verb-medial transitive sentence is
unspecified, the sentence is ambiguous outside its
discourse context as to an SVO or OVS interpretation.
Likewise, verb-initial transitives with unspecified final
NPs may be ambiguous as to a VOS or VSO interpretation.
If however, these NPs are appropriately specified, they
are unambiguously interpreted as subjects. Unspecified
NPs, on the other hand, can occur unambiguously as
objects in basic SVO constructions. The correlation
between specified NPs and subjects was discussed.
However, unspecified NPs do occur as subjects in
subject-focus constructions as previously noted (2.2.1.,
2.2.3.). Consider the following examples:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S/O & V & O/S \\
(1) Winik & k---u---kin---s---k & balum. \\
\text{N} & \text{asp-Dpr} & \text{V--caus-PM} \\
\text{man} & \text{inc-3} & \text{die} \\
& & \text{jaguar} \\
\end{array}
\]

a. SVO Man kills jaguars,
or b. S[foc]VO Man kills jaguars,
or c. O[foc]VS Jaguars kill man.
(2) A'---winik-eh balum t--u--kin--s--ah, the man jaguar com--J--die
det--N--top \( V \)
a. S/(foc)V As for the man, he killed jaguar.
or b. O/(foc)V As for the man, jaguar killed him.

(3) Wa ma' winik-eh, mia balum t--u--han--t--ah,
cond neg N--scope adv N asp-Dpr--V--tran-DPM
if not man maybe jaguar com-J--eat

If it wasn't a man, perhaps a jaguar ate it.

(4) Ma' wah-ii'ih a'---k---in---k'mat---ik-eh,
eg neg N--scope det--asp--Dpr--V-----PM--rel
inc--1sg--like

It's not tortillas that I like.

Generics implicitly contrast one class of referent to others, and when this contrast is highlighted I consider them to be in contrastive focus. Sentence (3) appears to be a case where two generics (winik and balum) are not highlighted by contrastive focus. Sentence (1) may or may not exhibit subject focus depending on intonation and context, but when the first NP is interpreted as an object it is contrastively focused. The unspecified noun in (2) is always in focus. Finally, (4) is an example of negative contrastive focus.

While some restrictions were noted in the occurrence of unspecified NPs as subjects, this is not the case for objects. In fact there is one type of construction in which the object cannot be specified: object incorporation. Object incorporation is a process in which the object is demoted such that it becomes attached to the verb and allows no specificity marking. Consider
the following:

(5) Tan-in-wen-s-ik a'-abil-eh.
    asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det-N-top
    dur-lsg-lower

I am picking the plum.

(6) A'-abil-eh tan-in-wen-s-ik.
    det-N-top asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM
    the-plum dur-lsg-lower

As for the plum, I am picking it.

(7a) Tan-in-wen-s-i-abil
    asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM-N
    dur-lsg-lower plum

I am plum picking.

(7b) *(Tan-in-wen-s-i a'-abil-eh.
    DPM det-N-top
    the-plum)

(8) *(A'-)abil-(eh) tan-in-wen-s-i.
    det-N-top DPM
    (the)--plum

(9) Wen-s-i-abil-n-ah-een.
    V-caus-DPM-N-detr-dist-Dpr
    lower plum lsg

I was a plum picker.

Sentences (5) and (6) are basic transitive sentences in which the object may be modified by specifiers (in these examples by a'-...eh) and may be moved to the front of the sentence. In contrast, in object incorporation (7)-(9), the object cannot be moved as is demonstrated by the lack of grammaticality of (8) nor can it be specified, as evidenced by (7b) and (8). In the
completive aspect, the object is entirely incorporated into the verb as may be seen in (9). In these cases of object incorporation, the objects are generics, having no specificity or reference, and are demoted rather than highlighted. The verb, on the other hand, gains salience as the object loses it.

Besides their purely generic meaning and the lexical level of contrast, unspecified NPs may implicitly refer to subcategories of a general class whose references are understood in their discourse context. However, there is no morphological marking or any modification of the NP to indicate subcategorization. For example, in (2), while the main discourse function of the NP balum 'jaguar' is one of contrastive focus at the generic level, (i.e., it is a jaguar and not some other animal that the man killed), it may also be understood that the noun refers to one animal in certain contexts and the speaker might well know which particular animal. Likewise in (3), one might assume that one animal in fact ate. Consider the following examples:

(10) A. Ba'tax t----a----wil---ah t----a'----beh---eh?
inter asp-Dpr---V----DPM prep-det---N----top
What com-2sg--see on-the--way

What did you see on the way?

B. T----in---wil---ah winik i balum,
asp--Dpr--V----DPM N conj N
com---1sg--see man and jaguar

I saw (a) man and (a) jaguar.
(11) A. Tan---a---kin---s---ik tsimin?
asp--Dpr---V--caus--PM N
dur--2sg--die horse

Are you butchering a horse?

B. Ha'k'ek'en tan---in---kin---s---ik.
eg N asp--Dpr---V--caus--PM
no pig lsg--die

No, I am butchering (a) pig.

In (10B) the speaker is undoubtedly aware of certain characteristics of the man (/men) and jaguar(s) that he saw but indicates none of them to the hearer. In (11) Speaker B undoubtedly knows quite a bit about the animal he is in the process of slaughtering but in his reply he highlights generic contrast in saying that it is a pig and not a horse, at which level particular information about the pig is irrelevant. Similarly, NPs with no specifying affixes may be followed by relative clauses in cleft contrastive-focus constructions which operate at the lexical level as in (12):

(12) Pek', {a'--he'--lo' t---u-han--t--ah in bik'--eh).  
N det-dem-dist asp-Dpr--V-trans--DPM Ppr N--rel 
dog com--3--eat lsg meat

It's a dog that ate my meat.

In (12), the speaker highlights the contrast of dog to other animals at the generic level rather than highlighting specific attributes of the referent. The noun pek' 'dog' is clefted, appearing in initial position and followed by a relative clause. Similarly, appositional structures where the referent might be quite
specific may include unmodified NPs when it is the speakers intention to make a contrast at the generic level as in (13):

(13)  A'---lah keeh.
det--prox  N
this one  deer

This is deer. (not jaguar)

In (13) the referent is specific but what is highlighted is that it is a deer and not some other animal.

As mentioned above (3.1.), there are some NPs which may be understood by the hearer to refer to specific referents without being modified by specifiers due to a high level of shared information.

(14)  Yan---ah---i(h) hun p'e k'in ke kal--een
cop--dist--Dpr  num  class  N  sub  V---Dpr
exist  3sg  one  inam  day  that  drink-1sg
i pat--een ich kah,
conj  V---Dpr  prep  N
and  remain-1sg  in  town

There was one day that I got drunk and stayed in town.

(15)  T---u---yok---s---ah---en---oo' ich nah.
asp-Dpr--V--caus--DPM--Dpr--Dpr  prep  N
com--3--enter  1sg  3pl  in  house

They brought me into the house.

In sentences (14) and (15) the unspecified NPs are understood to refer to the town and house of the speaker respectively and this is common for a few other nouns as well, such as ha' 'lake' and kol 'milpa', whose referents are familiar to both speaker and hearer.
One more usage of unspecified nouns will be mentioned - reference to indefinite nouns which are then further specified. As is shown in the next section, this is not the only (nor is it the most common) way to make indefinite mentions, but it is possible, as may be seen in the following:

(16) A'-winik-eh t---u---kin--s--ah balum, det--N--top asp-Dpr--V-caus-DPM N
the man com--3--die jaguar
a'---t---u---yok---l---ik ah--kax--eh.
det--asp-Dpr--V--intr-PH masc--N--rel
dur--3--enter chicken

The man killed (a) jaguar, the one that was stealing chickens.

(17) Ah--Juan-eh t--u--ts'on-ah balum i a'-balum-eh, masc-PN--top asp-Dpr--V--DPH N conj det--N--top
Juan com--3--shoot jaguar and the-jaguar
layti' a'--loh a'--t--u--yok--l--ah in wakax.
Ipr det-dist det--asp-Dpr--V--intr-DPM Ppr N
3sg that one com--3--rob 1sg cow

Juan shot (a) jaguar and the jaguar, it was the one which stole my cow.

In both (16) and (17) balum 'jaguar' occurs without specifiers and is then further modified, in (16) by a relative clause, and in (17) in the conjoined sentence. These may be examples of afterthought phenomena (Givon 1976; 1979). In any case, a more ordinary way to specify indefinite NPs that are to be further elaborated is to begin by at least marking number, particularly for singulars.

In summary, NPs without any specifiers may appear in
a variety of uses. In its generic usage, a noun is contrasted with other nouns at the lexical level. This contrast may be heightened through contrastive focus. Generics may also occur in cases where the noun is of little salience, as in object incorporation or cases where no individuation is considered relevant by the speaker, even though he might be aware of particulars. There are some cases where an unspecified noun is mentioned and then is later elaborated upon, but this is not the usual manner to introduce a noun that one intends to individuate further for the hearer. Finally, there is a small set of nouns referring to referents that are quite familiar to both speaker and hearer and therefore require no overt specifiers to indicate specific references.

3.3. **Indefinite Markers**

Although nouns without any morphological specificity markers may convey meanings of indefiniteness, as discussed above, indefinite reference may also be marked morphologically in Itza, and usually occurs with NPs about which the speaker knows certain particulars he intends to communicate. Indefinite marking provides a way for the speaker to introduce an NP about which he wishes to elaborate without assuming knowledge on the part of the hearer. The existential presentative is one typical means of introducing such information.
Indefinitely marked NPs consist of a numeral (e.g., hun 'one'), a numerical classifier, the choice of which depends on the semantic features (lexical class) of the noun modified (e.g., tuul for animate nouns and p'ool for inanimates) and a noun. For example, the NP hun tuul winik, consists of the numeral one, the classifier for animate nouns, and the noun winik 'man', and may be translated as 'a man'. No restrictions were observed regarding the possibility of indefinitely marked NPs to occur as subjects or objects but the frequency of indefinite objects appears to be significantly higher than indefinite subjects. This difference correlates with the tendency mentioned above (3.1.) for subjects to be definite (+specific), and may be psychologically motivated (Kuno 1976b; Givon 1976).

The following are some typical examples of indefinitely marked NPs:

1) Och-ih bin--eh yan--ah--ih hun tuul winik
   adv-Dpr report-top cop-dist-Dpr num class W
   before-3 3 one anim man

   kih-a'an wa'ye' i hach u--yohel ts'on.
   V--part loc conj adv Dpr--V V
   live here and much 3--know shoot

   Once, they say, there was a man living here and
   he really knew how to hunt.

2) T--in--min--t--ah in ts'on ti hun tu(ul) winik.
   asp-Dpr--V-tran-DPr Ppr W prep num class W
   com-1sg-lend 1sg gun to one anim man
I lent my gun to a man.
He has his milpa here, behind town.

I got a job and I went to do it. The boss of the job told me to make a small trough to hold water for all his horses.

They saw a big woman coming. Her hair was long.
In all of the examples given above, the indefinitely marked nouns refer to new information which is elaborated upon after its introduction. In (1) the existential presentative is used to introduce the subject of a story which is thereafter shared information to be further elaborated upon. In (2) the indirect object hun tuul winik 'a man' is new, this being its first mention in the discourse, and the referent is then elaborated upon by specifying the location of his milpa. After its introduction it becomes old information and is referred to by the anaphoric pronoun u. In (3) the shift from indefinite to definite reference is more obvious, the first reference hun tuul meyeh being replaced in the second sentence by a^-meyeh-sh. As may be seen in (3b) (hun p'ë monok cheh), in (4a) (hun tuul noxi' ix ch'up) and (5) hun tuul winik (k'ha'an ich k'axeh), indefinite MPs may be further modified by adjectives (3b and 4a) or by relative clauses (5). Thus not only number but also subsets of general classes may be indicated just as with unspecified nouns. In all of these cases, the speaker knows particulars about the referents of the indefinite nouns and intends to communicate more about them to the hearer. The hearer on the other hand is not expected to be aware of a particular referent when it is introduced but is from that point on, and the referent can then be referred to by anaphoric processes. Once an NP has been mentioned it cannot later be referred to by indefinite
marking. In examples (1)-(5) the indefinite NPs whether subjects (1), (3a), (5) or objects (2a), (3b), (4) are not highlighted and in fact, mechanisms for highlighting indefinite NPs are quite limited. Most highlighting mechanisms operate on definite (+specific) NPs. Contrastive focus, however, may occur with indefinites just as with unspecified NPs.

(6) Hun tuul winik tun----han----al.
    num class N asp/Dpr--v----intr
    one anim man dur/J---eat.

A man is eating.

(7) Hun kul abil tan---in---wen--s--ik.
    num class N asp---Dpr---V--caus--PM
    one plum dur---Isg--lower

I am picking a plum.

These focus constructions are very similar to those noted for unspecified NPs (3.2.1.), but add the distinction of number. There is still contrast at the lexical level - i.e., it's a man (not a member of some other class) that is eating in (6) and it is a plum, not some other object that is being picked in (7).

The function of these indefinite forms to add new information is also apparent in certain appositional (identity) constructions in which new information is introduced, including information about specific (known) referents. Consider the following examples:
Example (8) is a rather straightforward example of introducing new information in an appositional structure. It may be assumed that the hearer knows that the speaker is picking something but not exactly what and the speaker provides the identity of the object. In examples (9-11) however, the hearer already knows the identity of the
referent. What the speaker is doing is providing new information about that referent, not introducing a new referent. In (9B), the speaker assumes that the hearer knows the referent and in fact refers to it by the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun a*lo* but he adds information with the indefinite NP asserting an attribute about the known referent very much as adjectives or verbal form might (i.e., that the man is thieving or that the man steals). In (10) the referent is introduced by the indefinite NP hun tuul wach 'a Mexican' after which it may be referred to by definite expressions as was explained for examples (1-5). However, it is followed by another indefinite NP hun tuul yukatanil 'a Yucatecan' which modifies the first by offering new information that further specifies it. It provides a subcategorization but makes no definite (+ specific) reference. In (11) is another example of the use of indefinitely marked NPs that relate to specific referents. In this case there is a dramatic shift in the characteristics attributed to the referent in its transformation from a man into a lion which is marked by the indefinite NP.

There are also independent indefinite pronouns composed of the same morphemes - numeral and classifier - as may be seen in the following examples:

(12) In--ka'ah in---ben---es hun tuul, Dpr---V Dpr---V--caus num class 1sg-go 1sg--carry one anim
It is interesting to note that while the indefinite pronoun does not itself refer to any particular referent, it is referential and the class of referents of which it is a member is already mentioned or understood. In (14)
the class is explicitly mentioned and specified (*in wix kaxnh). As described above, the functions of the indefinite markers are to mark number and lack of specificity. In conjunction with other specifiers as in (16) the indefiniteness is largely lost but the distinction of number and contrast at the lexical level remains. In (15) it is the presence of other specifiers (the determiner *a* and the demonstrative ho^loh) that mark the referent of the pronoun as *specific*; in this case a particular rooster which is identifiable to both speaker and hearer.

The interaction of *specificity* markers with unspecified nouns and indefinites has been briefly mentioned thus far. The ways in which specificity markers contextualize NPs as particulars and in which they interact with each other is the topic of the next section.

3.4. Specific NPs

Although there are certain cases where nouns without any morphological modifiers are specific (have particular referents) as mentioned in Section 3.1, specific NPs are usually marked morphosyntactically to indicate both that the NP is specific and the way in which it is specific; i.e., what its specifying context is (space, time etc.). As previously discussed, specific NPs generally refer to particular information about which the addressee as well
as the speaker is aware, that is, shared information. A crucial feature of specific references is that the speaker assumes that the hearer is able to identify the particulars to which he is referring. The speaker is constantly confronted with the task of deciding how much information is understood by the hearer and the specificity marking of NPs reflects these considerations.

Morphosyntactic marking of specific NPs in Itza Maya entails a prefixed morphological marker which is often accompanied by further specifying material after the noun. The prefix may simply indicate the minimal specificity information that the modified noun is specific, referring to a particular referent but not giving any information as to its context, as the article 'the' often does in English. In Itza this function is served by the determiner $a^+$.

3.4.1. The Determiner $A^+$

The determiner $a^+$ is prefixed to the noun it modifies and marks only that the noun is specific. Information regarding the nature of a noun's specificity may be marked by a separate series of deictics which generally follow the noun. In most cases, when the determiner $a^+$ appears, one or more deictics will follow the NP but this is not always the case as the following examples indicate:
In the simple transitive sentences above, there are occurrences of the NP a'-winik in which no suffix appears (such as the topic marker -eh which is suffixed to balum in (2) and (3)). In accord with the paradigm presented for word order (Chapter 2), in (1) and (2) the NP a'-winik is in contrastive focus, while in (3) it is not highlighted but is probably new information in some sense. The term "new information" is somewhat problematic at this point in that specific NPs are to a degree old information, in so much as it is assumed that both speaker and hearer can identify the referent. In contrastive focus constructions with definite NPs, it is not the referents that are new, but rather some assertion about them. In (1) and (2) (in the case that the man is interpreted as the agent) the hearer is assumed to know
which man is referred to but he is not assumed to know
that the man killed the jaguar and might be assumed to
have believed that some other agent killed the jaguar.
Example (3) is more difficult to analyze. As was noted
in the discussion of word order, in verb-initial
sentences the first NP cannot be topicalized and
specification beyond the determiner may lead to
ambiguity. First NP position appears to be a position
for objects that are not highlighted and where the
referent of that NP is of low cognitive salience but I am
unable to make precise statements regarding the degree
that information is shared between speaker and hearer.

Having briefly discussed some occurrences of NPs with
determiners but no contextualizing information, I turn
now to those far more common examples where the NP is
further elaborated. This elaboration is especially
important when relatively new information is introduced
which the speaker believes the hearer needs help in
identifying. Consider the following:

(4) K'och—ih a'---nochoch winik,
    V----Dpr det----adj N
    arrive--3 the----great man

    u yum--il a'---meyah--eh,
Ppr N----pos det------N----top
    3 owner the----work

    The important man, the boss of the job, arrived.

(5) Max a'—winik, a'---kim---ih--eh?
    inter det------N det------V----Dpr-rel
    who the---man the---die----3

    Who is the man, the one who died?
In these examples, the speaker makes specific references marked by the determiner a'- and then adds parenthetic contextual information. It is similar to afterthought phenomena (Givon 1976, 1979). The speaker marks an NP as definite, that is, as an NP which the speaker can identify, and then adds information to help in the identification. In (4) the speaker first makes the definite reference a'-winik and then adds information identifying the particular man to whom he is referring (y yumil a'-seyaheh), this being shared information. In (5)-(7) the contextualizing information, which is old information, is contained in relative clauses framed by a second determiner and a suffixed -eh marker. As the translations evince, a very similar process occurs in English. After a speaker makes a definite reference, if he is in doubt that the hearer is able to identify it, he
may add contextualizing information in relative clauses. It is important to note that the contextual information included in the relative clauses in (5)-(7) is shared information. Additional new information would be of no use to the hearer in identifying the recently introduced NP.

Although it is possible to make definite references with the determiner a'-alone, it is far more common for the NP to be additionally modified and additional modification is generally expected following an NP with the determiner prefixed.

3.4.2. **Topicalization and Relativization**

Relative clauses are a natural and perhaps the most basic way to provide additional specifying information about NPs. Although even indefinite NPs may be specified by relative clauses, as was seen above (3.3.), relative clauses are contextualizing elements and as such usually modify definite, specific NPs that require more contextualization than do indefinite NPs. It is also to be noted that definite NPs are far more frequent in discourse than indefinite NPs.

The interaction of relativization with other markers of specificity is very complex, but certain generalizations can be made at the outset regarding its relation to definite NPs marked by the determiner a'. Structurally, the relative clause generally follows the
NP it modifies and the end of a relative clause is usually marked by the deictic suffix -eh. Information contained in a relative clause is generally old information which is highlighted by the relativization process. Consider the following sentences:

(1) A'=winik (t--u--yok--l--ah in wíh kax)--eh det--N (asp-Dpr--V-tran-DPM Ppr masc N)--rel/top the--man (com--3--rob 1sg chicken)

k--u--kin--s--ik balum. asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM N
inc--3--die jaguar

The man (who stole my chickens) kills jaguars.

(2) K--u--kin--s--ik balum a'=winik (bin--ih)--eh. asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM N det--N (V--Dpr)--rel/top inc--3--die jaguar the--man (go--3)

The man (that went) kills jaguars.

The subject of these sentences (winik) is framed by the determiner a' and the suffix -eh with the relative clause between the noun and the -eh suffix when it appears. Without the relative clauses, these sentences are examples of basic word order types as described earlier ((1) is SVO and (2) is VOS). With the addition of the relative clauses, the sentences are equally grammatical and unambiguous. The -eh suffix appears to serve the function of highlighting old information in all cases and appears at the end of the NP constituent modified. In other words, relative clauses with the suffix -eh and the -eh suffix on nouns with the determiner a'-- may be interchanged without increasing
ambiguity or ungrammaticality as examples (1) and (2) indicate.

Although the head nouns of the relative clauses in (1) and (2) are subjects of the main as well as the subordinate clauses, there are no restrictions in this regard. The head noun of a relative clause may be subject or object of either clause as is shown in the following:

(3) T---in--wil--ah a'---balum t--u--kin--s--ah
   asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--W asp-Dpr--V--caus--DPM
   com--1sg-see the---jaguar com--3--die
   a'---winik---eh.
det-----W-----rel
the-----man

I saw the jaguar that killed the man.

(4) Hach yaab a'--ha' t--in--wuk'---ah---eh.
   adv adj det--W asp-Dpr--V--DPM--rel
   very much the-water com--1sg-drink

It was a lot of water that I drank.

In (3) the head noun balum 'jaguar' is the object of the main clause but the subject of the subordinate clause. In (4) the head noun ha' 'water' is the syntactic subject in the main clause but the semantic patient of the verb in the subordinate clause. The relative clauses in the examples above are distinct from those that appeared previously in Section 3.4.1, in that the relative clauses following the definite head nouns do not begin with a second determiner (e.g., a'winik, a'kimiheh "the man, the one who died" vs. a'winik kimiheh "the man who died"). The determiner a'-- may occur at the
beginning of a relative clause following a specific head noun and also at the beginning of relative clauses with no head noun as in the following:

(5) T---in---wil---ah  a'---winik,  a'---hok'---ih
    asp-Dpr---V---DPM det---W  det---V---Dpr
    com-1sg-see  the---man  leave---]}
    ti  ts'on---eh,
    sub  V----rel
    to  shoot

    I saw the man, the one who went out to hunt.

(6) Ma' balum--i'i  a'---t--u---han---t--ah--eh,
    neg  N---scope det---asp-Dpr-V---tran-DPM-rel
    not  jaguar  com-3---eat

    It's not a jaguar that ate it.

(7) A'---t--u---kin---s---ah  a'---winik--eh,  balum,
    det---asp-Dpr-V---caus-DPM det---W---rel  N
    the---man  jaguar

    What killed the man was jaguar.

(8) A'---balum,  a'---t--u---kin---s---ah  a'---winik--eh,
    det---W  det---asp-Dpr-V---caus-DPM det---W---rel
    the  jaguar  com-3---die  the---man
    ts'on---b--ih.
    V---pas-Dpr
    shoot  ]

    The jaguar, the one that killed the man, was shot.

(9) A. T---u---kin---s---ah  keeh  a'---winik--eh.
    asp-Dpr-V---caus-DPM  W  det---W---top
    com-3---die  deer  the---man

    The man shot a deer.

B. Ba'ax  keeh--il--i'ih?
    inter  N---pos---scope
    what  deer

    What deer was it?
The one that goes into your milpa.

In (5) and (8) there are specific NPs (a'-winik and a'-balum respectively) which the relative clauses framed by a second determiner and the -eh suffix modify. In (6), (7), and (9) however, there are no head nouns for the relative clauses, but only the determiners. A relative clause introduced by the determiner a'- can occur after a noun or independently. In the latter cases, the determiner functions anaphorically as the head of the relative clause. The a'- prefix may thus occur with a noun or a relative clause. The -eh suffix on the other hand, may occur with a noun or at the end of a relative clause regardless of the grammatical category of the word to which it is suffixed but cannot be repeated within a relative clause. Consider the following:

(10) Ha' balum-i'i a'-t-u-han-t-ah (a'-)winik-eh.
    neg N--scope det-asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM det--N--rel
    not jaguar com-3-eat the-man

    It's not a jaguar that a (/the) man ate.

(11) *Ha' balum-i'i a'-t-u-han-t-ah--eh (a'-)winik-eh.
    rel rel

(12) Bin-een in-wil-a' a'-winik-oo'-ti kah-eh.
    V--Dpr Dpr--V--SPM det--N--3pl prep N--rel
    go--Isg 1sg-see the-man in town

    I went to see the men in town.

(13) *Bin-een in-wil-a' a'-winik-oo'-eh ti kah-eh.
    top rel
(11) and (13) are examples of sentences that are ungrammatical because the -eh marker appears inside the relative clause (compare with (10) and (12) respectively). If sentence (11) had ended with the first -eh marker, as in (6), it would have been acceptable. The -eh marker is acceptable as a suffix to a noun phrase before a relative clause if that relative clause is introduced by a determiner as may be seen in the following examples:

(14) K—in—wil—ik a’—winik—eh, a’—t—u—han—t—ah—eh  
    asp—Dpr—V—PM det—M—top det—asp—Dpr—V—tran—DPM—rel  
    inc—1sg—see the—man com—3—eat  

I see the man, the one who ate it.

(15) A’—winik—eh, a’—t—u—kin—s—ah—eh, balum.  
    det—M—top det—asp—Dpr—V—caus—DPM—rel W  
    the—man com—3—die jaguar  

As for the man, the thing that he killed was a jaguar.

(16) A’—balum—eh a’—t—u—kin—s—ah winik—eh.  
    det—M—top det—asp—Dpr—V—caus—DPM W—rel  
    the—jaguar com—3—die man  

a. As for the jaguar, it’s the one that killed men,  
   or b. As for the jaguar, it’s the one that a man killed.

(17) Yan ten a’—ts’on—eh, a’—t—u—ts’—ah ten—eh.  
    cop Ipr det—M—top det—asp—Dpr—V—DPM Ipr—rel  
    1sg the—gun com—3—give 1sg  

I have the gun, the one you gave me.

It may be noted that the relationship of the relative clause to the topicalized NP that precedes it is not always a direct modifying one. In (17) and perhaps in all of the examples above, the relative clause is a constituent independent of the head noun. In general the
relationship of the relative clauses to the topicalized NPs appears to be less direct, and the relative clauses have the status of separate (appositional) grammatical constituents.

The $a^-$ and -eh markers may have the functions of introducing and ending relative clauses respectively. $A^-$ marks definite information and -eh marks it as shared information. It has also been noted that relative clauses with these markers may stand independently, without head NPs. These are not the only markers of relative clauses, however, though they are the most frequent, and some of the others will now be examined.

Features of animacy and location may be encoded in relative markers following NPs marked by the determiner $a^-$ as in the following:

(18) T---a'--kah tu'ux kux---l--ah---een---eh, ts'am--ih.
    prep-det--N rel V-intr-asp-Dpr-rel V---Dpr
    in-the-town where live com-1sg sink---3
    (In) the town where I lived sank.

(19) T---in--wil--ah a'--winik max t--u--kin--s--ah
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--W rel asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM
    com-1sg-see the--man who com-3--die
    a'--balum--eh.
    det----W----rel
    the--jaguar
    I saw the man who killed the jaguar.

(20) T---a'--noh beh tu'ux k--in--meyah--eh.
    prep-det-adj N rel asp-Dpr---V---rel
    on-the--big way where com-1sg-work
    On the highway where I work.
In the locative constructions in (18) and (20), \textit{tu'ux} 'where' introduces the relative clause. In (19) \textit{maax} 'who' appears following the human head noun \textit{winik} 'man'. \textit{Maax} is not obligatory in this case and could be deleted or replaced by \textit{a'}. Independent relative clauses (with no head noun) can also be formed with these markers prefixed by \textit{a'}. As may be seen in the following:

(21) Kap-een \textit{in--tich'-k'ak'--t--eh} tulakal
\hspace{1em} \textit{V----Dpr Dpr-----V------tran-SPM quant}
\hspace{1em} \textit{begin-Isg 1sg-illuminate all}
\hspace{1em} \textit{u baak' a'--tu'ux} \textit{k--in--bel--eh}.
\textit{Ppr W det--rel asp-Dpr---V--rel}
\hspace{1em} \textit{3 circle} \hspace{1em} \textit{where inc-1sg--go}

\hspace{1em} \textit{I began to illuminate the whole area where I was going.}

(22) \textit{T--in--tsikba(l)--t--a(h) ti'sih} a'--ba'aax
\hspace{1em} \textit{asp-Dpr-----V-----tran-DPM Ipr det--rel}
\hspace{1em} \textit{com-1sg--tell 3 what}
\hspace{1em} \textit{t--in--wu'uuy--ah ich k'aax--eh}.
\textit{asp-Dpr----V--DPM prep N rel}
\hspace{1em} \textit{com-1sg--hear in forest}

\hspace{1em} \textit{I told him what I heard in the forest.}

(23) Lub-een \textit{a'--tu'ux} lub--een--eh,
\hspace{1em} \textit{V----Dpr det--rel V----Dpr-rel}
\hspace{1em} \textit{fall--1sg} \hspace{1em} \textit{where fall--1sg}

\hspace{1em} \textit{I fell where I fell.}

(24) A'--ba'aax \textit{uch--ih to'on--eh, ke u}
\hspace{1em} \textit{det-rel V----Dpr Ipr--rel sub Ppr}
\hspace{1em} \textit{what happen--3 1pl that 3}
\hspace{1em} \textit{ba'a'al in ts'on--eh, ma' wak'--ih}.
\hspace{1em} \textit{N Ppr N top neg V----Dpr}
\hspace{1em} \textit{bullet 1sg gun not fire--3}

\hspace{1em} \textit{What happened to us was that the bullet of my gun did not fire.}

In the examples above, the relativization pattern is
similar to that noted previously in this section for relative clauses marked by əɪ...-əh without head nouns. When there is no head noun, the relative clause is introduced only by əɪ- which is anaphoric for a head noun. Such relative clauses may be in apposition to the nouns about which they add information as in (21) or they may appear independently as in (22)-(24). In cases where there is no head noun, the relative clause may highlight other information included in the relative clause.

In summary, a very common pattern for the specification of NPs is relativization with a determiner prefixed to the NP and a relative clause ending with the -əh marker following the NP. It was noted that the information contained within a relative clause could be deleted leaving only the -əh suffix on the noun which has traditionally been termed a topic marker and functions to indicate that the NP is old information but does not repeat the contextualizing information that may occur in a relative clause. There are also intermediate structures between a full relative clause and simply a topic marker such as adjectives and prepositional phrases. In other words, there is a range of information that may be included in the əɪ...-əh frame. In its most expanded form it frames a full relative clause. It was also noted that relative clauses may operate independently of head nouns, in which case they give additional information about a noun (referent) but are
not in a dependent modifying relationship to any noun. These relative clauses are again framed by a*-...-eh but the determiner is not prefixed to a noun, rather, it stands alone anaphorically for a head noun.

Finally, it was noted that additional relative markers such as ba'ax 'what' and tu'ux 'where' could occur either following a head noun, or if there is none, after the determiner. The framing particles a*-...-eh are not the only elements that may specify a noun. I now turn briefly to other elements that may be prefixed to nouns and that serve a specifying function.

3.4.3. Indefiniteness and Topicalization

As was noted above, indefinitely marked nouns are prefixed by a numeral and a classifier (e.g., hun tuul winik - 'a man') which specify number but nothing more and do not require any suffixed -eh marker. In fact, in many cases a suffixed -eh marker would be ungrammatical due to the conflict of indefinite marking (e.g., hun tuul) which usually marks new information and the function of the -eh marker which is generally to highlight old (definite) information. Consider the following:

(1) T—in—wil—ah hun tuul kan ti hun p'e che'.
asp-Dpr—V—DPM num class W prep num class W
com-1sg-see     one anim snake in one inam tree

I saw a snake in a tree.
As may be seen in the examples above, the -eh marker is inappropriate in many instances of indefinitely marked NPs that are new information. It is generally inappropriate for sentence-final indefinites as evinced by (2) and (4) and is definitely unacceptable in contrastive focus constructions (6). It is more acceptable as a suffix to a prepositional phrase or relative clause modifying a sentence-initial indefinite NP as in the following.

(2) *T-in-wil-ah hun tuul kan ti hum p'e che'-eh.

(3) Uts wa-bin hum p'e ts'on.
adj num good class one inam gun

What a good thing a gun is.

(4) *Uts wa-bin hum p'e ts'on--eh.

(5) Hun kul abil tan-in-wen-s-ik.
num class one round asp--Dpr--V-caus--PM plum dur--1sg-lower

It's a plum I am picking.

(6) *Hun kul abil--eh tan-in-wen-s-ik.

As may be seen in the examples above, the -eh marker is inappropriate in many instances of indefinitely marked NPs that are new information. It is generally inappropriate for sentence-final indefinites as evinced by (2) and (4) and is definitely unacceptable in contrastive focus constructions (6). It is more acceptable as a suffix to a prepositional phrase or relative clause modifying a sentence-initial indefinite NP as in the following.

(7) Hun tuul winik ti kah--eh, bin--een in--wil--a'.
num class one anim man in town go--1sg 1sg-see

A man in the town, I went to see.

(8) Hun tuul winik kih--a'an ich k'aax--(eh)
num class one anim man live in forest
A man living in the forest gave me the gun.

(9) Hun tuul winik t-u-yil-ah a'-kan he'-lo'-eh
    num class W asp-Dpr-V--DPM det--N dem--dist-rel
    one man com-3--see the-snake that
    bin--ih.
    V--Dpr
    go--3

A man who saw that snake left.

(10) Hun tuul winik t-u-yil-ah a'-kan he'-lo' bin--ih--eh.
     rel

A man saw the snake that left.

In the examples above, the -eh marker occurs at the end of relative clauses. There is a general tendency for these relatives to modify initial position NPs which are subjects but this is not an absolute rule as evidenced by (7), where the modified NP is an object. The -eh serves the functions of highlighting and of marking the end of an NP constituent in these examples. Its function as a terminal marker may be seen by comparing (9) and (10). In (9) the -eh marks the end of a relative clause modifying the subject NP while in (10) -eh marks the end of a relative clause modifying the object NP.

3.4.4. Possessive Pronoun Prefixes

Another common prefix which specifies nouns is the possessive pronoun. Possessive pronouns specify NPs by indicating their relationship to another known referent.
They contextualize a referent by indicating that it is possessed by another (known) referent. This is a more complete specificity description than the determiner which merely indicates that an NP is specific but not what the context is. Frequently the identity of the possessor is evident by the pragmatics of the speech situation, e.g., the possessor of an NP modified by a first person possessive pronoun is the speaker and the possessor of an NP modified by a second person possessive pronoun is the hearer. Even with third person possessives the identity of the possessor must be known (shared information).

Although it is less obvious, the referent of an NP modified by a possessive pronoun is old information to some degree. Possessed nouns refer either to a referent of which the hearer is aware or one that is generally understood according to the cultural context (for example in nah 'my house' is perfectly acceptable without prior mention because everyone is expected to have a house and an addressee usually knows about the speaker's particular house. Of course, third person pronouns often require further disambiguating information about their referents when they are not present at the speech situation. NPs marked by possessive pronouns require no further specification such as topic marking although they may receive it for further highlighting. Consider the following:
He is killing his pig.

As for his pig, he is butchering it.

He is butchering his pig.

In (11) the possessed object NP is in an unmarked position following the verb and the possessive third person pronoun u is its only marker of specificity. In (12), however, the object is in initial position with a topic marker in addition to the possessive pronoun, indicating the highlighting of old information. In (13) the object is highlighted by its initial position, but by contrastive focus, and no topic marker is present.

As mentioned above, third person possessive pronouns often require further specification of their referents and this often takes the form of possessed-possessor constructions, with the referent of the pronoun given immediately after the possessed NP as in the following:

They opened the door of the house.

Juan heard Maria's song.
(16) K'och—een t--u yotoch ah Juan--eh.
V----Dpr prep-Ppr N masc PN-top
arrive-1sg at-3 house

I arrived at John's house.

In all of these cases, the possessed NP is specific and the possessor appears immediately following it to avoid ambiguity as to its identity. Although the possessive pronoun may interact with topic marking to highlight old information, it does not combine with the determiner prefix a' (*u a'-N; *a'-u-N). In certain cases a noun may be specified by both possessive pronouns and numerals.

(17) Yan--ah--ih ka' tuul u paal.
cop-dist-Dpr num class Ppr N
exist 3 two anim 3 child

She had two children.

(18) Yan hum p'eel u mots.
cop num class Dpr N
exist one inam 3 root

It has (/had) a root.

(19) T--in-ch'ik--ah kaa' p'eel u xet'--el che'--eh.
asp-Dpr--V---Dpm num class Ppr N--pos N--top
cut-1sg-cut two inam 3 piece wood

I cut two pieces of wood.

(20) Kim--ih hun tuul (ich) in wix kax--eh.
V--Dpr num class (prep) Ppr fem N--top
die one anim (among) 1sg chicken

One of my chickens died.

In these cases, while number and possession are specified, the NP remains indefinite and is used to introduce new information.
3.4.5. **Demonstratives**

Although the most common specificity suffix is the topic marker which has been discussed above, demonstratives may also occur as specifiers.

Demonstratives are defined here as specifiers that make a distal/proximal distinction of a noun's relation to the discourse situation, generally with respect to definite NPs. The determiner *a*, when it modifies a noun, marks it as definite and specific without any further indication of the relationship between the noun and the participants in the discourse. The demonstratives, which as suffixes always modify definite nouns in Itza, add the distinction of the relative distance between the noun (or its reference) and the participants in the discourse, be it spatial, temporal, or cognitive. The demonstrative adjectives in Itza (*-he'-la* 'this' and *-he'-lo* 'that') are composed of two morphemes, the demonstrative *he*- and the proximal marker *-la* or the distal marker *-lo*.

When demonstratives follow the definite noun that they modify, they appear immediately suffixed and no intervening material is permitted, unlike the topic marker which allows full relative clauses to appear between it and the modified noun. The demonstratives, while generally contrastive, are neutral in regard to the highlighting of new and old information and may occur in focus constructions or with topic markers. They modify old information to the extent that both speaker and
hearer are always able to identify the referent, but the referent need not have been mentioned previously in the discourse.

(1) \text{s/o} \quad \text{a'-balum-he'-loh k'-u-kin-s-ik a'-winik-eh.} \\
\text{det----dem--dist asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det----N----top} \\
\text{jaguar inc-3--die the--man} \\
a. SVO \quad \text{That jaguar kills the man.} \\
b. S[foc]VO \quad \text{That jaguar kills the man.} \\
c. O[foc]VS \quad \text{The man kills that jaguar.}

(2) \text{s} \quad \text{a'-balum-he'-lo'-eh k'-u-kin-s-ik (a')-winik-(eh).} \\
\text{top} \\
\text{svo} \quad \text{That jaguar kills (the) man.}

(3) \text{s/o} \quad \text{a'-winik-eh a'-balum-he'-lo'-k'-u-kin-s-ik.} \\
\text{man jaguar kill} \\
a. SO[foc]V \quad \text{As for the man, he kills that jaguar.} \\
b. OS[foc]V \quad \text{As for the man, that jaguar kills him.}

(4) \text{o} \quad \text{k'-u-kin-s-ik a'-balum a'-winik-he'-lo'--(eh).} \\
\text{kill the jaguar that man (top)} \\
\text{That man kills the jaguar.}

The examples above follow the paradigm presented in the discussion of word order. As is evident from (1) and (3) a noun modified by a demonstrative may be in contrastive focus but is not necessarily marked in this regard when in initial position. When the same initial noun is topicalized, as in (2), ambiguity is avoided and old information is highlighted. In (4) there is no ambiguity because the final NP is more highly specified than the first (see Chapter 2) and the subject may be
further highlighted by a topic marker. In all these cases, the noun modified by the demonstrative is prefixed by the determiner $a^i$, which as noted above (3.4.1.), generally requires that the noun it modifies be further specified. Conversely, the demonstrative suffix requires that the noun be morphologically marked as definite. Indefinitely marked nouns and nouns with no specifiers (with the possible exception of the noun class discussed in Section 3.2., which is generally understood to be definite (e.g., kah 'town') do not allow demonstrative suffixes as the following examples indicate:

(5) a. $T-in-wil-ah$ (hun tuul) winik.
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM (num class) N
    com-1sg-see (one anim) man
    I saw (a) man.

    b. *$T-in-wil-ah$ (hun tuul) winik--he'-lo'-(eh).
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM (num class) N--dem-dist-(top)
    com-1sg-see one anim man

(6) $T-in-wil-ah$ a'-winik t--u--kin--s--ah keeh-(eh).
    asp-Dpr-V--DPM det--N asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM N-(rel)
    com-1sg-see the man com-3--die deer
    I saw the man who killed the deer.

(7) $T-in-wil-ah$ a'-winik t-u-kin-s-ah a'-keeh-he'--lo'-(eh).
    det--N--dem-dist-(top).
    I saw the man who killed that deer.

(8)*$T-in-wil-ah$ a'-winik t-u-kin-s-ah keeh-he'--lo'-(eh).
    N-dem-dist-(top/rel)

Example (5) is evidence that unspecified or indefinitely marked MPs do not permit demonstrative
suffixes. In (6) to (8) the noun keeh 'deer' is the
direct object in a relative clause and acceptable if it
is unspecified (6) or if modified by both the determiner
and a demonstrative (7) but not when there is a
demonstrative but no determiner (8). It is to be noted
in these examples of relative clauses that the
demonstrative modifies only the noun immediately
preceding it, unlike the topic marker which modifies the
head noun (though it may also modify the immediately
preceeding noun as well (7)).

A noun modified by a demonstrative may be
topicalized or the head of a relative clause marked by
the highlighting -eh marker but the demonstrative does
not occur following the -eh marker.

(9) A' -winik- he' -la' k- -u- -kin- -s- -ik- -eh.
det- -N- -dem-prox asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM- -rel
the- -man inc-3- -die

It's this man that kills them.

(10) *A' -winik- -eh- -he' -la'...
det- -N- -top-dem-prox
the- -man

(11) A' -winik- -he' -la' -eh...
det- -N- -dem-prox- -top

As for this man...

As mentioned above, nouns modified by demonstratives
are often contextualized spatially in relation to the
participants of a discourse, in which case they are
specific but not necessarily old information in the sense
that they have been mentioned previously or that the
The speaker assumes that the hearer already shares information about the particular referent. The deictic force of the demonstrative may be sufficient to indicate the specific referent. On the other hand, demonstratives may be used in cases where the referent is not present or visible to the participants in the discourse, in which case there ordinarily is no problem identifying the referent and distality is marked. Consider the following:

(12) A. $A'\text{-pek}^'\text{-he}'\text{-lo}' \text{ t--u--han--t--ah in } b'k'$.  
   det---$W$---dem-dist asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM Ppr $W$ 
   the--dog com-3--eat 1sg meat 
   That dog ate my meat.

B. Ba'ax pek'--il--i'ih?  
   inter $W$---pos--scope 
   what dog 
   Which of the dogs?

A. $A'\text{-he}'\text{-loh}, a'\text{-box--eh}$. 
   det---dem-dist det--adj-top 
   the-black 
   That one, the black one.

(13) A. Sat--ih ten in $k'ek'\text{en sìk ho'leh--ih}$.  
   V---Dpr Ipr Ppr $W$ adj adv 
   lose 3 1sg 1sg pig white yesterday 
   I lost my white pig yesterday.

B. $A'\text{-k'ek'\text{'en--he}'--lo' t--in--wil--ah ti beh}$.  
   det---$W$---dem-dist asp-Dpr--V--DPM prep $W$ 
   pig com-1sg-see on road 
   I saw that pig on the road.

(14) Bin--een in--$k'a'ool--t--eh Eskipuulas i  
   V---Dpr Dpr---V---tran-SPM $PN$ conj 
   go--1sg 1sg--visit and
I went to visit (for the first time) Esquipulas and I really liked that town.

(15) A'-k'in--he'--lo'--eh tak ba--he'--la'--eh, ma' 
det--W--dem-dist-top prep temp-dem-prox-top neg 
day until now not

ka'-x(i')-ik--en t--u ka'-ye' t-a'-kol-he'--lo'--eh.
repet-V-irreal-Dpr loc-Ppr adv loc-det-W-dem-dist-top 
go 1sg 3 again to milpa

From that day until now I haven't returned to that milpa.

(16) T--u--ch'a'--ah a'--beh--he'--la' k--u--nak'--ul 
asp-Dpr--V----DPM det--W--dem-prox asp-Dpr-V-intr 
com--3--take road inc-3--rise

tu'ux k--u--muk--b--ul a'--kimen--oo'--eh.
adv asp-Dpr--V-pas-intr det--W----pl-rel 
where inc--3--bury the-dead

She took this road that goes up to where the dead are buried (cemetery).

Although the demonstrative often serves as sufficient specification for a definite noun when its referent is present to the participants in a discourse, it is clear from the examples above that it is not limited to such uses. In (12) the referent of the modified noun (a'pek'he'lō, 'that dog') is present to the speakers but is ambiguous with regard to its reference as Speaker B's question indicates. In (16) the speaker avoids any possible ambiguity in the specification of the noun beh 'road', although it is present to the speaker, by further modification via relative clause.

In (13)-(15) the referents of the nouns modified by
the demonstratives are not physically present to the participants in the discourse and their distance from the discourse situation is marked by the distal demonstrative he/-lo'. Distality marked by the demonstrative he/-lo' may be spatial, temporal, cognitive or a combination of these dimensions. There is a general correlation of proximal marking with the present and distal marking with the past, and a merging of the dimensions of time and space such that proximally marked NPs are usually (if not always) present both temporally and spatially while temporally distant NPs (past time reference) take the distal marker regardless of the spatial dimension. When there is a congruence of distality in the spatial and temporal dimensions there is no question of which demonstrative to use, but when there is a difference between spatial and temporal proximity there is some degree of choice.

In the present, the spatial relationships may be marked as proximal versus distal. In the past, however, temporal distality generally overrides spatial relations. Examples (13) and (14) are cases where the identity of the referent of the noun modified by the demonstrative is clear from prior mention. In (138) the function of the demonstrative appears to be to mark the noun as identical to the one mentioned by Speaker A without regard to spatial relations. In (14), however, in addition to marking the identity of prior reference, the spatial
dimension may also distinguish the town referred to from the town in which the discourse takes place. In (15) it is apparent that the demonstratives can function along a strictly temporal dimension as evidenced by the NPs a'k'ínhe'lo'eh 'that day' and bahe'la' 'now' which have no locative implications, or can have both locative and temporal significance as in the NP a'köhe'lo'eh 'that milpa' which refers to a milpa previously mentioned as having been visited.

The variety of functions of the demonstratives discussed above occur when the demonstrative follows the noun it modifies. Demonstratives may also precede the nouns they modify with a more limited function, or stand independently as pronouns with additional dependent pronoun suffixes. In these occurrences, the deictic force of the demonstrative is further highlighted and marked by its fronted position. These usages have a strong locative sense and are used only when the referent is present to the participants in the discourse. When a demonstrative precedes an NP, the NP is generally definite with a prefixed determiner and the highlighting -eh marker suffixed, often at the end of a relative clause. This is a clefting phenomenon that serves to highlight an NP which is itself old information or closely related to old information, either by semantic connections with a known NP or by its relation to a known event (VP). As a cleft construction, the demonstrative
appears at the beginning of a clause, a highlighted position. The following are examples of typical usages of this type of fronted and independent demonstratives.

(17) a. He'--loh a'-pek'--eh.  b. He'--loh pek'--eh.
    dem-dist det--M--top
    the-dog

    That (/there) is the dog.

(18) He'--la' a'-winik t--u--yok--l--ah in ta'--k'in-eh.
    dem-prox det--M asp-Dpr-V DPM Ppr CN--rel
    the--man com-3-steal 1sg money

    Here is the man who stole my money.

(19) He'--lo' a'-winik k--a--kix--t--ik--eh.
    dem-dist det--M asp-Dpr-V-trans-PM--rel
    the--man inc-2--seek

    There is the man you are looking for.

(20) In--ten xan t--in--kin--s--im--ah hun tuul
    emp-Ipr adv asp-Dpr-V-caus-perf-DPM num class
    1sg also com-1sg-die one anim
    keeh nohoch i he'--la' u kaachoh-eh.
    W adj conj dem-prox Ppr M--top
deer big and 3 antler

    I too have killed a big deer and here are its antlers (to prove it).

(21) T--in--man in--kix--t--ech tak te'--lo ih
    asp-Dpr-V Dpr-V-trans-Dpr prep loc-dist conj
    com-1sg-go 1sg-search 2sg to there and
    in--tech--eh, he'--la'--ech--eh.
    emp--Ipr-top dem-prox--Dpr-top
    2sg 2sg

    I'm going looking for you over there and you, here you are.

As (17), (20), and (21) indicate, these expressions are often quite brief consisting of the demonstrative and a definite noun or dependent pronoun. A noun modified by
the preposed demonstrative must receive some other specifying information, as the ungrammaticality of (17b) indicates, and is generally marked as definite either by a determiner or a possessive pronoun. This structure may be part of a more complex sentence as in (18) and (19) where the modified noun is followed by a relative clause and, as these examples evince, the nouns may be subjects or objects of those relative clauses. (20) and (21) indicate that the information highlighted by the demonstrative may be old information (21) or closely related to it semantically (20). Unlike contrastive focus constructions, the opposition of the noun's referent to other referents is not necessarily highlighted. Rather, it is the referent's presence which is highlighted.

The relation of nouns thus highlighted to prior information is not always direct as the following sentence demonstrates:

(22) Ich in kil-a'an-nil t--in--tox--ah ta'--k'in
loc Ppr V--part-nom asp-Dpr--V--DPM W
in Isg drink com--1sg--give money

i he'-la' a'-wínik t--u--ch'a'--ah
conj dem prox det--W asp-Dpr--V--DPM
and the--man com--3--take

u chuk--a'an.
Ppr V--part
3 remain

In my drunkenness I gave away money and here is the man that took what was left.

The old information relevant to (22) is that the
speaker lost his money, but that the man modified by the demonstrative was an agent in that loss may be new information. This structure may be used to highlight a noun which is new or old information, providing that the referent of the noun is present to the speaker. The following examples are further evidence that the referents of nouns modified by preposed demonstratives must be present and that locative highlighting is marked syntactically by the fronted position of the demonstratives.

(23) a. He'--la'--ech ka' tal--een--eh.  
    dem-prox--Dpr adv V--Dpr-top  
    2sg when come--lsg

    b. Wa'ye'--yan--ech ka' tal--een--eh.  
    loc----cop--Dpr  
    here--exist--2sg

    Here you were when I came.

(24) ?? K--u--yil--ik, he'--lo' a'--balum a'--winik--eh.  
    asp-Dpr-V--PM dem-dist det----N det----N--top  
    inc-3--see  
    the--jaguar the--man

    a. VOS There is the jaguar the man sees.  
    or b. VSO There is the jaguar that sees the man.

(25) ??K--u--yil--ik balum, he'--lo' a'--winik--eh.  
    see jaguar man

    a. VOS There is the man that sees jaguar.  
    or b. VSO There is the man that jaguar sees.

(26) a'--winik--eh, he'--lo' a'--balum k--u--yil--ik--eh.  
    det----N--top dem-dist det----N asp-Dpr-V--PM-rel  
    the--man the-jaguar com-3--see

    a. SOV As for the man, here is the jaguar he kills.  
    or b. OSV As for the man, here is the jaguar that kills him.
(27) K--in--wil--ik, he'--la' a'--winik--eh.
asp-Dpr--V--PM dem-prox det--W--top
inc-1sg-see
the--man

I see him, here is the man.

(28) e T--in--wil--ah, he'--la' a'--winik--eh.
asp-Dpr--V--DPM
com-1sg-see

(29) He'--lo' a'--winik--eh, t--u--kin--s--ah balum.
dem-dist det--W--top asp-Dpr--V-caus--DPM
the--man com-3--die jaguar

SVO There is the man, he killed jaguar.

(30) He'--lo' a'--winik t--u--yil--ah a'--keeh--eh,
dem-dist det--W asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--W--top
the-man com-3--see deer

a. SVO There is the man that saw the deer.
or b. OVS There is the man that the deer saw.

(23a) and (28) are examples of uses of the demonstrative that are ungrammatical because of the conflict of the past time reference and the requirement that the referent of the modified NP be present to the speakers (compare with (23b) and (27) respectively).

Verb-initial sentences, which do not highlight NPs, do not ordinarily permit a preposed demonstrative (24), (25), (27), but a pause before the demonstrative (which marks it as clause initial) improves such sentences' acceptability. In verb-final sentences the second NP (which is in a highlighted position) may be modified by a preposed demonstrative beginning a new clause (26). It is far more common for the demonstrative to appear in initial position as in (29) and (30), which is the basic position for a highlighted NP.
The demonstrative in the uses described above functions in some ways like a pronoun in these cleft constructions. However, its use is more restricted than other independent pronouns in several ways. It generally appears in conjunction with a noun which it specifies, and when it appears independently no constituents may follow within its clause. It has no direct sentential syntactic relation with a verb as the following examples indicate:

(31) *He'-lo' k--u--kin--s--ik balum. 
    dem-dist asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM  
    inc-3--die jaguar

(32) Layti' k--u--kin--s--ik balum.  
    Ipr  
    3sg

He kills jaguars.

When not in conjunction with a noun or another pronoun there is a terminal boundary both before and after the demonstrative resulting in one word sentences such as the following:

(33) a. He'--la'--en--eh.  b. He'--la'--ech--eh.  
    dem-prox-Dpr-top  
    dem-prox--Dpr-top  
    1sg 2sg

Here I am.  Here you are.

(c. He'--lo'--(0)--eh.  
    dist--(3)--top

There he is.

In these examples person and number are marked and,
as in the examples with nouns, the highlighting -eh marker is also present. However, there are demonstrative pronouns that have a wider distribution, equivalent to that of other independent pronouns. These are presented after the following general discussion of pronouns.

3.4.6. Pronouns

Pronouns in Itza Maya may be classified into three groups, independent, dependent, and possessive. The dependent pronouns are bound to the verb and are obligatory, agreeing in person and number with the basic arguments of the verb (Subject and Object, or S, A, and P). Because the dependent pronouns obligatorily occur marking an argument's relation to the verb (subject vs. object) the independent pronouns are redundant regarding the information encoded by the dependent pronouns. Their function is not one of providing information but of highlighting it.

3.4.6.1. Independent Pronouns

Third person pronouns are often cited as classic cases of anaphora (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Hinds 1978; Li and Thompson 1979). They mark old backgrounded information by encoding certain salient semantic features such as person and number and avoid the redundancy of repeating a full NP every time the speaker wishes to refer to it while also avoiding ambiguity and promoting
cohesion. This analysis is quite appropriate in considering dependent pronouns in Itza but fails to account for the usage of independent pronouns. Like the dependent pronouns they encode salient semantic features but that information is completely redundant because it must also appear in the dependent pronouns. Rather than backgrounding old information as the dependent pronouns do, the independent pronouns highlight it. The following are independent pronouns in Itza:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>excl. to'one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incl. to'one'ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>tech</td>
<td>te'ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>layti'</td>
<td>layti'oo'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent pronouns, but not dependent pronouns, undergo topicalization and contrastive focus.*

(1) A. Ma' a--wok--1--ik in--wixi'ìm.
    neg Dpr--V PM Ppr---X
    2--steal lsg-corn

    Don't steal my corn.

    B. Ma' in--ten--i'i(h).
    neg emp--Ipr-scope lsg

    It's not me.

    A. In--tech, tan--in--wil--ik--ech.
    emp--Ipr asp--Dpr---V--PM--Dpr
    2sg dur-lsg--see 2sg

    (It's) you, I see you (do it).
(2) A. Tech—eh, k—a—bel.
   Ipr-top asp-Dpr-V
   2sg inc-2sg-go

   As for you, you are going.

B. Max—i'i(h)?
   inter-scope
   who

   Who is?

A. In—tech yan—a—bel.
   emp—Ipr asp—Dpr—V
   2sg oblig-2—go

   You have to go.

(3) Tech—eh chen tan—a—pah—t—ik a’--kim—en-il
   Ipr-top adv dur-Dpr—V—tran—PM det—V—nom—nom
   2sg only 2—pretend the—die

   pero in—ten—eh ma’ tan—a—mich—ik—en,
   conj emp—Ipr-top neg asp—Dpr—V—PM—Dpr
   but 1sg not dur—2—grab 1sg

   As for you, you are only playing dead, but me,
   you are not going to grab me.

(4) Tak—u—pul—ik u—bah yok a’—winik—oo’—eh.
   asp—Dpr—V—PM Ppr-refl prep det—W—pl—top
   des—3—throw 3—self over the—man

   Layti—oo’—eh, ma’—ta’ax u—yil—ik—oo’
   Ipr—pl-top neg—adv Dpr—V—PM—pl
   ever 3—see

   a’—ba’al—che’—he’—lo’.
   det—-----CM------dem—dist
   animal

   It wanted to jump on top of the men. As for them,
   they had never seen that animal.

In examples (1) and (2c) is evidenced the use of
independent pronouns with contrastive focus while in (2a)
(3) and (4) the independent pronouns are topicalized. A
common instance of independent pronoun use is topic shift
(Givon 1976) which is evident in (3) and (4) above with
discourse context. Note that in all cases except (1B), where there is no verb, the pronominal information of person and number is repeated in the verb agreement system, and that the independent pronouns typically occur in sentence initial position. In sentences with no verb such as (1B) where the pronoun is always highlighted, the independent pronoun appears.

3.4.6.2. **Demonstrative Pronouns**

Returning to demonstratives, it was mentioned above (3.4.5.) that there are pronominal forms with a wider distribution than the highly ostensive he'-la' 'this' and he'-lo' 'that'. These are a'-he'-la' 'this one' and a'-he'-lo' 'that one' with the determiner a' prefixed to the demonstrative and may be contracted to a'-la' and a'-lo' respectively. The only difference between the full and contracted forms appears to be that the former carry more emphasis and more of a sense of ostensibility. However, unlike the he'-lo' and he'-la' forms, they do not require that the referent be present and there is no tense/aspect restriction on them. While the full and contracted forms are generally, if not always, substitutable, in cases where it is not natural to emphasize the pronoun highly, the contraction is preferable as the following examples indicate:
In the examples above, the demonstrative pronouns are in positions of low salience, as explained in the discussion of word order, and the contraction is more acceptable than the full form. The demonstrative pronouns follow the word order paradigm for nouns modified by demonstratives with respect to topicalization and contrastive focus.
That one watches cattle.

As for the man, he killed that one. As for the man, that one killed him.

A verb-medial sentence with an initial demonstrative pronoun such as (3) may be interpreted as a Basic SVO construction or as a contrastive focus construction, in which case it is ambiguous. If the initial demonstrative is topicalized as in (4), the sentence is unambiguously SVO. The demonstrative may also enter in contrastive focus constructions in verb-final sentences as evidenced in (5).

Like the independent pronouns discussed above, the demonstrative pronouns are interesting in that they highlight but are anaphoric. These demonstratives, however, mark only the third person, where the distal distinction is relevant for marking the relation of the referent to the speaker. First and second pronouns are so highly specified that definiteness and distality appear to be irrelevant. In the third person, however, the demonstrative adds specificity in marking distality beyond that encoded in the independent pronoun layti' ('he', 'she', or 'it'). While the referents of first and second person pronouns are necessarily present in the
discourse context, third person referents usually are not, and demonstrative pronouns serve to mark their relation to the speaker (which is most often distal) and highlight contrastiveness. Consider the following:

(6) A. Sat—ih ten in k’ek’en sik ho’leh—ih.
   V—Dpr Ipr Ppr N adj adv—Dpr
   lose—3 1sg 1sg pig white yesterday—3

   I lost my white pig yesterday.

   B. A’—(he’)—lo’—eh t—in—wil—ah ti beh.
      det—(dem)—dist-top asp—Dpr—V—DPM prep N
      com—1sg—see on road

   As for that one, I saw it on the road.

(7) A. A’—paal—he’—lo’—eh t—in—wil—ah
   det—N—dem—dist—top asp—Dpr—V—DPM
   boy
   ho’leh—ih ti Peten.
   adv prep PN
   yesterday in Flores

   I saw that boy yesterday in Flores.

   B. Max paal—il—i’ih?
      inter N—pos-partit/scope
      who boy

      Which of the boys?

   A. A’—lo’ k—u—bel—eh.
      det—dist asp—Dpr—V—rel
      inc—3

      That one who’s going.

(9) A. Ba—lah bin—een ti meyah t—in kol.
    temp—prox V—Dpr sub V prep—Ppr N
    today go 1sg to work in—1sg milpa

    Today I went to work in my milpa.

   B. A’—(he’)—lo’ ma’ tan—i—in—kreer—t—ik
      det—(dem)—dist neg asp—Dpr—V—trn—PM
      not dur—1sg—believe
In all of the examples above, the demonstratives are in initial position. As (6) clearly indicates, the referent of the distal demonstrative need not be physically present to the speaker. In (7), although the referent is present, it was not immediately identifiable to Speaker B and Speaker A provides additional specifying information in a relative clause following the demonstrative pronoun which is marked by the highlighting -eh marker. In (8) and (9), the demonstratives refer to prior discourse.

3.4.7. Layti Clefts and Related Constructions

It was noted above (3.4.5.) that the demonstrative he'lo may precede the noun it modifies in a cleft construction to highlight the noun. The third person independent pronoun layti and the demonstrative pronouns a'(he')lo' and a'(he')la interact with definite nouns in a variety of constructions including clefts. As
highlighting cleft constructions, the pronominal and demonstrative elements generally occur sentence initially and not after the verb.

The most marked constructions of this type include the pronoun layti', a demonstrative, and a definite noun which may appear in a number of different combinations to indicate slightly different highlighting foci. All of these constructions are highly contrastive but vary in the manner in which the referent is specified. Any two of these elements may also combine and the least marked examples of this type are layti' clefts.

(1) Layti' a'--winik--(he'--lo') t--u--kin--s--ah
Ipr det----W----(dem-dist) asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM
3sg the--man asp-3--die

a'--balum--eh,
det----W----rel
the-jaguar

He is the (/that) man who killed the jaguar.

(2) Layti' a'--balum (a'--)k--u--kin--s--ib--il
Ipr det----W (det-)asp-Dpr-V-caus-pas-intr
3sg the--jaguar inc-3--die

men a'--winik--eh,
pre det----W--top/rel
by the--man

It is the jaguar (the one) which is killed by the man.

(3) Mia u yum--il k'aax wa u yum--il wits wa
adv Ppr W--pos W conj Dpr W--pos W conj
dub 3 owner forest or 3 owner hill or

mia layti' a'--keeh t--in--wil--ah,
adv Ipr det----W asp-Dpr-V--DPM
dub 1sg the--deer com-1sg-see

t--in--ts'on--ah i ma' kim--ih--eh,
asp-Dpr--V--DPM conj neg V--Dpr-rel
com-1sg-shoot and not die--3
Perhaps it's the lord of the forest or the lord of the hills or perhaps it is the deer that I saw, that I shot and it didn't die.

(4) Ah t'u'ul—eh, layti' a'--winik—eh, hach masc W----rel Ipr det----W----top adv hare 3sg the---man much yan u na'at. cop Ppr  W 3 idea

The hare, he is the fellow, he has a lot of ideas.

(5) A'--che'--he'--la'--eh, layti' a'--ki' t--in wich—eh. det--W--dem-prox-top Ipr det--adj prep--Ppr  W-top tree 3sq good to-1sg eye

As for this tree, it is the one that I like.

(6) ...layt(i') a'--k'in--he'--lo' t--u--ts'on--ah Ipr det--W--dem--dist asp-Dpr--V----DPM 3sg dat good com-3--shoot

...it was that day which he shot the deer.

(7) ??A'--balum—eh t--u--yil—ah, layti' a'--winik—he'--lo'. det--W--top asp-Dpr--V-DPM Ipr det--W--dem-dist the-jaguar com-3--see 3sg man

The jaguar saw him, (pause) he is that man.

In the sentences given above, the third person independent pronoun layti' is followed by a definite noun which is topicalized as in (4) or followed by a demonstrative (1), (7) and/or followed by a relative clause (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6). In all cases there is a high level of contrastiveness even though the specified NP is, to a degree, old information. These constructions are similar to the focus constructions discussed previously with regard to word order and
generally do not follow the verb, although a pause after the verb makes them possibly acceptable (7). However, the shared information is more explicit in the cleft constructions because a coreferential NP is mentioned rather than simply being understood. The second mention serves to mark additional emphasis as well as to disambiguate and add cohesion (by relating to prior mention). The range of contrastiveness is also more narrow than simple NP focus constructions which may contrast one class to another. In the layti\textsuperscript{t} cleft constructions the contrast is between members of the same class (he is the man vs. it is a/the man (not a/the woman)).

As may be seen in (4) and (5), the independent pronoun may also follow a coreferential NP introducing a clause providing additional information and adding further emphasis to its referent. When the independent pronoun follows a coreferential NP, it need not introduce a relative clause as may be seen in (4) and the following example:

(8) Ix nok'ol-he'-loh, layti\textsuperscript{t} k--u--pîy--ik u yet'-ok. fem N---dem-dist 1pr asp-Dpr-V---PM Ppr N worm 3sg inc-3--call 3 friend

That worm, he calls his friends.

In addition to layti\textsuperscript{t}-definite noun clefts, layti\textsuperscript{t} may precede demonstrative pronouns. While both pronouns may be anaphoric, the construction is highly specific,
emphatic, and contrastive. Just as with the layti'-noun clefs, the demonstrative is usually followed by a relative clause and these constructions do not occur in denoted sentential positions, that is, after the verb.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \rightarrow V \\
(9) & * A' - balum - eh \, k - u - kin - s - ik \, layti' \, a' -(he')-lo'. \\
& \text{det-}\text{W-}\text{top aspDpr-V-causPM Ipr det-dem-dist} \\
& \text{the-jaguar inc-3-die 3sg}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow O \\
(10) & * K - u - kin - s - ik \, balum \, layti' \, a' -(he')-lo'. \\
& \text{aspDpr-V-causPM W Ipr det-dem-dist} \\
& \text{com-3-die jaguar 3sg}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
O & \rightarrow V \\
(11) & Ma' \, hok'--ih \, ki - pix - ik \, mix \, ba'al. \\
& \text{neg V-Dpr Dpr-V-PM neg W} \\
& \text{not leave-3 1pl-owe no thing}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow S \\
(12) & A' - loh \, k - u - tsikbal - t - ik \, to'on \, ki \, noolah \\
& \text{det-dist aspDpr-V-transPM Ipr Ppr W} \\
& \text{inc-3-tell 1pl 1pl MM}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \rightarrow V \\
(13) & * A. \, Ah \, Juan \, t - u - han - t - ah \, tulakal \, a' - hik' - eh. \\
& \text{masc PN aspDpr-V-transDPM quant det-W-top} \\
& \text{com-3-eat all the meat}
\end{align*}
\]

Juan ate all the meat.
B. Ma'. Layti' a'--lo' t--u--han--t--ah--eh,
   neg Ipr det-dist asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM--rel
   no 3sg com-3--eat

   No, It's that one who ate it.

(14) A. T--in--wil--ah ho'leh-ih ah Juan ich k'aax,
   asp-Dpr--V--DPM adv masc PN prep W
   com-1sg-see yesterday in forest

   I saw Juan yesterday in the forest.

B. Layti' a'--lo' a'--t--u--yok-l-ah in ta'--k' in-eh.
   Ipr det-dist det-asp-Dpr-V DPM Ppr CN-top/rel
   3sg com-3--steal 1sg money

   It's that one who stole my money.

A. Ma' a'--lo'--i'ih, layti' a'--(he')--lo'--(eh).
   neg det-dist-scope Ipr det--dem-dist----top

   It's not that one, it's that (other) one.

(15) A. Sas--ah--ih kim--en in k'ek'en i ma'
   V--dist-Dpr V--nom Ppr W conj neg
   dawn 3 die 1sg pig and not

   in--woh--el max t--u--kin--s--ah,
   Dpr--V-intr inter asp-V-caus-DPM-Dpr
   1sg know who com-3--die

   This morning my pig was dead and I don't know
   who killed it.

B. A'--t--u--kin--s--ah a'--k'e k'en--eh,
   det-asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM det----W----top/rel
   com-3--die the---pig

   layti' a'--he'--lo'--eh
   3sgIpr det--dem-dist-top

   The one who killed the pig, he is that one.

C. Ma' layti' a'--lo'--(eh), ah Juan t--u--kin--s--ah,
   neg Ipr det-dist-top masc PN asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM
   not 3sg com-3--die

   That one isn't he, Juan killed it.

That layti' cleft constructions do not occur after
the verb, as was noted above, is evidenced by (9) and
I'll generally these constructions occur sentence-initially as in (11)-(15) but they may occur medially as in the focus constructions previously noted.

(16) A'--winik--eh, layti' a'--(he')--loh det----N----top Ipr det--(dem)--dist the man 3sg
    k--u--han--t--ik--eh.
    asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM--rel inc-3--eat

a. SOV As for the man, it is that which he eats.
or b. OSV As for the man, it is that one which eats him.
or c. SV(O) As for the man, it is that one who eats it.

As is apparent from the example above, the interpretation of this type of sentence is dependent upon its discourse context. According to interpretations (16a) and (16b) the sentence is ambiguous just as other verb final transitive sentences are, but the focused constituent is additionally emphasized by the preposed layti'. In interpretation (16c), however, the grammatical relations of the layti' cleft, and its discourse function are quite distinct. In that case, the layti' cleft is interpreted as coreferential with the noun it follows, adding emphasis and contrastiveness and possibly disambiguation in an appositional or parenthetical construction.

The contrastive and emphatic nature of the layti' demonstrative construction is evident in all of the examples above. The use of this construction appears to be based on the speaker's decision to add emphasis. The
sentences would be grammatical without either layti' or the independent demonstrative pronoun. As is evident from (11), (12), and (14) the demonstrative may refer to elements of prior discourse regardless of the physical presence of its referent. In (13) and (15), on the other hand, the demonstrative refers to a physically present referent in which case it may serve a disambiguating function by means of the distal distinction. Also note that it is the distal and not the proximal demonstrative that generally appears in this construction. In all cases, the layti'-demonstrative construction is highly specific and the proposition to which it relates is old information. Whether or not that proposition is presented in a relative clause (which is a typical cohesive mechanism to relate an NP to prior discourse) is difficult to determine at times because of the multiple functions of the highlighting (relative) -eh marker and in cases where it is optional. In contrast to definite NPs, the occurrence of demonstrative pronouns before a coreferential independent pronoun (layti') is questionable grammatically if acceptable at all. As was mentioned above, the layti'-demonstrative construction may follow a coreferential NP to add emphasis and avoid ambiguity.
(17) Ah Juan-eh t--u--ts'on-ah balum i a'-balum-eh, masc PN-top asp-Dpr-\(V\)--DPM N conj det--N-top com-3--shoot jaguar and the-jaguar layti' a'-lo' a'-t--u--yok-1-ah in-wakax-eh. Ipr det-dist det-asp-Dpr-\(V\) DPM Ppr--N--rel 3sg com-3-steal 1sg cow
Juan shot a jaguar and the jaguar, it was that one which stole my cattle.

(18) A'-winik-eh, layti' a'-lo' (a'-)tan--u--tal--el-(eh). det--N--top Ipr det-dist (det-)asp-Dpr--V-intr-(rel) the-man 3sg dur--3--come
As for the man, he is that one who is coming.

In both cases above, the referent is old information but the layti' a'lo' construction introduces additional information about it. For example, in (17) the jaguar is old information due to its immediately prior mention and the hearer is assumed to know that a jaguar was killing the speaker's cattle. The new information conveyed is that the jaguar that was shot and the thieving jaguar are identical and this information is presented emphatically. While the layti'-demonstrative construction may be juxtaposed following a definite NP, it does not appear to occur preceding one, though either layti' or a demonstrative pronoun alone may.

Although demonstrative pronouns do not precede the independent pronoun layti', they may precede or follow nouns. When preceding a noun, the demonstrative pronouns function much like layti' although the added distinction of distality is of course present, further marking the relation of its referent to the participants in the
discourse. The demonstrative serves to contrastively emphasize old information while allowing new assertions regarding it (often in the form of a following relative clause, just as with layti' clefts). Consider the following:

(1) Ha'li bay--lo pat--al u--bo'--t--ik tech
    adv adv-dist asp Dpr--V-tran-PM Ipr
    only thus abil 3--pay 2sg
    a'--ba'ax t--u--bet--ah tech--eh. A'--lo'
det--rel asp-Dpr-V--DPM Ipr-rel det-dist
    what com-3--do 2sg
    u na'at yun ayim.
Ppr N rev N
3 idea lord lizard

Only thus can he pay you for what he did to you.
That was the idea of lord lizard.

(2) Ma' t--in--wil--ik ma'lo', komo chen u yich
    neg asp--V---PM-Dpr adv adv adv Ppr N
    not dur-1sg-see well as only 3 eye
    a'--k--in--tich'--k'ak'--t--ik--eh... I ka'
det--asp-Dpr-----CV-------tran-PM-rel conj conj
inc-1sg----light up and when
    t--in--wa'al--ah t--in wet'ok-eh "Ma' a--bel
asp-Dpr----V----DPM prep-Ppr N----top neg Dpr-V
com-1sg--say to-1sg companion not 2--go
    ti t'an. A'--lah keeh."
sub V det-prox N
to speak deer

I didn't see it clearly since it was only its eyes
that I was lighting up... And then I said to my
friend: "Don't start talking. This is a deer."

(3) Baay--lo kap--ih ti ts'on i ti ts'on.
    adv-dist V--Dpr sub V conj sub V
    thus begin-3 to shoot and to shoot
    I layti' k--u--kon--ik yaab bik' porke chen
conj Ipr asp-Dpr-V----PM adj N conj adv
and 3sg inc-3--sell much meat because only
Thus he began to hunt and to hunt. And he sold lots of meat because only that was his work, it was only that from which he made a living.

(4) A'-loh in pek'-eh, layti' a'-t--u--han--t--ah
    det-dist Ppr  N---top  Ipr det-asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM
    1sg dog  3sg  com-3--eat

    in bık'-eh,
    Ppr  N---rel
    1sg meat

    That one, my dog, it's it that ate my meat.

(5) *T--in--wil--ah  a'--(he')--lo'  a'--pek'--eh.
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM  det-(dem)-dist det---N---top
    com-1sg-see  the--dog

As may be seen from the examples above, in these constructions the demonstrative appears clause initially and the following noun is in an appositional relationship. The demonstrative-noun construction does not occur after the verb (a demoted position) as (5) indicates. The demonstrative may refer to immediately prior discourse as in (1) and (3) or to referents present to the speaker as in (2) and (4). In both types the demonstrative serves to contrastively emphasize known information about which additional information is subsequently provided.

The demonstrative pronoun may also follow a noun. It may serve as an emphatic demonstrative modifying and
disambiguating the NP it follows or it may be in an 
appositional relationship to the noun and the head of a 
relative clause.

(6) A. T—in—wil—ah ah Juan ho'leh.
    asp-Dpr-V—DPM masc PN adv
    com-1sg-see yesterday

    I saw Juan yesterday.

    B. Wa' pat-al in—wil—ik a'—winik a'—loh,
     neg asp Dpr—V—PM det—n det-dist
     abil 1sg—see the-man

    I can't stand that man.

(7) A. Sat—ih ten in k'ek'en sik ho'leh—ih,
    V—Dpr Ipr Ppr  N adj adv—Dpr
    lose—3 1sg 1sg pig white yesterday—3

    I lost my white pig yesterday.

    B. A'—ke'ek'en a'—lo'—(eh) t—in—wil—ah ti beh,
     det—N det-dist—(top) asp-Dpr—V—DPM prep N
     the-pig com-1sg—see on way

    That pig, I saw on the road.

(8) A'—pek a'—he'—lah, layti' a'—t—u—han—t—ah
    det—N det—dem-dist Ipr det—asp—Dpr—V—tran—DPM
    the-dog 3sg com—3—eat

    This dog, it's he that ate my meat.

(9) A. Max t—u—kin—s—ah a k'ek'en?
    inter asp—Dpr—V—caus—DPM Ppr N
    who com—3—die 2 pig

    Who killed your pig?

    B. A'—winik a'—he'—lo'—(eh) t—u—kin—s—ah,
     det—N det—dem-dist—(top) asp—Dpr—V—caus—DPM
     the—man com—3—die

    The man, that one killed it.

(10) A'—winik a'—lo' k—u—kin—s—ik—eh,
    det—N det-dist asp—Dpr—V—caus—PM—rel
    the—man inc—3—die

    The man is that one who kills them.
A. $A'$-winik-he'-lo' t--u--yok-l--ah in pek'.
   det---N---dem-dist asp-Dpr--V---DPM Ppr N
   the-man com-3--steal 1sg dog

   That man stole my dog.

B. Max-i'ih?
   inter-scope

   Who was it?

A. $A'$-winik a'-he'-lo' wa'an--eh.
   det---N det--dem-dist V/part-rel
   the--man stand

   The man, that one who's standing,

(12) Layti' $a'$-winik a'-he'-lo' t--u--yok-l--ah.
   Ipr det---N det-dem-dist asp-Dpr--V DPM
   3sg the man asp-3--steal
   in ts' on--(eh),
   Ppr N (rel)
   1sg gun

   He is that man who stole my gun.

(13) Layti' $a'$-winik a'-he'-lo'-eh t-u-yok-l-ah in ts' on.
   top

   As for that man, he stole my gun.

(14) *Layti' $a'$-winik a'-he'-lo'-eh t-u-yok-l-ah in ts' on-eh,
   top

(15) Layti' $a'$-balum a'-he'-lo' a--t--u--kin--s--ah.
   Ipr det---N det-dem-dist det-asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM
   3sg the-jaguar com-3--die
   a'--k'ek'en--eh.
   det-----N------rel
   the--pig

   It is that jaguar which killed the pig.

As may be seen in (6B), a noun followed by a demonstrative pronoun may occur after the verb, although the demonstrative morpheme he' is not ordinarily
permitted in this position (see 3.4.6. regarding the unacceptability of he in post-verb position). In (6) the demonstrative adds no disambiguating information but does emphatically mark the noun it follows and the noun's relationship to the speaker. Similarly in (7) the demonstrative is emphatic and relates its referent to prior discourse and the speaker, but the information contained in the verb phrase is new.

In conjunction with a modified noun, a demonstrative may serve a number of discourse functions, although it always refers to a referent that may be identified by the participants in the discourse. It may simply emphasize the referent of the noun it follows, or also add disambiguating information in the case that the referent is present, or introduce additional shared information regarding its referent.

In (6) and (7) the demonstrative's basic function is one of emphasis. In (8) and (9) it may disambiguate by contextualizing it spatially but does not introduce additional shared information, though the pronoun layti does serve this function in (8). In (10) and (11), however, the demonstrative pronoun heads a relative clause containing additional shared information about its referent and thus highlights its relation in the relative clause. In (12)-(15) the referent is further marked by a preposed layti. Layti adds further contrastiveness and emphasis to an already highly marked construction. In
(12) and (15) the demonstrative pronoun is the head of a relative clause that contains shared information and is marked by the terminal -eh marker. However, when the -eh marker is suffixed to the demonstrative, the following clause is not a relative and cannot receive an additional -eh marker as a comparison of (13) and (14) indicates. In this case, the information following the demonstrative need not be shared.

3.5. Summary

As the preceding pages suggest, the specificity system in Itza Maya is a complex one which interacts with word order to reflect the highlighting of new and old information. The specification of NPs, in addition to aiding the addressee in identifying their referents, may highlight contrastiveness or promote discourse continuity.

Generic NPs are unspecified and may enter into contrastive focus constructions. Nouns may also receive indefinite marking, often modifying a noun about which the speaker wishes to elaborate.

The determiner at- and possessive pronouns are common prefixes which mark NPs as specific. It was noted that the determiner ordinarily requires that the NP be further specified. Topicalization and relativization are common mechanism of such additional specification. The communality of these processes, both of which
highlight shared information, typically appear following a noun, and are marked by the -en suffix was also noted. Demonstratives are another common suffix to NPs marked by the determiner and provide additional context along the distal/proximal axis.

While dependent pronouns often serve an anaphoric function and aid in discourse cohesion, independent pronouns, including demonstrative pronouns, generally serve the function of contrastively highlighting information. A variety of constructions involving the third person independent pronoun laγti', demonstrative pronouns, and specified NPs were considered, indicating the richness of the specificity system in its function of highlighting new and old information.
Footnotes

1. The difference between "A bird has feathers" and "Birds have feathers" is not one of number but rather of discourse function and context. The indefinitely marked noun phrase is used in a generic and not a referential sense in this case.

2. As noted in Chapter 1, anaphora may be distinguished from deixis in that the former has reference to the actual prior discourse while the latter has external pragmatic reference.

3. This distinction is perhaps responsible for the possible use of the proximal demonstrative in English in such cases; i.e., "I saw this man in the park yesterday..." but not the distal "I saw that man in the park yesterday"... The referent of the object is specific, close to the speaker but not to the hearer.

4. This may be seen in English in such sentences as the following: "I am going to town", where 'town' while unmarked by specifiers, nevertheless refers to one specific town. In Itza Maya similar uses occur such that the word kah 'town' without modifiers can refer to the speaker’s town; the unmodified noun ha’ 'water' can refer to a particular lake, and the unmodified noun kol ‘milpa’ can refer to a particular milpa.

5. The determiner a’- is not to be confused with the masculine prefix ah although there are some functional connections between the two. Historically, it appears that the determiner derived from la(’)- which occurs in colonial Yucatec, (McQuown 1967) Lacandon (Bruce 1968) and in Itza of a hundred years ago (Means 1917:198ff.) with a similar meaning. ah, the masculine prefix, and its counterpart ix, the feminine prefix, do not necessarily mark a noun as specific. As was shown above (3.2., 3.3), NPs with the ah or ix prefix may be generic or indefinite. Kax (chicken) is one of a class of nouns which is always modified by one of these markers regardless of its specificity as may be seen below.

(1) a. ah kax masc chicken
b. hun tuul ah kax
    one anim masc chicken
    chickens a chicken
c. Tan---in---kin---s---i ah kax,
    asp---Dpr---V-caus---DPM masc N
    dur---1sg--die chicken

    I am dressing chickens.
In the examples given in (1) the NP ah kax is not specific and the ah prefix is obligatory. In contrast, the examples in (2) indicate that the determiner a'- cannot occur in unspecific uses of the NP tsimin. (2b-c) would be acceptable if the determiner were removed. As regards specific uses, a comparison of (3a) and (4a) shows that ah remains as a prefix on possessed nouns but that a'-, does not. Finally, (3b) and (4b) indicate that in cases corresponding to definite NPs with the a'- prefix only ah appears with nouns of its class. A'- and ah are never substitutable nor can they be combined. In short, the classifiers ah and ix always prefix nouns of their classes regardless of specificity.

6. No violations of the NP Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) were observed.

7. Perhaps the interrogative pronouns serve as anaphoric elements which refer to definite information which the speaker is about to communicate. In contrast, in questions they may refer to definite information which the speaker wants the hearer to communicate. In both cases a specific referent is generally implied.

8. Reflexives are a more restricted example of specific possessed NPs. In this case the noun bah 'self' always occurs after the verb and the possessive pronoun agrees with the subject (agent) of the verb.
(1) In--k'a'ah in--k'ak--es in bah.
Dpr---V Dpr----V--caus Ppr refl
1sg--go 1sg--stick 1sg self

I'm going to get myself stuck.

(2) Yok' a'--wits--eh, te' t--u--yil--ah u bah
loc det----M----top loc asp--Dpr--V--DPM Ppr refl
on the--hill there com-3--see 3 self

a'---winik et a'---balum---eh.
det----N conj det----N----top
the---man and the---jaguar

On the hill the man and the jaguar saw each other.

V
(3) T--u--p'o--ah u bah,
asp--Dpr--V--DPM Ppr refl
com-3--wash 3 self

He washed himself.

V
(4)#U bah t--u--p'o'--ah,
3 self com-3--wash--DPM

In the examples above, the person and number of the possessive pronoun agrees with that of the subject of the preceding verb. The reflexive pronoun may not be moved from its position following the verb as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (4).

9. The first and second independent pronouns noted above are identical to a special type of independent pronouns, indirect object (or recipient) pronouns. In the third person, however, the indirect object pronoun is ti'ih regardless of number. The first and second independent and indirect object pronouns may have derived from the preposition ti' to plus dependent pronouns. Such a derivation is also likely for the third person indirect object pronoun. Indirect object pronouns occur following the verb, often immediately following the verb as the following examples indicate:

(1) T--u--p'it--a(h) ten yaab u ba'al ts'on,
asp--Dpr--V--DPM Ipr quant Ppr M M
com-3--leave 1sg much 3 thing gun

He left me a lot of bullets.
(2) Bay-\text{lo}^\prime pat-\text{al} \text{u-}bo^\prime-t-ik \text{tech...}  
adv-dist asp Dpr-V-tran-PM Ipr  
thus abil 3-pay 2sg  

Thus he can pay you...

(3) K-\text{u}^\prime ya'al-ik u yitan ti(ih-eh:...  
asp-Dpr-V-PM Ppr W Ipr-top  
inc-3-say 3 wife 3  

His wife says to him:...

(4) Pero layti'-eh, k'uben-b-ih ti'ih men a'-chumach-eh...  
conj Ipr-top V-pas-Dpr Ipr prep det-W-top  
but 3 recommend 3 3 by the-old man  

But as for him, it was recommended to him by the old man...

As (4) indicates, when a third person pronoun is fronted, 
it is the independent form appears and not the indirect  
object form, which appears following the verb.

10. A proximal demonstrative can appear in this  
construction as the following example indicates:

\text{Layti'} a'-he'-la' a'-k-\text{u-han-t-ik} a'-winik-eh.  
Ipr det-dem-prox det-asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM det-W-rel  
inc-3-eat the-man  

It is this that the man eats.

11. See the following example:

??A'-\text{lo}^\prime layti'-eh...  
det-dist Ipr-top 3  

The reasons for this restriction are not clear but may  
depend on the conflicts of anaphora, highlighting, and  
disambiguation. An independent pronoun following a  
demonstrative adds nothing as regards disambiguation and  
it\text{ its anaphoric function is doubly redundant.}
4. The Verb

Although verb morphology is one of the most studied aspects of Mayan languages, the syntactic and discourse functions of verb morphosyntax have just begun to be examined (Durbin and Ojeda 1978a, 1978b, 1982). Even in morphological analyses, the categorization of Mayan verbal morphology according to such traditional categories as aspect, tense, mood, voice, and transitivity is often less than satisfactory. The difficulties of morphological analysis are rooted, in part, in general linguistic theoretical problems in so far as the criteria for analytical categories for verbs are not generally agreed upon. Even given the validity of traditional categories (generally derived from analyses of Indo-European languages), it is very difficult to apply them in a consistent fashion to Mayan verbs. This appears to be due in part to a distinct formal grammaticalization of semantic features such that a morpheme may have features characteristic of two or more of the traditional categories. This conflation (and at times confusion) is immediately apparent in considerations of the morphosyntactic category aspect, where the same morpheme may be variously categorized as a tense marker, a modal or an aspectual marker (e.g., -past tense, perfective/completive aspect; he- future tense, assurative mood/aspect). The marking of varying
degrees of transitivity, subordinate relations, and a split-ergative morphology add richness to the structure, meaning, and function of the verb in Itza.

Main verbs in Itza Maya are usually composed of the following parts: aspect marker affixes, dependent pronoun affixes marking subject and object agreement, the verb root, and transitivity affix markers all of which have been noted in many previous examples. Aspect is now examined in greater detail.

4.1. Aspect

Aspect is generally differentiated from tense on the basis of its relation to a time scale. Tense is said to be a deictic that relates the time of the verb to the time of discourse (Lyons 1968:30ff.; Comrie 1976). Thus the past tense marks time prior to the discourse, the present marks the action of the verb as of approximately the same time, and the future marks actions or states that will occur after the discourse. Aspect on the other hand, does not have such a deictic relationship but rather marks other features about the action of the verb. A basic division of aspects is between the perfective and the imperfective (Comrie 1976). The perfective marks the action of the verb as having been completed while the imperfective marks the action of the verb as not completed (e.g., in process, habitual, repetitive). As mentioned above, the application of these categories to Itza verbs does not yield clear results.
Aspect in Mayan languages traditionally refers to a morphosyntactic category which often has some of the semantic features generally associated with aspect. By and large, in main clauses, Itza verbs require modifiers that are often grammaticalized as prefixes. These markers may contain semantic features of tense and mood as well as aspect. The following is an example of an aspect marker whose function is primarily one of a past tense marker:

(1) T--in--wil--ah--ech.
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM--Dpr
    com-1sg-see 2sg
    I saw you.

On the other hand, the aspect marker in the following example has distinct modal qualities.

(2) Tak--in--wil--ik.
    asp--Dpr--V--PM
    desid--1sg-see
    I want to see it.

The following are examples where the aspect markers function to mark the completion or incompletion of the action, the classic aspectual distinction.

(3) Ho'm--ih u--ya'l--ik.
    asp-Dpr Dpr--V--PM
    finish--3 3---say
    He finished saying it.
The wide semantic range of aspect as a general adverbial category preceding the verb is indicated in the following list of examples:

(4) Tan—in—wil—ik—ech
    asp-Dpr—V—PM—Dpr
    dur—1sg—see    2sg

    I am seeing you.

(5) Bix—u—han—t—ik?
    asp-Dpr—V—tran—PM
    how—3—eat

    How does he eat it?

(6) K—in—wil—ik—ech.
    asp-Dpr—V—PM—Dpr
    inc—1sg—see    2sg

    I see you.

(7) Chak—u—tal.
    asp—Dpr—V
    dub—3—come

    Perhaps he is coming.

(8) Yan—a—han—t—ik.
    asp—Dpr—V—tran—PM
    oblig—2—eat

    You have to eat it.

(9) Pat—al a—han—t—ik.
    asp—intr Dpr—V—tran—PM
    abil    2—eat

    You can eat it.

(10) He'—in—kin—s—ik—eh.
    asp—Dpr—V—caus—PM—scope
    assur—1sg—die

    I will kill it.

(11) Ma't—a'ax in—han—t—ik.
    aspect     Dpr—V—tran—PM
    never     1sg—eat

    I never eat it.
(12) Samal in-ts'-ik tech.
    asp Dpr-V-PM Ipr
tomorrow 1sg-give 2sg

    Tomorrow I'll give it to you.

(13) Mia (he')-u-han-t-ik-(eh).
    adv (asp)-Dpr-V-tran-PM-(scope)
perhaps (assur)-3-eat

    Perhaps he will eat it.

(14) Kil-in-han-al-eh, k--u--k'as-tal in nik'.
    asp-Dpr-V-intr-scope asp-Dpr-V-intr Ppr W
when-1sg-eat inc-3-hurt 1sg stomach

    When I eat, my stomach hurts.

(15) Chik-a'an in-wil-ik.
    asp-part Dpr-V-PM
clear 1sg-see

    I see it clearly.

(16) Laili' tan-u-wen-el-eh.
    adv asp-Dpr-V-intr-scope
still dur-3-sleep

    He is still sleeping.

(17) [Mak-i(h) in wool] in-pul-ik in hook'.
    V-Dpr Ppr W Dpr-V-PM Ppr W
tire-3 1sg body 1sg-throw 1sg hook

    I was tired of throwing my hook.

(18) Tantoh-in-ven-t-ik.
    asp-Dpr-V-tran-caus-PM
immed-1sg-sleep

    I just put him to sleep.

(19) Ts'o'ok-ih ki-kin-s-ik-e'ex.
    asp-Dpr Dpr-V-caus-PM-Dpr
finish-3 1pl-die 2pl

    We all finished killing it.

(20) Suk-u-tal.
    asp-Dpr-V
habit-3-come

    He is accustomed to coming.
As may be seen in the examples above, there is a wide array of forms that modify the verb and appear before the verb stem. Elements of time reference (tense/aspect), of the probability or actuality of the action (mood), and the manner or state of the action (adverb/aspect) are often encoded in this prefixed morphosyntactic category with varying degrees of formalized grammaticalization. Two or more of these categories (tense, aspect, and mood) sometimes occur in the same form, making a classification according to such categories somewhat artificial. While following tradition in labeling these forms aspect markers, I wish to emphasize that this is a general adverbial (manner) category which has been grammaticalized as an obligatory verbal prefix, although there are some possible 'aspect' markers that are exceptions to this order restriction (cf. 4.2.1.3. and 4.3.1.3.).

The choice of the term aspect is not an arbitrary one, however, to the extent that it is broader than either tense or mood (both of which often include aspectual features), and because semantic features associated with aspect generally appear to be central to this category while tense and mood are secondary.

In Itza Maya, the speaker has a wide range of choices of prefixed verbal modifiers as the list of examples above indicates, but tense is not the foremost consideration in these choices. There is no present or future tense in Itza and the existence of a past tense is
debatable, although time reference is often a relevant feature in discourse. The incompleted aspect marked by k- and the durative aspect marked by t(an) often have a present time reference but need not. The incompleted is basically neutral regarding time and often indicates habitual action.

(21) A'-k'in k--u--bet--ik ha'-eh k--u--bet--ik ke'el.
det-W asp-Dpr-V---PM W-rel asp-Dpr-V---PM adj the-day inc-3-make water inc-3-make cold

On the days that it rains it makes it cold.

(22) Wa k--u--tal--el--eh, k--in--bel.
cond asp-Dpr-V-intr-scope asp-Dpr-V if inc-3-come inc-1sg-go

If he comes I go.

(23) In--to'on (k)--ki--kin--s--ik wakax.
enp--Ipr asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM N 1pl inc--1pl--die cow

We slaughter cattle.

A major function of aspect is to contextualize actions, just as specificity contextualizes the referents of nouns, with respect to discourse. While the time axis is one dimension of contextualization, it is not the only nor necessarily the most important one and other features relating verbs to participants in discourse or prior reference often take precedence in aspectual marking.

The incompleted aspect, neutral in respect to time reference, is often used with a habitual meaning but also often has a simple present meaning, as the present is the unmarked state in discourse. Whether or not the action of verbs marked by the incompleted aspect has any time
reference is determined by discourse context (e.g.,
temporal adverbs and previous aspectual marking).

The durative aspect t(aan) may also often be
translated as a present tense marker but its salient
semantic feature is imperfectivity (aspect). Its time
reference may be past as well as present as the following
eamples indicate (contrast (24) with (25)):

(24) Ta(a)n--u--bel--oo' ti kol.
asp-Dpr--V--Dpr prep N
dur--3--go--3pl to milpa

They are going to a milpa. (observing men passing)

(25) T--u--yil--ah--oo' hun tuul noxi' ix ch'up
asp-Dpr-V--DPM--Dpr num class adj fem N
com--3--see 3pl one anim big woman

They saw a big woman coming.

Time reference of the durative aspect is strictly
discourse dependent and the process of the action rather
than its result is marked.

Aspect markers may also have future time reference,
generally with modal features as well, as evidenced in
(2), (7), (10), (12), and (13). All of these aspect
markers modify verbs referring to actions that may not
have yet begun but their modal/aspectual features are at
least as important as their time reference. None of them
simply mark future time reference and thus none can be
considered as tense markers. Rather, they indicate the
possibility or probability of an event taking place (a
modal feature) from the speaker's point of view, which includes information regarding the speaker's and or actor's attitude toward the event such as obligation (yan-), desire (tak-), ability (pat-), or assurance (he'-). While the irrealis and non-completive features of these aspects are most compatible with future time reference, this is relative to the discourse context (time reference may be marked in previous discourse by verbs and adverbs) and the absolute time reference may be in the past as in the following:

(26) Mix ts'eeek t--in--tuk--1--ah ke u chun
    neg measure asp-Dpr--V     DPM sub Ppr N
    not bit com-1sg-think     that 3 trunk
    a'--che'--eh pat-al u--wa'--tal t--u-ka'--ye'.
    det--N--top asp Dpr--V--intr adv
    the-tree abil 3-stand again

    I had no idea that the trunk of the tree was able to stand up again.

(27) T--u--k'a't--ah ten meyah. Tak--u--paak--t--ik.
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM Ipr N asp-Dpr--V--tran-PM
    com-3--want 1sg work des--3--clear

    He asked me for work. He wanted to clear it. (the yard)

Several of these aspect markers may combine with distal marking (indicating past time reference) to modify verbs whose action is past and completed.

(28) Ten--eh, yan--ah--ih in--lah--ts'ik--ik.
    Ipr-top asp-dist-Dpr Dpr-adv----V----PM
    1sg oblig-past-3 1sg-all--cure

    As for me, I had to care for all of them.
The aspects in the examples above have a distinctly verbal flavor as they are marked for person by dependent pronouns and receive distal marking typical of intransitive verbs (see 4.1.3.), and might in fact be interpreted as matrix verbs of complex sentences (Bricker 1981b). While such an interpretation appears to be of historical significance in that many aspect markers may have developed from verbs, synchronically it does not accurately describe sentential syntactic relations and would categorize virtually all sentences with non-completive aspects as complex. Whatever verbal nature aspect markers may have, has been reduced through grammatical formalization to the degree that it is recognizable only in a few cases such as those above, and even in those cases the aspects do not function fully as verbs since verb agreement has been frozen to third person and there is no marking of subordination.

4.1.1. The Assurative Aspect

In Section 4.1., examples (10) and (13) are evidence that the -eh marker, previously noted in its function as
a topic marker and as a marker of relative clauses (3.4.2.), also marks the end of clauses with the assurative aspect he'- in the frame he'-...-eh. It appears that the -eh marker has the general function of highlighting old information. It is natural for this marking to be formalized as a trapping particle in conjunction with the assurative aspect since whatever is assured is generally understood by discourse participants to be a possibility. Examples of the assurative aspect in context indicate the relation of the information of the clauses in which they occur to prior information.

(1) "A'-k'in--eh ya tan--u--bel i wa ma' tan--ki-
det---N---top adv asp-Dpr--V conj cond neq asp-Dpr-
the--day already dur-3--go and if not dur-1pl
-a(-)seb-il-kun--t--ik ki bah--eh, he'-u--yok--ol
CV-----tran-PM Ppr refl-scop asp-Dpr-V-intr
hurry 1pl self assur-3-enter

to'on k'in ti beh--eh", ka' bin--oo'
Ipr 3sg sun on way and go--3pl

The sun is already going and if we are not hurrying ourselves, it will set on us on the way, and they went.

(2) ...layti' in--k'a't--ih ka' a--men--t--eh ten
Ipr 3sg 1sg want that 2--make

a'--chem--eh. ...ka' t--in--wa'al--ah ti'ih--eh
det---N--top conj asp-Dpr---V---DPM Ipr--top
the--canoe and com-1sg--say 3

ke a'--che'--eh hach yuts--il. He'-u--hok--ol
sub det--N--top adv adj--pos asp-Dpr--V--intr
that the-tree very good assur-3--leave
hun p'e ma'lo' chem--i'ih--eh.
nun class adj N--partit-scope
one inam fine canoe

I (speaker A) want you to make me a canoe from it.
...and I (speaker B) said to him that the tree was very good, a good canoe will come out of it.

(3) A. Mia ma' tan--bel ti lik'--il.
adv neg asp/Dpr-V sub V---intr
dub not dur/2--go to get up

I don't think you're going to get up.

B. He'-le'-eh, he'-in--lik'--il--eh,
asp---scope asp---Dpr---V---intr-scope
assur assur---1sg-get up

I will, I will get up.

In the examples above, the verbs with the assurative aspect are clearly related to prior discourse. In (1) after noting that the sun was passing, the speaker warns that they must hurry or it will set, using the assurative aspect. In (2) after the selection of log for a canoe, the workman assures his boss that a good canoe will result. In (3) Speaker B emphatically assures Speaker A that he will get up after the latter expresses his doubts. Emphasis is marked by the repetition of the assurative aspect. It appears first in its full form (he'-le'-eh) where the verb is understood and then is repeated in trapping particle form with the verb. Although the assurative aspect generally appears as he'- with a verb, this is a contracted form of he'-le'- and they are substitutable. The highlighting -eh marker however, generally appears clause-finally and never before the dependent pronoun of a verb.
4.1.2. Completi ve and Non-completi ve Aspects

In the analysis of aspect in Yucatecan Maya, a basic division is often made between the completive aspect and all of the other (non-completive) aspects, similar to the general perfective-imperfective aspectual distinction (Bricker 1981b). There is strong motivation for this distinction on the basis of the verb agreement system, which is ergative-absolutive in the completive and nominative-accusative in the other aspects, a point I examine in detail below. It is an oversimplification, however, to view this distinction as one based simply on the semantic features of perfectivity or tense. Perfectivity and past time reference are also features of several of the non-completive aspects, as noted previously. However, non-completive aspects with past time reference also often mark the process or duration of an event unlike the completive, and are used to background old information while providing a context for new (Hopper 1979). Consider the following:

(1) T--u yok--s--ah--en--oo ich nah i tantoh--in-asp-Dpr-V-caus-Dpm-Dpr prep N conj asp--Dpr com-3-enter 1sg-3pl in house and immed
-wok--ol ich nah ka' u--yil--ah--oo ix ch'up-eh.
V-intr loc N conj Dpr--V--Dpm--Dpr fem N--top
enter in house when 3--see 3pl woman

They (the speaker's wife and mother) brought me into the house and I just entered the house when they saw the woman.

(2) Kap--ih ti sen-kech ts'on i t--u--kin--s--ah
V--Dpr sub adv V conj asp-Dpr-V-caus-Dpm
begin-3 to much shoot and com-3--die
He began to shoot a lot and he killed many animals, then he finished shooting it (well) and began to shoot poorly.

(3) Bin—een t—u lak' kol. Ho'm—ih in—lah-man

V---Dpr loc-Ppr adj N asp--Dpr Dpr-adv--V

go---1sg to--3 other milpa term--3 1sg-all-walk

I went to the other milpa, I finished walking around the milpa. I didn't see a thing.

(4) Kap—ih u—tsikbal—t—eh t—u yîtan...

V--Dpr Dpr---v---tran--SPM prep--Ppr N

begin--3 3---tell to--3 wife

He began to tell it to his wife... and he just finished talking to his wife, they say, when he died.

In the examples above, non-completive aspect markers modify verbs that have previously been introduced in the discourse or are presupposed (old information) and mark the end of an event as context for new information. In (1) the root of the verb tantoh—in—vok—ol was mentioned in the preceding clause (t—u—vok—sah—en) and the end of
the task of carrying in the speaker is duly noted, serving as background to the new information following. The aspect marker *tantoh* adds cohesion by further modifying old information and marking its temporal context as immediately prior to the information to follow.

In (2) the duration of the activity referred to by the verb *ts'on* is clearly marked at its beginning by *kap-ih* and at its end by *ho'm-ih* which leads to further new information.³ (3) and (4) are similar examples where the aspect marker *ho'm-ih* marks the end of an activity understood by the hearer, serving as temporally contextualizing background for the following narration.

As a grammatical category, aspect includes a wide variety of forms ranging from the verb-like (as those just mentioned) to the clearly adverbial (e.g., *samal* 'tomorrow', *bix* 'how') and the modal (*tak* (desiderative)). Aspectual features may even be encoded in full clauses (4.1.17). Though the structural and semantic range is great, this general adverbial category is obligatorily present as part of the main verb and in all cases with the exception of the completive it must occur prefixed to the subject dependent pronoun in a nominative-accusative system.¹ The completive aspect is quite distinct morphologically from those just discussed.

In all of the non-completive aspects, the aspect marker precedes the subject dependent pronoun (*S* or *A*) which is prefixed to the verb, be it transitive or
intransitive. The object (P) dependent pronoun is suffixed to the stem. Thus, the verb agreement system operates on a nominative-accusative basis. Transitivity is marked by verbal suffixes, the proximal patient marker (PM) -ik for full transitives and usually the intransitive suffix -vl for intransitives, with the vowel in the suffix in harmony with the one that precedes it in the root. As will be shown in the following section, verbal marking in the completive aspect is quite different.

4.1.3. The Compleitive Aspect

In the completive aspect, transitive and intransitive verbs receive different marking with respect to aspect, and the verb agreement system is ergative-absolutive. For transitive verbs, the completive aspect is marked by the prefix t- which precedes the agent dependent pronoun prefixed to the root just as in the non-completive aspects. Transitivity is marked by the distal patient marker (DPM) verbal suffix -ah (Durbin and Ojeda 1982) analogously to the -ik suffix in the other aspects and the patient (P) dependent pronoun is suffixed to the -ah marker.

Intransitives are marked quite differently. There is no prefixed aspect marking but a distal marker (-ah) may be suffixed to the root, and the subject dependent pronoun (S) is suffixed to it. The distal -ah marker which occurs as a suffix on intransitives appears to be
the same marker as the distal patient marker (DPM) which occurs in transitive verbs (Durbin and Ojeda 1982). In the case of intransitive verbs, however, the distal marker simply marks past tense reference as a tense marker does. It has been mentioned that the verb-agreement system is ergative-absolutive in the completive (it is also ergative-absolutive in the subjunctive), which is to say that the subject of an intransitive verb (S) and the object of a transitive verb (P) are marked in the same way, while the agent of a transitive verb (A) is marked differently. The two sets of pronouns that enter into this system are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set A</th>
<th>Set B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>in(w)</td>
<td>excl. ki(w)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incl. ki(w)-...-e'ex</td>
<td>incl. -o'on-e'ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>a(w)</td>
<td>a(w)-...-e'ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>u(y)</td>
<td>u(y)-...-oo'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following paradigms indicate the differences in the verb agreement system of the incompletive and completive aspects where S, A, and P refer to the subject of an intransitive verb, the agent of a transitive verb, and the patient of a transitive verb, respectively.
As example (1) indicates, the non-completive and completive aspects differ little for fully transitive verbs. The agent is marked in both cases by a Set A pronoun and the patient by a Set B pronoun. The transitivity marking does differ with -ik marking non-completive transitive verbs and -ah marking completives. The difference between intransitive verbs in the incompletive and the completive is much greater. Unlike the incompletive, in the completive there is no prefixed aspect marking but a distal marker may follow the verb stem indicating past time reference as in (3).

In addition, the S pronouns are of Set B in the incompletive and not Set A, as they are in the
non-completive aspects, which leads to the characterization of the completive as ergative absolutive.\(^9\)

### 4.2. Transitivitx\(_\text{a}\), Ergativity, and the Verb-Noun Continuum

Itza Maya, with its split ergative system, is an interesting case for examination with regard to recent proposals regarding ergativity and transitivity (Comrie 1978; Hopper and Thompson 1980; M. A. Durbin 1981). Ergativity includes a wide range of linguistic phenomena (Comrie 1978, Dixon 1979, S. Anderson 1976, Plank, ed. 1979) and it has been suggested that it may indicate a high level of transitivity (Hopper and Thompson 1980). A split ergative system such as in Itza is a test case for such a hypotheses as noted by M. A. Durbin (1981).

Ergativity, which is most generally defined as a system that marks the identity of S and P in contrast to A, may be marked morphologically in verb agreement or by case marking in nouns. This identity may be further exhibited syntactically by restrictions which exclude an A noun phrase (as opposed to a S or P noun phrase) from entering into certain syntactic processes such as NP-equi deletion and raising. Syntactic ergativity appears to be far less common than morphological ergativity, though a continuum from morphology to syntactic consequences has been suggested (Comrie 1978; Dixon 1979; M.A. Durbin 1979b).
Split nominative-accusative / ergative-absolutive systems may operate along a number of dimensions as Comrie (1978) and Dixon (1979) noted, and one of the most common is an aspectual one - the imperfective with a nominative-accusative system and the perfective with an ergative/absolutive system. As noted above, such a split exists in Itza, although the ergative-absolutive system is not restricted to the perfective (completive) aspect as it also appears in certain subordinate constructions (the "subjunctive") and is applicable to stative constructions regardless of aspect.

The origins of ergativity are obscure, as are factors that might lead to the transformation of an ergative system into an accusative system or vice versa (S. Anderson 1977; Comrie 1978). Split ergative systems are potentially very important data in resolving such questions if one assumes that the languages are in the midst of a change from one system to the other.

The nominative-accusative system has generally been considered as the more basic or natural of the two, leading to interpretations of the ergative systems as historically derived reinterpretations of passive formations (Dik 1980). Although Comrie (1978) notes the ethnocentricity of considering the nominative-accusative (Nom-Acc) as the more basic system, as it happens to be the system of most European languages, he also suggests the reinterpretation of the passive as a mechanism leading to ergativity. Comrie, however, also notes that
nominalization, which is often cited as a mechanism leading to ergativity due to the relative ease of the nominalization of verbs with their patients and intransitive subjects, but not their agents (e.g., fox hunting; bird chirping) may also function to effect change in the opposite direction and he cites the Mayan languages of Chol and Jacaltec as examples (Comrie 1978:377). Bricker (1981b) has recently made a similar analysis for lowland Maya, citing nominalization as the source of the present split ergative systems in the family.

The work of Hopper and Thompson (1980) on transitivity is also of relevance to a discussion of the function of a split ergative system, as they suggest that ergative marking in the perfective aspect is characteristic of high transitivity, which has the discourse function of marking the skeletal structure of narrative discourse. However, M.A. Durbin (1981) has called into question some of their conclusions regarding the relation of transitivity and ergativity.

The question of the discourse function of an Erg-Abs as opposed to a Nom-Acc system is emphasized by Hopper and Thompsons' (1980) suggestion that the ergative marks heightened transitivity. As Comrie has noted (1978), the general function of disambiguating A and P arguments of transitive verbs is served equally in either system, and thus cannot serve as an explanation for a split ergative system. On the other hand, Hopper and Thompsons'
hypothesis, with regard to the correlation of perfectivity, ergativity, and heightened transitivity is somewhat circular, in as much as perfectivity, which relates to one of their transitivity features (Feature C), naturally correlates with other of their transitivity features such that the object is more likely to be totally affected (Feature I) and to be definite (Feature J) and the verb is more likely to be punctual (Feature D) for the syntactic/discourse/pragmatic reasons that the perfective aspect necessarily implies a completed action of the verb and the object of completed past action is likely to be affected and to be old information (definiteness correlates with old information which correlates with past communication (Chafe 1976; Givon 1976)). The correlation of these features does not necessarily indicate high transitivity. M. A. Durbin (1981) has also suggested interrelationships of these transitivity criteria and the possibility of hierarchical relationships among the transitivity features.

The hypothesized increase in transitivity in the past/perfective is irrelevant to discussions of ergativity unless there is a split system, as the marking would be identical in all aspects otherwise, but may be tested in such a system as Itza which has an aspectual division with the Erg-Abs system in the completive aspect. Since transitivity is a syntactic/discourse notion, one might expect that in the completive aspect, the verb or one of its arguments would have a wider
distribution than in the non-completive aspects as a marker of increased transitivity, or as a counter example they might have a narrower distribution (M. A. Durbin 1981). In Itza, however, fully transitive sentences appear to have the same distribution in the completive and non-completive aspects, contrary to expectations either way. According to the transitivity hypothesis, nominalization, which lowers transitivity, would be expected to be more prominent in non-completive aspects, as Bricker (1981b) suggests.

In short, a correlation between high transitivity and the perfective aspect has been suggested by Hopper and Thompson (1980) but questioned by M. A. Durbin (1981). Nominalization, which is generally agreed to lower transitivity, has been hypothesized as a mechanism for both the creation and the disintegration of ergative systems. A correlation of the perfective aspect and Erg-Abs morphology is well documented and if high transitivity is not the basis of the split, the question remains, what is? Comrie (1981a) has suggested as partial explanation that in the perfective, it is the patient and not the agent which is most salient, because it is most likely to be changed (cf. Hopper and Thompson's transitivity Feature I regarding the total affectedness of O). The hypothesis that Erg-Abs systems mark increased transitivity has been presented (Hopper and Thompson 1980) and its opposite, that lower transitivity is marked has also been suggested (M. A.
A careful examination of ergativity with relation to particular languages may lead to questions of the usefulness of the concept ergativity both as a descriptive and as a theoretical term. It appears that an Erg-Abs marking system may come about in a variety of ways and may serve a number of functions. There is an array of quite different marking systems that are classified as ergative. The distinction of Nom-Acc versus Erg-Abs has been suggested as an important one for linguistic typology (Comrie 1981b) but the value of this distinction may be called into serious question if no functional correlates (or correlates of any sort) are established. Perhaps it is considerations such as these that have led some to the opinion that Erg-Abs systems are a peculiarity of morphology of little significance (leaving unanswered the question of why so many languages are marked with the Erg-Abs system). These theoretical difficulties have led to opposite conclusions such that ergative constructions are described as passive by nature on the one hand (Dik 1980), and highly transitive on the other (Hopper and Thompson 1980).

A careful examination of the Itza data may help to clarify some of the questions raised above regarding the function of a split ergative system with respect to transitivity marking, ergativity, and aspect. As was described above (4.1.3.), there is a congruence of Erg-Abs and transitivity marking in the completive
aspect. Thus there may be no marking of intransitivity and past time reference other than the Set B (absolutive) pronouns. The functional relationships between transitivity, aspect, and the verb agreement system are complex in the non-completive aspects as well.

4.3. The Transitivity Continuum in Itza Maya

As mentioned above (4.1.2.), the classification of completive vs. non-completive aspects is an oversimplification in regard to time reference and the perfective vs. imperfective distinction. It is, however, a descriptive generalization which accounts for a large body of morphological data. With the exception of the statives, which will be examined below, all non-completive verbs have a nominative-accusative verb agreement system, with the subject dependent pronoun (whether S or A) following an aspect marker and preceding the verb stem.13

Transitivity may be marked morphosyntactically by a series of suffixes. In the non-completive aspects fully transitive verbs, with patient nouns that can be moved from post-verbal position and specified, have the proximal patient marker (PM) -ik (Durbin and Ojeda 1982) - e.g., T-in-han-t-ik wah "I am eating tortillas"; A'-wah-eh t-in-han-t-ik "As for the tortillas, I am eating them". The proximal patient marker (PM) indicates that the verb is transitive whether or not an overt patient marker (pronominal or otherwise) is present.
(I-in-han-t-ik "I am eating it"). However, the salience of the Object (O) is decreased if an O NP does not appear. When the O is old information, it is often omitted, as it is redundant and recoverable information.

At the opposite end of the scale of transitivity are basic intransitives, which may be marked for intransitivity or may be completely unmarked by verbal suffixes (e.g., tan-in-bel "I am going"). The basic intransitives are thus less marked morphologically than the transitives, as they need not have any transitivity marking and never have dependent pronoun or NP patients.

As mentioned above, there is also a class of stative verbs. Statives differ from non-completive intransitives in two fundamental ways: 1) Statives receive no aspectual marking; 2) Statives are marked by Set B pronouns. They are composed of an adjectival or nominal root and pronominal suffixes and thus evidence minimal transitivity with absolutive marking.

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad a. \text{Wi'tih--en} & b. \text{Saak--ech} & c. \text{Ba'al-che--en.} \\
& \text{adj--Dpr} & \text{adj--Dpr} & \text{CM--Dpr} \\
& \text{hungry-1sg} & \text{afraid-2sg} & \text{animal-1sg}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
I & \text{am hungry.} & \text{You are afraid.} & \text{I am an animal.} \\
& \text{You are dead (a corpse).} & \text{He is dead.}
\end{align*}
\]

Between the extremes of pure statives and basic intransitives and fully transitive verbs are a range of forms that either add transitivity to basic
intransitives, or subtract it from basic transitives, or do both.

Transitive roots fall into three major classes according to morphosyntactic criteria: 1) those with no transitivity suffixes (*k-in-wil-(0)-ik* "I see it"); 2) those with the -t- transitivity suffix (*k-in-han-t-ik* "I eat it"); and 3) causative verbs with the -s- (or -es) suffix (*k-in-kin-s-ik* "I kill it") which may combine with the -t- suffix (*k-in-wen-t-es-ik* "I put him to sleep"); *k-in-han-t-es-ik* "I feed him"). These verb classes are also distinctively marked in the completive aspect and the subjunctive mood as the following examples indicate:

(1) a. *T-in-wil-ah*.
    asp-Dpr-V-DPM
    com-1sg-see
    I saw it.

    b. ka' *in-wil-a'*
    sub Dpr-V-SPM
    that 1sg-see
    that I see it.

    c. *T-in-ten-on-ah*.
    asp-Dpr-V-DPM
    com-1sg-shoot
    I shot it.

    d. ka' *in-ten-on-o'*
    sub Dpr-V-SPM
    that 1sg-shoot
    that I shoot it.

(2) a. *T-in-han-t-ah*.
    asp-Dpr-V-trans-DPM
    com-1sg-eat
    I ate it.

    b. ka' *in-han-t-eh*.
    sub Dpr-V-trans-SPM
    that 1sg-eat
    that I eat it.

    asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM
    com-1sg-die
    I killed it.

    b. ka' *in-kin-es-(0)*.
    sub Dpr-V-caus-SPM
    that 1sg-die
    that I kill it.

As may be seen in the examples above, the three verb classes maintain their distinctive markers in the completive aspect and the subjunctive mood. In the
subjunctive, the basic transitives (with no transitivity markers) take a suffix as a patient marker, with the vowel generally in harmony with the vowel in the syllable that precedes it as in (1d). The subordinate patient marker (SPM) of the verb wil (1b) is an exception to this rule as the vowel is not in harmony. The -t- transitive verb class takes the suffix -eh as its SPM (optional when not clause-final), and the causatives take no suffix as an SPM but the causative allomorph -es appears.

As noted in the discussion of word order (Chapter 2), specified nouns may precede or follow fully transitive verbs as subjects or direct objects depending upon discourse functions and contexts such as topicalization and contrastive focus. With fully transitive verbs, both arguments (subject or agent and object or patient) are approximately equal with regard to the possibilities of specification, although a tendency to interpret the more highly specified NPs as subjects was noted. A decrease in transitivity implies a demotion of one of the basic arguments of the verb (A or P), and one indication of such a demotion is a specification restriction. The demotion of one argument implies the promotion of the other as well as a promotion of the verb.

The passive, which is the demotion of the subject and the promotion of the object, has been extensively studied in many languages. In passives, the patient is promoted to the subject position, and the agent, if
present, is demoted to an oblique case. In addition, the verb receives intransitive marking. The particulars of passive formation in Itza are discussed below but at this point I wish to emphasize that when the agent is demoted, the verb is marked morphosyntactically as an intransitive, thus losing transitivity whether or not the agent appears as an oblique or the transitive origin of the verb is apparent.

The patient may also be demoted and a similar loss of transitivity occurs. Thus, the demotion of either agent or patient results in a loss of transitivity and the verb receives intransitive marking.

There is a continuum of transitivity, which is to say, a continuum in the demotion of the basic arguments of a transitive sentence. The demotion of the object (patient) is considered first.

4.3.1. Object Demotion

Although the object is always below the subject in the NP hierarchy, it may lose its independent object status to varying degrees in a number of ways. Two major strategies of demoting the object are intransitivization and stativization, both of which mark decreased transitivity.
4.3.1.1. **Object Demotion: Non-Compleitive Aspects**

4.3.1.1.1. **Intransitivization**

In the non-compleitive aspects, a first stage of object demotion is marked by the object's loss of specificity and possibilities of movement.

(1) Tan—in—kin—s—ik a°—balum—he°—lo°°(eh).
    asp-Dpr—V-caus-PM det—N—dem-dist—(top)
    dur—1sg—die  the—jaguar

I am killing that jaguar.

(2) a. Tan—in—kin—s—i—balum.
    asp-Dpr—V-caus-DPM—N
    dur—1sg—die  jaguar

    I am jaguar killing.

    DPM  det—N—dem-dist—(top)

(3) a. A'°—balum—eh tan—in—kin—s—ik.
    det—N—top  asp-Dpr—V-caus-PM
    the—jaguar  dur—1sg—die

    As for the jaguar, I am killing it.

b. *(A—) balum—(eh) tan—in—kin—s—i.
    det—N—(top)  asp-Dpr—V-caus-DPM
    the—jaguar  dur—1sg—die

    asp-Dpr—V-tran—PM det—N—top
    dur—1sg—eat  the—meat

    I am eating the meat.


    As for the meat, I am eating it.

    DPM

    I am meat eating.
In the paradigms presented above, it is clearly evinced that for all verb classes, the object may be demoted such that it can receive no specifier and cannot be moved from post verbal position. The morphosyntactic marking for this demotion varies for each verb class. For causatives the suffix -i, an allomorph of the distal marker -ah which has already been noted in the completive aspect, replaces the PM -ik (2). The -t- transitives lose both the PM -ik and the -t- marker which are replaced by the distal -i marker (5). The difference between the marking of object demotion for the -t- transatives and the -s- marked causatives may be
explained by the general differences in the functions of these morphosyntactic markers. The -t- adds transitivity so that an intransitive or neutral root such as han- (han-al 'to eat', intransitive) is marked as transitive. To mark a lowering of transitivity, the -t- marker would be contradictory, as it marks increased transitivity. On the other hand, the intransitively marked form han-al allows no object (*tan-in-han-al bik*). By replacing the transitivity marker and the PM by -i-, the verb is marked as having a patient but a demoted (distal) one. The distality indicated by this marker is not temporal as it is in the completive, but a marker of the speakers point of view in which the object has lost salience and thus proximity to the subject.

Causatives cannot be marked in the same way. Although their roots are also (often) intransitive, they mark causativity in addition to transitivity and with their deletion the marking of both functions would be lost. By marking the verb with both the -s- and the -i- suffixes, causativity remains while transitivity is diminished. For basic transitives (7) there is no marking on the root such as a distal marker to indicate object demotion but the PM is absent.

In all of the cases of demotion above, the object NP has been demoted as far as it can be and still be present. It has no specificity and is frozen in its post-verbal position, which is virtually object incorporation. I hesitate to say it is definitely object
incorporation because no verbal suffixes appear attached to the patient noun. The expression is still verbal as evidenced by aspectual marking and prefixed dependent pronouns, and retains some transitivity as evidenced by the presence of the patient NP which is not marked as oblique. Verb agreement follows the general nominative-accusative pattern of non-completive verbs.

Within this marking framework, the only further demotion of the object and thus further loss of transitivity possible, is object deletion, which is a complete demotion of the patient NP.

(1) Tan—in—kin—s—ah,
    asp-Dpr—V-caus—DPM
    dur-1sg—die
    I am butchering.

(2) Tan—in—han—al,
    asp-Dpr—V—intr
    dur-1sg—eat
    I am eating.

(3) Tan—in—wil—(ah)
    asp-Dpr—V—DPM
    dur-1sg—see
    I am watching.

(4) Tan—in—huch'—(O).
    grind—(DPM)
    I am grinding.

None of the above forms permits objects of any kind.

In (1) the transitive origins of the verb are marked by the distal patient marker. A patient is thus semantically implicit, but none can appear and the verb functions
syntactically like other intransitives. In (2), where the root is neutral with regard to transitivity morphosyntactically, there is no marking of a lowering of transitivity, rather, it is marked as a basic intransitive. Basic transitives (3) and (4) vary as to lower transitivity marking. The DPM may appear with the irregular root wil 'see' but not with huch 'grind' in (4).

As is evident from the discussion above, one strategy of demoting object (patient) NPs is to mark the verb as less transitive, while retaining its verbal status by aspectual marking and Set A pronoun verb agreement. There is another closely related strategy that marks detransitivization by means of nominalization: stativization.

4.3.1.1.2. Stativization

It was noted that while there are many intransitive verbs that receive intransitive markers and have aspectual and verb agreement markers, there is also a class of statives that have nominal origins, no aspectual marking, and Set B pronouns (rather than Set A pronouns). These statives are as low in transitivity as possible, as no action is indicated. They bridge the gap between nouns and verbs as they have nominal or adjectival origins but are marked by dependent subject pronouns, which in other cases are affixed to verbs. Verbs may also be detransitivized via nominalization.
(stativization) and conform to the stative paradigm. However, their verbal origin and their nominalization are marked by the masculine and feminine prefixes ah and ix respectively. While the lowering in transitivity marked by the distal patient marker -ah in the examples above (4.3.1.1.1.) may imply habitual action, the nominalized (stativized) forms more strongly mark the activity as an occupation or habitual activity and do not refer to present activities or particular instances of the action. As with the examples given above, the object may be demoted but present, or deleted.

(1) Ah (/Ix) kin--s--i--k'ek'en--en.
    masc (/fem) V-caus-DPM--M--Dpr
    die pig--Isg

I am a pig butcher.

b. Ah (/Ix) kin--s--ah--en.
    masc (/fem) V-caus-DPM-Dpr
    die 1sg

I am a butcher.

(2) a. Ah (/Ix) han--i--bu'ul--en.
    masc (/fem) V-DPM--M--Dpr
    die bean--Isg

I am a bean eater.

b. Ah (/Ix) han--al--en.
    masc (/fem) V-intr-Dpr
    eat 1sg

I am a glutton (eater).

(3) a. Ah (/Ix) il--k'ek'en--en.
    masc (/fem) V--M--Dpr
    see pig--Isg

I am a pig watcher.
The roots of the different verb classes are distinctly marked for lower transitivity just as they were in the object demotion paradigm presented above (4.3.1.1.1.). The causatives have a DPH suffix with or without a nominal patient. The transitivized verbs receive the DPM (¿) suffixed to the root when the object is present (2a), and the intransitive suffix (VI) when no patient noun is present (2b). Basic transitives receive no overt transitivity patient marking in either case.

Although the object may be present in this paradigm, transitivity is clearly very low. If the object is present, it is incorporated into the verb with Set a dependent pronouns suffixed. No aspectual marking is present and the nominal masculine and feminine prefixes generally appear.

4.3.1.2. Object Demotion: The Completive Aspect

As mentioned above (4.3.), for fully transitive verbs there is no obvious difference in transitivity between the completive and non-completive aspects. In both, the verbs may have specified objects that may be moved from post verbal position.

However, in the completive aspect, the two strategies for lowering transitivity (intransitivization
and stativization) merge into one. The detransitivized forms have no prefixed aspect and receive Set B dependent pronouns, just as all completive intransitives do. The transitive origins of the verbs are apparent, however, and an agentive prefix may appear in cases of object incorporation.

(1) a. Kin--s---ah---n--ah---een.
   V-caus-DPM-detr-dist-Dpr
die     past-1sg
   I butchered.

   b. (Ah / Ix)  kin--s--i--balum--n--ah--een.
      (masc/fem)  V-caus-DPM--N--detr-dist-Dpr
die   jaguar   past-1sg
   I was a jaguar hunter.

(2) a. Han--al--n--ah--een.
   V-intr-detr-dist-Dpr
eat    1sg
   I have eaten.

   b. (Ah / Ix)  Han--i--bik'--n--ah--een.
      (masc/fem)  V--DPM--N--detr-dist-Dpr
eat   meat   past-1sg
   I was a meat eater.

(3) a. Huch'--n--ah--een.
   V--detr-dist-Dpr
grind    past-1sg
   I ground.

   b. (Ah / Ix)  Huch'--ixi'im--n--ah--een.
      (masc/fem)  V------N--detr-dist-Dpr
grind---corn    past-1sg
   I was a corn grinder.

Although general similarities of detransitivized verbs in the completive and the non-completive aspects are apparent, there are also significant differences.
The distal marker -ah may appear more than once, with different functions in the completive. In the non-completive aspects it functions to mark the cognitive distality of the object, or object demotion (Durbin and Ojeda 1982). In the completive it may mark the distality of the object along the temporal axis even with fully transitive verbs. Thus the distal marker may appear twice in the completive to mark both the temporal distality of the object and its demotion for object incorporation of causative and transitivized verbs (1b) and (2b).

The basic transitives, which generally receive no DPM in the non-completive aspects, receive a distal marker in the completive that marks temporal distality, and appears after the detransitive -n- marker. The detransitivizing -n- marker appears in all cases of object demotion in the completive, suffixed to the verb stem and prefixed to the (second) DPM which marks temporal distality. It never appears in the non-completive aspects but does occur in the subjunctive in cases of object demotion.

Another significant difference between the marking of object demotion in the non-completive and completive aspects is the distinct distribution of the masculine and feminine agentive prefixes, which, it was suggested, have the function of marking nominalization or stativization in the non-completive aspects. In the completive aspect, these prefixes are optional in cases of object
incorporation, and do not appear when the object is deleted.\textsuperscript{16}

It was noted that there is a merging of strategies of lowering transitivity due to the close morphological relations of basic intransitives and statives in the completive. The following are statives marked for past time reference:

\begin{enumerate}
\item\textit{a. saak--ah--een} \hspace{1cm} \textit{b. ki'--ah--ih} \hspace{1cm} \textit{c. ke'eel--ah--een}
\item\textit{adj--dist--Dpr} \hspace{1cm} \textit{adj--dist--Dpr} \hspace{1cm} \textit{adj--dist--Dpr}
\item\textit{afraid-(past)-1sg} \hspace{1cm} \textit{good-(past)-3} \hspace{1cm} \textit{cold-(past)-1sg}
\end{enumerate}

I was afraid. \hspace{1cm} It was good. \hspace{1cm} I was cold.

The statives are very similar morphologically to other intransitives in the completive, the only difference being the general presence of the distal -\textit{ah}-marker to indicate past time reference, which, as noted above (4.1.3.), occurs only in certain classes of intransitive verbs. A morphological difference between the cases of object demotion and the statives is the presence of the detransitivizing -\textit{n}-marker in the former, suffixed to the root.

4.3.1.2.1. \textit{Stativization with -a\'an}

The (passive) past participle -\textit{a\'an} may also be suffixed to detransitivized forms in which the object has been demoted. The -\textit{a\'an} suffix occurs only with object demoted forms with past time reference, which are typically marked by -\textit{n-ah} affixes (detransitivizer and distal markers). In these cases the verb is
morphosyntactically stative, but the dependent pronoun agrees with the semantic agent. Thus, in these constructions, -a'an is not P oriented (as -a'an construction often are (4.3.2.2.)), but neutral in this regard to the extent that the verbs are intransitives. -a'an is a participial marker, and in these cases it always indicates past states.

(1) a. Huch'--n--ah--a'an--en,
   V--detr-dist-part-Dpr
   grind
   1sg
   I have been a grinder.

b. Huch'--ixi'ia--n--ah--a'an--en.
   V------M--detr-dist-part-Dpr
   grind--corn
   1sg
   I have been a corn grinder.

(2) T--in-t'ın-ik ah Juan ti han--al i layti'--eh,
   asp-Dpr-V---PM masc PN sub V-intr conj Ipr--top
   dur-1sg-call to eat and 3sg
   ya han--al--n--ah--a' an ich u tal,
   adv V-intr-detr-dist-part prep Dpr-V
   already eat
   on 3-come
   I'm calling Juan to eat and as for him, he has already eaten when he came.

(3) In-ten-eh bo'ol--n--ah--a'an--en ti hum p'e kol
   emp-Ipr-top V-detr-dist-part-Dpr prep num class
   1sg pay
   1sg at one inam milpa
   tu'ux yan yaab ah meyah--oo'.
   rel cop adj masc W---3pl
   where are many worker
   I have been a paymaster on a ranch where there are many workers.

(4) In--ten--eh in--woh--el mas ke in-tech tumen
   Ipr-top Dpr--V-intr comp Ipr conj
   1sg 1sg-know more than 2sg because
in-ten-eh kin--s--i--k'ek'en--n--ah--a'an--en.
Ipr-top V-caus-DPM---N--detr-dist-part-Dpr
1sg die pig 1sg

As for me, I know more than you because me,
I have been a pig butcher. (In a conversation
concerning the price of pigs).

(5) K--in-pak't--ik ma' kin-s--i-pek'--n--ah--a'an-ech.
asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM neg V-caus-DPM-N-detr-dist-part-Dpr
inc-1sg-hope not die 2sg
dog

I hope that you haven't been a dog butcher.

The verb forms in the examples above are very similar
to the object demoted forms previously discussed. They
differ in that the -a'yan marker is present, suffixed to
the distal -ah marker (which marks past time reference)
and preceding the dependent pronouns; the agentive
markers (ah and ix) are never permitted; and the first
and second person dependent pronouns are of the form VC
(vowel-consonant) rather than VVC (lengthened
vowel-consonant). Also, as mentioned above, -a'yan occurs
only with object demoted forms with past time reference
as evidenced by the following:

(6) a. Ah kin--s--i--balum--en
masc V-caus-DPM--N---Dpr
die jaguar-1sg
I am a jaguar killer.

b. *(Ah) kin--s--i--balum--a'yan--en.
(masc) V-caus-DPM--N---part-Dpr
die jaguar 1sg

Whether or not an agentive marker is present, -a'yan
cannot appear in object-demoted forms with present time
reference. Verb forms with -a'yan need not indicate
habitual action but only that a particular state existed.

4.3.1.3. Object Denotation: The Perfective

It was noted above that in some of the object-demoted forms in the completive there may be an added semantic feature of perfectivity. Perfectivity may also be marked morphologically by the suffix -m- (allomorph -ım- with causative verbs) in full transitive verbs as well as object demoted forms. The paradigm of perfectives for full transitive verbs in the three major classes is as follows (compare with the completive paradigm in 4.3.).

(1) In--kin--s--ım--ah a'--k'ek'en--eh,
Dpr--V-caus-perf-DPM det----N----top
1sg--die  the--pig

I have killed the pig.

(2) In--han--m--ah a'--bik'--eh,
Dpr--V-perf-DPM det--N----top
1sg--eat  the meat

I have eaten the meat.

(3) In--wil--m--ah a'--k'ek'en--eh,
Dpr--V-perf-DPM det----N----top
1sg--see  the--pig

I have seen the pig.

In fully transitive perfectives, there may be a specified object (in the examples above, the object is specified by the determiner and topic marker) and the object may be moved from post-verbal position as in the following example.
As for the pig, I have killed it.

In these examples, the agent is marked by Set A pronouns, prefixed to the verb, and the DPM appears as a suffix. In these respects, the perfectives are like other transitive verbs in the completive.

Aspect marking, however, is quite different from the completive, and unlike any aspect marking so far considered. Transitive verbs in all other aspects (and intransitives as well in the non-completive aspects) require an aspectual prefix (e.g., the completive t-). As evidenced in the examples above, no aspectual prefix is required in the perfective. Rather, the -m- affix appears suffixed to the root in all verb classes except the causatives, where it follows the causative -s- marker. In the class -t- transitives, the perfective -m- replaces the -t- and there is no loss in transitivity (2). It appears that the perfective affix may thus mark transitivity as well as aspect.

In the object-demoted forms, the perfective is like the completive in most respects.

(5) a. Kin----s----im----ah----n----ah----een.
  v-caus-perf---DPM-detr-dist---Dpr
die  past---1sg

I have butchered.
b. (ʔah) kin--s--im--ah-k'ek'en--n--ah--een.
   (masc) V-caus-perf-DPM---M---detr-dist-Dpr
   die pig past-1sg
   I have been a pig butcher.

   (6) a. Han--m--ah---n---ah---een.
       V-perf-DPM-detr-dist-Dpr
       eat past-1sg
       I have eaten.

   b. (ʔah) han--m--ah--bik'--n--ah--een.
       (masc) V-perf-DPM--M--detr-dist-Dpr
       eat meat past-1sg
       I have been a meat eater.

   (7) a. Il--m--ah--n---ah---een.
       V-perf-DPM-detr-dist-Dpr
       see past-1sg
       I have seen.

   b. (ʔah) il--m--ah--k'ek'en--n--ah--een.
       (masc) V-perf-DPM----M---detr-dist-Dpr
       see pig past-1sg
       I have been a pig watchman.

In the cases of object deletion, (5a), (6a), 7a),
Set B dependent pronouns appear suffixed to the verb,
just as in the completive aspect. Also, as in the
completive aspect, the detransitive affix -n- and the
suffixed distal marker -ah- appear. Unlike the
completive aspect, the DPM always appears in object
demoted forms following the perfective marker -m-, which,
as in fully transitive perfective verbs, is suffixed to
the verb stem. For causative verbs, the only
morphological change between the completive and the
perfective is the addition of the perfective -im- affix
(compare (5a) above with 4.3.1.2.(1a)) but for -t-
transitives and basic transitives the DPM appears in the perfective following the perfective marker but not in the completive (compare (6a) and (7a) above with 4.3.1.2.(2a) and (3a) respectively). Even with object deletion, these perfective verbs evidence additional residual transitivity with the -m-ah affixes.

Object-incorporated forms in the perfective follow an analogous pattern. The -m-ah affixes always follow the stem, preceding the incorporated noun. The distal marker also precedes the incorporated noun in the completive except for the class of basic transitives (compare (7b) above and 4.3.1.2.(3b)). The perfective forms are virtually identical in other respects to the completive forms, except of course for the presence of the perfective marker. One difference is the acceptability of the agentive markers prefixed to the verb. While they may optionally occur in the completive, in the perfective they appear to be less acceptable, though not always judged as absolutely ungrammatical.

4.3.1.3.1. Stativization with -a'an

It has been mentioned that cross-linguistically perfective forms are often P oriented (Comrie 1981) to the extent that the verb may function semantically as a modifier of the patient and the change in state of the patient is salient. P orientation is evident in certain perfective forms in Itza with the passive participle -a'an, where the dependent pronoun agrees with the
patient or there is some ambiguity whether it refers to the agent or patient. In object-incorporated forms, however, the dependent pronoun always refers to the semantic agent, which has become the subject of an intransitive verb. It appears that the system is in a state of change or flux with two markers (-m- and -a'an, the latter having passive origins which have become obscured) serving similar functions. In some cases with -m-ah-, P orientation is prominent as may be seen in the following:

(7) a. Kin--s--im--ah--n--ah--a'an tumen a'-ayim-eh.
   V-caus-perf-DPM-detr-dist-part prep det--N--top
die
   by the crocodile

   It has been killed by the crocodile.

b. Han--m--ah--n--ah--a'an tumen a'--huh--eh.
   V-perf-DPM-detr-dist-part prep det--N--top
eat
   by the iguana

   It has been eaten by the iguana.

c. Bo'ol--m--ah--a'an--en tumen a'--ts'ul--eh.
   V-perf-DPM--part-1sg prep det--N----top
pay
   by the rich man

   I have been paid by the rich man.

(8) a. Il--m--ah--a'an--en.
   V-perf-DPM-part-1Dpr
see
   1sg

   I have been seen, or I have been a watchman.

b. Kin--s--im--ah--n--ah--a'an.
   V-caus-perf-DPM-detr-dist-part
die

   He has been a butcher, or ??He has been killed.
c. Han--m--ah--n--ah--a'än--en.
    V-perf-DPM-detr-dist-part-Dpr
eat 1sg
I have eaten, or ??I have been eaten.

(9) a. Kin--s--im--ah--k'ek'en--n--ah--a'än--en.
    V-caus-perf-DPM--N--detr-dist-part-Dpr
die pig 1sg
I have been a pig butcher.

b. Han--m--ah--b'k'--n--ah--a'än--en.
    V-perf-DPM--N--detr-dist-part-Dpr
eat meat 1sg
I have been a meat eater.

c. Uy--m--ah--k'ay--n--ah--a'än--en.
    V-perf-DPM--N--detr-dist-part-Dpr
listen song 1sg
I have listened to songs.

In (7) above, are examples where the dependent
pronoun agrees with the patient and the agent is present,
in an oblique relation to the verb. Due to the presence
of the agent, there is no possibility of ambiguity as to
which argument is in agreement with the verb. In
contrast, in the object incorporated forms in (9) the
dependent pronoun is unambiguously referring to the
semantic agent and functioning as the subject of an
intransitive verb. In (8), however, where the agent is
not present in an oblique relation to the verb, ambiguity
arises as to whether the dependent pronoun refers to an
Agent or a Patient and lexical semantics influences the
interpretation. In (8b) and (8c), for example, the
influence of lexical semantics results in a tendency to
interpret the dependent pronoun as an Agent, while this
is not the case in (8a). We thus have a mixed system prone to ambiguity and thus highly dependent on discourse context for interpretation.\textsuperscript{20}

The discourse functions of object demotion have been mentioned only in passing, and are now examined in more detail.

4.3.1.4. Discourse Functions of Object Demotion

I have suggested that there is a continuum of object demotion, which in turn suggests that discourse functions may vary according to the level of the demotion. A first level of demotion, which has been mentioned, is the deletion of the object while retaining full transitivity marking on the verb. This might also be considered as a case of zero anaphora.

\[(1)\] Te' wa'an hun tu noh keeh--eh ka' 
loc  V/part num class adj  N---top conj  
there stand  one anim big  deer  
and 

t--in--ts'\textsuperscript{on}--ah--(0).
asp-Dpr---V---DPM---(Dpr)
com-1sg-shoot  \(\text{(3)}\)

There was a big deer and I shot it.

In the example above, there is no marker of the object of the verb but specific information regarding the object is fully recoverable. The patient was the deer just mentioned.\textsuperscript{21} Zero anaphora for third person objects serves the same function which anaphoric pronouns generally do. The object is old information and may have any level of specificity but is omitted to avoid
unnecessary redundancy. The verb in these cases is marked as fully transitive and a specified NP may be grammatically inserted, although it might seem overly repetitious. While the object loses some salience due to its deletion, the verb is transitive and a specific object NP may be understood.

The cases outlined in the paradigms of object demotion presented above are distinct morphologically and functionally from the simple case of zero anaphora. In the paradigms of object demotion the object NP cannot be specified and no specific reference is ever implied. These forms are used when the action itself and the semantic agent are highlighted and the specificity of the P noun is irrelevant.

With future time reference the non-specific nature of the object may be due in part to the speaker's (or actor's) lack of awareness about particular information regarding the object or the irrelevance of such information.

(1) U ka'ah ti kin--s--i---balum.
   Dpr V sub V-caus-DPM---N
     3 go to die jaguar

   He is going jaguar hunting.

(2) T--in--t'--in---ik--ech ti huch'---ixi'im.
   asp-Dpr---V---PM--Dpr sub V------N
   dur-1sg-call 2sg to grind----corn

   I am calling you to grind corn.

(3) Ah Hoseh--eh bin--ih ti ts'--on i ti beh--eh
   masc PM---top V--Dpr sub V conj prep N--top
     go---3 to shoot and on way
Josef went hunting and on the way he heard the report of a bullet.

(4) Ma' a bel ti t'an; a'-lah keeh.

Don't start talking; this is a deer.

In the examples above, the speaker (or actor) may have no knowledge of particular patients, but of equal importance is that specific information regarding the patient even if known is not communicated. It is the action and its agent, not particular patients, that the speaker marks in his communication. In each of the examples above, the object-demoted form follows the subordinate marker ti, which appears before intransitive subordinate verbs. In these expressions, the object of the action may be expressed at the generic level (1)-(2) to indicate a type of object, but no individuation of the object is marked. In (3) and (4) the further object demotion of deletion is evident, in which cases an object is implicit but not marked even at the generic level.

These object demotions may serve slightly different purposes, but always mark the object as being below its status as an independent argument of the verb. It may be either that the speaker has no knowledge of a particular object or class of objects, or that regardless of the speaker's knowledge, the identity of the object is irrelevant. In (2) the speaker likely knows something
about the corn he is calling the hearer to grind, but it is not particulars about the object but rather the call to action which he communicates. In (4) it is the action regardless of the object which the speaker admonishes. In all cases, specificity of the object is irrelevant to the speaker's communicative intent.

Indefiniteness of objects is quite natural in cases of subordination with future time reference where the speaker has no particular object in mind, and object demotion is frequent in such cases. Nevertheless, it is clear that indefiniteness of the object is not necessarily a result of a lack of the speaker's knowledge, nor is it necessarily related to irrealis features associated with the subjunctive.

Object demotion with the associated loss of specificity may also occur in non-subordinate clauses where the function is not a matter of reflecting the speaker's lack of knowledge of the patient's specificity, but rather, reflects the lack of importance attributed to such information. Consider the following non-completive examples:

(5) K(il)—in—kin—s—i—k'ek'en—eh, hach
adv—Dpr—V-caus—DPM—W—scope adv
when—1sg-die pig very

k—in—wi'ih—tal,
as—Dpr—V—intr
inc—1sg—hunger

When I butcher pigs I get very hungry.
(6) Winik k--u--kin--s--i--balum.
           W asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM--N
    man inc-3--die jaguar
    Man kills jaguars.

(7) Tan--in--min--k'ek'en tumen tan--in--kin--s--ah.
    asp-Dpr---V------N conj asp--Dpr--V-caus-DPM
    dur-1sg--buy----pig because dur--1sg-die
    I am pig buying because I am butchering.

(8) Ma'ta'aax in--kin--s--ah.
    neg-adv Dpr---V-caus-DPM
    never 1sg--die
    I never have butchered.

(9) Ma' pat--al in--bel.
    yan--in--kin--s--ah
    neg asp-intr Dpr-V asp--Dpr--V-caus-DPM
    not abil 1sg-go oblig-1sg-die
    tumen in--ten--eh ah kin--s--ah--en.
    conj Ipr-top masc V-caus-DPM-Dpr
    because 1sg die 1sg
    I can't go, I have to butcher because I am a butcher (by profession).

In (5) and (6) the object is present in nominal form but has no specificity, even less than indefinite NPs. With indefinite marking, the speaker may mark number and signal the introduction of new information about which he wishes to elaborate. In these examples, the speaker is not referring to an object about which he intends to elaborate, but to a class of objects. The emphasis is on the activity, which the object noun may further specify. In (5) one might assume that the speaker is fond of pork since pig butchering is specifically mentioned. In (6), which is a subject focus construction, the scope of the assertion is certainly limited by the inclusion of the object. The object serves to delimit the verb in these
Similarly, in (7) the object noun *k'eke^n en *pig* narrows the context of the verb. The verb in the coordinate clause (*tan-in-kin-s-ah*), however, is not limited in this way. With the aid of cultural assumptions one might assume that the speaker is butchering food animals or pigs in particular, but no object type is marked linguistically. In (8) the verb is maximally general and no particular type of object is indicated. In (9) object deletion according to both the intransitive and the stative paradigms is evidenced and the difference is functionally significant. In the first instance, the verb with the obligative aspect marker *yan* communicates the speaker's intention of butchering in the near future, though not specifying the object of the activity. The stativized form of the verb that follows, marked by the masculine prefix *ah*, neither indicates a particular type of object nor a particular instance of the activity. The verb has lost all independence of the agent and serves simply to modify the agent as in appositive structures. It marks the agent as an habitual participant in the activity without marking particular instances of the activity or its patients. Stativized transitive verbs may, of course, include objects as indicated above. Even with objects, however, they continue to mark an habitual activity of the agent.
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(10) Ma' a'-winik--he'--la' ah ok--ol--eh.
    neg det--N---dem-prox masc V--intr-top
    rob
    Layti' a'-he'--lo' a'--k--u--yok--ol--eh.
    Ipr det--dem-dist det-asp-Dpr-V--intr-top
    3sg inc-3--rob

This man is not the thief. It's that man who steals.

(11) A. Ah Juan bin k--u--kin--s--ik mak,
    masc PN report asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM W
    inc-3--die person
    They say Juan kills people.
    B. Max ah kin--s--ah--eh?
    inter masc V-caus-DPM-top/rel
    who die
    Who is the murderer?
    A. A'-winik a'-lo'--eh ah kin--s--i--mak.
    det--N det-dist-top masc V-caus-DPM-W
    the--man die person
    That man is the murderer. (pointing)

(12) A'-winik, ah ok--ol--kax--eh, t--u--kin--s--ah
    det--N masc V-intr--N--top asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM
    the--man rob-(DPM)-chicken com-3--die
    a'-balum--eh.
    det--N--top
    the-jaguar

The man, the chicken thief, killed the jaguar.

(13) A'-winik--eh k--u--kin--s--ik a'-balum,
    det--N--top asp-Dpr V-caus-PM det--N
    the--man inc-3--die the-jaguar
    ah han--t(1)--kax--eh.
    masc V-intr/(DPM)-N--top
    eat chicken

The man kills the jaguar, the chicken eater.

(14) A. Ah Juan, ko'on ti han--al t--in--wet--el.
    masc PN V/imp sub V-intr loc-Ppr-loc-nom
    come to eat 1sg-with
    Juan, come eat with me.
I'm full. I just finished eating with Jose.

The examples above of stativized verbs evidence their function to mark an actor's habitual activity. In (10) the stative ah okoleh 'the thief' is in an appositional relationship to the NP that precedes it and is later paraphrased in verbal form in a relative clause (a'k-u-yok-ol-eh). In (11) the same verb kin-s 'to kill' appears in three forms, the latter two stativized. It appears first (11A) in a fully transitive form with a nominal object when the subject and VP are introduced. Speaker B's question is in the form of subject contrastive focus and the object is completely demoted in the stativized verbal form. Speaker A, in his response, follows B's lead in highlighting the agent, but includes the patient (mak 'person') in an object-demoted stativized verb form. Again, the stativized forms are in appositional and not direct verb agreement relations to the NPs that precede them.

In (12) and (13) the stativized forms with patient nouns also appear in appositional relationships to preceding NPs and serve to provide additional information about them as either subject (12) or object (13). Their function is basically one of modifying another NP whose referent is semantically an agent of the stativized verb.
form. Specification of the patient, while it adds information, is subordinated to the major function of highlighting the agent and the verb. The disambiguating information encoded in the stativized forms is contextualizing old information in these cases.

(14) is an example of a pure stative form (na'ah-en 'I am full') not marked by the agentive prefix characteristic of the stativized verb forms. The stative, like the stativized verbs described above, modifies its subject in an attributive relationship. There is no possibility of object relations in pure statives. Unlike many stativized verbs, pure stative forms have no necessary implication of an habitual action or state as is evident in (14).

In the completive aspect and the perfective, differences between intransitivization and stativization are largely neutralized, but may appear in cases of object incorporation and when the participle -a'ah appears.

(15) Ix Maria k'ay-n-ah-ih i uy-b-ih men ah Juan, fem PN V-detr-dist-Dpr conj V-pas-Dpr prep masc PN sing past-3 and hear 3 by Maria sang and was heard by Juan.

(16) Si-b-i(h) ten han-al i han-al-n-ah-een, V-pas-Dpr Ipr N-nom conj V-intr-detr-dist-Dpr give 3 1sg food and eat past-1sg Food was given to me and I ate.

(17) U ts'o('o)k a'-ba'al-che', ka' Ppr N det----CN adv 3 last the--animal when
The last animal, when I was butchering (I was a butcher), I bought dearly.

(19) Ix ch'up--eh (ix) kin--s--i--balum--n--ah--ih. fem N-top (fem) V-caus-DPM---N-detr-dist-Dpr
        die jaguar past-3

The woman killed jaguars (I was a jaguar killer).

(19) A. In-tech-eh ma' a--woh--el min--k'ek'en. emp--Ipr-top neg Dpr--V-intr V N
        2sg not 2-know buy pig

Ma' pat--al a--na't--ik boon pat--al
        neg asp-intr Dpr-V----PM quant asp-intr
        not abil 2--know abil

u-ts'--ik hun tuul k'ek'en. Dpr-V----PM num class N
        3--give one anim pig

You don't know pig buying. You can't know how much a pig is worth.

B. In-ten-eh in--woh--el mas ke in-tech-eh emp--Ipr-top Dpr-V-intr adv comp emp--Ipr-top
        1sg 1sg-know more than 2sg

tumen in-ten-eh kin--s--i-k'ek'en-n--ah--a'an-en. conj Ipr-top V-caus-DPM---N-detr-dist-part-Dpr
        because 1sg die pig past 1sg

I know more than you do because I have been a pig butcher.

As in the non-completive aspects, a primary function of these object demoted forms is to highlight the action and its actor. Examples (15)-(17), cases of object deletion, do not indicate a difference between habitual and non-habitual action through morphology, unlike the non-completive aspects. The action marked by these forms may be interpreted as either, according to their discourse context. Habitual action, past states, or
occupations may be marked morphosyntactically by the participle -a¿an as in (19B). Even when the contrast of habitual and non-habitual action is neutralized, the action itself is always highlighted. In (15) it is Maria singing and not the song she sang that is highlighted. Similarly in (16), it is the subject's action of eating and not the object that is highlighted, although the object's referent is implicit as it was mentioned in the preceding clause.

While the object demoted forms in (15) and (16) do not indicate habitual action, the verb form kin-a±-a±-oon in (17) may, though no agentive prefix is permitted. In contrast, in object-incorporated forms such as (18) the presence of the agentive marker (in this case the feminine ix) marks habitual action. Even without the agentive marker, however, an habitual interpretation is possible as a natural consequence of the object's lack of specificity and the absence of adverbial time reference (e.g., ho±leh-ih 'yesterday').

4.3.2. Agent Demotion

It was noted above (4.3,) that transitivity may be lowered by the demotion of either of the verb's main arguments (A or P). Object (P) demotion has been considered above with reference to an accompanying loss of transitivity. As with object demotion, there are several degrees of agent demotion possible, ranging from anaphora in which the agent noun or independent pronoun
does not appear but an agent dependent pronominal marker remains, without a notable loss in transitivity, to passives in which the agent neither occurs nor is recoverable and the verb is marked intransitively. A major discourse function of passives is to highlight the patient and the verb while backgrounding the agent.

In fully transitive sentences, whether or not there is an independent agent noun, the agent is obligatorily marked by a Set A dependent pronoun prefixed to the verb. If an agent noun or independent pronoun is not present, the dependent pronoun still marks it anaphorically, in which case it is shared (old) information with the anaphoric pronominalization serving to reduce redundancy.

(1) Layti'-oo' hach ki' u yool--oo' tumen yaab
   Ipr--3pl adv adj Ppr N--3pl conj adj
   3 very good 3 spirit because many

   ch'iich' t--u--yil--ah.
   N asp-Dpr-V--DPM
   bird com-3--see

They were very happy because they saw many birds.

(2) A'-ba'al-che' tun tal tulakal t--u haal ha'.
    det----CN asp/Dpr V quant prep-Ppr W W
    the-animal dur/3 come all on-3 shore lake

    T--u--hum u yawat i k--u--ya'al--ik ti u
    asp-Dpr-V Ppr N conj asp-Dpr-V----PM prep Ppr
    dur-3-sound 3 roar and inc-3--say to 3

    suku'un--eh:...
    N----top
    older brother

The animal was coming all along the shore of the lake. Its roar was sounding and he said to his older brother:...
In the examples above, the agent's referents are fully recoverable and may be grammatically inserted and the verbs are marked as fully transitive. The deletion of the agent NP backgrounds the agent as redundant information but does not demote it from subject status.

4.3.2.1. The Canonical Passive

In contrast to transitive sentences, with or without a nominal agent, the agent may be morphosyntactically demoted from subject status in passives. In passives, the patient is promoted to subject status and the verb receives intransitive rather than transitive marking in addition to a passive marker. The agent may be present in an oblique relationship to the verb or deleted.

A. Non-completive Aspects:

(1) Tantoh--u--kin--s--ib--il.
    asp-Dpr--V-caus-pas-intr
    immed--3--die

    It was just killed.
In town I am being expected by them.

A jaguar was seen by a man.

B. Completive Aspect:

A jaguar was killed.

On the hill, the jaguar was seen by the man.

As is evident in the examples above, canonical passives are morphosyntactically much like other intransitive verbs. The passive morpheme -b- appears suffixed to the verb root in -t- transitives and basic transitives (2)-(3); (5)-(6), and after the causative -s- marker the allomorph -±b- appears (1), (4). Formally, the verb forms are identical to simple intransitives in other respects. The subject is marked by a Set A dependent pronoun and the verb receives the typical -VI intransitive suffix. Semantically, however, the
subject-verb relationship is quite different from basic intransitives. The subject of the verb is semantically a patient (P), and the agent (A), if present, is in an oblique relationship to the verb following the preposition (tu)men 'by'.

In the completive, (1)-(3), the canonical passives also follow the pattern of intransitive verbs, with Set B pronouns marking verb agreement. The passive marker has the same distribution as in the non-completive aspects: the -ib- allomorph follows the causative suffix and the -b- allomorph occurs elsewhere. Regardless of aspect, in canonical passives the verb is marked as intransitive and its subject is its semantic patient. The agent, if present, is in an oblique relationship to the verb. The function of passives to highlight their patients while backgrounding their agents is more clearly seen in their discourse contexts:

(7) A. Ok--s--ib--ih ti chem a'--k'ek'en--eh?
    V-caus-pas-Dpr loc N det---W-----top
    enter 3 in canoe the--pig

    Was the pig put in a canoe?

    B. Ha', ti che' k'ix--b--ih.
    neg loc W V--pas--Dpr
    no to tree tie 3

    No, it was tied to a tree.

(8) A. Ix ch'up--eh t--u--yil--ah a'--winik
    fem N---top asp-Dpr V--DPm det---W
    woman com-3--see the--man
The woman saw the man seated there.

**B. Ma', a'--winik--he'--lo' a'--il--b--ih**

neg det--N----dem-dist det-V--pas-Dpr

no the--man see 3

men ix ch'up--eh,

prep fem W--rel

by woman

No, that man is the one who was seen by the woman.

**(9) A. Tan--u--yaal--b--il ke ah Juan--eh hach sakan,**

asp-Dpr--V-pas--intr sub masc PN--top adv adj
dur--3--say that very lazy

It's being said that Juan is a real bum.

**B. Layti' a'--winik--he'--lo'--eh in--k'a'ool**

Ipr det--N----dem-dist-top Dpr--V

3 the--man Isg-know

hach t'a'ah,

adv adj

very industrious

That man, I know is a hard worker.

**(10) Bis--ib--een t--u meyah hun tuul ts'ul i**

V/caus-pas-Dpr loc-Ppr N num class N conj
go 1sg to-3 work one anim rich man and

a'--meyah ts'a--b--i(h) ten--eh chen ah bo'ol-en,

det--N V--pas--Dpr Ipr-rel adv masc V--Dpr

the-work give 3 Isg only pay-1sg

I was taken to a job for a rich man and the work I was given was only as paymaster.

**(11) A'--beh--he'--lah k--u--bel tu'ux k--u--muk--b--ul**

det--N----dem-prox asp-Dpr-V rel asp-Dpr-V-pas-intr

the-way inc-3--go where inc-3-bury

a'--kim--en--oo'--eh.

det--V--nom--pl--rel

the-die

This road goes where the dead are buried. (cemetery)
(12) Mia kim--ih, pero in--ten--eh, k--u--yal--b--i(1) 
adv V--Dpr conj emp-Ipr-top asp-Dpr-V-pas--intr 
maybe die--3 but 1sg inc-3--say 
ten--eh ke a'--kim--en--oo'--eh, ma' nich'--a'an 
Ipr-top sub det--V--nom--pl--top neg V--part 
1sg that the-die not bare

u koh--oo'.
Ppr-M--pl
3 tooth

Maybe he died, but me, I am told that the dead do not 
bare their teeth. (from a folktale)

(13) Bin--oo' naach wa'ye' ti hun p'e pay u--k'aba 
V--Dpr adv loc loc num class M Dpr--V 
go--3pl far here to one inam beach 3--name 

Hobon Pich. U--k'aba--he'--lo' ts'a--b--i(h) 
Ppr--M--dem-dist V--pas--Dpr 3--name give 3

ti'i(h) hach uch--ih.
Ipr adv adv-Dpr
3 very before-3

They went far from here to a beach called Hobon Pich. 
Its name was given to it long ago.

The reasons for agent demotion in the examples above
vary, reflecting such factors as the speaker's intention

to make the patient more prominent, ignorance of the
identity of the agent, or judgement that information
regarding the agent is irrelevant. In (7), the focus of
the communication is the semantic patient (k'ek'ien).
Information regarding the agent, if known, is irrelevant
and no agent is marked in even an oblique relationship.
In (8) there is a shift of emphasis from agent to
patient. Speaker A makes an assertion in a relatively
unmarked fashion with a simple transitive sentence.
Speaker B, however, shifts the emphasis to the patient,
which is focused contrastively and the subject of the verb in the relative clause, while the agent is demoted to an oblique relationship to the verb.

In (9) the agents of the gossip that Juan is lazy are irrelevant and not specified but the gossip about Juan is important, accounting for the passive formation of Speaker A and Speaker B's denial. Similarly, in (10) the agent is not specified by the speaker (who as the patient, is undoubtedly aware of the agent's identity) because the agent is not pertinent to the message he wishes to communicate, while the patient and indirect object (the speaker) are important.

In (11)-(13) the agents are deleted as well, in these cases due to the speakers' lack of knowledge concerning agents, or to judgements that information concerning the agents is superfluous. In (11), for example, the salient semantic feature of a cemetery marked by the speaker is that people are buried there and the agents of the burials are irrelevant. General socio-cultural knowledge is often conveyed in passives with non-specific agents deleted as in (12) and (13).

4.3.2.2. The Passive Participle -a'an.

Just as with object (P) demotion, there is a nominalization strategy for agent or actor demotion, that utilizes the passive participial marker -a'an. The agent demoted (passive) stativized verbs never allow the agentive prefixes ah (masculine) and ix (feminine) but
like other statives they are always marked by Set 3 pronouns. Verb agreement is thus absolutive for the -a'an forms. The -a'an affix, in addition to marking passives, marks stativized forms (as seen in 4.3.1.2.1. and 4.3.1.3.1.). The dependent pronoun refers either to the semantic patient (for passives of transitive verbs) or to the subject of an intransitive verb. By and large, the -a'an forms have a passive flavor as past participles do in general.\(^2\) Time reference is generally context dependent for the -a'an forms and not marked morphologically.

4.3.2.2.1. **Intransitive Verbs with -a'an**

As participial forms, verb roots with the -a'an marker often function as modifiers of preceding nouns, losing much of their kinetic, verbal nature. Consider the following examples with intransitive roots:

(1) A'-mak--oo' kih--a'an--oo' nats'--i'ih--eh, te' det--N--3pl V--part-Dpr prep--loc--rel loc the-man live 3pl near--dist

k--u--ch'--ik--oo' wal u che'--il.

asp-Dpr-V--PM-3pl adv Ppr N--pos inc-3-take perhaps 3 wood

The man living near there, it's from that place, I believe they take the wood.

(2) ...yan--ah--ih hun tuul winik kih--a'an wa'ye'
cop-dist-Dpr num class N V--part loc 3 one num man live here
There was a man living here and he really knew hunting.

(3) A'-ka' t--in wil--ah--eh, te' chil--a'an
det-adv asp-Dpr V--DPR-rel loc V--part
when com-1sg-see there lie

hun tuul keeh--i'ih,
num class W----scope
one anim deer

Then I saw it, there was lying a deer.

(4) In-to'on--eh nak'-a'an--o'on t--u ni' a'-wits-eh.
emp-Ipr-top V----part-Dpr loc-Ppr W det-W--top
1pl climb 1pl to-3 top the-hill

As for us, we were on top of the hill.

(5) A. Hoseh, in-ten--eh bin--een in--wil--a'
PN emp-Ipr-top V----Dpr Dpr--V--SPM
1sg go---1sg 1sg-see

a'--k'o--a'an--eh.
det--V----part-top
the-sick

Jose, I went to see the sick one.

B. I bix a--wil--ik--il? Hes'-u--sas-tal kux-a'an-eh?
conj inter Dpr-V--PM-pos asp-Dpr--V--intr V--part-scope
and how 2-see assur-3--dawn live

And how did he look to you? Will he be alive at dawn?

In the examples above, the participle -a'an is
suffixed to intransitive verb roots and the dependent Set
B pronouns agree with their subjects (S). In these
examples, time reference is not morphologically marked on
the participle but determined from discourse context, as
a comparison of examples (1) and (2) indicates. In (1)
the participle kih-a'an-oo' (living) refers to the
present or the time at which the discourse takes place.
In contrast, k'h-a'an in example (2) refers to the past, which is marked on the copula yan-ah-ih by the distal marker -ah. Future time reference might also occur as in (5). Aspect marking is never permitted on participial forms but the distal -ah marker occasionally occurs, apparently to disambiguate or emphasize past time reference.

(6) a. k'och-a'an--oo'     b. k'och-a'an-ah-oo'
    V--part-Dpr     V--part-dist-Dpr
    arrive 3pl      arrive 3pl

They have (/had) arrived. They had arrived.

(7) Ka'-ti' kin--s--ah--n--ah--een--eh, k'oh-a'an--ah--ih.
    adv V-caus-DPM-detr-dist-Dpr-scope V-part-dist-Dpr
    when die 1sg sicken 3

When I butchered, he got sick.

Passive past participles, like other statives, function more as modifiers than other verbal forms, and as such, often follow the nouns that they modify in relative clauses or appositional constructions as in (1), (2), and (4). However, the noun may follow the participle as in (3), which is a cataphoric reference, apparently for dramatic effect in this case, or the noun may be deleted when referring to shared information as in (5). As previously noted, masculine and feminine agentive markers are never permitted with verb forms marked by -a'lan.
4.3.2.2.2. **Transitive Verbs with -a'an**

Transitive verb stems with the -a'an suffix are similar to intransitives in most ways but are different in the important respect that dependent pronoun agreement is with their semantic patients (P). As mentioned above, the verb-agreement with the subjects of intransitives (S) or patients of transitives (P) is characteristic of an ergative system. Consider the following examples in which -a'an is suffixed to transitive stems:

1. **A'—winik t—u—yil—ah a'—tsimin kon—a'an—eh.**
   
   det---N asp-Dpr-V--DPM det---N V--part-rel
   the-man com-3--see the--horse sell

   The man saw the horse that had been sold.

2. **kin—s—zh—a'an men a'—winik—eh.**
   
   V-caus-dist-part prep det---N---top
die by the--man

   It has been killed by the man.

3. **A'—nah—he'—lah toh men—a'an he—bix in—tia'al—eh.**
   
   det---N---dem-prox adv V---part dem-adv Ppr-pos-scope
   house well make like 1sg-own

   This house is well made like my own.

4. **Men—t—zh—eh, k'ix—a'an u yok a'—keeh**
   
   adv V---part Ppr N det--N
   thus tie 3 hoof the-deer

   yok a'—k'aak'—eh,...
   prep det---N---scope
   over the-fire

   For that reason, when the foot of the deer is tied over the fire.

5. **A. Tan—in—kix—t—ik in baat. Ma' tan—u—chikpaal.**
   
   asp-Dpr--V-tran-PM Ppr N neg asp-Dpr----V
dur-1sg-seek 1sg ax dur--3--appear

   I'm looking for my ax. It's not turning up.
B. Ba'ax k--in--wil--ik--eh, pach nah pul--a'an.
inter asp-Dpr--V---PM-scope prep N V---part
what inc-1sg-see behind house throw

When I saw it it was thrown behind the house.

In the examples above, as with intransitive verbs, the participial marker a'an follows the stem and has Set B pronoun suffixes. The masculine and feminine markers, ah and ix respectively, do not appear and these forms often function as nominal modifiers. A state, not an action, is communicated and time reference is context dependent or neutral, not marked morphologically on the participial verb form. For causative verbs, the -s-marker is present, but for other verb classes (the -t-transitives as in (3) and (4) and the basic transitives as in (1) and (5)), -a'an is directly suffixed to the root. (1) is a typical example of the passive participle following the noun it modifies in a relative clause. (2) is an unusual example in that the agent is present in an oblique relationship to the verb, as with other passives. Ordinarily, with past participles of transitive verbs, there is a strong patient orientation corresponding to their modifying function and the semantic agents do not occur at all. In (3), men-a'an is in an appositional relationship to the preceding NP which it modifies. In (4) the participle precedes the noun it modifies to mark contrastive focus (it is only when the deer hoofs are tied over the fire that the deer hunter's magic is effective). In (5) the participle follows a
prepositional phrase and its referent is not present, but is understood from prior discourse.

As evidenced above, -a'an may be suffixed to either intransitive or transitive verbs and verb agreement is possible for only one argument (the S or P). In the case of transitive verbs, the occurrence of an agent NP in even an oblique relationship to the verb is unusual. Participles with the -a'an affix are low in transitivity and P oriented.

4.4. **Summary: Transitivity and Ergativity in Itza**

A large number of verb forms have been considered above with regard to transitivity and ergativity. Three major classes of ergative constructions have been noted: the subjunctive, the completive, and stative, the last two of which have been described in considerable detail.

Transitivity may be lowered by demoting either argument (A or P) of a transitive verb, which serves the discourse function of highlighting the other argument of the verb and the action of the verb itself. Two mechanisms of decreasing transitivity have been described: intransitivization and stativization. In the former, verbs with semantically transitive origins are marked morphosyntactically as intransitive. Object demotion via intransitivization in the non-completive aspects entails intransitive marking and distal patient marking. Agent demotion via intransitivization entails intransitive marking and passive marking. In the
completive aspect (and the perfective) there is a merging of intransitivization and stativization for agent and object denoted forms and ergative-absolutive case marking. Stativization processes operate to lower transitivity and are marked by ergative-absolutive agreement regardless of aspect.

In Itza it appears that ergative-absolutive verb agreement correlates with low transitive constructions. The subjunctive and related irrealis constructions with ergative-absolutive marking are clearly quite low in transitivity, as they mark an event or action which has not taken place and may not ever occur, that is, a state that does not exist. Pure statives and stativized verb forms are also clearly of low transitivity as described above. It is not so clear that ergative-absolutive marking in the completive aspect indicates decreased transitivity, but there is evidence to suggest this conclusion. Completed actions may be viewed as past states. Two features of transitive verbs in the completive aspect are common to object denoted forms in the non-completive aspects: the distal patient marker (DPM) and ergative-absolutive verb agreement. Intransitives in the completive are always marked by absolutive verb agreement, as are stativized forms regardless of aspect. This congruence of Erg-Abs verb-agreement suggests that lower transitivity is marked in the completive, and that past actions of verbs with the completive aspect are marked as past states.
1. This grammatical formalization entails a grammatical category shift from verb to aspect.

2. It is difficult to determine whether or not the morpheme hei of the assurative aspect is the same morpheme noted in Chapter 2 for demonstratives (e.g., hei' -lo' 'that'). As an aspect marker, hei' does not combine with the distal or proximal markers -lo' or -la' respectively, but the -lei' morpheme present in the full form of the assurative aspect (hei'-lei'-eh) may be related to them. Like the demonstratives and unlike (most) other aspects, the highlighting -eh marker may be suffixed. A hei' morpheme may also combine with bix 'how' unlike other aspects with the suffixed -eh marker as in the following:

(1) Ka' xi'ma--n--ah--een t-u-ka'ye'. He--bix t--in--con conj V--detr-dist-Dpr adv dem?-adv asp-Dpr and walk past-1sq again how com-1sg

bel ti xi'mal--eh, tan--in--wu'y--ik u hum u-tal...
V sub V---scope asp-Dpr---V---PM Ppr N Dpr-V
go to walk dur-1sg--hear 3 sound 3-come

And I walked again. As I was going to walk, I was hearing the sound coming.

(2) ...yaab ch'iich' k--u--yil--ik--oo'. He--bix--u--quant N asp-Dpr-V---PM--Dpr dem?-adv-Dpr many bird inc-3--see 3pl how--3

ts'on--ik--oo'--eh, he--bix--u--lub--ul
V---PM--Dpr-scope dem?-adv-Dpr---V--intr shoot 3pl how--3--fall

a'--ba'al--che'--oo'--eh, det-------CN-------pl--scope the--animal

...they saw a lot of birds. As they shot them, thus the animals fell.

He-bix may also function as a comparative with no aspectual significance.

(3) Mia u ya(a)l--oo'--eh hei'--u--hok'--ol xan adv Ppr N---pl--top asp--Dpr---V--intr adv perhaps 3 young assur-3--leave also
I think her young will grow up well too, just like their mother.

He comes like the wind.

3. Kap-ih is not considered as an aspect because a subordination marker follows it marking it as a full matrix verb of a complex sentence. It may be inflected for person and number as are other intransitive verbs.

4. There is a small class of verbs including ka'ah 'go' and leh-el 'know' that do not require aspect marking.

5. Some intransitives are reduced so that there is no overt marking of intransitivity (e.g., bel 'to go'). There is also a class of 'posturative' intransitives (Blair 1964) marked by the suffix -tal (i.e., nic-tal 'to sit').

6. The distal patient marker (DPM) in Itza Maya has the same function it has in Yucatec Maya (described by Durbin and Ojeda 1982). The DPM is a suffix on transitive verbs that marks cognitive distance of the patient to the speaker in contrast to the proximal patient marker (PM). The DPM occurs in the completive aspect and in cases of object demotion regardless of aspect as will be described in 4.3.

7. The glides w and y replace glottal stops in glottal-initial stems. The first person singular Set A dependent pronoun in may occur as in preceding labial stops or as in before velars and other nasals. The Set B third person dependent pronoun appears as -ih for intransitive verbs in the completive but as zero (0) elsewhere. The vowel in first and second person singular Set B pronouns (-en and -ech) is lengthened when they mark the subject of an intransitive verb in the completive and when they mark the object of a transitive verb in the subjunctive.

8. In the closely related dialect Yucatec Maya there is a completive aspect prefix h- for intransitive verbs.

9. In strictly morphophonemic terms, the completive must be considered as a neutral system, neither
ergative-absolutive or nominative accusative because the singular dependent pronouns of intransitive verbs differ from both the subject (agent) and object (patient) pronouns of transitive verbs. In intransitive verb agreement, the vowel is lengthened for the first and second person (see 4.1.3. (2) and (3)), and the third person is marked by the suffix -ih rather than having the zero marking which the patient dependent pronouns exhibit. The plural S dependent pronouns however are identical to the P pronouns. This difference between singular and plural may be related to the animacy hierarchy with the singular ranking above the plural and thus having finer morphosyntactic distinctions.

10. The subjunctive in Itza refers to cases of subordination where the matrix verb is a modal such as ka'it 'want', a'al 'tell', and tika' 'send' or 'order' and the subject of the subordinate verb is not equivalent to the subject of the matrix verb. The subordination marker ka' appears in front of the subordinate verb. Very similar constructions appear in Yucatec Maya (Durbin and Ojeda 1978b).

Subordinate transitive verbs are marked by Set A (ergative) pronouns for agent verb agreement, Set B (absolutive) pronouns for patient agreement and have a subordinate patient marker (SPM). Intransitive subordinate verbs are marked by an irrealis marker V_k with the vowel in harmony with the vowel in the verb root, and Set B (absolutive) pronouns mark subject verb agreement. Thus, the verb agreement system is ergative-absolutive with Set A pronouns marking the agent and Set B pronouns marking both the patient and the subject of intransitive verbs. The following are examples of the subjunctive:

(1) K-in--tika'--t--ik ka' u--ben---es---eech.
   asp-Dpr--v--tran--PM sub Dpr--v-caus/SPM-Dpr
   inc-1sg-send 3-move 2sg

   I send him to carry you.

(2) In-k'a'tih ka' u--meyah--t--eh.
   Dpr--v sub Dpr--v-tran--SPM
   1sg--want 3--work

   I want him to work it.

(3) K-in--wa'al--ik tech ka' a--kim--es.
   asp-Dpr--v--PM Ipr sub Dpr--v-caus/SPM
   inc-1sg-say 2sg 2sg-die

   I tell you to kill it.
The same paradigm of verb forms with ergative-absolutive agreement occurs in certain other irrealis constructions such as the negative perfective and admonitions as in the following:

    neg Dpr--V--tran-SPM               Neg V--irreal-Dpr
    3--eat                            2sg

He hasn't eaten it.    You haven't left.

(8) a. Biki a--xot''--o' a wok.
    admon Dpr-V--SPM Ppr M
    2--cut    2 foot

You could cut your foot.

b. Biki lub--uk--en.
    admon V--irreal-Dpr
    fall       1sg

I could fall.

11. The following are the features relevant to the Cardinal Transitivity Relationship according to Hopper and Thompson (1980):
FEATURES

A. Participants
B. Kinesis
C. Aspect
D. Punctuality
E. Volitionality
F. Affirmation
G. Mode
H. Agency
I. Affectedness of O
J. Individuation of O

HIGH TRANSITIVITY

2 or more participants, A and O
action
telic
punctual
volitional
affirmative
realis
A high in potency
0 totally affected
0 highly individuated

12. A further problem with the Hopper and Thompson (1980) hypothesis is that passives, which are generally agreed to be low in transitivity may score as highly transitive according to their criteria.

13. Some adverbials may also precede the root, e.g., lah, 'completely', and ka', a repetitive marker, as in the following example:

You (will) have to arrive again.

14. The -es allomorph of the causative appears after the transitive -t- and when it appears word finally as in the following example where the causative verb is subordinate:

I want to kill it.

15. There is some question whether the -i- marker appearing with the -t- transitives should be derived from the -al and not the DPN. Functionally, this is a moot point.

16. It is not entirely clear if the -n- marker has functions in addition to marking lowered transitivity but it appears likely that it may additionally mark present perfectivity for low transitive verbs.

17. Object demoted forms in the subjunctive are marked by the -n- detransitive affix and by an -ak irrealis suffix.
that does not harmonize with the vowel in the root, unlike basic intransitives in the subjunctive (cf. footnote 10).

(1) U-k'a'tih ka' kin--s--i--balum--n--ak--en.
    Dpr--V sub V-caus-DPM--M--detr-irreal-Dpr
    3-want die jaguar 1sg
    He wants me to kill jaguars.

(2) U--k'a'tih ka' bo'ol--n--ak---ech.
    Dpr--V sub V--detr-irreal-Dpr
    3-want pay 2sg
    He wants you to pay.

(3) T--u--tikai--t--ah ah Paablo ka' ok--ol--n--ak.
    asp-Dpr--V--tran-DPM masc PN sub V-DPM-detr-irreal
    com-3--send steal
    He sent Pablo to rob.

18. It is unclear why the agentive prefixes fail to appear in the cases of object deletion in the completive. A possible explanation is that the verbs have lost transitivity to the point where agentive marking is superfluous. Object incorporated forms, which are higher in transitivity, do permit the agentives.

19. Generally no aspectual prefix appears but a t- may. This is presumably on analogy with the completive transitives.

20. Verb class/semantics appear to be affecting these forms in a fashion not entirely understood. For certain verbs the -n-ah affixes are not permissible in conjunction with -m-ah. Contrast the following with (7c) and (8a) respectively.

    *Bo'ol--m--ah--n--ah--a'an--en.
    V-perf-DPM-detr-dist-part-Dpr
    pay 1sg

    *Il--m--ah--n--ah--a'an--en.
    V-perf-DPM-detr-dist-part-Dpr
    see 1sg

21. The fact that the third person object is marked by zero anaphora while the first and second persons are
marked pronomially may be evidence of the animacy hierarchy and the fact that objects are most often third person. It also indicates a difference in the marking of deixis and anaphora.

22. *Ok-o1* 'to steal' is a member of a small verb class characterized by an -(V)1 suffix that remains in transitive and intransitive forms. In the non-completive aspects, the -(V)1 suffix appears in the intransitive but is reduced to -1- in transitives with the patient marker suffixed (*k-u-yok-o1 'he steals; k-u-yok-1-ik 'he steals it'). In the completive aspect, the -(V)1 suffix appears with intransitive forms followed by the -n-ah markers and for transitives the -1- affix appears followed by the DPM (*ok-o1-n-ah-een 'I stole'; t-in-wok-1-ah 'I stole it'). It is very similar in verbal morphology to the -t- transitives described above (4.3.), but the -(V)1 affix is obligatory in all cases and is not replaced by the -t- affix in full transitives.

23. Contrast example (15) with the following sentence where it is the object that is highlighted.

\[
\text{Ü k'ay \text{ix} \text{Maria} uy--b--ih \text{men ah Juan.}}\]
\[
Ppr \text{ Féem PM V-pass-Dpr prep masc PM}
\]
\[
3 \text{ song hear 3 by}
\]

The song of Maria was heard by Juan.

24. The presence of the object in the preceding clause may account for the presence of the object demoted form rather than the simple intransitive *han-een* 'I ate', in which not even implicitness of an object is marked. The following example indicates another possible semantic difference between object demoted and basic intransitive forms of the verb class (transitivity neutral) to which *han* 'eat' belongs.

\[
\text{.A'--ka' tal--0'on t--in meyah--eh, in wits--oo'--eh}
\]
\[
det-adv V----Dpr loc-Ppr N--scope Ppr W----pl--top
\]
\[
\text{ when come-1pl to--1sg work 1sg y.bro}
\]

\[
\text{han--al--n--ah--oo'}.\]
\[
V--intr:detr-dist-3pl
\]
\[
eat-(DPM)
\]

When I went to my work, my younger brothers had already eaten.

In this example, perfectivity is a salient feature beyond that of ordinary completive verbs, which simply mark past time reference.
25. Synchronically it appears that -a'an is a single morpheme in Itza. However, it is possible that historically it developed from at least two morphemes, one being a glottal stop infixed intervocally (WV or a'a) that served as a passive marker and the other being a perfective marker, (a)n. In the closely related dialect of Yucatec Maya, two morphemes occur (Blair 1964).
5. SCOPE

The highlighting and backgrounding of information is reflected in NP specificity, verbal morphosyntax, and word order in all types of sentences; simple and complex; affirmative, negative, interrogative and imperative. Such processes as interrogation and negation, however, are additionally marked to contrast with affirmative declarative sentences. In addition to the marking of such sentence types as interrogative or negative, the scope of the question or negation may also be marked. Scope refers to the delimitation of the boundaries of constituents being questioned, negated, etc.

In the discussion of word order and NP specificity it was pointed out that there is an interaction between the two that results in the marking of contrastive new information. The highlighting of new information is also a pronounced feature of interrogation and negation. While the interrelationship of given and new information is crucial in any discourse, it is the focus of communication in both interrogatives and negatives. In questioning, the speaker requests that he be provided with some new information regarding a situation or information with which he is familiar. In negation, the speaker provides new information relevant to information he shares with his audience, just as he often does in
affirmative sentences. However, in interrogation and negation (with the exception of certain rhetorical or emphatic instances), unlike affirmative declaration, the focus of communication is generally the transmission of new information and the specification of how it is new. While the subject of an affirmative sentence may be contrastively focused, it need not be. In a question regarding the subject of a sentence, the subject is always contrastively focused. In asking who performed a certain action, one is requesting new information, the identity of the actor, which is contrastively focused.

Similarly, when one denies that a particular entity was an actor in a given proposition, it too is always in contrastive focus. However, unlike the contrastive focus in affirmative sentences where one referent may be highlighted as the actor in a proposition in contrast to all other possible actors, in negative contrastive focus it may be asserted that one referent was not the actor in a given proposition.

In Itza Maya, the major function of interrogatives and negatives to request or provide contrastive new information is reflected in morphosyntactic marking, particularly with regard to the scope of such information. This is not to say that all questions and negatives involve contrastive focus. Simple Yes-No questions or negatives always involve new information, but it need not be highlighted by contrastive focus nor
be marked for scope. However, the speaker often requests or asserts particular information regarding the identity of actors, patients, time, location, the action or the manner of the action. In questions, such particular requests of information have been formalized in the lexicon as question words such as max 'who', ba'ax 'what', bik'in 'when', tu'ux 'where', and bix 'how'; and by morphosyntactic marking of scope. In negatives, the lexicalization of scope is less developed and treated more extensively in morphosyntax.

Because the function of markers of scope is to delimit the constituent(s) being questioned, denied etc., they naturally appear at the beginning, the end, or both of scoped constituents. Unlike English, in Itza Maya (and Yucatec Maya, for which scope is described by Durbin and Ojeda 1978c) both the beginning and end of constituents are often marked morphosyntactically by trapping particles.

5.1. Interrogation

5.1.1. Intonationally Marked Yes-No Questions.

Yes-No questions may be marked intonationally by a final rise in pitch without additional morphosyntactic marking. Just as in any sentence type, word order, NP specificity, and verb morphosyntax may mark highlighting in such questions.
Are you going to eat beans?

Did you send the man to eat beans?

Is your father in the milpa?

He's there.

Did the man kill deer?

No, the man killed jaguar.

The questions above are identical to affirmative statements except for intonation. As may be seen in (3) and (4), even without discreet interrogative morphosyntactic marking, particular kinds of information may be requested, but it is not in contrastive focus. In (3), speaker A clearly wants to know the location of speaker B's father. In (4), the first speaker is interested in the object of the man's hunting expedition, which is contrastively focused in Speaker B's response.
Simple tags may also be added to the end of a question without additional interrogative marking as in the following:

(5) (Ix) Maria bin-ih u-yil--a' a'-winik-oo'-eh, hah?
   fem  PN  V-Dpr  Dpr-V-SPM  det--N--pl-top  afrm
   go-3   3-see  the-man  yes

Maria went to see the man, didn't she?

(6) T--a--tika'--t--ah a'-winik u--han--t--eh bu'il,
   asp-Dpr--V-tran-DPM  det--N  Dpr--V-tran-SPM  N
   com-2--send  the-man  3--eat  bean

   hah  wa  ma'?  
   affirm  conj  neg
   yes  or  no

Did you send the man to eat beans, yes or no?

In these tag questions, as in the previous examples, no particular constituent of the sentence is in contrastive focus. A general proposition is in question. As mentioned above, the scope of interrogation may be narrowed from the sentence level to its constituents and marked morphosyntactically.

5.1.2. The Interrogative Marker Wah.

In addition to marking questions simply by intonation or tags, the scoping particle wah may be employed. As a marker of scope as well as interrogation, it occurs after the element(s) that are the focus of the interrogation and may occur after any major sentential constituent.
(1) Taan wa(h) a--han--t--ik bu'ul?
asp inter Dpr--V--tran-PM N
dur 2--eat bean

Are you perhaps eating beans?

(2) Taan--a--han--t--ik wa(h) bu'ul?
inter

Are you eating perhaps beans?

(3) Taan--a--han--t--ik bu'ul wah?
inter

Are you eating beans perhaps?

(4) A. Taan wa(h) u--han--al?
asp inter Dpr--V--intr
dur 3--eat

Is he perhaps eating?

B. Taan, (or) Ma' taan.
asp neg asp
dur dur

He is, (or) He isn't.

(5) A. Tun--han--al wah?
asp/Dpr--V--intr inter
dur/3--eat

Is he eating?

B. Ma' tan--u--han--al, tan--u--pol--che'.
neg asp-Dpr--V--intr asp-Dpr--V--PM
no dur--3--eat dur--3--work-wood

He's not eating, he's wood working.

As the examples above evidence, the interrogative wah may appear after various sentential constituents marking them as the focus of the question. As may be seen in a comparison of (1) through (3), the aspect, verb, or object may be marked by wah as the focus of the question in otherwise identical sentences. In examples (4) and (5) with intransitive verbs it is equally
apparent that the interrogative *wah* marks scope as well as interrogation. In (4) it is the aspectual information that is questioned and in (5) it is the action of the verb, as the answers to both questions indicate.

*wah* may appear in transitive and intransitive sentences, simple or complex, following the constituent that it scopes. However, in accordance with its interrogative function (requesting new information), it does not ordinarily appear as a modifier of a topicalized or relativized constituent.

(6) *In-tech* wa(h) *t--a-tika'--t--ah winik ti kah-eh?  
    *Ipr* inter asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM *N* prep-N-top  
    2sq com-2--send *man* to *town*  

   Is it you perhaps that sent a man to town?

(7) *In-tech-eh* wa(h) *t--a-tika'--t--ah winik ti kah-eh?  
    *Ipr*-top

(9) *T--a--tika'--t--ah a'-winik wah ti kah--eh?  
    asp-Dpr--V--tran-DPM det--N inter prep N--top  
    com-2--send *the-man* to *town*  

   Did you finally send the man to town?

(9) *T--a--tika'--t--ah a'-winik ti kah-eh wah?  
    inter

(10) Ti kah wah *t--a--tika'--t--ah a'--winik--eh  
    loc *N* inter asp-Dpr-V--tran-DPM det--N--top  
    to town com-2--send *the--man*  
    wa ich k'aax,  
    conj prep *N*  
    or into *forest*  

   Is it to town you sent the man or into the forest?

(11) *Ti* kah wah--eh *t--a--tika'--t--ah.  
    prep *N* inter-top asp-Dpr-V--tran-DPM  
    to town com-2--send
It isn't perhaps there?

You sent the man to eat beans didn't you perhaps, or not?

While wah does not appear following dependent subject pronouns, it may occur following independent subject pronouns as in (6), provided that they refer to new information. In these cases the subject may not be topicalized as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (7). Similarly in (8), wah may follow an object in a request for new information, but not after a topic marker as in (9). In (10) the oblique object kah is the focus of interrogation marked both by its initial position and wah which immediately follows. As indicated by the ungrammaticality of (11), once the object has been marked as the focus of contrastive focus, it cannot be additionally marked by topicalization.

It is unusual for the interrogative marker to follow topicalized old information. However, in questions with wah as in questions marked by intonation, the speaker shares a great deal of information with his addressee and is often requesting confirmation of his suppositions.
Examples where a basic argument of the sentence is the focus of interrogation, or when an affirmative or negative is questioned as in (12) and (13), are Yes-No questions, though if the answer is negative, further information is expected. The speaker is requesting less specific information in these cases than in interrogative word questions which are considered below.

5.1.3. Interrogative Word Questions

In questions with the interrogative word max 'who' ba'ax 'what' etc. as in wah questions, it is not a proposition as a whole, but one of its constituents that is the focus of interrogation. In interrogative word questions, however, the speaker does not ask if particular information is true, he asks for some particular information. Compare the following examples.

(1) In-tech wah t--a--tika'-t--ah a'-winik ti kah-eh?
    emp-Ipr inter asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM det--N prep N-top
    2 com-2-send the man to town

    Is it you perhaps that sent the man to town?

(2) Max t--u--kin--s--ah a'--k'ek'en--eh?
    inter asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM det---N-----top
    who com-3-die the--pig

    Who killed the pig?

In both of the examples above, the subject of a transitive verb is the focus of interrogation. However in (1) the speaker suggests the identity of the subject and asks for verification while in (2) he asks for the
identification of the subject. Interrogative words
typically appear in sentence-initial position reflecting
their highlighting function.

(3) Max bin—ih ich k’aax tun?
    inter V—Dpr prep W adv
    who go--3 into forest then

Who went into the forest then?

(4) A. Max ah Naando wa’ye’?
    inter masc PN loc
    who here

Who here is Don Fernando?

B. In-ten,
    emp-Ipr
    Isg

I am.

(5) Max k—u—yil—ik ah xi’—paal—eh?
    inter asp-Dpr—V—PM masc CN----top
    who inc-3-see boy

a. Who sees the boy?
   or b. ??Who does the boy see?

(6) Max a’—k—u—yil—ik ah xi’—paal—eh?
    det rel

Who is it that the boy sees? or
?? Who is it that sees the boy?

(7) A. Max t—u—kin—s—ah a k’ek’en—eh?
    inter asp-Dpr—V—caus-DPM Ppr W----top
    who com-3-die 2 pig

Who killed your pig?

B. Layti’ a’—loh t—u—kin—s—ah in k’ek’en.
    Ipr det-dist asp-Dpr—V—caus-DPM Ppr W
    3sg com-3-die 1sg pig

It’s that one who killed my pig.
As may be seen in the examples above, the interrogative *max* often functions to mark a request for the identity of the referent of the subject of a sentence. There is no problem of ambiguity as to the focus of the question in intransitive sentences as in (3) or appositional constructions as in (4). But in transitive sentences ambiguity may arise as to whether it is the agent or patient of the proposition which is the focus of the interrogation. This ambiguity is parallel to that discussed previously with regard to contrastive focus in affirmative declarative sentences (2.2.1.). Unspecified sentence-initial NPs may be interpreted as either subjects or objects in an SVO or OVS pattern depending on their discourse contexts.

It is far more frequent for *max* to refer to the agent and not the patient of a simple transitive sentence as in (5) and (7). When *max* refers to a patient it is
usually followed by a relative clause as in (6) and (8B1) in an cleft construction. These too may be ambiguous outside of their discourse context or even in it as evidenced in (8). In (8) Speaker B asks a question that is slightly ambiguous in (8B1) (as he may not of heard Speaker A well), an ambiguity avoided in (8B2) where, with an object demoted verb form, it is clearly the semantic agent that is the focus of the interrogation.

Ba'ax 'what' functions quite similarly but more frequently refers to a patient rather than an actor, perhaps reflecting the general tendency for subjects to be high in animacy.

(9) Ba'ax k--a--ts'--ik?
   inter asp-Dpr-V---PM
   what inc-2-give

What are you giving?

(10) Ba'ax k--u--bel u--kim--es a'--winik-eh?
    inter asp-Dpr-V Dpr--V-caus det---N--top
    what inc-3--go 3--die the--man

   a. What is going to kill the man?
   or b. ??What is the man going to kill?

(11) Ba'ax a'--k--u--bel u-kim-es a'--winik-eh?
     det

     rel

   a. What is it that the man is going to kill?
   or b. ??What is it that is going to kill the man?

(12) A. Ba'ax k--a--bel a--bet--eh ba--lah?
     inter asp-Dpr-V Dpr--V---SPM temp-prox
     what inc-2--go 2--do now

     What are you going to do now?
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B. In-ten ih in wet'ok--eh ki--ka'a ich k'aax,  
emp-Ipr conj Ppr N----top Dpr---V prep N  
1sg and 1sg friend 1pl-go into forest

I and my friend are going into the forest.

(13) A. Ba'ax a'-k--u--kin--s--ik a'--balum--eh?
inter det-asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det---N----top what inc-3--die the-jaguar

What is it that the jaguar kills?

O V S

B1. Winik a'-k--u--kin--s--ik a'--balum--eh.  
N det-asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det---N----top man inc-3--die the-jaguar

O[foc]VS It's man that the jaguar kills.

or B2. A'-balum-eh winik (a'-)k--u--kin--s--ik-(eh).  
det---N----top N det-Asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM-rel inc-3--die the-jaguar man

S O V

SO[foc]V As for the jaguar, its man (that) he kills.

(14) A. Ba'ax k--u--bet--ik a'--winik--eh?
inter asp-Dpr-V---PM det---N----top what inc-3--do the--man

What is the man doing?

B. K--u--kin--s--ik a'--balum a'--winik--eh.  
asp-Dpr-V-caus-PM det--N det---N----top inc-3--die the-jaguar the-man

The man is killing the jaguar.

(15) A. In--ka'ah in--min--i' in baat.  
Dpr---V Dpr---V--SPM Ppr N  
1sg--go 1sg-buy 1sg ax

I'm going to buy my ax.

B. Ba'ax ti'a'al tech baat?  
inter prep Ipr N what for 2sg ax

Why do you want an ax?
A. Ti'ih in kol.
    prep Ppr N
    for 1sg milpa

    For my milpa.

Verb agreement, semantics, and context usually eliminate ambiguity in ba'ax 'what' questions. In (9) and (12) there is no possibility of ambiguity due primarily to second person verb agreement. In (14) as in (12) verbal semantics certainly aids in eliminating ambiguity. The possibility of ambiguity can arise nevertheless both when ba'ax appears directly in front of a verb as in (10) and when it is in apposition to a relative clause (clefted) as in (11). In (10), the preferred interpretation is that ba'ax refers to the agent, while in (11) it refers to the patient reflecting the pattern noted for max 'who' questions.

Ba'ax most frequently refers to a patient and as the responses in (13) indicate, the patient is contrastively focused. The questions are typically object-focused in the OV(S) pattern. It is also evident in (12), (14) and (15) that ba'ax may mark a request for more information than a single argument of a proposition, unlike max. It may mark a request for propositional information as in (12) and (14) including explanation as in (15).

Ba'ax 'what' and max 'who', as they may refer to either agents or patients, allow ambiguity though context is usually a sufficient disambiguator. Question words focusing on other sentential constituents do not risk
such ambiguity, as the following list of examples with bik'in 'when', bix 'how', boon 'how much', and tu'ux 'where' indicates:

(16) Bi--k'in a---bel?
    inter-day Dpr V
    when 2---go

When are you going?

(17) A. Hooseh, bi--k'in--i(h) tal--echn?  
    PN inter-day---Dpr V---Dpr
    when--3 come--2sg

Jose, when did you come?

B. Tal--een ho'leh--ih
    V---Dpr adv--Dpr
    come--1sg yesterday--3

I came yesterday.

A. I bix ich a--tal-el (or Bix tal-ik-il-ech)
    conj inter prep Dpr--V--intr inter V---?---?---Dpr
    and how in 2--come how come 2sg

    xi'ma'--ok wa ti avioon?
    V----N conj prep N
    walk-foot or on plane

And how did you come, on foot or by plane?

B. In-ten-eh tal--een xi'ma'--ok tumen
    Ipr-top V---Dpr V----N conj
    1sg come--1sg walk-foot because

    ma' yan--ah--ih ten ta'-k'in ti'ih
    neg cop-dist-Dpr Ipr CN sub
    3 1sg money for

    in--tal ti avion.
    Dpr--V prep N
    1sg--come on plane

I came on foot because I didn't have money to come by plane.
(18) Boon ah kax yan tech?
     inter masc N cop Ipr
     how many chicken 2sg
     How many chickens do you have?

(19) Boon u tool a'--ba'ax--eh?
     inter Dpr N det--N--top
     how much 3 price the-thing
     How much does the thing cost?

(20) A. Boon a'--k'an--ih?
      inter Dpr--V--?
      how many 2--want
      How many do you want?

    B. Hun p'eel.
       num class
       one inam

       One.

(21) A. T--in--wil--ah hun tuul ku'uk.
      asp-Dpr--V--DPM num class W
      com-1sg-see one anim squirrel

      I saw a squirrel.

    B. Tu'ux t--a--wil--ah?
      inter asp-Dpr-V--DPM
      where com-2--see

      Where did you see it?

    A. Ti che'--eh yan u k'ul'.
       loc W--top cop Ppr W
       in tree is 3 nest

      It has its nest in the tree.

(22) A. Tu'ux u--bel a'--mak--oo'--eh?
      inter Dpr-V det--W--pl--top
      where 3--go the-person

      Where are the people going?
Certain semantic features encoded in interrogative words such as time reference, location, and quantity appear to be universal while other features may appear in some languages marking additional distinctions. In general, Itza encodes such additional distinctions not in the interrogative words, but elsewhere in the sentence. In (16) and (17) interrogative focus on time reference of a proposition is marked by bik'in 'when' with past time reference marked in (17) by the -ih suffix. However, the simple distinction of future versus past time reference does not reflect the elaborate aspectual distinctions possible in Itza, described previously in Chapter 4 (4.1.). The various aspects may be the foci of interrogation when followed by the interrogative marker wah but such distinctions are not lexicalized in
interrogative words.

Interrogative focus on quantity is reflected by boon 'how much' or 'how many' as evidenced in (18)-(20). Boon may refer to subject (18, 19) or object (20) and count (18, 20) or non-count (19) quantities.

When location is the focus of interrogation, it often refers to a proposition and not just an argument as in (21) and (22) but the location of a single referent may be the focus of the question as in (23) where the copula yan is also present. As the answers to the tu'ux 'where' questions indicate, a speaker has considerable freedom in choosing the information he wishes to provide, unlike the situation when the question focuses on a single argument. In (21) Speaker A focuses on the location of the object but in an oblique manner which depends on underlying presuppositions or shared information. One assumes that since the squirrel's nest is in the tree, that is where the speaker saw it. In (22) Speaker B, in his response, does not explicitly provide locational information, but information regarding the purpose of the men's journey. Similarly in (23), Speaker B does not explicitly indicate the location of his wife, but one may assume that the speakers share information regarding the location of her mother, i.e., she is at home in bed, and that the response is a sufficient and appropriate answer to the question.

The last question word to be considered, bix 'how',
may function to mark requests for a variety of types of information of a propositional nature as evident in the following examples:

(24) a. Bix u--tal--(el)? 
   inter Dpr-V--intr
   how 3--come 
   How does he come?

   b. Bix tal--ih?
   inter V--Dpr
   how come-3
   How did he come?

   c. Bix ich u--tal--(el)
   inter prep Dpr-V--intr
   how in 3--come
   How did you come?

   d. Bix tal--ik-(il)-ech?
   inter V--??--??--Dpr
   how come 2sg
   How have you come?

   or How have you come?

(25) A. Bix ma' ki--wok'--ol si tech--eh
   inter neg Dpr--V--intr conj Ipr--top
   how 1pl-cry if 2sg
   satal--ech ya yan ox p'e mes...
   adj---Dpr adx cop num class N
   lost---2sg already three inam month
   Why wouldn't we cry since you've been lost for three months...

   B. Bix a wool--e'ex ka' kim--ik--en...
   inter Dpr-V----Dpr sub V-irreal-Dpr
   how 2--know--2pl that die 1sg
   How do you know that I'm dead...
   (or) Why do you think that I'm dead...

(26) A. Hwaan, ko'on ti han--al t--in wet--el.
   PN V/1ap sub V-intr prep-Ppr prep-pos
   come eat 1sg with
   Juan, come eat with me.

   B. Na'ah--en, Ho'm--ih in--han-al kan ah Hoseh,
   adj--Dpr asp--Dpr Dpr--V-intr prep masc PN
   full-1sg termin-3 1sh-eat with
   I'm full, I just finished eating with Jose.
A. I bix han--ik--il--ech, hach ma'lo' a han-al?
  conj inter V--?--?--?--Dpr adv adj Ppr N
  and how eat 2sg very good 2 food

  And how did you eat, was your food very good?

B. Aaa, ma' ki' tumen ah Hoseh-eh chen ik
  neg adj conj masc PNM--top adv N
  good because only chile

  t--u--ts'--ah in--han--t--eh, pero na'ah-en.
  asp-Dpr-V--DPM Dpr--V-tran-SPM conj adj-Dpm
  com-3-give 1sg-eat but full-1sg

  Ah, not good because Jose only gave chiles for me to eat but I'm full.

As may be seen in (24) there are a number of forms of bix 'how' questions with intransitive verbs. In addition to simple non-compleetive or compleetive verb forms as in (24a) and (24b) respectively, are two additional forms, both with past time reference, one marked by ich with nominative verb agreement (24c) and the other marked by the verbal suffixes -ik(-il) and absolutive verb agreement (24d).

As is evident from examples (17), (25), and (26), there is a wide semantic range of information that may be marked as the focus of interrogation by bix. In (17), Speaker A requests information regarding the means of Speaker B's transportation; in (25) the speaker requests explanation, and in (26) a quality judgement is requested.

A similar variety of forms occurs in bix questions with transitive verbs is evident in the following examples:
(27) a. Bix u-kin-s-ik?  
inter Dpr-V-caus-PM  
how 3-die

How does he kill it?

b. Bix tun-han-t-ik?  
inter asp/Dpr-V-tran-PM  
how dur/3-eat

How is he eating it?

c. Bix t-u-han-t-ah?  
asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM  
com-3-eat

How did he eat it?

Bix ich u-kin-s-ik?  
prep Dpr-V-caus-PM  
in 3-die

How did he kill it?  or How has he killed it?  or How does he kill it?

e. Bix (ich) a-wil-ik-il?  
prepDpr--V--PM-?  
in 2-see

How did you see it?  How has he killed it?  or How did he like it?

f. Bix ich-il u-kin-s-ik?  
prep-? Dpr-V-caus-PM  
in 3-die

How did he kill it?

(28) A. Ah Hwaan-eh t-u-kin-s-ah hun tuul winik.  
masc---PN-top asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM num class W  
com-3-die  one anim man

Bix ich u-kin-s-ik?  
intr prep Dpr--V-caus-PM  
how in 3-die

How did he kill him?

A. Pwes, ma' in-woh-el bix (ich) u-kin-s-ik-il.  
adv neg Dpr-V-intr inter  
well 1sg-know how

Well, I don't know how he killed him.

(29) A. Hoseh, in-ten-eh bin-een in-wil-a'  
PN emp-Ipr-top V--Dpr Dpr--V--SPM  
1sg go--1sg 1sg--see

a'-k'oh-a'an-eh.  
det--V----part-top  
the-sicken

Jose, I went to see the sick one.

B. I bix a-wil-ik-il, he'-u-sas-tal  
conj inter Dpr-V----PM-? asp--Dpr--V-intr  
and how 2-see fut--3-dawn
kux--a' an--eh?
V---part-scope
live

And how did he seem to you, is he going to be alive in the morning?

A. In-ten-eh k--in--wa'1--ik ke u-ka'a ti kim-il,
emp-Ipr-top asp-Dpr-V----PM sub Dpr-V sub V-intr
Isg inc-Isg-say that 3-go to die

Hach k'oh-a'an, bay--lo' in--wil--ik--il,
adv V---part adv-dist Dpr---V---PM--?
very sicken thus Isg--see

I say that he is going to die. Very sick, that's how he seemed to me.

In (27a-c) verb morphology is like that of other questions (bix 'how' like tu'ux 'where' may appear without additional aspectual marking on the verb (27a)). As with intransitive verbs, ich and the -il suffix are associated with bix questions with past time reference (27d-f), though as the glosses for (27d) indicate, questions with ich alone may be interpreted as having present time reference. In transitive bix questions the semantic range of information requested is also broad as examples (28) and (29) indicate. The specific functions of ich and the suffixes -ik(-il) for intransitives and -il for transitives are not clear.

5.1.4. The Interrogative Marker -i'iü.

It was previously noted that in interrogation in general and question words in particular, the speaker shares a great deal of information with his addressee(s). This situation permits elliptical mechanisms to apply,
removing redundancy and further highlighting the focus of the interrogation. In Itza, the suffix -iiih may appear with any of the interrogative words discussed above and in certain instances with nouns to further highlight them as the focus of interrogation. In addition, the -iiih suffix functions anaphorically to mark the deletion of shared information.

The analysis of the -iiih interrogative scope marker is complicated by the fact that -iiih also has partitive, locative, and negative scope functions in non-interrogative as well as interrogative sentences. All of these markings are discussed below as well as their possible relationships, but first the interrogative -iiih is considered.

who-scope  what-scope  how much-scope  how-scope
Who is it?  What is it?  How much is it?  How is it?

e. Bik'ín--iiih  f. Tu'ux-yan--iiih?
when-scope  where-cop-scope
When is it?  Where is it?

(2) A¿l--e(h) ten max--iiih,  V--imp Ipr inter-scope
tell 1sg who
Tell me who it is.

(3) Ma¿ a--woh--el boon--iiih?
eg neg Dpr--V-intr inter-scope
2--know how much
Don't you know how much it is?
The man is going to kill whom?

Who is it that killed the man? or Whom is it that the man killed?

As for you, you're going. You have to go.

My wife is older than whom?

My older sister.

That man stole my dog.
B.  maa—íi'ih?
inter-scope
Which (of the men)?

A. A'-winik--he'--lo' wa'an--eh.
det--M---dem-dist V/part-rel
the-man stand

That man standing.

(10) ...in-ten-eh ma' tan--a--mich--ik--en. I a--ka'a
emp-Ipr-top neg asp-Dpr-V----PM-Dpr conj Dpr-V
1sg dur--2--grab 1sg and 2-go
a--mich--í', ma' in--woh--el max--í'ih,
Dpr--V--SPM neg Dpr--V-intr inter-scope
2--grab 1sg-know who
a'-k--a--bel a--mich--í'--eh,...
det-asp-Dpr-V Dpr-V----SPM--rel
inc-2-go 2--grab

...as for me, you are not grabbing me, and you are
going to grab (someone), I don't know whom it is
that you are going to grab...

As indicated in the examples above, -íi'ih may be
suffixed to any interrogative word (1) and with the -íi'ih
suffix, interrogative words may appear clause finally
(2), (3), (4), (8), unlike interrogative words without
this suffix. As may be seen in examples (7)-(10) where
it appears in context, interrogatives with the -íi'ih
suffix often have a very close relationship to
immediately prior discourse. It may appear when the
speaker has not heard part of a message (or is in
disbelief) or when a referent has not been sufficiently
identified. In these cases all of the proposition except
one part is understood and need not be repeated as in (7)
and (9). Unlike an interrogative -d without the -íi'ih
suffix, these forms do not appear in a direct relation to
the verb in sentence-initial position (6) but are
clefted, with a relative clause following (5), in which
case they may be interpreted as subjects or objects. In
such a case, the shared information is repeated in the
relative clause rather than being deleted.

These are cleft constructions where the focus of the
interrogation is marked morphologically and by word
order. When -i'ih is suffixed to a sentence-initial
interrogative word, the unmarked position for
interrogative words, the focus of interrogation cannot
have a direct relationship to the verb, but must be
followed by a relative clause. Interrogative words with
the -i'ih (but not those without it) may occur clause
finally, a marked position for interrogative words. This
might be referred to as backwards clefting. While one
ordinarily expects clefts to involve fronting, a reverse
movement is equally marked for interrogatives.

The possible relationship of the interrogative -i'ih
to -i'ih in its other functions such as partitive or
locative marking is not obvious in examples (1)-(10).
None of those examples have a particularly locative
flavor and only (9) appears interpretable as partitive.
The following examples, however, suggest that there may
be a connection between the interrogative and partitive
functions of -i'ih:
(11) Ba'ax pek'-il-(i'ih) a'-chi'-b--ih men kan-eh?
inter N--pos--scope det--V--pas-Dpr prep N-rel
what dog bite 3 by snake

Which of the dogs is the one that was bitten by a snake?

(12) A A'-pek' he'-loh t--u--han--t--ah in bik'.
det-N dem-dist asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM Ppr N
the-dog com-3--eat Isg meat

That dog ate my meat.

B Ba'ax pek'-il--i'ih?
inter N--pos--scope
what dog

Which of the dogs?

A A'-he'-loh (a'-)box--eh,
det-dem-dist (det)-adj--top
black

That one, the black.

(13) A A'-paal he'-loh t--in-wil-ah ho'leh-ih ti Peten.
det-PN dem-dist asp-Dpr-V-DPM adv-Dpr prep N
the-boy com-Isg-see yesterday in Flores

I saw that child yesterday in Flores.

B Max paal--il--i'ih?
inter N--pos--scope
who child

Which of the children? (or What child?)

A A'-lo' k--u--bel--eh,
det-dist asp-Dpr-V-rel
inc-3-go

That one who's going.

(14) A T--u--kin--s--ah keeh a'-winik--eh.
asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM N det--M--top
com-3--die deer the--man

The man killed a deer.

B Ba'ax keeh--il--i'ih?
inter N--pos--scope
what deer

Which of the deer was it?
The one that comes out of your milpa.

In examples (11)-(14), where -iʔih is suffixed to an NP, there is a distinctly partitive meaning. When suffixed to a noun phrase, -iʔih typically occurs clause finally, where it is obligatory. However, as indicated by (11), it is optional when it occurs in front of the verb, and when it occurs in this position, a relative clause follows, as with interrogative words in general. Except for the presence of a noun with the -il (possessive) suffix, these examples are like those discussed above, occurring when the speaker has not heard or is unable to identify one piece of information of a proposition. Most of the shared information is then deleted (11)-(14) or appears in a relative clause (10) but not as much information is deleted as in some of the previous examples because the noun class of the focus of interrogation is still present.

It is certainly easier to attribute partitive meaning when the domain from which the part is drawn is clearly defined as in (10)-(14), although in these examples, the -il suffix may be solely responsible for this meaning. An alternative explanation is that the -iʔih also marks partitivity in these cases and perhaps in the previous examples as well but that the partitive meaning is clearer when the scope of the whole is well
marked rather than deleted or amorphous (e.g., Ba'ax pek'ili'ih? "Which of the dogs is it?" vs. Ba'axi'ih "Which (of non-human things) is it?").

Partitivity, which is examined below, ordinarily requires that the domain of the whole is shared information. In questions where a noun is present, it is more obvious that this condition is met. Any interrogative word question is a partitive construction in the sense that it requests particular information from a specified range of possibilities. That domain may be quite large: human beings, non-human animate beings, amounts, times, etc. However, when the interrogative is followed by -i'ih, there is increased specificity of the whole and correspondingly of the part. The speaker may have an idea of the identity of the referent of the focus of interrogation and request confirmation. At any rate, the domain of the whole is clearly smaller in cases where the speaker uses the cleft -i'ih construction than when he does not. The increased degree of shared information thus appears to give rise to partitivity. The evidence is somewhat ambiguous, but it would be premature to dismiss the possibility that -i'ih does mark partitivity in these cases. To add perspective to such a possibility, cases where -i'ih clearly has a partitive function are now considered.
5.2. The Partitive

As suggested in the previous section, it is often difficult to determine what the functions of the -i'ih suffix are in a particular sentence. The suffix -i'ih may have more than one function or be ambiguous as to its function in a given instance. In this section examples are presented where the partitive function of the -i'ih suffix is primary.

Although the partitive is not frequent, it is very interesting both semantically and morphosyntactically. As the following examples indicate, the partitive presupposes that the whole is shared information, or context.

(1) In-ten xan tan--in--han--t--ik bu'ul-i'ih (wa'ye). emp-Ipr adv asp--Dpr--V-tran-PM N--partit loc 1sg also dur--1sg-eat bean (here)

I also am eating some beans (here).

(2) a. Tan--a--han--t--ik (t---)a' bu'ul-i'ih?
asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM (prep-)det N--partit/loc dur--2--eat (to-)the bean

Are you eating some beans (there)?

b. Tan--a--han--t--ik (t---)a' bu'ul-i'ih wa'ye? 
asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM (prep-)det N--partit loc dur--2--eat (to-)the bean here

Are you eating some beans here?

(3) Tan--a--han--t--ik ts'eek bu'ul--l'ih?
asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM quant N--partit/loc dur--2--eat little bean

Are you eating a little bit of the beans (there)?
We are eating also some of the beans (there).

I am eating some of the beans, the ones there.

Are you eating some of the beans over there?

The partitive suffix -\(i'\)=ih may be suffixed to a variety of grammatical categories including nouns, noun classifiers, verbs, and certain adverbials. In all cases, it refers to an object (patient) which is shared information, though various degrees of deletion of object information may take place. It is also clear from the examples above that out of context, there is often a risk of ambiguity as to whether the -\(i'\)=ih suffix marks partitivitiy, locativity, or both.

In (1)-(7) an object noun is present with the -\(i'\)=ih suffix. As may be seen in a comparison of (2a) and (2b) the proximal locative wa'ye\(h\) 'here' removes ambiguity with regard to the function of the -\(i'\)=ih suffix. When wa'ye\(h\) is present -\(i'\)=ih must be interpreted as a
partitive and not a locative marker since -i'i\text{h} as a locative is a distal marker. Nevertheless, as the possible ambiguities of (2), (4) and (5) indicate, the locative interpretation of -i'i\text{h} suffixed to an NP is often possible in addition to or instead of the partitive. In other cases, to be discussed in Section 5.3., the suffix -i'i\text{h} is unambiguously locative which is also a far more frequent function of this suffix. Interestingly, distal locative specification following the -i'i\text{h} suffix does not interfere with its partitive function as may be seen in (6) and (7). Thus, additional locative specification, either proximal (wa'ya\text{r}) or distal (te\text{r}), serves to disambiguate the partitive.

As noted above, the referent of the object noun in partitive expressions is always shared information and this is reflected by the specification with the determiner a\text{r} of the non-count object bu'ul 'beans', which is not usually so specified, in (2), (4), and (6). In (3) quantity as well as the object noun are indicated and the -i'i\text{h} suffix appears to function both as a partitive and a locative. It may be that when little information is deleted, the anaphoric function of -i'i\text{h} as a partitive is less crucial and its locative function surfaces. When the object noun is deleted, -i'i\text{h} is unambiguously partitive as in the following examples:
You have to eat a little of it.

I want to buy a measure of it.

Do you want to buy one measure (perhaps) of it?

You are perhaps going to eat a lot of it?

This meat, do you (ever) eat (some of) it?

Do I have to eat some of it?

It's not some beans that I am eating here.

a. As for the beans, I don't want to eat any of them.

b. As for the beans, I don't want to eat them there.
In (8)-(11), -i'ih is suffixed to markers of quantity including noun classifiers. The amount of the part is clearly indicated but the whole from which it is drawn is not, with -i'ih anaphorically in its place.

A further deletion occurs in (12) to (15) where -i'ih is suffixed to the verb and neither the part nor the whole need be present. Nevertheless, it is clear that the object is shared information and it may be present as in (12) and (15), though in the latter case with a topicalized object noun, ambiguity arises. In (14) it is clear that the degree of shared information is somewhat less than in the other examples, although it is considerable. The information shared is that the speaker was eating something but exactly what is not known to the hearer, although he believed it was beans.

(16) and (17) are interesting examples where the
partitive is suffixed to NPs other than ones referring to the domain of the whole. However, as the context makes clear in both cases, the whole is shared information. In (16) -i'ih is suffixed to the recipient of the part and in (17) to the part itself.

In summary, the partitive suffix may appear suffixed to a variety of grammatical categories and in all cases, its referent is shared information. Ambiguity between locativity and partitivity appears to be highest when the least information is deleted, that is, when the object noun is present. The locative function of the -i'ih suffix is examined in more detail in the next section.

5.3. Locatives

The suffix -i'ih may also appear as a locative scope marker after the locative te marker (either suffixed or as a final trapping particle) or without the te marker, suffixed to the last word of a clause. There are a variety of forms involving the te and -i'ih markers which have distinct discourse functions. Te alone is ordinarily insufficient as a locative marker and further specificity marking must follow, most typically the distal marker -lo' or the scope marker -i'ih. These forms may have quite different discourse functions, ranging from the specification of nouns, in which case they provide new locational information (or information to aid the hearer in identifying a noun's referent) to
cases where a major function is discourse cohesion, in which the location is shared information. *Tello*, which may function as a noun phrase specifier will now be considered.

5.3.1. The Locative *Tello*

As a noun phrase specifier, *tello* (composed of the locative *te* and the distal -lo) typically occurs following the noun it specifies and may indicate a particular point in space, often immediately present to the discourse participants. However, it may also appear in final position and refer to the location of a proposition as a whole. Movement from final position indicates further highlighting of the locative.

(1) He'-lah winik k--u--bel t--a' kah te'-loh, dem-prox N asp-Dpr-V prep-det M loc-dist man inc-3--go to-the town

This man is going to the town there.

(2) T--in--wil--ah a'--kol te'--lo'--eh, asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--W loc-dist-top/rel com-1sg-see the-milpa

I saw the milpa there.

(3) A. Ix ch'up-eh t--u--yil--ah a'--winik fem N--top asp-Dpr-V--DPM det--W woman com-3--see the-man

nik--a'an te'--lo'--eh, V--part loc-dist-rel sit

The woman saw the man seated there.
That man doesn't have any money.

It's not that man who is the thief. It's the man seated there who steals.

The scope of the locative te-lo' is not always well defined but may range from noun phrase to sentence level. In sentences (1) to (4) the locative follows a noun phrase which it modifies. In these examples the determiner a'- is prefixed to the noun and requires additional specification as noted in Chapter 3. Tel-lo', which may also have a topic marker suffixed, serves this specificity function. Tel-lo' is a locative marker which highlights the noun it modifies and provides additional contextual information for the hearer.

In the following examples, tel-lo' appears in clause-final position but does not modify a noun phrase and its scope is more diffuse.

What are you making there?
I'm eating some beans over there.

Stand there. I see you clearly.

Here comes a naked man and get away from there, you could see him.

One of the men went there.

Where did you see it?

There.

In these examples te'lo^ continues to mark emphasis on location. The reference of the location may be inferred pragmatically from the speech situation (which is also apparent in (3) and (4)) including the location of the hearer ((5) and (9)) and the speaker's gestures ((6) and (10)), and need not have been previously mentioned. The fact that the location referred to by the deictic te'lo^
may provide new information is clear from example (10) where it occurs in answer to a question of location.

While by its very presence *te'lo* highlights locational information, such information may be further highlighted by fronting the locative as in the following examples:

(11) *Te'--lo* tal--een--eh.
    loc-dist V--Dpr--rel
    come--1sg

    (It's) there I came.

(12) *Te'--lo* ich k'aax t--in--wil--ah a'--paal-eh.
    loc-dist prep N asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--N--top
    in forest com-1sg-see the-child

    There in the forest I saw the child.

(13) A. *Te'--lo'--eh* hach yan ba' al-che'-eh.
    loc-dist-top adv cop CN--top
    much animal

    There, there are a lot of animals.

    B. Ma' *te'-lo'(-i'ih) a' tu'ux* yan ba' al-che'-eh.
    neg loc-dist(-scope) det rel cop CN--rel
    where animal

    It's not there where there are animals.

(14) A. *Bin-o'on* ki--k'a'ool-t-eh Esquipulas...
    V--Dpr Dpr----V--tran--SPM PN
    go--1sg 1sg--visit Esquipulas

    We went to visit Esquipulas.

    B. *Te'--lo* ma' ki' t--in wic h a'--mak--oo'-eh.
    loc-dist neg adj prep-Ppr N det--N--pl-top
    good to--1sg eye the-person

    There I don't like the people.
As with NPs, the locative in sentence-initial position may be topicalized or in contrastive focus. In (11) and (13B) the locative is contrastively focused in cleft-like constructions and in (13A) and (15) it is topicalized. Examples (12), (14), and (16) are perhaps better described as examples of locative emphasis, though contrastiveness is present. As (12) evidences, the location referred to by te'-lo' may be further clarified by a following prepositional phrase, indicating that it is not completely shared information and that locational information is highlighted.

Another function, that of discourse cohesion, is evident in examples (13) to (16). In these cases, the locative serves as a link between previous discourse and
new information which the speaker wishes to communicate but it should be emphasized that the highlighting of location remains salient.

In summary, te'lo' always highlights location, but alone is rather indeterminate as to the scope of its locative emphasis. It often depends on the pragmatics of the speech situation rather than prior discourse for its interpretation but may serve a discourse cohesive function as a connective.

5.3.2. The Locative Te'lo'i'ih

It was noted in the section above that the scope of the locative te'lo' can be variable and somewhat ambiguous. In conjunction with the terminal trapping particle -i'ihh, scope may be more clearly marked, ranging from a focus on the location itself to sentence level scope. It has also been noted previously that -i'ihh, in addition to marking scope, may serve an anaphoric function, replacing elements of prior discourse. As described in Section 5.3.1, above, te'lo' is often dependent on the pragmatics of the actual speech situation rather than prior discourse for its interpretation, and may provide new locational information. The distal marker -lo' marks this deictic relation to the speech situation and there is usually no need for the additional -i'ihh marker. However, -i'ihh may appear suffixed to te'lo' marking a previously mentioned
location as may be seen in the examples below:

(1) T--in--wil--ah a'--winik (he'--lah) te'--lo'--i'ih-eh.
   asp-Dpr--V--DPM det-N dem-dist loc-dist-scope-top
   com-1sg-see the-man

   I saw the (this) man there.

(2) Bin-een te'--(lo')--i'ih.
   V--Dpr loc-(dist-)scope
   go--1sg

   I went there.

(3) A. Te'--lo'--eh hach yan ba'al-che'.
   loc-dist-top adv cop CN
   much animal

   There, there are a lot of animals.

   B. Ma' te'--(lo')--i'ih a' tu'ux yan ba'al-che'.
      neg loc-(dist-)scope det inter cop CN
      where animal

   It's not there where there are animals.

(4) A. A'--ts'on-eh ma'an t--in wotoch,
   det--N--top neg/cop prep-Dpr N
   the-gun in-1sg house

   The gun isn't in my house.

   B. Te'--yan--i'ih.
   loc--cop--scope

   It's there.

   A. Ma' te'--yan--i'ih.
      neg loc--cop--scope

   It's not there.

   B. Te'--lo'--i'ih!
   loc-dist--scope

   It's there!

As locative scope is marked by the trapping particles
te'...i'ih, the scope in the examples above is simply the
location itself and is somewhat redundant. As a
comparison with examples 5.3.1.(5-9) indicates, te'i'teh may appear finally as in (1) and (2) without the -i'ih suffix. In examples (3) and (4), however, the -i'ih suffix carries a heavier functional load. In (3), a cleft construction, it marks the locative as the scope of negative contrastive focus, a situation in which the reference of the locative is old information and the distal marker is optional. This construction is similar to the interrogative word clefts discussed above (5.1.4) and is common for negative contrastive focus, which will be discussed in more detail below. In (4) there are three similar instances of contrastive locative reference with -i'ih and Speaker B's final emphatic response includes both the distal and the scope marker. Note that in this example, the reference of the location is clearly old information.

As the examples above indicate, when scope increases in importance, and reference is not in doubt, the distal marker loses importance. Following are some examples of te'i'teh without the distal marker.

(5) A'-winik-eh, (ma') te'-i'ih a' tu'ux bin-ih-eh,
    det--N--top (neg) loc-scope det rel V-Dpr-top
    the-man where go-1sg

    As for the man, it's (not) there where he went.
(6) A. Hoseh, ben--es ten u tsimin ah Hwaan-eh i
PM V-caus/imp Ipr Dpr N masc PM-top conj
go 1sg horse and
k--a--kix--t--ik t--u hol a'--nah--eh.
asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM prep-Dpr N det--N-top
inc-2--tie to-3 door the-house
Jose, take Juan's horse for me and tie it to the
doors of the house.

B. (Juan speaking) Ma' te'--i'ih. Tal---es ten wa'ye'.
neg loc-scope V-caus/imp Ipr loc
come 1sg here
Not there. Bring it to me here.

(7) Ma' te'--i'ih a' tu'ux t--in--tika'--t--ah--ech,
neg loc-scope det rel asp-Dpr---V-tran-DPM--Dpr
where cop-1sg-send 2sg
It's not there where I sent you.

(8) A. Te'--i'ih?
loc-scope
Is it there?
B. Ma', tak te'--lo'.
neg prep loc-dist
No, over there.

(9) A. Ich kol yan a tat-eh?
prepp N cop Ppr N-top
in milpa 2 father
Is your father in the milpa?
B. Te'--i'ih.
loc-scope
He's there.

(10) *Te'--i'ih t--in--wil--ah a'--winik he'--lah.
loc-scope asp-Dpr-V--DPM det--N dem-prox
com-1sg-see the-man

(11) *Te'--i'ih ich k'aax-eh hach yan kan.
loc-scope prep N--top adj cop N
in forest many snake
(12) *Te'-i'ih a' tu'ux yan yaab ba'al-che'-eh
    loc:scope det rel cop adj   CM---top
    where       many      animal

(13) *Te'-i'ih ma' ki' t--in wich a'-mak-oo'-eh.
    loc:scope neg adj prep-Prc N  det-N--pl-top
    good   to-1sg  eye   the-man

A comparison of the examples above, with those in 5.3.1, indicates a number of differences between te'lo' and te'i'ih. Unlike te'lo', te'i'ih does not appear in sentence-initial position (unless alone as in (8) and (9)), as indicated by the ungrammaticality of (10) through (13), all of which would be acceptable sentences if te'i'ih were replaced by te'lo' (compare with 5.3.1. (12)-(14)).

The difference in the acceptability of te'lo' and te'i'ih is in accord with the scoping and anaphoric functions of -i'ih. When the speaker wishes to highlight new locational information te'lo' is employed and even when such information is shared, te'i'ih is inappropriate in sentence initial position, as the final trapping particle -i'ih normally occurs clause-finally. (11) is ungrammatical due to the position of te'i'ih and the fact that the locational information is new. As the following prepositional clause indicates, the locational information was not assumed to be fully known to the hearer and is not anaphorically deleted. It is only in cases of emphasis and contrastive focus of location (usually negative contrastive focus) that te'i'ih appears in a fronted position as in (5) through (7). The fact
that -i'ih has an anaphoric function is evident in (6),
(8), and (9). In (6), an example of negative contrastive
focus, it is clear that the location, just mentioned by
Speaker A, is shared information. In (8) a contrast of
the use of te'i'ih for shared information and te'l'o' for
new information is evident; and in (9) the reference of
the location referred to by te'i'ih is clearly shared but
not contrastive information. In certain cases te'i'ih
occurs finally as evidenced by the following examples:

(14) Ten--in--wil--ah ah mis te'--i'ih.
Ipr asp-Dpr--V--DPM masc W loc-scope
1sg Com-1sg-see cat
Me, I saw the cat there.

(15) A'--winik yan te'--i'ih.
det---W cop loc-scope
the-man
The man is there.

(16) *In--ka'ah te'--i'ih.
Dpr---V loc-scope
1sg---go

(17) *T--in--wil--ah a'--winik he'--lah te'--i'ih.
asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--W dem-prox loc-scope
asp-1sg-see the-man

(18) *Hun tuul a'--winik oo' bin-oo' te'--i'ih.
num class det--W---pl V-Dpr loc-scope
one anim the-man go-3pl

As may be seen by the ungrammaticality of (16)-(18)
there are also restrictions on the occurrence of te'i'ih
finally which do not apply to te'l'o' (compare with
5.3.1. (5)-(9)) though te'i'ih may appear finally as in
(14) and (15). Again, what appear to be crucial features
of te'i'ihi are that it refer to shared locational information and that it has a highlighting, scoping function, which is not the case in the ungrammatical examples. In short, when -i'ihi is suffixed directly to the locative te', its scoping function is quite limited and it typically occurs alone or in negative contrastive focus with ma'.

5.3.3. The Locative Trapping Particles te'-...-i'ihi

The function of -i'ihi to mark broader scope is evident in the following examples, where the trapping particles te'-...-i'ihi frame larger constituents of discourse.

(1) Te' wa'an a'-noh keeh t--u--ts'on--ah xan-eh.
loc V/part det-adj N asp-Dpr-V---DPM adv-rel stand the-big deer com-3-shoot too

Te'-yan-i'ihi, tun---chul u k'ik'--eh.
loc-cop-scope asp/Dpr-V Ppr N--top dur/3-flow 3 blood

There stands the big deer that he shot too.
There it is, it's blood running.

(2) Te' yan a'-winik-i'ihi.
loc cop det--N--scope the-man

There is the man.

(3) a, Te' tan-a--han--t--ik bu'ul-i'ihi.
loc asp-Dpr-V-tran-Pm N--scope dur-2--eat bean

There you are eating beans.
b. Te tan--a--han--í--bu'ul--í'ih.
loc asp-Dpr--V--dist--N--scope
dur--2
eat

There you are bean eating.

(4) (Ma') te' in-k'at-ih ka' tak--ech a-wil-een-í'ih.
(neg) loc Dpr--V--? sub V/irreal-Dpr Dpr--V--Dpr--scope
1sg-want that come--2sg 2sg-v-1sg

It's (not) there I want you to see me.

(5) A'-paal-eh, te' t--in--wil--ah--í'ih.
det--H-top loc asp-Dpr--V--DPM-scope
the-child com-1sg-see
As for the child, there I saw him.

(6) Te' t--in--wil--ah a'-paal-í'ih,
loc asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--N--scope
com-1sg-see the-child

There I saw the child.

(7) *Te' ich k'aax-í'ih.
loc prep N--scope
in forest

When the locative te' and the scope marker -í'ih are
trapping particles, as in the examples above, the
functions of these two markers are more easily discerned.
The fronted te' marks the highlighting of location and
the initial scope boundary while -í'ih marks the final
scope boundary and indicates that the location is shared
information. Te'...-í'ih may frame such small
constituents as the copula and/or noun phrase as in (1)
and (2) (see also 5.3.2.(4)), verb phrases (5) or complex
clauses and sentences (4 and (6). The ungrammaticality
of (7) is an indication of the requirement that the
identity of the location be shared information in these
cases. It is perfectly acceptable for a prepositional
phrase or relative clause containing locational information to precede te' as evidenced in the following examples, but not for it to follow it as in (7), though as indicated previously (5.3.1.(12)) te'lo' may precede a prepositional phrase.

(8) A. T--a'-chem he'-loh ma' tal-ih ah Hwaan.
    prep-det-W dem-dist neg V-Dpr masc PN
    in-the-canoe come-3

    In that canoe John didn't come.

B. Te'^-tal--ih--i'ih.
    loc---V--Dpr-scope
    come--3

    It's there he came. (in that canoe)

(9) T--a'-motor bin--ih ti Peten--eh,
    prep-det---W V--Dpr prep PN--rel
    in-the-launch go--3 to Flores

    te' bin-ih hun tuul a'-winik-i'ih,
    loc V-Dpr num class det--W--scope
    go--3 one anim the-man

    In the launch which went to Flores, there one of the men went.

(10) ...tulakal a'--k'aax tu'ux hach sup--eh,
    quant det--W rel adv adj-rel
    all the-forest where very muddy

    te' k--u--kix--t--ik--i'ih, te' k--u--bel,
    loc asp-Dpr-V-tran--PM--scope loc asp-Dpr-V
    inc-3-seek inc-3-go

    te, k--u--hil--t--ik u bah--i'ih,
    loc asp-Dpr-V-tran--PM Ppr refl-scope
    inc-3-throw 3 self

    All over the forest where it's very muddy, there he seeks it (escape), there he goes, there he jumps.
(11) ...ix ch'up-eh bin--ih tulakal t--a'-beh
fem N--top V--Dpr quant prep-det-N
woman go---3 all on-the-road
k--u--bel ich kah-eh. Te' bin--ih--i'ih,
asp-Dpr-V prep N-rel loc V--Dpr-scope
inc-3--go in town go---3

...The woman went all along the road that goes
into town. There, she went.

(12) ...u wits ah Chan-oo'. Te' bin p'at-oo'-i'ih,
Ppr N masc PN--pl loc report V--Dpr-scope
3 hill
remain-3pl
3 hill

...the hill of the Chans. There, they say, they
remained, there they ended, and there they died.

(13) Ma' u--k'a'ool a'-hol-eh. A'-ka' tak--eh,
neg Dpr---V det--N-top det-sub V/irreal-top
3--know the-hole when come
k--u--hup--ik u pol-i'ih-eh, te' k--u--bel
asp-Dpr-V---PM Ppr N--loc-top loc asp-Dpr-V
inc-3--put 3 head inc-3-go

...the hill of the Chans. There, they say, they
remained, there they ended, and there they died.

(14) T--u chi' a'-noh ha' he'-lo' yan--eh, te'
prep-Ppr N det-adj N dem-dist cop-rel loc
on--3 edge det-big water

pat-al a-chi-tal-i'ih a--pah--t--eh a'-kim-il.
asp Dpr--V-intr-scope Dpr-V-tran-SPM det-V-nom
abil 2--lie 2-pretent the-die

On the shore of the great lake, there you can
lie down to play dead.
Where the roots ended (on the tree trunk), there, I cut it.

...I fell head first and in the middle of all of the wood chips where I finished cutting it, there, I fell.

And I began to illuminate it all around where it was clear when I saw it, there was lying a deer.

I fell where I fell. There I remained to sleep.
It is evident from examples (8) to (18), where discourse context is provided, that the location referred to is shared information, typically mentioned just prior to the te\textsuperscript{-}.\texti\textsuperscript{ih} clause. As an anaphoric device, these constructions also serve as discourse cohesive mechanisms, providing context for new information contained within the te\textsuperscript{-}.\texti\textsuperscript{ih} frame. These frames are quite frequent in narrative discourse, from which examples (9) to (18) were drawn, functioning both to highlight location and to link new information to old information.

While it was noted above (5.1.2.) that \texti\textsuperscript{ih} may be ambiguous as to its function (i.e., partitive vs. locative) when it appears alone, this is not the case when it appears in conjunction with te\textsuperscript{'}\. When te\textsuperscript{'} appears, \texti\textsuperscript{ih} always has a locative scope function, though it may have others as well. As example (3) indicates, the \texti\textsuperscript{ih} marks locative scope and not partitivity (compare with examples in 5.1.2.) and may appear with intransitive and object demoted (3b) verbs as well as transitive verbs, unlike the partitive marker. Its interaction with the negative scope marker will be considered in Section 5.4.

It was noted above that the functions of te\textsuperscript{'} and \texti\textsuperscript{ih} are distinct. When they appear together as trapping particles, te\textsuperscript{'} marks scope and locative highlighting while \texti\textsuperscript{ih} marks scope and anaphora. Each
may appear without the other. If te' appears without -i'ih, the locative is still highlighted but scope is less determinate and need not be shared information. When -i'ih appears without te', again scope is less determinate, but the locative is not highlighted to the same degree and the reference of the location is always shared information.

5.3.4. The Locative Te'

In the following examples te' occurs without the final trapping particle i'ih:

(1) a. Te' t—in—wil—ah a'—paal ich k'aax—eh,
   loc asp-Dpr—V—DPM det—N prep N—rel
   com-1sg-see the-child in forest

   There I saw the child in the forest.

   b.*Te' t—in—wil—ah a'—paal ich k'aax-i'ih,
   loc asp-Dpr—V—DPM det—N prep N—scope
   com-1sg-see the-child in forest

(2) a. Te'—loh ich k'aax t—in—wil—ah a'—paal—eh,
   loc-dist prep N asp-Dpr—V—DPM det—N—top
   in forest com-1sg-see the-child

   There in the forest I saw the child.

   b.*Te' ich k'aax t—in—wil—ah a'—paal—eh,
   loc prep N asp-Dpr—V—DPM det—N—top
   in forest com-1sg-see the-child

(3) Ah Hwaan—eh, te' yan ich k'aax—eh,
   masc PN—top loc cop prep N—rel
   in forest

   As for Juan, there he is in the forest.

In the grammatical examples above, te' appears in clause-initial position but there is no final -i'ih scope
marker. The locational information need not be shared, as the inclusion of prepositional phrases after the locative in (1) and (3) indicates, but it is highlighted in all cases. The ungrammaticality of (1b) is due to the conflict of the new locational information provided in the relative clause and the -i'ih suffix, which marks shared information. While te' without -i'ih allows new locational information, it may not appear directly after the locative marker as the ungrammaticality of (2b) indicates, in contrast to (1a) and (3). The following are examples of te' in discourse context:

(4) ...
  chumuk t--a'--kol-eh, te' wa'an
  and inside of-the-milpa stand
  hun tu noh keeh---(eh).
  one anim big der
  ...and in the middle of the milpa, there was standing a big deer.

(5) ...
  a'-mak-oo' kih-a'an-oo' nats'--i'ih--eh,
  the-person live 3pl close
  te' k--u--ch'i'--ik-oo' wal u che'--il
  inc-3--take 3pl perhaps 3 wood
  ti'(ih) u--si'--in--t--oo'.
  to 3-make firewood 3pl
  ...

...the people living near there, from there they take, perhaps, the lumber in order to make firewood.
...as for the water, since it's there that the people take it, they guard it.

(7) I te' t--u--yil--ah yaab keeh k--u--man conj loc asp-Dpr--V--DPM quant N asp-Dpr--V and com-3-see many deer inc-3--walk

u--baak'--t--oo' a'-winik-eh.
Dpr--V--tran-Dpr det--N-top/rel 3--surround 3pl the-man

And there he saw many deer walking to surround the man.

Unlike the examples with the clause-final -i'ih marker, contrastive focus is evident in (4) to (5) (see also 5.3.3.1), often in cleft-like constructions where the clause is marked finally by the relative marker -eh. In fact, all of the examples above except (5) (where te' is followed by a complex sentence) have a terminal -eh marker, supporting the generalization that some additional specification marking must follow te'.

In terms of discourse cohesive processes, the examples above differ from previous examples with -i'ih. When i'ih is present, the locative is shared contextual information, often framing new information, but without contrastive highlighting on location. In the examples without -i'ih, while there may be some sharing of
knowledge with respect to location, there is generally not as much, and the location may be contrastively focused. The speaker often offers more contextualizing information about the location which may occur in a following relative clause. In the case of te'...-i'ih, the locative may provide context for new scoped information but with te'...-eh, the information in the relative clause modifies the locative.

The usage of te' without the scoping -i'ih marker is in some respects intermediate between the usage of te'lo' and te'...-i'ih. Te'lo' does not require prior mention of locational information, often relying on the pragmatics of the actual speech situation for its interpretation, and when fronted often marks contrastive focus. Te'...-i'ih, on the other hand, always refers to locational information previously mentioned in the discourse. Te' without the distal or the scope markers must occur in clause-initial position and, while locational information may be shared to some degree, it may be contrastively focused, but lacks the emphasis of te'lo'.

It should be noted that the occurrence of te' without the distal or scope markers is relatively infrequent. In most cases the additional markers of locative information do appear. The locative marker -i'ih, however, often appears without a preceding te', though as noted in 5.1.2., there is some risk of
ambiguity.

5.3.5. The Locative Scope Marker ...-i'ih

Without the locative te', -i'ih may be a locative marker whose scope is rather indeterminate, ranging over the preceding clause. In these cases, identity of the location is shared but not highlighted information.

(1) Tan—a—han--t--ik bik' wah-i'ih ke ma' asp-Dpr--V-tran-PM W inter-loc sub neg dur--2--eat meat perhaps that tan--a--tal--el? asp-Dpr--V--intr dur--2--come

Are you eating meat there, perhaps, so that you are not coming.

(2) a. Ten-eh bel in--ka'ah ti kah he'-loh, Ipr-top V Dpr--V prep W dem-dist 1sg--go 1sg--go go to town

As for me, I'm going to that town.

b.*Ten-eh bel in--ka'ah ti kah he'-lo'--i'ih. loc

(3) A. Ko'ox San Andres, PM go

Let's go to San Andres.

B. Ma', in--ten--eh tal--n--ah--een--i'ih, neg emp-Ipr-top V-detr-dist-Dpr-loc 1sg come 1sg

No, I've come from there.

(4) A. ...i hach ki' t--in wich a'-kah he'--loh, conj adv adj prep-Ppr W det-W dem-dist and very good to-1sg eye the-town

...and I like that town very much.
I can't (stand to) go there because I don't like the way the people talk.

(5) Mia bel in--ka'ah ti wen--el-i'ih yok' ma' adv V Dpr---V sub V-intr-loc sub neg prob go 1sg--go to sleep so that

in--tal t--u ka'--sut.
Dpr--V prep-Ppr rep-N
1sg--come 3 return

I'm probably going to sleep there so I don't have to come back again.

(6) ...yan u laak' kol in--k'a'ool. Uch--ak cop Ppr adj N Dpr---V adv--irreal
3 other milpa 1sg--know perhaps

patal ki--kil--ik ba'al-che'-i'ih.
as Dpr--V---PM CN----loc
abil 1pl--see animal

...there is another milpa I know. Perhaps we can see animals there.

(7) A'--ka' t--u--yil--ah a'--winik a'--keeh tu'uux det-conj asp-Dpr-V--DPM det--W det--N rel then com--3--see the-man the-deer where

lub--ih--eh, ka' bin--ih u--yil--a'. A'--ka' V--Dpr--rel conj V--Dpr Dpr--V--SPM det-conj fall--3 and go--3 3--see when

k'och--ih--eh, k--u--yil--ik--eh, yah ma'an V--Dpr--rel asp-Dpr-V--PM-rel adv neg/cop arrive--3 inc--3--see already

keeh--i'ih, hun tuul winik a'--wa'an--i'ih--eh.
N--loc num class N det-V/part-loc-rel
deer one anim man stand

Then the man saw the deer, where it fell, and went to see it. When he arrived, he saw it; then it wasn't a deer, a man was standing there.
As may be seen in the examples above, -i'i'h as a locative marker appears in clause-final position and may be suffixed to a wide variety of grammatical categories. The location referred to is shared information, previously mentioned in the discourse, with -i'i'h standing anaphorically in its place, as evident in examples (3) to (7). The ungrammaticality of (2b) is due to the newness of the locational information.

A comparison of the examples above with the examples with te' in the previous sections (see particularly 5.3.4.(5) and 5.3.3.(13) where examples of -i'i'h without te' and examples with te' are juxtaposed) indicates a basic difference of locative highlighting. In order to highlight the locative, whether it is new or old information, te' must appear. If it is shared and highlighted information, its scope may be clearly delineated by the trapping particles te'...i'i'h. When shared information is not highlighted, as in the examples above, scope, too, is less determinate. Scope, thus, is part of the highlighting of locational old information. When it is not highlighted, a cohesive anaphoric function is still served by -i'i'h, but its scoping function is diminished.

5.4. Negation

Negative constructions, like interrogatives, bear a close relationship to prior discourse and scope is marked
morphosyntactically. Negation is often a denial of some part of prior discourse or of the hearers' expectations and the specification of scope indicates exactly what portion of information is being negated. Negation in general, of course, is contrastively marked in relation to the unmarked positive assertion. As a denial of previous information, it is also contrastive and contrastive focus is often marked.

5.4.1. The Negative Markers *ma* and *mix*

In Itza, the primary marker of negation is *ma* 'no' or 'not' and it appears before the negated constituents. *Ma* appears in front of the aspect marker in the least marked negative constructions and its scope covers the constituents that follow. Word order movements and morphosyntactic marking serve to narrow scope, often additionally marking contrastive focus.

Another marker of negation is *mix* which may be variously glossed as 'neither', 'nor', or 'not even' according to context. It too appears in front of the negated constituents.

The scope of negation may vary from the propositional level to the level of such information as aspect and location and the range of scope is marked by the position of the negative and other word order changes. With regard to aspect, there is possible ambiguity between the incompletive and the durative in
negative sentences:

(1) a. Ma' tun--kin--s--ik. b. Ma' tan--u--kin--s--ik.
   neg asp/Dpr--V-caus-PM   neg asp--Dpr--V-caus-PM
   inc/dur/3-die               dur--3--die
   He doesn' t kill it.        He isn' t killing it.
   or He isn' t killing it.

(2) A. K--u--han--al?
    asp--Dpr--V-intr
    inc/3--eat
    Does he eat?

   B. Ma' tun--han--al.
      neg asp/Dpr--V-intr
      inc/3--eat
      He doesn' t eat.

(3) A. Tan--u--han--al?
    asp--Dpr--V-intr
    dur--3--eat
    Is he eating?

   B. Ma' tan(--u--han--al).
      neg asp(-Dpr--V-intr)
      dur(--3--eat)
      He isn' t (eating).

(4) Ma' tan-in-rol--ik, tan-in-wen--s--ik.
    neg asp-Dpr--V---PM   asp-Dpr--V-caus-PM
    dur-1sg-gather      dur-1sg-lower
    I' m not gathering it, I' m picking it.

(5) Hun tuul winik k--u--wen--el yaab-eh
    num class N asp-Dpr--V--intr adv-rel
    one anim man inc-3--sleep much
    ma' tun----meyah.
    neg asp/Dpr----V
    inc/3----work
    A man that sleeps a lot doesn' t work.

As evident in (1a), in the negative, the contracted forms
of the durative aspect marker with dependent pronouns
(tin - dur/1sg; tan - dur/2; tun - dur/3) are identical to the negative of the incompleteive aspect marker with dependent pronouns. Discourse context serves to eliminate ambiguity in these cases as may be seen in (2) through (5). When the durative aspect marker is not contracted there is no ambiguity as may be seen in (1b.), (3), and (4).

Another interaction of negation and aspect is evident in sentences with ma'ata'ax, 'never' as in the following examples:

(6) Ma'-ta'ax in--kin--s--ik.
   neg-adv Dpr--V--caus-PM  ever 1sg-die

I've never killed it.

(7) Layti'-oo'-eh, ma'-ta'ax u--yil--ik--oo'.
   Ipr--pl-top neg-adv Dpr--V--PM--3pl 3  ever 3--see
   a'-ba'äl-che' he'-lo',
   det-----CN dem-dist
   the-animal

As for them, they had never seen that animal.

(8) a. *Ma'-ta'ax tan--in--wil--ik.
    neg-adv asp-Dpr--V--PM  ever dur-1sg--see

b. *Ma'-ta'ax t--in--kin--s--ah.
   neg--adv asp-DPr--V--caus-DPM  ever com-1sg-die

Ma'ata'ax serves as an aspect marker (indicating at no time up to the present) and may not combine with other aspect markers as evidenced by the ungrammaticallity of the sentences in (8).
The function of word order change to mark
highlighting and its relation to negative scope are
indicated by the following examples:

(9) Ma' tan--in--tal etel a'--winik--eh.
    neg asp-Dpr--V prep det--N--top
    dur-1sg-come with the--man
    I'm not coming with the man.

(10) Tan--in--tal ma' yetel a'--winik-eh,
    asp-Dpr--V neg prep det--N--top
    dur-1sg-come with the--man
    I'm coming (but) not with the man.

(11) A'--winik-eh ma' tun--tal t--in wetel,
    det--N--top neg asp/Dpr-V prep-Ppr prep
    the-man dur/3-come to--1sg with
    As for the man, he isn't coming with me.

(12) A'--winik-eh ma' kim--ih ti kah,
    det--N--top neg V--Dpr prep N
    the-man die--3 in town
    As for the man, he didn't die in town.

(13) Ti kah--eh, ma' kim--ih winik.
    prep N--top neg V--Dpr N
    in town die--3 man
    In town, a man didn't die.

(14) Ma' a'--winik a' kim--ih ti kah--eh.
    neg det--N det V--Dpr prep N--rel
    the-man die--3 in town
    It's not the man that died in town.

(15) Ma' t---in--bel in--wil--a' a'--winik-eh.
    neg asp-Dpr--V Dpr--V--SPM det--N--top
    dur-1sg-go 1sg-see the--man
    I'm not going to see the man.

(16) A'--winik-eh, ma' t--in--bel in--wil--a'.
    det--N--top neg asp-Dpr--V Dpr--V--SPM
    the--man dur-1sg-go 1sg-see
    As for the man, I'm not going to see him.
Example (9) is an unmarked negative sentence, with the negative marker $ma^+$ appearing in sentence initial position, before the aspect marker, with the remainder of the sentence as its scope. In (10) the scope is narrowed to cover the oblique object, marked by the change in the position of $ma^+$. In (11) the referent which was an oblique object in (9) and (10) is highlighted as a topicalized subject and the negative scope is generalized over the verb phrase.

A comparison of examples (12) through (14) also indicates variation in scope and the highlighting of MPs. In (12), the subject is highlighted as a topicalized, sentence-initial subject and the negative, whose scope is the VP, appears in unmarked preverbal position. In (13), the location is highlighted, marked by sentence-initial position and the topic marker and the negative again appears before the verb with the VP (a different VP from (12)) as its scope. In (14), the subject is again highlighted but by negative contrastive focus and $ma^+$ appears in sentence-initial position marking the subject as the focus of the negation.

Examples (15) and (16) evidence a difference in the highlighting of the patient. In (15) the object is in an unmarked position after the verb, and the negative, in sentence-initial position, has generalized scope. In (16), however, the patient is further highlighted, marked by the movement of the object to sentence-initial
position while the negative appears preverbally, scoping the VP.

Another type of scoping phenomenon is evident in the following examples:

(17) A. Ah Hwaan t--u--han--t--ah tulakal a'r-bik'-eh.
   masc PM asp-Dpr-V-tran--DPM quant det-N--top com-3--eat all the-meat
   Juan ate all of the meat.

   B. Ma', layti' a'-lo' t--u--han--t--ah--eh.
   neg Ipr det-dist asp-Dpr-V-tran--DPM-rel 3sg com-3--eat
   No, it's that one who ate it.

(18) A. Tan--a--kin--s--ik u tsimim?
   asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM Ppr N
dur--2--die 3 horse
   Are you butchering his horse?

   B1. Ma', a'-k--in--kin--s--ik--eh, k'ek'en.
   neg det-asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM rel N
   inc-1sg--die pig
   No, what I butcher is a pig.

   or B2. Ma', k'ek'en tan--in--kin--s--ik.
   neg N asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM pig dur-1sg--die
   No, I'm butchering a pig.

(19) A. T--u--ts'on--ah keeh a'-winik-eh?
   asp-Dpr--V--DPM N det-N--top com-3--shoot deer the-man
   Did the man shoot deer?

   B. Ma', a'-winik-eh balum t--u--ts'on--ah.
   neg det-N--top N asp-Dpr--V--DPM the-man jaguar com-3--shoot
   No, the man shot jaguar.
(20) A. Tan--a--mol--ik a'--abil he'--lo'?  
asp-Dpr--V---PM det--N dem-dist  
dur--2-gather the-plum  
Are you gathering those plums?  
B. Ma', tan--in--wen--s--ik.  
neg asp-Dpr--V--caus-PM  
dur-1sg-lower  
No, I'm picking them.  

(21) A. A'--winik-eh hok'--ih ti ts'ón,  
det--N--top V--Dpr sub V  
the-man leave-3 to shoot  
The man went out to shoot.  
B. T--u---tas---ah bik'?  
asp-Dpr-V/caus-DPM N  
com--3-come meat  
Did he bring meat?  
A. Ma', balum t--u--kin--s--ah.  
neg N asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM  
jaguar com-3--die  
No, he killed jaguar.  

In the examples above, the negative scope applies to a proposition made or suggested by another participant in the discourse, typically in a question as in (18) to (21). The negative negates the prior proposition but requires further clarification as to which part of the proposition is not true. Such further specification generally occurs following the negative, often in contrastive focus constructions. In (17), Speaker B denies the validity of Speaker A's proposition and asserts that another agent performed the action in a subject-focus construction. In (18) and (19) the first speaker's questions are answered in the negative and it
is the object that is in contrastive focus. In (20), the
second speaker's denial focuses on the verb and in (21)
it is the entire proposition that is denied (for the
reason that the man mentioned shot jaguar (which is
considered inedible) and not any edible game).

As the examples so far discussed indicate, there is
considerable flexibility in the highlighting of
sentential constituents and the scope of negation. When
a noun phrase is topicalized and fronted, it is not
entirely clear that it is included in the scope of the
following negation. When a proposition (either a
question or an assertion) is denied, further
clarification of the scope of the negation is required.
This results from the distinct nature of the highlighting
processes involved. While both negation and
topicalization have reference to old information,
negation is a contrastive mechanism while topicalization
is a cohesive mechanism. Negation is always contrastive,
but its scope is not always clearly marked. Consider the
following examples:

(22) Ma' ok--s--ib--ih ti chem, ti che' kix--b--ih.
    negV-caus-pas-Dpr prep N prep N V--pas-Dpr
    put 3 in canoe to tree tie 3

It wasn't put in the canoe, it was tied to a tree.

(23) A'--he'--loh ma' a--bis--ik tumen ma' ki'.
    det-dem-dist neg Dpr-V/aus-PM conj neg adj
    2-go because good

Don't take that one because it's not good.
(24) Ah Kalix-eh ma' u--k'a'nt--ih u--han--t--eh
mascPN--topneg Dpr--V----? Dpr--V-tran--SPM 3--want 3--eat

a'--nil-eh, chen tan--u--bax--t--ik.
det--N--topadv asp-Dpr--V-tran--PM corn only dur--3--play

Calish doesn't want to eat the ear of corn, he just wants to play with it.

(25) K--u--yil--ik--oo' hun tuul noxi' ah koh.
asp-Dpr--V----PM----pl numclassadv mascN inc--3--see one animbiglion

A'-ba'al-che'-eh, tulakal u yich ma' chik--a'an
det----CM----topquant Ppr N neg V--part the--animal all 3 face see
etel u tso'ots--el.
prep Ppr N----pos with 3 hair

They saw a huge lion. As for the animal, all of its face wasn't visible with its hair.

(26) Bayorita ich k'aax-eh, ma' patal u--wen--el mak
adv prep N--topneg asp Dpr--V-intr N
now in forestabil 3-sleepperson

ma'lo' tumen hach yan k'o'xol.
adv conjadv cop N well because much gnat

Now in the forest a person can’t sleep well because there are a lot of gnats.

(27) ...a'-k'in ke Dios k--u--ts'-ik ten a'-ba'al-che'
det--Nrel PN asp-Dpr--V--PM Ipr det----CM
the-day that God inc-3-give 1sg the-animal
t--in ben-il--eh, k--in--ts'on--ik, i a'-k'in
prep-Ppr N-pos-rel asp-Dpr--V----PM conjdet-N
on-1sgpath inc-1sg-shootand the-day

ma'--eh, pwes ma' t--in--ts'on--ik mix ba'al.
eg-nereladv neg asp-Dpr----V----PM negN
well com-1sg-shoot thing

...the days that God gives me an animal on my path
I shoot it and the days he doesn't, well, I don't shoot anything.
...the man didn't have his speech, he wasn't able to say anything to him...

I wasn't able to hook even one fish.

Not even once did I kill it.

When the negative marker ma^ appears immediately in front of the verb as in (22) to (29), scope is generalized over the entire VP. However, as may be seen in (22) and (24), the scope of the negation may be more clearly defined in the following discourse. In (22), it is location that is the most relevant feature while in (24) it is the action. The appearance of of the negative marker ma^ to post-verbal position as in (10) and (23) narrows the scope of the negation without marking contrastive focus.

Due to the fact that the negative marker appears in front of the constituents that it scopes, scope may be narrowed by movements of the negative to positions after the verb and movements of other sentential constituents in front of the negative. (23), (25) and (26) are
further examples where highlighted constituents appear in front of the negative, evidencing contrastive focus in (23) and topicalization in (25) and (26). (27) is an interesting example where the information scoped by the first negative marker is anaphorically deleted, after being mentioned in immediately prior discourse. All that appears is the anaphoric relative marker, suffixed to the negative.

While the least marked position for *ma* is in front of the verb, *mix* ("neither", "nor", or "not even") typically appears in front of a noun phrase, often after the verb as may be seen in (27) to (29). Except when in sentence initial position, as in (30), *mix* appears in conjunction with *ma*. *Mix* adds contrastiveness and clarifies negative scope, which is typically the noun phrase which follows.

Still higher degrees of contrastiveness are evident in negative contrastive focus constructions, in which the negative appears before a fronted constituent which it scopes.

5.4.2. Negative Contrastive Focus

In addition to word order movements and specificity marking, which mark contrastive focus generally, negative contrastive focus is marked by a negative marker (*ma* or *mix*) which appears immediately in front of the focused constituent and in certain circumstances the -iřih scope
marker, which is suffixed to the focused constituent.

Consider the following examples:

(1) Ma' t--in--han--t--ik bu'ul wa'ye'.
    neg asp-Dpr--V-trans--PM N loc
    inc-lsg-eat bean here

I don't eat beans here.

(2) Ma' bu'ul (a') k--in--han--t--ik wa'ye'.
    neg N det asp-Dpr--V-trans--PM loc
    beab inc-lsg-eat here

It's not beans (that) I eat here.

(3) A'. A'--k--u--kin--s--ik a-k'ek'en-eh, layti'.
    det-asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM Ppr--N--rel Ipr
    inc-3--die 2--pig 3
    a'--he'--lo'--eh.
    det-dem-dist-top

The one who killed your pig is that one.

B. Ma' layti' a'-loh, ah Hwaan t--u--kin--s--ah.
    neg Ipr det-dist masc PN asp-Dpr--V-caus--PM 3
    com-3--die

It's not that one, Juan killed it.

(4) Ma' a'-winik he'-loh ah okol--eh, layti'.
    neg det--N dem-dist masc N--rel Ipr the-man
    thief 3
    a'--he'--lo' a'--t--u--yok--l--ah.
    det-dem-dist det-asp-Dpr--V-trans--PM com-3-steal

It's not that man who is the thief, it's that man that stole it.

Example (1) above is an unmarked negative sentence with the object in post-verbal position. In contrast, in (2) the object appears immediately following the negative, in front of the verb, a position for object-contrastive focus (see Chapter 2). Similarly, in
(3) and (4) the constituents that are in contrastive focus, in these cases subjects, immediately follow the negative markers. In these examples, position and specificity marking (but not topic marking) are sufficient to signal negative contrastive focus without the further highlighting of the -i'ih suffix. It should also be noted that these are a type of cleft construction with the constituent in focus fronted and often followed by a relative clause as in (2) and (4). As a comparison of the aspect marking in (1) and (2) indicates, the verb is within the scope of the negative in the former (with the negative incompletive marker t-) while it is not in the latter. The boundary of the clefted constituent may be additionally marked by -i'ih as may be seen below:

(5) Ma' bu'ul-i'ih a'-k--in--han--t--ik--eh.  
    neg  W--scope det-asp-Dpr-V-tran-PM-rel  
    bean  inc-1sg-eat  

It's not beans that I am eating.

(6) A'-t--in--han--t--ah--eh, ma' bu'ul-i'ih.  
    det-asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPM-rel neg  W--scope  
    com-1sg-eat-tran  bean  

What I ate wasn't beans.

(7) T--in--wil--ah a'-winik-eh, ma' balum-i'ih.  
    asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--W--top neg  W--scope  
    com-1sg-see  the--man  jaguar  

I saw the man, not a jaguar.

(8) A'-la'-eh, ma' ma'lo' ba'ax--i'ih.  
    det-prox-top neg  adj  W--scope  
    good  thing  

As for this, it's not a good thing.
In examples (5) and (6) above, the noun **bu'ul 'beans'** refers to a semantic patient and is in contrastive focus as in (2) but is additionally marked by the **-i'ih** suffix and may appear before or after the relative clause. As in the case of the interrogative words with the **-i'ih** suffix noted in 5.1.4., final position is also a marked position for negative contrastive focus. Examples (7) and (8) are additional examples where the constituent which is in negative contrastive focus appears in sentence-final position and is marked by the **-i'ih** suffix.

In examples (9) and (10) is further evidence concerning contrastive focus of patient noun phrases. In (9), **tsimin 'horse'** is in negative contrastive focus followed by an instance of affirmative contrastive focus, with the patient noun **pek' 'dog'** preceding the verb. In (10) are two examples of contrastive focus in succession focus marked by two occurrences of **mix 'neither/nor'** and (optionally) two occurrences of **-i'ih**. Two occurrences
of -i'ih rather than one appear to mark increased contrastiveness of each constituent.

It has been noted previously in this chapter that -i'ih has several functions including the partitive and locative and negative scope. However, there is little chance of ambiguity between its function as a marker of negative scope and its other functions. As a marker of negative scope, it appears immediately after the constituent in contrastive focus. When it occurs elsewhere, it serves one of the other functions.

(11) Ma' bu'ul k--in--han--t--ik-(i'ih) wa'ye'.
    neg W asp-Dpr--V-tran-PM-(partit) loc
    bean inc-1sg-eat here

It's not (some) beans that I eat here.

(12) *Ma' t--in--wil--ik bu'ul--i'ih wa'ye'.
    neg asp-Dpr-V---PM W----scope loc
    inc-1sg-see bean here

(13) a. Ma' samal-i'ih in--wil--ik.
    neg adv-scope Dpr--V---PM
    tomorrow 1sg-see

It's not tomorrow I see it.

b. *Ma' samal-eh in--wil--ik.
    neg adv-top Dpr--V---PM
    tomorrow 1sg-see

c. Ma' samal in--wil--ik-i'ih.
    neg adv Dpr--V---PM--loc
    tomorrow 1sg-see there

It's not tomorrow I see it there.

(14) a. Wa ma' bu'ul-i'ih, ba'ax tak---a---min--ik?
    cond neg W---scope inter asp-Dpr--V---PM
    if bean what desir-2---buy

If not beans, what do you want to buy?
b. *wa ma' bu'ul-i'ih-eh, ba'ax tak-a-min-ik?

top

(15) A. Ma' a--wok--l--ik in wixi'im.
    neg Dpr--V-trans-PM Ppr N
    2--steal 1sg corn

Don't steal my corn.

B. Ma' in--ten--i'ih.
    neg emp--Ipr--scope
    1sg

It's not me.

(16) A. Max t--u--kin--s--ah a'--balum-eh?
    inter asp-Dpr-V-caus-DPM det-N--top
    who com-3-die the-jaguar

Who killed the jaguar?

B. Layti' a'-winik he'--lo', k--u--tal--eh.
    Ipr det--N dem-dist asp-Dpr-V-rel
    3 the-man inc-3-come

It was that man who's coming.

C. Ma' a'--lo'--i'ih, layti' a'-winik
    neg det-dist-scope Ipr det--N
    3 the-man

nik--a'an he'--lo'.
    V--part dem-dist
    sit

It wasn't that one, it was that man seated.

It was seen in (5), where -i'ih is suffixed to the patient noun in contrastive focus, that -i'ih marks negative scope, but in (11), if it occurs suffixed to the verb it functions as a partitive. The ungrammaticality of (12) may be attributed to the fact that none of its functions are interpretable in this context; the verb does not allow a partitive interpretation, the word order is not appropriate for negative contrastive focus, and
the locative wa'ye 'here' conflicts with a locative interpretation for the -i\textsubscript{m}ih suffix.

In example (13) is similar evidence of varying interpretations of the function of -i\textsubscript{m}ih. In (13a) the temporal adverb is in negative contrastive focus marked by initial position and the ma\textsuperscript{m}"i\textsubscript{m}ih frame. As a negative contrastive focus construction, the topic marker may not appear suffixed to the adverb as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (13b). Similarly, the topic marker may not appear suffixed to -i\textsubscript{m}ih when it functions as a negative scope marker as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (14b). (13c) is also a negative contrastive focus construction, marked by ma\textsuperscript{m} and the fronted position of sam\textsubscript{m}al 'tomorrow', but the -i\textsubscript{m}ih suffix cannot be interpreted as a negative scope marker as it appears suffixed to the verb, but serves instead as a locative marker.

Examples (15) and (16) are further examples of negative contrastive focus with discourse context provided. In (15), Speaker B adamantly denies the accusation of Speaker A, highlighting negative contrast. In (16), Speaker C contradicts Speaker B in a negative contrastive focus construction and then provides information as to the correct identity of the agent in question.

While it was noted above that there is little ambiguity between the function of -i\textsubscript{m}ih as a negative
scope marker and its other possible functions, there is an interesting interaction between the locative and negative scope functions as may be seen in the examples below:

(17) Ma' a-wil-een in-k'a't-ih ka' tak-ech
    neg Dpr--V--Dpr Dpr--V--?
    2--see--1sg 1sg-want  come--2sg
te'--lo'--(i'ih),
loc-dist--(loc)

It's not to see me that I want you to come there.

(18) Ma' a-wil-een-i'ih in-k'a't-ih ka' tak-ech-i'ih.
    scope loc

It's not to see me that I want you to come there.

(19) Ma' te'-i'ih in-k'a't-ih ka' tak-ech a-wil-een.
    loc-scope

It's not there that I want you to come to see me.

(20) Ma' te' in-k'a't-ih ka' tak-ech a-wil-een-i'ih
    loc loc scope

It's not there I want you to come to see me.

(21) Ma' te'-(lo') tak--in--bel--i'ih.
    neg loc-(dist) asp--Dpr--V--loc scope
desir--1sg-go

It's not there I want to go.

(22) a. Ma' te'-lo'--i'ih tak--in--bel.
    neg loc-dist-scope asp--Dpr--V
desir--1sg-go

    It's not there I want to go.

b. *Ma' te'-lo'--i'ih tak-in-bel-i'ih, scope

(23) A'-winik-eh, ma' te'--i'ih a'-tu'ux bin-ih-eh.
    det--N--top neg loc-scope det-rel V--Dpr-rel
    the-man where go--3

As for the man, it's not there where he went.
(24) A'-tu'ux t--in--tika'--t--ah--ech--eh,
det-rel asp-Dpr--V---tran-DPM-Dpr-rel
where com-1sg-send 2sg

ma' te'--i'ih,
neg loc--scope

Where I sent you was not there.

In example (17), it is the subordinate verb which is in negative contrastive focus, marked by its movement in front of the main verb and by the negative ma', though not by the -i'ih suffix. If -i'ih appears suffixed to te'lo' 'there' in sentence final position, its function is simply locative scope. In (18), however, there are two instances of -i'ih, each with a distinct function. The first, suffixed to the verb in negative contrastive focus, marks negative scope, while the second, in sentence final position serves the locative function.

Examples (19) and (20) are instances where it is the locative that is in negative contrastive focus. In sentences such as these, -i'ih may only occur once (see (22b)). If it occurs suffixed to the locative te' as in (19), it serves both negative and locative scope functions. However, if it appears in sentence-final position as in (20), it is only the locative scope function which is served. (21) and (22) are similar examples where the -i'ih suffix serves only the locative function in the former, although there is negative contrastive focus, but serves both functions in (22a), where it is suffixed to the locative which is in
contrastive focus. As evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (22b), -i'ih cannot occur both suffixed to the locative and in sentence final position. Finally, examples (23) and (24) indicate that the locative in negative contrastive focus may appear in other positions than sentence-initial position, although they too are marked. In (23) a topicalized subject appears in initial position with the negative contrastive focus cleft construction following and in (24) the constituents in negative contrastive focus appear after a clause in sentence-final position, a marked position for -i'ih as noted above (5.1.4.).

5.5. Summary

Scope is often marked morphosyntactically in Itza, with morphosyntactic markers appearing before and/or after the constituent which is scoped. Scope of interrogation may be marked in a variety of ways. For Yes-No questions, the interrogative marker wah appears following the constituent which is the focus of the interrogation. In interrogative word questions, the scope of the interrogation is marked initially by an interrogative word and (optionally) by the -i'ih suffix. The suffix -i'ih marks cleft constructions and relative clauses often follow. It has been noted that in both interrogation and negation there is a high degree of shared information. The -i'ih marker, in addition to its
function as a marker of the final boundary of the scoped constituent in both cases, is an anaphoric marker replacing deleted shared information.

It was also noted that -i'sih may function as a partitive marker, in which case the referent of the whole from which the part is drawn is shared information and may be anaphorically replaced by -i'sih. It was also suggested that there may be a semantic connection between the partitive function of -i'sih and its other functions as a scope marker based on its anaphoric function. The contrast of part-whole marked by the partitive may be equivalent to the contrast involved in scoping phenomena such as interrogation where the referent (the part) is contrasted to the universe of possible referents (the whole).

Locative scope has also been examined in detail and it was noted that the locative frame te'...-i'sih serves a scoping function when the identity of the location is shared information. Either of these scoping particles may appear without the other, though the range of scope in such cases is less determinate. When te' appears without the -i'sih suffix it may serve the function of contextualizing new information. When -i'sih appears without a preposed te' marker, the identity of the location is shared information but scope is indeterminate.

Scope in negation is marked by a preposed negative
marker, word order, and the -i'ihih suffix. As with interrogative and locative scope, -i'ihih marks shared information and often occurs in contrastive clefted constructions. The scope of a negative marker covers the remainder of the clause or sentence in which it appears. The -i'ihih suffix further delimits the boundaries of negative scope and often occurs in cases of negative contrastive focus.

In interrogation, specification of location, and negation, scope may be marked by a preposed marker and the -i'ihih suffix, often in cleft constructions. The -i'ihih suffix functions as an anaphoric marker and often appears in contrastive focus constructions.
1. The interrogative marker *wah* is very similar if not identical in function to the Yucatec Maya interrogative marker *waa*, described by Durbin and Ojeda (1978c).

2. In (10) and (13) the conjunction *wa* appears in addition to the interrogative *wah*. On the basis of phonological and semantic similarity one suspects that the two are historically related. At present, however, their distribution and functions are distinct.

3. One case where the interrogative marker may appear following a topic marker is after a fronted prepositional phrase as in the following example.

   Ti kah-(eh) wa(h) t--a-tika'--t--ah a'--winik-eh?
   prep N--(top) inter asp-Dpr-V-tran-DPm det--N--top
   to town com-2-send the-man

   To town, perhaps, you sent the man?

Initial position is marked for prepositional phrases, both as topics and in contrastive focus. In this case, an object of a preposition may be highlighted in both ways, first as a topic and then, as in afterthought phenomena, interrogatively focused. As may be seen in 5.1.2.(11), a reversal in markings with the interrogative first is ungrammatical. It should be noted that it is unusual for an oblique object to receive both markings and NPs higher in the Accessibility Hierarchy cannot.

4. One other sentence type where these suffixes (*-ik(-il)) for intransitives and *-il* for transitives) appear is in the declarative counterparts of *bix* 'why' questions, adverbial focus *baay* 'thus' statements as in (31) and the following:

   Baay--lo' lub--ik--il--ech.
   adv-dist V--?--?--?--Dpr
   thus fall 2sg

   Thus you fell.

These suffixes are infrequent, however, and ordinary verb morphology is far more common as with *bix* questions. They appear to mark some semantic distinction regarding the manner of the action. These suffixes also appear in Yucatec Maya in reversed order (*il-ik*) and are discussed
by Bricker (1979, 1981b).

5. As regards frequency of usage, the -i'ih suffix usually functions to mark locative scope.

6. There may also be a tendency for objects with the i'ih suffix in sentences with first person (singular) subjects to be more prone to a partitive rather than a locative interpretation in contrast with other subjects as suggested in a comparison of (1) and (2a). This may be due to the natural correlation of first person and proximity.
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I attempt to demonstrate in the previous chapters that by means of discourse analysis, much of the variation in the order of sentential constituents and morphosyntactic marking in Itza Maya may be understood. Without attention to discourse context (including prior discourse, the physical and socio-cultural setting of discourse, and the relationships among the participants in discourse), speakers' intentions of highlighting and grounding information, speakers' assumptions about the amount of information shared by addressees, and the speakers' need to provide cohesion in discourse, many of the syntactic structures and morphosyntactic markers in Itza cannot be adequately described or explained. An outline of the basic principles of discourse analysis is provided in Chapter 1.

In Chapter 2 it is demonstrated that the ordering of constituents reflects the speakers' intentions to highlight and background information, and whether such information is new information or shared information. If the information is new, it may be highlighted with contrastive focus. If it is old, it may be highlighted with topicalization. Contrastive focus and topicalization are reflected in both the order of constituents and the specificity marking of nominal arguments.
The specificity system, examined in Chapter 3, reflects the speaker's intentions to highlight and background information, his judgements about the amount of information shared by his audience, and the communicative requirement to provide discourse continuity. When the speaker wishes to introduce new information into a discourse, about which he wishes to elaborate, indefinite marking is generally employed. Unspecified NPs often reflect new information, but information that is not intended to be elaborated upon. Specificity marking in contrastive focus constructions reflects the type and degree of shared information and the need of the speaker to provide sufficient context for the hearer to identify an NP's referent. Specific shared information is periodically reintroduced in a discourse to facilitate cohesion and hearer comprehension.

The specificity system also reflects the highlighting of old information. Old information is always specific and may be highlighted via topicalization or relativization processes or backgrounded via anaphoric and elliptic processes. It is noted with regard to specificity, that the contextualizing information provided by specificity markers may be deictic, referring to the context of the actual speech situation, or anaphoric, referring to prior discourse.

Verb morphosyntax, like nominal morphosyntax, is quite complex in Itza Maya and reflects the speakers' intentions to highlight and background information and
the requirement of discourse continuity in addition to marking semantic aspectual distinctions and propositional semantic relations. Itza has a split ergative verb agreement system, with ergative verb agreement in the completive aspect, the perfective, the subjunctive and related irrealis constructions, and with statives. The relationship of transitivity and ergativity is examined and it was suggested that ergative marking correlates with lower transitivity in Itza Maya.

Transitivity is a discourse concept referring to the relationship of the verb to its basic arguments (S, A, and P) and functions to highlight information and promote continuity in discourse. It was found that the specificity marking of NPs interacted with verbal morphosyntax. Highlighted arguments of the verb typically receive specificity markers, which do not occur on backgrounded arguments. The backgrounding of the patient is marked by object demotion from its unmarked independent status which culminates in object incorporation or deletion (the antipassive) and intransitive or stative verb morphology. The backgrounding of the agent results in passive formations where the agent is demoted from subject status to an oblique relationship to the verb or deleted, and the verb again receives intransitive or stative markers. Thus, the backgrounding of either major argument of the verb leads to lower transitivity.

The marking of contrast in discourse, which is
evident in word order, NP specificity, and verb morphosyntax is especially important in the scoping processes described in Chapter 5. Contrast in scope depends on the balance of new and old information and is often marked morphosyntactically in Itza Maya by trapping particles framing the constituent which is the focus of interrogation, negation etc. Scoping processes in interrogation, negation, and locational identification in Itza indicate that the degree of shared information and the speaker's intention of highlighting information are intricately interrelated. Contrast in these scoping processes implies that relevant information is understood by the hearers. The speaker may indicate the level of contrast in relation to the amount of information shared by his audience and promote discourse cohesion by using anaphoric mechanisms. Anaphoric mechanisms may serve the joint purpose of delimiting the contrast and promoting cohesion.

The discourse principles employed in this thesis, such as new and old information, highlighting and backgrounding, contrast and cohesion, reflect the view that human communication is both conventional and creative. Linguistic structure, with its constraints, provides a means for the transmission of shared information and the transmission of new information. The richness and complexity of linguistic systems provide speakers with the means and opportunity to communicate creative and complex messages that reflect both their
individuality and their cultural heritage.
APPENDICES

Appendix A. Abbreviations

A
abil
abs
Acc
adj
admon
adv
affirm
anim
asp
assur
caus
class
CN
cop
com
comp
cond
conj
cv
dem
des
agent
abilitive
absolutive
accusative
adjective
admonition
adverb
affirmative
animate
aspect
assurative
causative
noun class
complex noun
copula
completive
comparative
conditional
conjunction
complex verb
demonstrative
desiderative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detr</td>
<td>detransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dist</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>distal patient marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dpr</td>
<td>dependent pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dub</td>
<td>dubitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emp</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excl</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foc</td>
<td>contrastive focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habit</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hort</td>
<td>hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immed</td>
<td>immediate past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imp</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inam</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc</td>
<td>incompletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipr</td>
<td>independent pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unreal</td>
<td>irreals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblig</td>
<td>obligative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pas</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partit</td>
<td>partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>proximal patient marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ppr</td>
<td>possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prox</td>
<td>proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quant</td>
<td>quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repet</td>
<td>repetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>reportative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rever</td>
<td>reverential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPM</td>
<td>subordinate patient marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub</td>
<td>subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temp</td>
<td>temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term</td>
<td>terminative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B. Texts

Text I. Hunting

1. Ak'7--(4h)--ih bin-o'on ti ts'on. Bin-o'on
    N--(dist)--Dpr V--Dpr sub V V--Dpr
    night 3 go-lpl to shoot go-lpl

   Last night we went to hunt. We went

2. tulakal t--a'-noh beh k--u--bel tak Sik'u'-eh,
   quant prep-det-adj N asp-Dpr-V prep PM--rel
   all on-the-big way inc-3--go up to
   all the way on the road that goes up to La Trinidad.

3. Te'--lo' ti--ki--ch'a'--ah u ben--il tsimin.
   loc-dist asp-Dpr--V--DPM Ppr N--pos N
   com-1pl--take 3 way mule

   There we took the mule path.

4. Ka'nak'-o'on t--a'--yax kol--oo' yan t--u chi'
   conj V--Dpr prep-det-adj N--pl cop prep-Ppr N
   and climb-1pl to-the-first milpa on-3 edge

   And we climbed to the first milpas that are on the edge

5. a'--noh beh--eh. A'--ka' k'och--o'on--eh, k--in-
   det-adj N--rel det-adv V--Dpr--rel asp-Dpr--rel
   the-big way when arrive-1pl inc-1sg
   of the road. When we arrived, I

6. wa'il-ik t--in wet'ok--eh: "Ko'ox ki--wuts-kin--t--eh
   V--PM prep-Ppr N--top V/hort Dpr----CV----trans-SPM
   say to--1sg friend let's go 1pl----fix

   say (said) to my friend: "Let's fix

7. ki k'aak' ti'a'al ka' ki--tich'--k'ak'--t--eh
   Ppr N sub sub Dpr----CV----trans-SPM
   1pl fire in order to that 1pl--illuminate

   our light so that we can illuminate

8. a'--kol--he'--la'--eh." I layti' k--u--ya'(a)l--ik
   det--N--dem-prox-top conj Ipr asp-Dpr--V--DPM
   the-milpa and 3 inc-Dpr--say

   this milpa." And he says
9. ten-eh: "Ma'lo'.

10. I pr-top adv V-imp quant det---- N adj 1sg fine give all the-battery good
to me: "Fine. Put all the good batteries

in the flashlight (and) so that the lamp's light is bright."

11. a'k'aak'-eh." I layt(i) a'-lo' niik-- l-ah-- o' on det---- N-top conj I pr det-dem v-intr-dist-Dpr the-lamp and 3 sit 1pl

And it's that (place) we sat

12. yok' hun p'e che' in wuts-kin-- t-eh in prep num class N Dpr------ CV- tran-SPM Ppr over one inam log 1sg----- fix 1sg on a log for me to fix my

13. k'aak'-eh ka' ti-- ki- wu'y-- ah-- eh, wak'-- ih N-top conj asp-Dpr---- V--- DPM-rel V--- Dpr lamp when com-1pl-- hear explode-3 lamp when we heard it,

14. u hun hun p'e ts'on ich a-- kol tu'ux bel ki- Ppr N num class N prep det-- N rel V Dpr 3 sound one inam gun in the-silpa where go 1pl the sound of a gun exploded in the milpa where we were

15. ka'a kuch-- ih ki-- tich'- k'ak'-- t-eh in- to' on- eh. V adv-- Dpr Dpr------ CV-- tran-SPM emp-- I pr-top go before-3 1pl-- illuminate 1pl going before to illuminate it ourselves. And I say to him: "We aren't going

16. Ih k-- in--wa'al-- ik ti'ih-- eh: "Ma' tan-- ki-- bel

17. ki-- wil-- a' mix ba' al-- i'ih tumen yah yan Dpr---- V-- SPM neg N--- scope conj adv cop 1pl-- see thing because already
to see anything because there are already
18. *mak tal-ih* taan-il to'on i *ba-lah ko'ox*
   
   *W V---Dpr N--pos Ipr conj temp-prox V--hort*
   
   person come-3 front 1pl and let's go
   
   people that came in front of us and now let's go

19. *tak ka'nal. T--a'--beh--eh yan u laak' kol*
   
   *prep N prep-det--W--top cop Ppr adj W*
   
   to top to-the--way 3 other milpa
   
   up to the top. On the road there is another milpa

20. *in--k'a'ool. Uch-ak pat--al ki--kil--ik*
   
   *Dpr---V adv--irreal asp Dpr---V---PM*
   
   1sg-know perhaps abil 1pl--see
   
   I know. Perhaps we can see

21. *ba'al-che'-i'ih." I ka' nak'--o'on, ok--o'on*
   
   *CM------loc conj conj V----Dpr V---Dpr*
   
   animal and and climb-1pl enter-1pl
   
   animals there." And we climbed, we entered

22. *t--a'--kol--eh ka' kap-een in--tich'-k'ak'-t-eh,*
   
   *prep-det--N--top conj V--Dpr Dpr----CV---tran--SPM*
   
   to--the--milpa and begin--1sg 1sg--illuminate
   
   the milpa and I began to illuminate it.

23. *Mix ba'al ti--ki--wil--ah. In--ten--eh yan in ben-il*
   
   *neg N asp--Dpr---V--DPM emp--Ipr-top cop Ppr N--pos*
   
   thing come-1pl--see 1sg 1sg path
   
   We saw nothing. Me, I have my path

24. *in--heb--m--ah tu'ux k--in--hok'--ol tu'ux yan*
   
   *Dpr--V--perf--DPM rel asp--Dpr--V--intr rel cop*
   
   1sg--clear where inc-1sg--leave where
   
   that I have cleared where I go out where there are

25. *a'--muknal a'--kim--en--oo' uch--ben--oo' tu'ux*
   
   *det--CN det--V--nom--pl adj--pl rel*
   
   the-grave the-die old where
   
   the graves of the ancient dead where

26. *k--in--kinin--t--ik--eh. Ka' k'och--o'lon--eh*
   
   *asp--Dpr--V--tran--PM--rel adv V---Dpr--rel*
   
   inc-1sg-guard when arrive-1pl
   
   I guard it. When we arrived,
27. komo han--il tulakal u baak' a'--wits--oo'--eh, adv adj-pos quant Ppr W det--M----pI-top as clear all 3 foot the-hill
   as it is clear all around the foot of the mounds,

28. ka' kap--een in--tich'--k'ak'--t--eh tulakal a'--tu'ux conj V---Dpr Dpr-------CV---tran--SPm quant det-rel and begin-1sg 1sg--illuminate all where
   (and) I began to illuminate it all around where

29. han--il--eh a'--ka' t---in--wil---ah--eh, adj-pos-rel det-conj asp--Dpr--V---DPM-rel clear when com--1sg-see
   it is clear, when I saw it,

30. te' chil--a'an hun tuul keeh--i'ih i in-ten-eh loc V----part num class W--scope conj emp--Ipr-top lie one anim deer and 1sg
   there was lying a deer and I,

31. t--in t'an--eh wa balum. Ma' t--in--wil--ik prep--Ppr W--top conj W neg asp--Dpr--V---PM in--1sg thought if jaguar not com--1sg-see
   I thought it might be a jaguar. I'm not seeing it

32. ma'lo', komo chen u yich a'--k--in-tich'--k'ak'--t-ik--eh, adv adv adv Ppr W det-asp--Dpr----CV----tran--PM-rel well as only 3 eye inc--1sg-illuminate
   well as it's only his eyes that I am lighting.

33. I in-to'on-eh nak'--a'an-o'on t--u ni' a'--wits--eh, conj emp--Ipr-top V----part--Dpr prep--Dpr W det--W--top and 1sg climb 1pl on--3 top the-mound
   And as for us, we were up at the top of the mound.

34. I ka' t--in--wa'al--ah t--in wet'ok--eh: "Ma' conj conj asp--Dpr---V---DPM prep--Ppr W--top neg and and com--1sg--say to--1sg friend
   And I said to my companion: "Don't

35. a--bel ti t'an, a'--lah keeh," ka' kap--een, Dpr--V sub V det-prox W conj V---Dpr 2--go to speak deer when begin--1sg
   go speaking, this is a deer," when I began,
I grabbed the gun and I shot it.

And the thing that happened to us is that the bullet of my gun didn’t explode. Two bullets

I put inside and they didn’t fire,

I say: "Pass me the rifle that you are carrying to see if I can shoot it." And he passed it to me and when he passed it to me the deer lept. I couldn’t
45. *in-ts'on-ik i bin--ih, I to'on-eh ka' tal-o'on*
   Dpr---V----PM conj V---Dpr conj Ipr-top adv V--Dpr
1sg-shoot and go---3 and 1pl when come-1pl

Shoot it and it went. And we, when we came

46. *ti--ki--wil--ah ke ma' pat--ah--ih ki--kix--t--ik*
   asp-Dpr---V----DPM sub neg asp-dist-Dpr Dpr--V-tran-PM
   com-1pl-see that not abil. 3 1pl-find

We saw that we couldn't find

47. *mix ba'al i bin--o'on kuch--ih ete swerte pero*
   neg N conj V---Dpr adv--Dpr prep N conj
   thing and go--1pl imperf--3 with luck but
   anything and we were going with luck but

48. *ma' ti--ki--woo(l)--t--ah ki--tas--ik porke*
   neg asp-Dpr---V----tran-DPM Dpr-V/caus-PM conj
   not com-1pl--know 1pl-come because

We didn't know how to bring it in because

49. *a'-ba'al-che'-eh bin--i(h) to'on.*
   det----CW----top V--Dpr Ipr
   the-animal go---3 1pl

The animal went from us.
Text II. The Lord of the Deer

1. Uch—ih bin-eh yan—ah—ih hun tuul winik
   adv-Dpr report-top cop-dist-Dpr num class W
   before-3 3 one class man

   Long ago, they say, there was a man

2. kih—a’an wa’ye’ i hach u—yoh—el ts’on. Tulakal
   V—part loc conj adv Dpr—V—intr V quant
   living here and he knew a lot about shooting. Every

3. k’in k—u—hok’—ol ti xi’mal ich a’—kol—oo’—eh,
   N asp-Dpr—V—intr sub V prep det—W—pl-top
day inc—3—go out to walk among the milpas,
day he goes out to walk among the milpas,

4. k—u—ts’on-ik keeh. I baay—loh i baay—loh kap—ih
   asp-Dpr—V PM W conj adv-dist conj adv-dist V—Dpr
   inc—3—shoot deer and thus and thus, he began
   he shoots deer. And thus, and thus, he began

5. ti ts’on i ti ts’on. I layti’ k—u—kon—ik yaab
   sub V conj sub V conj Ipr asp—Dpr—V PM quant
   to shoot and to shoot and 3 inc—3—sell much
   to shoot and to shoot. And he sells a lot of

6. bik’ porke chen a’—lo’ u meyah—eh, chen a’—lo’
   W conj adv det—dist Ppr W—top adv det—dist
   meat because only 3 work only
   meat because only that was his work, only that

7. tu’ux k—u—kux—tal—eh. Pero yan—ah—ih bin
   rel asp—Dpr—V—intr—rel conj cop—dist—Dpr report
   where inc—3—live but 3
   was where he made a living. But there was, they say

8. hun p’e k’in, layti’ t—u—yil—ah bin
   num class W Ipr asp—Dpr—V—Pm report
   one inam day 3 com—3—see
   one day, he saw, they say,

9. a’—noh ba’al—che’ wa’an chumuk kol—eh ka’
   det—adj CW V/part prep N—rel conj
   the big animal stand mid milpa and
   the big animal standing in the middle of a milpa and
10. t--u--ts'on--ah i a'--ka' wak'--ih u ts'on-eh, asp-Dpr--V--DPM conj det-adv V----Dpr Ppr W--rel com-3--shoot and when fire--3 3 gun
he shot it and when his gun fired,

11. a'--keeh-eh wak'--ih u siit', ma lub-ih, A'--ba'aax det--N-top V----Dpr Ppr W neg V-Dpr det-rel the-deer explode-3 3 jump fall-3 the-thing
the deer made a leap, it didn't fall. The thing

12. t--u--bet--ah a'--keeh-eh ka' tal-ih tun--siit', asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--N-top sub V-Dpr asp/Dpr--V com-3--do the-deer that come-3 dur/3-jump
that the deer did was that it came jumping

13. yok' a'--winik-eh. I a'--winik-eh t--u--ka'--ts'on-ah prep det--N-top conj det--N-top asp/Dpr-repet--V--DPM over the-man and the--man com-3 shoot over the man. And the man shot it again

14. i a'--ka' ti wak'--ih u ts'on-eh a'--ba'al-che'--eh conj det-adv conj V----Dpr Ppr V--rel det----CN----top and when explode-3 3 gun the-animal
and when his gun fired, the animal

15. ka' hok'--ih u--yalka'--eh ka', ka' bin-ih, ok-ih conj V--Dpr Dpr----V--rel conj conj V-Dpr V-Dpr then leave-3 3--run and and go enter
then left running and, and it went, it entered

16. ich k'aax-eh bel t--u--bet--ah. Ma' kim-ih i prep N--top W asp-Dpr-V--DPM neg V-Dpr conj in forest exit com-3-make die-3 and
into the forest, it made an exit. It didn't die and

17. ah ts'on-eh ka' wa' (a)l--ah--ih u--yil--a' a'--tu'ux masc N--top adv V----dist-Dpr Dpr--V--SPM det-rel hunter then stand 3 3--see where the hunter then stood to see where

18. bin a'--ba'al-che'--eh, ka' bin--ih t--u pach, V det----CN----rel conj V--Dpr prep-Ppr W go the-animal and go---3 at-3 back
the animal went and he went behind it.
The animal was losing a lot of blood. And he was going, he sees where the blood goes.

And he went, he went all over following where the animal went.

When he saw it, he arrived at the base of a hill. And at the base of the hill was a big cave, like the door of a house.

He sees that the blood entered into the cave and he stood, they say,
28. i k--u--ya'al--ik--eh: "A'-aktun he'--la'--eh
conj asp-Dpr-V---PM-top det--N dem-prox-top
and inc-3--say the-cave
and he says: "As for this cave,

29. wa'ye' ok--(ih) a'-ba'al-che'--eh. In--ten
loc V-(Dpr) det--CM--top emp--Ipr
here enter-(3) the-animal 1sg
here the animal entered. I

30. in--wok--ol in--wil--a'--eh." A'-aktun-eh
Dpr--V-intr Dpr--V--SPM-top det--N--top
1sg-enter 1sg-see the-cave
enter to see it." As for the cave,

31. sas--il u hol, chik--a'an kooch ich-il.
adj-pos Ppr N V--part adj prep-pos bright 3 entrance appear wide in
it's entrance is bright, it looks wide inside.

32. Ka' t--u--mic--ah--eh, t--u--mic--ah u ts'on-eh,
conj asp-Dpr-V---DPM-rel asp-Dpr-V---DPM Ppr N--top
and com-3--grab com-3--grab 3 gun
And he grabbed it, he grabbed his gun

33. ka' ok--ih ich a'-aktun-eh i bin--ih i
conj V--Dpr prep det--N--top conj V--Dpr conj
and enter-3 into the-cave and go--3 and
and he entered into the cave and he went and

34. bin--ih, tun--t'ut'--l--ik a'--k'ik'--eh.
V--Dpr asp/Dpr--V PM det--N--top
go--3 dur/3--follow the-blood
and he went, following the blood.

35. A'--ka' k'och--ih--eh, k--u--yil--ik bin--eh
det-adv V---Dpr-rel asp-Dpr-V---PM report-top
when arrive-3 inc-3--see
When he arrived, he sees, they say,

36. te' wa'an hun tuul nooch winik--i'ih. A'-ka'
loc V/part num class adj N---scope det-adv
stand one anim old man when
an old man standing there. When
37. k‘och—ih—eh, k—u—yil—ik—eh, baay, bay hun p‘e
V—Dpr-rel asp-Dpr-V---PM-top adv adv num class
arrive-3 inc-3—see lke like one inam
he arrived, he saw it, it seemed like, like a

38. noh kah-tal-il a‘-tu‘ux yan a‘-chumach—eh.
adj V-intr-nom det-rel cop det---N-----rel
big live where the-old man

big ranch where the old man was.

39. I layti‘-eh wa‘an a‘-chumach-eh tun--ts‘--ik
conj Ipr--top V/part det---N--top asp/Dpr-V---PM
and 3 stand the-old man dur/3-give

And as for him, the old man is standing giving

40. u han--al u ba‘al-che‘-oo‘. I te‘ t--u--yil—ah
Ppr N Ppr CWM-----pl conj loc asp-Dpr-V-DPM
3 food 3 animal and com-3—see

the animals' food. And there he saw

41. yaab keeh k--u--man u--baak‘--t--oo‘ a‘-winik—eh
quant N asp-Dpr-V Dpr--V---tran-3pl det--N--rel
much deer inc-3—pass 3-surround the—man

a lot of deer that pass surrounding the man

42. i a‘--winik--eh k--u--ts‘--ik u han--al.
conj det---N--top asp-Dpr-V---PM Ppr N
and the—man inc—give 3 food

and the man gives their food.

43. I k--u--yil—ik—eh te‘ wa‘an a‘—noh keeh
conj asp-Dpr-V---PM-top loc V/part det—adj N
and inc—see stand the—big deer

And he sees that there is standing the big deer

44. t--u--ts‘on--ah xan—eh. Te‘ yan--i‘ih,
apsp-Dpr-V---DPM adv-rel loc cop—scope
com—shoot also

that he shot too. There it is,

45. tun--chul u k‘ik‘el i k--u--ya‘al--ik bin
asp/Dpr-V Ppr N--pos conj asp-Dpr-V---PM report
dur/3—run 3 blood and inc—say
its blood running and (the old man) says, they say,
46. a'-nooch winik ti'ih--eh: "Kon ke tech
det--adj N Ipr--top prep sub Ipr
the-great man 3 with that 2sg
to him: "Since you

47. ah ts'on--ech--eh, in--tech a'-winik--ech
masc V----Dpr-top emp--Ipr det--N----Dpr
shoot--2sg 2sg the--man--2sg
are the hunter, you are the man

48. k--a--sen--kech ts'on--ik a'-in--ba'al-che'-oo'-eh.
asp-Dpr--adv V----PM det-Ppr-----CN-----pl-rel
inc-2-----much shoot the-1sg--animal
that so often shoots my animals.

49. Ba-lah tan--wil--ik boon ba'al-che' ho'm-ih
temp-prox asp/Dpr-V--PM quant CM asp-Dpr
dur/2-see how many animal finish-3
now you are seeing how many animals you have

50. a--k'oh--a'an--kun--t--es--ik ten. Tulakal
Dpr--V----part--?--tran-caus-PM Ipr quant
2-sicken
made sick for me. All

51. a'-ba'al-che'-oo'-he'--la' k--a--wil--ik--oo'-eh
det-----CM----pl--dem-prox asp-Dpr-V----PM--Dpr-rel
the--animal inc-2--see
these animals that you see

52. a--lah--ts'on--a--ah i ten--eh yan--ah--ih
Dpr--adv----V--perf-DPM conj Ipr-top asp-dist-Dpr
2-totally-shoot and 1sg oblig 3
you have shot them all and as for me, I had

53. in--lah--ts'ik--ik i ba-lah asta ka' k'och-ih
Dpr--adv----V----PM conj temp-prox prep sub V--Dpr
1sg-totally-cure and until arrive-3
to cure them all and it is (only) now that has come

54. t--u k'in in--k'a'ool--t--ik-ech" ki bin a'-nooch
prep-Ppr N Dpr----V----tran-PM-Dpr V report det--N
to-3 day 1sg-know 2sg say the-old
the day for me to meet you" they say the old (man) said
55. winik ti'ih-eh, I a'-winik-eh ma' yan--ah--ih
    Ipr-top conj det--W--top neg cop-dist-Dpr
man 3 and the-man 3
to him. And the man couldn't

56. u--t'an, ma' pat--ah--ih u--ya'al--ik mix ba'al
    Ppr-W neg asp-dist-Dpr Dpr--V--PM neg W
3-speech abil 3 3--say thing
speak, he couldn't say anything

57. ti'ih tumen u--yoh--el ke layti' u si'pil
    Ipr conj Dpr-V-intr sub Ipr Ppr n
3 because 3-know that 3 3 crime
to him because he knows that it is his crime,

58. t---u hah---il a'-k--u--yaal--b--i(l) ti'ih-eh.
    prep-Ppr affirm-pos det-asp-Dpr--V--pas-intr Ipr--rel
3 true inc-3--say
truly, what is said to him.

59. I entoneses a'-nooch winik-eh k--u--ya'al--ik bin
    conj adv det-adj W--top asp-Dpr--V--PM report
and then the-old man inc-3--say
And then they say the old man said

60. ti'ih--eh: "Ba--lah k--in--k'uben--t--ik tech ke
    Ipr-top temp-prox asp-Dpr--V--trans-PM Ipr sub
3 inc-1sg-recommend 2sg that
to him: "Now I recommend to you that

61. t--u laak' k'in-eh, ka' a--ts'on--o' a'-ba'al-che'e-eh,
    prep-Ppr adj W--top adv Dpr--V--PM det--CM--top
on--3 other day when 2--shoot the-animal
on another day, when you shoot the animal,

62. ts'on--o' ma'lo', ma' a--maan--ts'on--t--ik. Wa mah,
    V--SPM adv neg Dpr-adv--V--trans-PM cond neg
shoot well 2-badly-shoot if not
shoot it well, don't shoot it badly. If not,

63. wa'ye' k--in--bel in--pak'--t--ech t--u ka'--ye'--eh,
    loc asp-Dpr-V Dpr--V--trans-Dpr prep-Ppr adv--top
here inc-1sg-go 1sg-await 2sg 3 again
I'm going to await you here again,
Entones sub det--M--top adv
adv then arrive the-man when
you have to come." Then is when the man

took fright and they say that (the old man) said

And the man, the hunter, (and) he closed

And he, then he closed his eyes and
74. t--u--ya'l--ah a'--chumach--eh ti'ih--eh: "Ba--lah
asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--N--top Ipr--top temp-prox
com--3--say
the old man said to him: "Now

75. heb--e' a wich. A'--ka' t--u--heb--ah u yich bin
V--SPM Ppr N det--conj asp-Dpr--V--DPM Ppr N report
open 2 eye when com--3--open 3 eye
open your eyes". When he opened his eyes, they say,

76. a'--winik, ah ts'on--eh k--u--yil--ik--eh, t--u chun
det--N masc V--top asp-Dpr--V--DPM--top prep--Ppr N
the--man shoot inc--3--see at--3 base
the man, the hunter, he sees it, at the base

77. a'--wits--eh te' wa'an--i'ih a'--tu'ux ok--i'ih--eh.
det--N--top loc V/part--scope det--rel V--Dpr--rel
the--hill stand where enter--3
of the hill, there he is standing where he entered.

78. Pero a'--ka' hok'--i'ih--eh, ya ma' sut--n--ah--ih
conj det--conj V--Dpr--top adv neg V--detr--dist--Dpr
but when leave--3 already return 3
But when he came out, he didn't again

79. u--yil--a' u hol a'--aktun--eh, ya wa'an aktun.
Dpr--V--SPM Ppr N det--N--top adv neg/cop N
3--see 3 door det--cave already cave
see the door of the cave, already there was no cave.

80. I ka' tal--ih layti', wa'l--ah--ih u--yil--a'
conj adv V--Dpr Ipr V--dist--Dpr Dpr--V--SPM
and when come--3 3 stop 3 3--see
And when he came, he stopped to see

81. a'--wits--eh i k'ah--i'ih ti'i'ih ke t--u chun
det--N--top conj V--Dpr Ipr sub prep--Ppr N
the--hill and remember--3 3 that in--3 base
the hill and he remembered that in the base

82. a'--wits--eh t--u--yil--ah a'--aktun--eh i ich
det--N--top asp-Dpr--V--DPM det--N--top conj prep
the--hill com--3--see the--cave and inside
of the hill he saw the cave and inside
the cave, there he entered. But

as for him, it was recommended to him by the old man

that he not go saying anything.

And he came and he arrived at his house.

His wife and all of his small children

when they saw that the man was coming

to his house (and) they began to cry with

the happiness they felt. They began

to cry and the children came, they arrived
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92. u--mek'--t--oo' u tat i u yitan--eh, tak
Dpr--V--tran-pl Ppr W conj Ppr W--top prep
3--hug 3 father and 3 wife until
to hug their father and his wife, even

93. layti' xan. I layti'--eh hak'--a'an u yool
Ipr adv conj Ipr--top V--part Ppr W
3 too and 3 surprise 3 spirit

her too. And he, surprised,

94. k--u--ya'ah--ik t--u paal--oo' i t--u yitan--eh:
asp-Dpr--V--PM prep-Ppr W--pl conj prep-Ppr W--top
inc-3--say to-3 child and to-3 wife

he says to his children and to his wife:

95. "Ba'ax u--ka'ah tan--wok'--ol--ex?" I
inter Dpr--V asp/Dpr--V--intr--Dpr conj
what 3--go dur/2--cry 2pl and

"Why are you crying?" And

96. k--u--ya'ah--ik u yitan ti'ih--eh: "Bix ma'
asp-Dpr--V--PM Ppr W Ipr--top inter neg
inc-3--say 3 wife 3 how

his wife says to him: "How aren't

97. ki--wok'--ol si tech--eh sat--al--ech ya yan
Dpr--V--intr conj Ipr--top V--intr-Dpr adv cop
2pl--cry if 2sg lose already

we crying if you are lost, its already

98. ox p'e mes xik--ech ti ts' on i ma'
nun class n V/irreal-Dpr sub V conj neg
three inam month go 2sg to shoot and

three months that you went to shoot and you haven't

99. tak--ech. Asta ba--he'--lah tan--ki--kil--ik
V/irreal-Dpr adv temp-dem-prox asp-Dpr--V--PM
come 2sg until dur-1pl--see
come (back). (Not) until now we are seeing

100. a wich--eh. In-to'on--eh ti ki t'an--eh wa
Ppr W--top emp--Ipr--top prep Ppr W--top cond
2 face 1pl in 1pl speech if

your face. We were saying what if
101. yah ho'm--ih a--kim--il." "Bix a--wool--e'er adv asp--Dpr Dpr--V--intr inter Dpr--V--Dpr already term-3 2--die how 2--think you had already died." "How are you thinking
102. ka' kim--ik--en si ten--eh ba-la k'och--een sub V--irreal--Dpr cond Ipr-top temp-prox V--Dpr that die if 1sg arrive that I would die if I arrived now
103. kan a'--nooch winik--eh." Layti'--eh t--u--l't'an--eh prep det--adv N--top Ipr--top prep Ppr--N--top with the-old man 3 in--3-thought from the old man." As for him, he was believing
104. wa layt(i') a--k'in-he'--lo' t--u--ts'on--ah cond Ipr det--N--dem-dist asp--Dpr--V--DPM if 3 the-day com--3--shoot it was that day he shot
105. a'--keeh--eh, layti' a'--mismo k'in-he'--lo' ka' det--N--rel Ipr det--adv N--dem-dist adv the-deer 3 the-same hday when the deer, that it was that same day when
106. sut-k'--ah--ih--eh, I ke si layti' xan--ah--ih V dist-Dpr-rel conj sub cond Ipr V-dist-Dpr return 3 and that if 3 delay 3 he returned. And if he delayed
107. ox p'e mes, sat--ih ox p'e mes ich num class N V--Dpr num class N prep three inam month lose--3 three inam month inside three months, he lost three months inside
108. a'--ch'e'em--eh, xan--ah--ih i layti' a'--ka' det--N--top V--dist-Dpr adv Ipr det-conj the-cave delay 3 and 3 when the cave. He lingered and he, when
109. hok'--ih--eh t--u t'an--eh wa layti' a'--mismo V--Dpr-top prep Ppr N--top cond Ipr det--adv leave--3 in--3 mind if 3 the-same he left it was in his mind that it was that same
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110. k'in--he'-lo' k'o'ch--ih ti u yotoch--eh, N--dem-dist V--Dpr prep Ppr N--rel
day arrive to 3 house
day that he arrived to his house.

111. Baa'y--lo bin uch--ih t--a'--winik hach adv-dist report V--intr prep-det--W adv
thus happen-3 to-the-man much

Thus they say it happened to the man that

112. (u)--yoh--el ts'on--eh. A'--lo'oh k--u--tsikbal-t-ik (Dpr)--V--intr V--rel det-dist asp-Dpr--V--tran--PM
(3)--know shoot inc-3--tell

hunts a lot. That our grandmother told

113. to'on ki noolah uch--ih mehen--o'on toh. I Ipr Ppr N V--Dpr adj--Dpr adv conj
1pl 1pl grandma before-3 young--1pl still and
us long ago when we were still little. And

114. layt'(i') a'--lo' k'ih--a'an ten--eh tak Ipr det-dist V--part Ipr-rel prep
3 remember 1sg until
it is that which I remember until

115. ba--he'--la'--eh, ma' tu--b--uk ten, I layt(i) temp--dem-prox--top neg V--pas--irreal Ipr conj Ipr
forget 1sg and 3

now, it hasn't been forgotten to me. And it is

116. a'--lo' k--in--tsikbal--t--ik tech--eh yok' det-dist asp-Dpr--V--tran--PM Ipr-rel sub
inc-1sg--tell 2sg

that which I tell you so that

117. a--wu'y--ik--e'ex bix u--ts'0'ok--ol a'--winik Dpr--V--tran--PM--Dpr adv Dpr--V--intr det--W
2--hear 2pl how 3--end the-man

you all hear how the man ended

118. a'--hach u--yoh--el ts'on keeh--eh, det-adv Dpr--V--intr V N--rel
the-much 3--know shoot deer

that was a real deer hunter.
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