Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics

edited by

Stacey Stowers
Nathan Poell

Volume 26
2002

Partial funding for this journal is provided by the Graduate and Professional Association of the University of Kansas

ISSN 1043-3805

© Linguistics Graduate Student Association
University of Kansas, 2002

Cover design by Nathan Poell and Stacey Stowers
Mayan Morphosyntax
Clifford Pyz.................................................................1

Acquisition of Mayan Morphosyntax
Clifford Pyz.................................................................19

Spanish Present Subjunctive Usage
by US Spanish Heritage Speakers
Kathryn Hadipo............................................................39

Light Verbs just as a Little
Daklo Jung........................................................................9

Effects of Context F0 Range in Perception and
Production of a Lexical Tonal Distinction
Travis Wade........................................................................75

Acoustic and Perceptual Evidence of
Complex Neutralization of Word-Final
Tonal Specification in Japanese
Kazuhiro Matsuoka..........................................................93

Do Mass Nouns Contain ?
Semantically Uniform Class?
David Nicolas....................................................................113
Mayan Morphosyntax

Clifton Pye

The University of Kansas

Abstract: This paper uses data from the Mayan languages to evaluate expanded INFL theories derived from the work of Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1995). The combination of ergative agreement with subject agreement closer to the verb than object agreement pose interesting problems for this framework. The real challenge, however, is to account for the variation in verbal agreement that occurs across the family of languages. The languages exhibit several forms of functional interaction that are not predicted within the expanded INFL framework. Structural configurations may be augmented with something like a feature matrix to capture significant interactions that take place between functional heads in the world's languages.

Languages typically make use of word order, case morphology and/or agreement morphology to express basic syntactic relations. Recently, linguists have proposed elaborated functional projections that attempt to capture these morphosyntactic relations (Abney 1987, Chomsky 1986, Fukui & Spear 1985). The structure that appears in (1) provides an example of such a structure for English (cf., Belletti 1990, Chomsky 1995; Pollock 1989).

(1) An exploded inflectional structure for English (after Chomsky 1995:60)
Such trees offer something for everyone, or, should I say, every infection. The basic idea is to check noun and verb features against the functional projections for subject agreement, etc. at some point in the derivation. One way to check the 'D'-feature of the subject in both Tin and Ag\'g\' is by moving the subject phrase to the Specifier position as the Tin and Ag\'g\' phrase. The verb's features may be checked by moving the verb to the head of the corresponding functional projections. Thus, inflectional morphology not only expresses basic syntactic relations, but also participates in the derivation of sentences. The most appealing attribute of the model is the use of the syntactic structure to constrain the checking process through the Spec-Head system of agreement. The verb moves to the head of the functional projection while the nominal categories move to the specifier position of the functional projection. The movement of the major lexical elements within the structure determines sentence word order while agreement is assigned by the functional projections for agreement. Case can be checked independently of agreement, the Tense head checking the Nominative Case of the noun phrase in [Spec, IP], while the head of Ag\'g\' checks the Accusative Case of the direct object in VP. The syntactic structure restricts the types of possible movements, and hence limits the possible types of inflectional systems.

While this model has a certain elegance, it also has definite shortcomings. The evidence for an Ag\'g\' functional projection is meager at best for English. The model offers no explanation for the overt realization of Case and agreement inflections in languages that capture the generalizations that exist across this domain. For example, the model provides no explanation of why agreement is only marked in English for the third person, present tense forms of verbs or more broadly, how syntactic movement interacts with the overt realization of morpho-phonetic features. These concerns are relegated to Spell-out at PF. It is ironic the current linguistic theory cannot account for the common morpho-phonetic elements of the world's languages.

At least some linguists have begun to apply this framework to describe other languages. Edgar Jinik (1998) proposes the structure shown in (2) for Yaqui, a Uto-Aztecum language spoken in Arizona and northern Sonora. The Yaqui subject is inserted in [Spec, Voice] and raises to the subject position [Spec, App]. The verb raises via head-to-head movement to Aspect and collects the inflections for voice and aspect. Aspect assigns Nominative Case to the argument in [Spec, Aspect] while the objective receives Accusative Case in [Spec, Tran].

Jinik's structure neatly accounts for the word orders and verbal inflections in Yaqui at the cost of departing from the supposedly universal structure in (1). She achieves these differences in the overt differences in morphology between English and Yaqui. This may well be the case, but the current situation leaves us without a theory that constrains the distribution of functional projections across
languages. Why is the projection of aspect so high in Yaqi while being one of the lowest projections in English?

In the context of this research, the Mayan family of languages provides a critical test of theoretical relationships between word order, case and agreement. Mayan languages are well known for presenting a linguistically interesting array of distinct morphosyntactic types. The languages have a generally agglutinative

(2) The morphosyntactic structure of Yaqi

morphology with overt agreement for subject, object, indirect object and instruments. The languages display the usual pro-drop characteristics of languages with a rich verbal morphology. Mayan languages have an ergative type of agreement with a variety of ergative 'spills' along the dimensions of person, aspect and clause type. Many Mayan languages also display idiosyncratic constraints in their agreement systems. The morphosyntactic analysis of any single Mayan language proves many challenges for current syntactic theory, while a comparative study of the all the languages not only reveals fundamental limitations in syntactic theory, but also points the way to a better understanding of the way morphology integrates with syntax.

The Mayan language family contains some 30 different languages with an historical depth that is roughly similar to that of the Romance languages. The Mayan languages fall into four main subdivisions: a. Huastekan, b. Yukatekan, c.
Westerns and d. Eastern. The first three branches are located primarily in Mexico while the Eastern branch is located in Guatemala. I will begin with the Eastern Mayan language that I know the best, K'iche', and gradually bring the other languages into my discussion where they become relevant. K'iche' verbs have the infinitival template shown in (3).

(3) Aspect = Absolute + (Motion) + (Ergative) + Root + Derivation + Status

The ergative prefixes mark agreement with the subject of transitive verbs while the absolutive prefixes mark agreement with the direct objects of transitive verbs and the subjects of intransitive verbs. The aspect markers distinguish between inchoative and compitative aspect as well as the imperative mode. The status suffixes are the most complex part of the verbal inflectional system. They run against the agglutinative grammar of the language in that they simultaneously mark aspect, transitivity, and phrasal position. I provide examples of K'iche' verbs in (4). Intransitive verbs Transitive verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K'iche'</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. k'ak'ik'</td>
<td>'You are coming.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. xalik'</td>
<td>'S/he saw you.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ma ti' k'aj</td>
<td>'He (she) came.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ma k'aj</td>
<td>'I saw him.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ma k'aj x'e'l'aj</td>
<td>'He (she) did not come.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ken Hale (ms.) proposed the morphosyntactic structure in (5) to describe K'iche'. Hale assumes that L assigns nominative agreement and aspect. The lower functional head, L, is responsible for assigning ergative agreement as well as case. He relies on the framework of Bittner and Hale (1996) for the constraints needed to restrict ergative agreement and Case. In their model, Case-binding between a head and an argument only occurs in the presence of a 'Case Competition'. The nominative argument can fill the role of Case Competitor since it is in a bare DP that lacks Case. Since L governs a small clause containing the ergative argument, and since the nominative Case Competitor becomes visible to L once the verb moves to L, L can assign the ergative Case to the subject argument.
(5) Hale’s structural analysis of K’iche’ (mis., Figure 12):

```
  UP
   / |  \
  U-  L  V-
     /   |
    VP   ERG
       /  |
     NOM t`
```

Hale dismisses the possibility of an ergative syntactic analysis for K’iche’. This could come about through raising the nominative argument to tipes, L. The result would be what Dixon (1979) terms a syntactically ergative language in that the normal syntactic relations are reversed (see 6).

(6) Accusative and ergative syntactic configurations (Dixon 1979; Johnson 1977; Manning 1995)

a. Accusative syntax

```
  S
   / |  \  
  Subject   VP
   /   |
  Object  
```

b. Ergative syntax

```
  S
   / |  \  
  Object   VP
   /   |
  Subject  
```

Although languages such as Tom Larsen (1987) and Christopher Manning (1995) have proposed treating K’iche’ as a syntactically ergative language, these analyses face certain difficulties (cf. Pye 1990). Languages with accusative-syntax tense/aspect reflexive pronouns to the object position as shown in (7). We would predict that languages with ergative syntax would demonstrate the opposite restriction, but this is not the case for K’iche’ as shown in (8).

(7) a. I scare myself
    b. *Myself scared me

(8) a. since’ we b’
    x-dim-nx’-j w-xl b’
    COMP-JABS-ERG—care-STATUS 1ERG-self
    ‘I was afraid’ (cf. ‘I scared myself’)
The difficulties inherent in acquiring syntactically ergative languages pose another problem for this approach. The typical hallmarks of syntactic ergativity are found in complex sentences in control and coordination structures. Children acquiring such languages would set the basic syntactic parameter for the language on the basis of simple sentences long before they encounter evidence for syntactic ergativity in more complex sentences. This situation should lead to a massive unlearning problem unlike anything that exists in the acquisition literature. For these reasons, syntactic ergativity fails to offer a viable analysis for verbal inflection in K'iche'.

Hale also rejects the syntactic-ergative analysis for K'iche' and proposes an alternative morphological ergative analysis. In this analysis, the nominative argument is licensed in situ through the transparent LP. When the verb raises to L in the syntax, its dominating VP causes LP to be a barrier to government. Verb raising allows the nominative to become visible to L and thus fill its role as a Case Competitor to the ergative argument. Further raising of L to U allows U to assign nominative Case to the object through the transparent LP and VP nodes without requiring the direct object to move to a SpecIP position.

Hale's analysis provides an elegant description of K'iche' morphosyntax in that it places the absolutive agreement prefix (assigned by U) before the ergative agreement prefix (assigned by L). At the same time the model produces a VOS word order that is typical for K'iche'. Hale notes that his model makes possible a simple rearrangement of nodes as shown in (9) that would account for a common VSO word order in K'iche' displays when both the subject and object are definite.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{UP} \\
  \text{U} \\
  \text{L} \\
  \text{LP} \\
  \text{ERG} \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{V} \\
  \text{NOM} \\
  \text{L} \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{L}
\end{array}
\]

Despite all of these advantages, I remain unsatisfied with Hale's model. The use of U and L rather than more familiar functional projections such as C and I obscures any structural similarities that might exist between K'iche' and other
Languages. While Hale states that U contains C and L contains I, he does not address the problem of accounting for the realization of aspect-inflexion under C rather than under I that his model requires. The structure in (5) also does not provide a projection for the status suffixes on K'iche' verbs. These are a prominent part of verbal inflection in K'iche' and their omission raises serious concerns about the adequacy of Hale's description.

I have tried to develop an analysis of K'iche' that seeks to account for the full range of morphosyntactic features in the language. The most obvious omission from Hale's model is a place for the status suffixes. I start with the assumption that the primary function of these suffixes is to indicate verb transitivity; I therefore propose adding a functional projection for transitivity to the K'iche' structure as shown in (10).

(10) Basic K'iche' morphosyntactic structure

```
CP
  C
  AspP
    s
    A3sP
    ErgP
      Tran
      VP
        -oh
        NP
          le a Wan
          to
          NP
            al Mary

xato' al Mary' le a Wan
x-ASP-3sg-eRGS-help FAM Mary the FAM John
'John helped Mary.'
```

I assume that Tran, the head of the functional projection for transitivity, has a feature with a plus or minus value for transitivity. When the feature is plus, Tran will project the Ergative phrase, while with the minus feature the ergative phrase is
not projected. Follow Hale in assuming that verb raising to the head of the Aspect phrase makes both arguments visible to the higher functional projections. This allows the functional projections for agreement to cross-reference the verb arguments. I do not follow Bittner and Hale in their reference to a Case Competition. I assume Case is assigned structurally in the usual way with the exception that the subject is not forced to move since it is visible to the functional projection for aspect. This would mark a major difference between English and K'iche' in that English subjects are forced to move to Spec IP for Case while K'iche' subjects can receive Nominative Case in Spec/VP.

This configuration suggests that the status and ergative inflections are more closely associated with the verb than the aspect and absolutive inflections. The structure allows the agreement projections to become disassociated from the underlying syntactic relations in that intransitive verbs will not project the ergative phrase and thus will assign absolutive agreement to the subject, while transitive verbs that project the ergative phrase will assign ergative agreement to the subject.

Western Mayan

We can gain a better perspective on the structural configuration of K’iche’ by examining other Mayan languages. I turn next to a language in the Western branch of the Mayan language family—Tzeltal. Tzeltal verbs have the configuration shown in (11) to provide examples of Tzeltal verb in (12).

(11) Tzeltal verb structure
Aspect + Ergative + Root + Status + Absolutive + (Plural)

(12) Examples of Tzeltal verb inflection (Penny Brown, pc)
a. Plain Intransitive ma 7-ocl-n
NEG COMP-enter-3ABS
“You did not come in.”
b. Imperative Intransitive ool-at-tul
enter-STATUS-PL DIR
“You all come in!”
c. Plain Transitive

sea a pet-at-ik it
NEG.SRG-bug.JABS-PL DIR

"They are not hogging you still."

Tzeltal differs from K'iche' in placing the absolutive agreement markers after the status markers at the end of the verb stem. The ergative agreement markers remain in front of the verb (120). Tzeltal also has a separate plural agreement marker that follows the absolutive agreement marker, but which marks plural subjects whether they are absolutive (122) or ergative (126). The intransitive morphology of Tzeltal is much reduced in comparison to the K'iche' aspectual system, but is still visible on imperative and perfect verbs.

Once again we see that the ergative agreement markers are closer to the verb than the absolutive markers. Tzeltal provides direct confirmation that the (much reduced) status markers are also positioned closer to the verb root than the absolutive markers. We can alter the inflectional structure in (10) to account for Tzeltal by simply changing the absolutive prefix to a suffix (see 15).

(15) Structural configuration for Tzeltal

Unfortunately, this configuration fails to predict several features of Tzeltal verb inflection—namely the use of a separate plural suffix for subjects of transitive verbs. It is easy to add a functional projection for the plural. The question is how to account for the connection between this plural suffix and the #active subjects.
Tzeltal’s plural projection may be tied to another feature of its inflectional system—the distinctive aspect prefixes for transitive and intransitive verbs (see 14).

(14) Tzeltal aspect paradigm


The presence of a transitive distinction in the Tzeltal aspect paradigm suggests that verb transitivity is more important in Tzeltal than K’iche’. Try to capture this observation by projecting a secondary transitivity node in Tzeltal that intervenes between the complementizer and aspectual phases (see 15). The transitivity node also has plus and minus transitivity values. Plus values produce the plural suffixes and select the transitive sequential prefixes, while the minus values select the intransitive sequential prefixes. Tzeltal, like K’iche’, typically displays a VOS word order (Kaufman 1971).

(15) Structure configuration for Tzeltal with plural projection


The discussion of the Tzeltal inflectional structure highlights an important feature of Mayan morphothemes—the degree to which we find an interaction.
between functional projections. While current models of morphosyntactic structure describe the distribution of functional elements fairly successfully, they fail to predict the ways in which these elements may interact. The structure in (15) does not account for the interaction between the functional projections for transitivity and ergativity or the lack of interaction between aspect and absolutive. I will propose that we take this interaction seriously as a natural result of the immediate association between functional projections. In a configuration, such as the one shown in (16), we may expect features of the head Y to interact with those for X. The idea is that if VP has to attach to an XP then features in Y may limit features in X.

(16)

\[ X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \]

Given something like this mechanism for functional interaction, we might expect functional elements to interact with their immediate superiors as the default case. I am assuming that the lack of an interaction is the marked case, and requires an explanation. The models for K'sche (10) and Tottel (15) place the ergative projection next to the absolutive projection, so we would expect these projections to interact at some level. While the K'sche focus antipassive construction discussed by Hali may provide some evidence for such an interaction, I will not pursue this topic any further at this point.

Yukatek

Instead, I now wish to turn to the Yukatek branch of Mayan. Yukatek verbs have the inflectional template shown in (17). I provide some examples of Yukatek verbs in (18).

(17) Yukatek verb structure

Aspect (Ergative) Adverb Root + Status + Absolutive + Plural

(18) Examples of Yukatek verb inflection (Barbara Pfeiler, pc)
a. Incomplete transitive

`you enter`

INCOMP ZERG enter-STATUS

b. Complete transitive

`you did not come`

INCOMP ZERG enter-STATUS-2ABS-NEG

The Yakultik inflectional structure is not entirely different from that of Tzidal. Thus, we may propose a morphosyntactic configuration like the Tzidalian structure shown in (13). In Yakultik, like Tzidal, there is a separate plural suffix for ergative subjects, and like Tzidal, the Yakultik plural follows the ablative agreement suffix (see (13)). Yakultik also resembles Tzidal in the use of distinct inflectional prefixes for transitive and intransitive verbs, although in Yakultik, the intransitive derivation only occurs for the complements aspect.

c. Incomplete transitive

`they are not building you again`

INCOMP VOSNAXAGINGA hag-2ABS-3PL-NEG

The novel feature in Yakultik is, of course, the split ergative agreement system. This split occurs on intransitive verbs in the incomplete aspect as shown in (14). These verbs are the ergative set of agreement prefixes with intransitive subjects rather than using the regular ablative set of agreement suffixes as shown in (16). For instance, verbs in the complete aspect. The question is whether our configurational structure can provide any insight into this type of split ergativity.

The approach that I have taken is to specify a structural configuration like that in (15). In Yakultik, transitive verbs I assume that Trans and Trans have linear values for ergativity since the verbs are ergative. This configuration is unsatisfactory in that it provides no explanation for Yakultik's ergative split. The analytic approach to functional structure that I have followed to this point splits on separating the functional categories. This approach can only describe the interaction that takes place between functional categories in terms of projection and selection. Neither of these mechanisms is strong enough to constrain the interaction between functional categories in any degree.
(19) Structural configuration for Yukatekian transitive verbs

```
CP
  C
  TranP
  AobjP  Tran
    Asp  AobjP  Tran
      VP  Tran  [-]
        VP  NP
          V
```

We lack a calculus of functional categories that would allow such features to surface in separately marked inflections while also accounting for the fundamental interaction that occurs between such categories in the world's languages. The Mayan language family provides a wealth of data that is essential to the development of this calculus. The easiest way to capture the interactions that I have discussed so far is through an implicational matrix (see 20).

(20) Mayan feature matrix (c.f. Silverstein 1976)

```
Marked
  Tran > Person > Numer
    N  N
    Obj  Sing
  Aspect  Incomp  Comp
```

I organized the features in (20) along the lines of the interactions that we have seen so far. Transitivity affects the selection of Person features in determining whether or not to mark object agreement as well as selecting an ergative or accusative form of agreement. We have also seen that Transitivity can affect the realization of Aspect features through separate aspect forms for transitive and intransitive verbs. Yukatek demonstrates the possibility that Aspect can affect
Person selection that is realized in split ergativity in Yukatek. Finally, Tronsil and Yukatek demonstrate that Person selection may also affect the nature of Number since both languages have plural suffixes for ergative subjects.

In addition to describing the interaction between features, the matrix in (10) can be used to predict ways in which the features could coincide across languages. Thus, many languages merge features for Person and Number into a single affix, and many languages take this process a step further and merge the features for Transitivity, Aspect, Person, and Number into a single affix.

It is interesting to add a distinction between marked and unmarked values to the features in the matrix as a way of conceptualizing the possible interactions between features. I have tried to arrange the features with the idea that only unmarked values select other features. Thus, the only possible value of Transitivity selects for Object Agreement and Ergative Case, only Incompletive Aspect selects for Ergative Case, and only Subject selects for Place.

Although this matrix fails to account for all of the feature interactions which we have looked at so far (it does not explain why the ergative split in Yukatek is limited to intransitive verbs), it does provide a compact view of the structural configuration. All that remains is to add a labeling algorithm that captures the structural relations between the features. The syntactic Spell Out will reflect language-specific functional categories and hierarchies.

Meanwhile, we are far from exhausting the relational interactions that obtained in the Mayan languages. The examples in (21) come from Mocho, another Western Mayan language.

(21) Split ergativity in Mocho (Larsen & Norman 1979)

Mocho demonstrates an ergative split by person, substantive verbs with first and second person subjects take Ergative agreement while intransitive verbs in the third person use the Absolute agreement marker. The close association of Transitivity and Person in our feature matrix suggests that such splits might be expected, while the Mocho split between first and second person and third person...
suggests that the first and second person values have a more marked status than the third person. This hierarchy is supported by the zero-marking for third person absolutive affixes across the Mayan languages, as well as in many other of the world’s languages.

Acquisition

Now that we have examined some of the ways in which functional categories can interact across the Mayan languages, we can begin to use this model to make predictions about the acquisition of functional categories (see 22). I derive these predictions from the implicational nature of the interactions that the model captures. Since verb transitivity determines so many of the other features, I take transitivity as a starting point for acquisition. Since aspect also constrains the realization of subject markers, the model would also predict an early acquisition of aspect. The model puts the marked and unmarked values for each category on the same level, so it would predict that children would acquire such values at the same point. The main prediction here would be that children would acquire the ergative and absolutive agreement markers around the same time. Finally, children should use the singular forms of the ergative markers before using the plural suffixes.

(22) Acquisition predictions

- a. Children will acquire transitivity inflections first
- b. Children will acquire aspect inflections next
- c. Children will acquire ergative and absolutive inflections at the same time
- d. Children may first restrict ergative use to verbs in the inchoative aspect
- e. Children will use ergative singular forms before using the separate plural inflections

Summary

The Mayan languages demonstrate several deficiencies in current conceptions of morphosyntactic projection. These include the necessity of distinguishing between Case and Agreement in morphologically ergative languages, the close association between subject agreement and the verb, and the projection of transitivity/modality phrase. Structural configurations must be augmented with something like a feature matrix to capture significant interactions that take place between functional heads in the world’s languages. These interactions become especially noticeable when comparing feature projections across languages within the same family. The comparative method offers syntactic clues heretofore little used, but extremely powerful for developing structural descriptions that extend well beyond a single language. The resulting descriptions lead to specific predictions about the acquisition of...
NOTES

I have discussed the ideas in this paper with many people and have benefited from their suggestions. I began this project in conjunction with the comparative Mayan acquisition project that includes Pasdeloup-Hovius, Lourdes de Leon and Barbara Pfifker. I also had the privilege of discussing these ideas with John Hale. My paper owes much of its original inspiration to John Hale’s work on K’iche’ and other languages. I would also like to thank the participants at the University of Kansas Linguistics Colloquium for their suggestions.

I use the following abbreviations throughout the paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRS</th>
<th>subject agreement</th>
<th>AgrO</th>
<th>object agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>specifier</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCOMP</td>
<td>compleative aspect</td>
<td>NCGI</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOMP</td>
<td>incomplete aspect</td>
<td>NOOG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>nominative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>ablative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>first person singular</td>
<td>Erg</td>
<td>ergative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person singular</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>the status suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM</td>
<td>familiar particle</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>directional particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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