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1 Introduction

This article is an informal discussion of the grammatical category of voice in Tzutujil, a member of the Quichean branch of the Mayan language family (cf. Kaufman 1976, Campbell 1977). Tzutujil is spoken by approximately fifty thousand people in an area extending from the south end of Lake Atitlán to the southern Pacific coastal plain in the Republic of Guatemala. The Tzutujil area includes all of the towns on the south shores of the lake, namely, San Lucas Tolimán, Santiago Atitlán, San Pedro la Laguna, San Juan la Laguna, and San Pablo la Laguna, as well as Santa María Visitación to the southwest in the highlands above the lake. It is also spoken in Chicacao on the coastal plain, and on many plantations and in many small villages and hamlets scattered to the south of the lake. The Tzutujil area is bordered on the north, east, and southeast by speakers of Cakchiquel, and on the west and southwest by speakers of Quiché. In fact, Cakchiquel is also spoken in San Lucas Tolimán, which lies on the eastern edge of the Tzutujil area, and Quiché is spoken in and around Santa María Visitación, which actually lies within Quiché territory. Both Cakchiquel and Quiché are also Quichean Mayan languages. Spanish is spoken throughout the area, primarily by 'ladinos' (i.e., non-Indians), although most Tzutujil men know Spanish to one degree or another and use it when traveling outside of the Tzutujil area or when dealing with non-Indians in the area who don't speak Tzutujil. Few Tzutujil women speak Spanish although some understand it to varying degrees. The ladino population, although in some cases prominent politically and economically, comprises a small minority (generally, less than 5%, and virtually non-existent in the smaller towns, villages, and hamlets). Most ladinos who were born in the
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area or who have lived there for a long time speak Tzutujil, at least minimally, and some with a high degree of proficiency.

Generally speaking, there are two major dialects of Tzutujil, one spoken in Santiago Atitlán and the other spoken in the rest of the Tzutujil area. However, every town has its own variety, which usually contains lexical differences and may include minor phonological, morphological, and syntactic differences as well. All of the data presented in this article is from the Tzutujil spoken in San Juan la Laguna, one of the more conservative varieties.¹

Before actually presenting a description of the grammatical category of voice in Tzutujil a number of other concepts need to be introduced. Thus, in Section 2 a brief informal (and I emphasize ‘informal’) discussion of transitivity, ergativity, subjecthood, and voice is given. The discussion is cursory and is not meant to be definitive. Nevertheless, these concepts are introduced because they are crucial to the description, given in Section 5, of voice in Tzutujil.² In addition, some understanding of the Tzutujil verb, case marking, and word order is crucial to the discussion. The verb is discussed in Section 3, and case and word order in Section 4.

2 Transitivity, ergativity, subjecthood, and voice

2.1 Transitivity

The concept of voice as a grammatical category presupposes the semantic notion of transitivity, in which there is a basic and direct relationship between a transitive predicate and its two arguments. That is, there is a relation between (A) an actor or agent – something or someone that does something or initiates an action, (B) an action or an act – something that is done, and (C) a patient – something that is acted upon, has something done to it, or receives the action. In its simplest form we might diagram this relationship as in (1) where the straight lines indicate a direct relationship.

(1) Transitive relationship: agent – action or act – patient

The terms ‘agent’ and ‘patient’ are being used somewhat loosely here³ as general names for the various kinds of semantically distinct arguments that occur in a direct relationship with transitive predicates. Let’s examine the sentences (2–5) in which the boy and the fire would be referred to as agents, and the dog as a patient.

(2) The boy killed the dog. agent – action – patient
(3) The boy saw the dog. experiencer – act – experienced
(4) The boy wanted a/the dog. thinker – act – goal
(5) The fire burned the dog. agent – action – patient
Each of the sentences is somewhat different. In (2) the boy is a true agent and killing is a true action and the dog is a true patient. In (3) the boy does something, that is, he experiences, but it is not clear whether seeing is really an action although it is a kind of act. The dog, however, is not (necessarily) affected at all by being experienced and therefore is not a true patient in the technical sense. In (4) the boy does something again, but it seems clear that wanting, a type of thinking, is not an action. The dog again is not affected by the boy’s wanting; for that matter, the dog may not even exist. In (5) the dog is definitely affected and burning is clearly an action, but it has been claimed that inanimate things cannot be agents (cf. Fillmore 1968). This seems clearly incorrect, however, since some of the most potent agents in the world are inanimate, for example earthquakes, volcanoes, water or the sea, fire, lightning, etc., as well as less grandiose things such as drugs (which cure you or get you high), books (which stimulate or bore you), and sugar cane (which gives you diarrhoea).

What is important here is that the kinds of relations the arguments have in sentences like (2–5) may be lumped together as agents and patients, respectively, even though on some level they are semantically distinct. Smith-Stark (1976b: 27) has suggested, correctly I believe, that agent and patient are the central or core ‘meanings’ of these relations while experiencer, experienced, goal, etc. are analogs of, or peripheral to, the central meanings.4

Traditionally, the arguments of a transitive predicate, that are being called agent and patient in this article, have been referred to variously as ‘the basic’, ‘logical’, ‘transitive’, or ‘deep’ subject, and ‘basic’, ‘logical’, ‘transitive’, or ‘deep’ object, respectively.

2.2 Ergativity

Typologically, Tzutujil is an ergative language. An ergative language is one in which the patient of a transitive predicate and the theme (or subject) of an intransitive predicate are treated alike grammatically (i.e., morphologically or syntactically), as opposed to the agent of a transitive predicate which is treated differently from the patient and theme. Thus, in an ergative language, the patient of a transitive verb and the theme of an intransitive verb are marked as if they were the same grammatical relation, which is called the absolutive. The opposing grammatical relation of the agent of a transitive verb is called ergative.

Ergative languages contrast with accusative languages (like most European languages) in which the agent of a transitive verb and the theme of an intransitive verb are marked as belonging to the same grammatical relation, the nominative, as opposed to the patient of a transitive verb which is marked as the accusative. Traditionally, in accusative languages, agents of transitive verbs and themes of intransitive verbs are called
subjects, and patients of transitive verbs are called (direct) objects. Generally, in an ergative language the absolutive relation is unmarked and the ergative is marked, while in an accusative language the nominative is unmarked and the accusative is marked.\

(6) Ergative/absolutive languages:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{agent} \\
\text{ergative} \\
\text{theme} \\
\text{absolutive} \\
\text{patient}
\end{array}
\]

Nominative/accusative languages:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{agent} \\
\text{theme} \\
\text{nominative/subject} \\
\text{patient} \\
\text{accusative/object}
\end{array}
\]

In recent years it has been shown that most, if not all, ergative languages are not entirely ergative in nature (Anderson 1976, Dixon 1979, Larsen and Norman, 1979, Norman and Campbell MS, Silverstein 1976, Smith-Stark 1976a). Rather, they often display accusative properties to one degree or another. Usually, the degree of ergativity (or more properly 'split' ergativity) is evaluated by the extent to which the grammatical rules of a language apply to ergative as opposed to accusative relational structures. It is beyond the scope of this article to show in detail the degree of ergativity in Tzutujil. It will suffice to say that Tzutujil is 100% morphologically ergative in that case marking via verb agreement is always marked according to ergative relations; Tzutujil is also syntactically ergative to a degree in that Agent Relativization, Agent WH-Question, and Agent Clefting all apply to ergative structures. On the other hand, for syntactic rules such as Equi-deletion and Imperative to apply, accusative relations must be taken into consideration. Thus, although Tzutujil is morphologically ergative, on the syntactic level it is a split or mixed ergative language.

2.3 Subjecthood

Traditionally, the grammatical category of voice has been discussed in terms of subjects and objects; and in recent years the notions ‘subject of’ and ‘object of’ have been treated as the most important basic, non-derived, undefined, universal grammatical relations (cf. Johnson 1974, Perlmutter
and Postal 1974, 1977). The assumption that subjects and objects are the most important universal grammatical relations is questionable. It is an empirical, as well as theoretical, question, and the linguistic facts do not seem to justify it. It seems clear that there are many languages in the world in which the relations of subject and object either do not exist or are unimportant or, at least, they are not the most important ones (cf. Dixon 1979, Foley and Van Valin 1977, Li and Thompson 1976, Van Valin 1977).

In ergative languages (i.e., those which are not just superficially ergative) the absolutive relation usually plays a more important role than any subject relation. It could be stated that the importance of the subject relation in a given language is inversely related to the degree of ergativity in that language. That is, the more ergative a language is, the less important the subject relation becomes. As noted above, Tzutujil is syntactically a mixed ergative language, and therefore the subject relation does play a role in the grammar, but it certainly isn’t clear that the subject relation is more basic or important than the absolutive relation.

Given the problematic nature (especially in ergative languages) of the assumption that the subject and object relations are the most important ones, or most basic ones, the notions of subject and object are not used in the discussion of voice in Tzutujil.  

2.4 Voice

Voice is an overt grammatical category which primarily pertains to transitive verbs and which indicates the relationship the arguments have with their verb. What has been traditionally called the active voice is the normal or unmarked voice since it indicates the direct relationship the basic arguments, agent and patient, have with a transitive verb.

(7) Active or normal voice: agent – transitive verb – patient

A modification in the direct relations that an agent and patient have with their verb results in a change of voice. For example, in the passive voice the agent is taken out of direct relationship with the verb; it may be removed altogether or put into an oblique relation with the verb. When one of the basic arguments is taken out of direct relationship with the verb, the basically transitive predicate becomes intransitive; that is, it is overtly marked to be intransitive rather than transitive. Thus, for example:

(8) Passive voice: intransitive verb – patient (agent)
(here, ‘(X)’ indicates an optional oblique relationship)

Another possible kind of voice change is the addition of an argument other than the agent and patient, to be in direct relationship with the verb (e.g. the instrumental voice discussed in Section 5.7). Basically, a change
in voice involves an overtly marked modification of the fundamentally two-place argument relationship inherent in a transitive predicate.

3 The Tzutujil verb

In this section the Tzutujil verb is discussed. The discussion is simplified in that details irrelevant to voice are omitted.

There is a very important structural contrast between transitive verbs (TVs) and intransitive verbs (IVs). Transitive verbs are further subdivided into three classes: root or non-derived transitives (RTVs), derived transitives in $j$ (DTJs), and derived transitives in 7 (DT7s) (see Section 3.3). All finite verbs are inflected for (A) person – for theme in IVs and for agent and patient in TVs (Section 3.1), and (B) tense, aspect, or mode (Section 3.2). Infinitive forms are never inflected for tense, aspect, or mode, and only the passive infinitives of TVs may be inflected for person, and then only for the patient.

3.1 Person markers

There are two sets of person markers, the absolute and the ergative. The absolute person markers are prefixes in verbs and indicate the theme of IVs and the patient of TVs. They also function as proclitic stative pronouns in copulative sentences and as bases for the independent personal pronouns in the first and second persons.

(9) Absolutive person markers (set B):

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S_1$</td>
<td>in-</td>
<td>$P_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_2$</td>
<td>at-</td>
<td>$P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_3$</td>
<td>$\phi$-</td>
<td>$P_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:

- xinwari ‘I slept’
- xatwari ‘you slept’
- xwari ‘he/she/it slept’
- xoqwari ‘we slept’
- xixwari ‘you all slept’
- xeeewari ‘they slept’

- xinkeech’ey ‘they hit me’
- xatqaach’ey ‘we hit you’
- xkeech’ey ‘they hit him/her/it’
- in winaq ‘I am a person’
- at winaq ‘you are a person’
- winaq ‘he/she is a person’

The ergative person markers are prefixes and indicate the agent of a transitive verb and the possessor of a noun. They are divided into two sets, those occurring before consonants and those occurring before vowels.

(10) Ergative person markers (set A):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>before consonants</th>
<th>before vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S_1$</td>
<td>nuu-/n-/in-</td>
<td>w-/inw-/nw-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_2$</td>
<td>aa-/a-</td>
<td>aaw-/aw-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_3$</td>
<td>ruu-/r-/uu-/$\phi$-</td>
<td>r-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forms with long vowels occur before stems of only one syllable; forms with short or no vowels occur before stems of more than one syllable. First person singular in(w)- and third person singular uu- occur in transitive verbs when the absolute prefix is ø- third person singular. uu- disappears altogether in TVs of more than one syllable, and in- disappears after the n-present/habitual prefix.

The absolute prefixes always precede the ergative ones in TVs. Some examples of the ergative markers are given in (11).

(11)  
\[ \text{xatnuuch'ey 'I hit you'} \quad \text{xat(n)waaj07 'I loved you'} \\
\text{xinch'ey 'I hit it'} \quad \text{xinwaaj07 'I loved her'} \\
\text{xinaach'ey 'you hit me'} \quad \text{xinawaaj07 'you loved me'} \\
\text{xinruuch'ey 'he hit me'} \quad \text{xatraaj07 'she loved you'} \\
\text{xuxuch'ey 'he hit her'} \quad \text{xqaajo7 'we loved it'} \\
\text{xqaach'ey 'we hit him'} \quad \text{xooqewaajo7 'you all loved us'} \\
\text{xineech'ey 'you all hit me'} \quad \text{xkaajo7 'they loved him'} \\
\text{xixkkeechn'ey 'they hit you all'} \quad \text{xatnuuanaaj 'I cured you'} \\
\text{nootzayn 'my nose'} \quad \text{xinuunaaj 'you cured me'} \\
\text{nkootz'i7j 'my flower'} \quad \text{xatruunaaj 'she cured you'} \\
\text{aawey 'your teeth'} \quad \text{xkuunaaj 'she cured him'} \\
\text{reey 'his teeth'} \quad \text{xaatuunaaj 'we cured you'} \\
\text{awoochooch 'your house'} \quad \text{xekuunaaj 'you all cured her'} \\
\text{roochooch 'his house'} \quad \text{xinkikuunaaj 'they cured me'} \\

3.2 Tense, aspect, and mode inflections

Tense, aspect, and mode inflections are divided into the non-perfective and perfective, two categories which are mutually exclusive. In the non-perfective they are indicated by a set of mutually exclusive paradigmatic prefixes which occur as the first morpheme in a finite non-perfective verb. The non-perfective prefixes are the same for all verb classes with one exception: j- is used only before the third person singular ø- absolute prefix and a second person ergative prefix in transitive verbs. The prefixes in ti seen in (12) are used only before the third person singular ø-absolute prefix, while the forms in k are used before all other absolute prefixes.

(12)  
\[ \text{Tense, aspect, and mode prefixes in the non-perfective:} \]

- x- preterite/past
- n- present/immediate future/habitual
- k-/ti- (. . .-a7) obligatory/imperative/optative
- xk-/xti- potential/future
- j- (. . .-a7) directional ('go') imperative
Examples
xatwari ‘you slept’
natwari ‘you sleep, you’re going to sleep’
katwari ‘sleep! you must sleep’
tiwari ‘he must sleep’
xkatwari ‘you would sleep’
xtiwari ‘he would sleep’
xaach ‘ey ‘you hit it’
naach ‘ey ‘you hit it, you’re going to hit it’
kinaach’eya7 ‘hit me! you must hit me’
tach’eya7 ‘hit it! you must hit it’
kinaach’ey ‘hope you hit me’
ixtaach’ey ‘you’d hit it’
jach’eya7 ‘go hit it’
jachuunaj ‘go cure him!’

The optative is formed with the k-/ti- prefixes along with the enclitic na (e.g. katwar na ‘hope you sleep’, tiwar na ‘hope he sleeps’, kinaach’ey na ‘hope you hit me’, taach’ey na ‘hope you hit it’). The obligative/imperative is simply formed with k-/ti- on intransitives and derived transitives, but root transitives require, in addition, the suffix -a7. The j- prefix also requires -a7 on root transitives. The future is formed with xk-/xti- plus the enclitic na (e.g. xkinwar na ‘I’ll sleep’, xtiwar na ‘he’ll sleep’, xkinruuch’ey na ‘he’ll hit me’, xuuch’ey na ‘he’ll hit her’). The potential indicates a potentially possible action, process, or event but one that has not occurred. Normally, out of context, a verb with the potential inflection would not be used alone. For example, xkinwari means something like ‘I would sleep (if such and such)’. Like the English translation, it makes no sense without a context.

The perfective is indicated by a suffix which occurs as the last morpheme in a finite perfective verb. The form of the perfective suffix depends on the verb class (see Section 3.3). Perfective verbs also function as past participial adjectives which are inflected for person with the absolutive proclitic pronouns.

(13) The perfective suffixes:
- IV -naq
- RTV -oon (~ -oon after root vowel u)
- DTJ -Vn
- DT7 -oon ~ -Vn
Examples:
in warnaq ‘I have slept, I am asleep’
nch’eyoon ‘I have hit it’ (cf. in ch’eyoon ‘I am hit’)
in akuuaan ‘you have cured me’ (cf. at kuunaan ‘you are cured’)
ee qab’irib’aan (~ ee qab’irib’a7oon) ‘we have shaken them’ (cf. ee b’irib’aan ~ ee b’irib’a7oon ‘they are shaken’)

It should be noted that one and only one tense, aspect, or mode inflection, whether perfective or non-perfective, is used on each finite verb.

3.3 Verb classes
As noted above there are four primary verb classes in Tzutujil: (A) intransitive verbs, (B) root or non-derived transitives, (C) derived transitives in j, and (D) derived transitives in 7. These classes are distinguished by their inflectional and derivational characteristics. The easiest way to distinguish the class of a given verb is to view its ‘principal parts’ which include a finite form, a perfective form or past participle, and one or more infinitive or nominal forms.

3.3.1 Intransitive verbs (IV).
IVs are distinguished from TVs in a number of ways. First, IVs are inflected only for theme while TVs are inflected for agent and patient. Second, only IVs take the -naq perfective suffix. Third, only IVs take the phrase-final suffix -i. This suffix is obligatory on IVs in phrase- or sentence-final position and before definite nouns or noun phrases. There are no phrase-final markers on TVs. And fourth, only IVs take the infinitive suffix -ee (~-aam and -iim on a few IV stems). The principal parts of two IVs are given in (14).

\[(14)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{waraam} & \quad \text{‘to sleep’} & \quad \text{yawajeeem} & \quad \text{‘to get sick’} \\
\text{warnaq} & \quad \text{‘have slept, asleep’} & \quad \text{yawajnaq} & \quad \text{‘have got sick’} \\
\text{xinwari} & \quad \text{‘I slept’} & \quad \text{xinyawaji} & \quad \text{‘I got sick’}
\end{align*}
\]

3.3.2 Root transitive verbs (RTV).
RTVs are distinguished from derived transitives in that: (A) they are all non-derived monosyllabic roots, (B) only RTVs take the -ooj (~-uuj after root vowel u) active infinitive suffix, (C) only RTVs take the long ergative prefixes (cf. (10)), (D) only RTVs take the obligative and directional suffix -a7 (~-07 and -u7 after root vowels o and u, respectively),
\[(E)\] only RTVs form the simple passive with an infixed -j- (~-7- and -V-), and
\[(F)\] only RTVs form the focus antipassive with the suffix -ow (see Section 5 for details). The principal parts of two RTVs are given in (15).
The active case unmarked All word markers have with the occurring (17) DT7S (16) they active a (C) DTJS vowel, perfective (B) have active infinitive (15) the DTJS DT7S (14) have active -Vn. (13) None of the active infinitive (A) are based on the suffix -Vn. Like all derived transitives they take the suffix -x to form the simple passive, and they have no freely occurring active infinitive. Two examples are given in (16).

(16) kunaxik ‘to be cured’ k’ayixik ‘to be sold’
    kuunaan ‘(have) cured’ k’aayin ‘(have) sold’
    xatnkuunaaj ‘I cured you’ xeenk’aayij ‘I sold them’

3.3.3 Derived transitive verbs in j (DTJ).
DTJs are distinct in that: (A) their stems are polysyllabic and always end in a vowel, (B) in the non-perfective active voice they take the suffix -Vj, and (C) the perfective, the absolutive and focus antipassives, and the bound active infinitive are all based on the suffix -Vn. Like all derived transitives they take the suffix -x to form the simple passive, and they have no freely occurring active infinitive. Two examples are given in (16).

(17) ajo7xik ‘to be loved’ ch’anab’a7xik ‘to be undressed (by)’
    ajo7oon ‘(have) loved’ ch’anab’aan ‘(have) undressed’
    xatwaaj07 ‘I loved you’ xatnch’anab’a7 ‘I have undressed you’

    b’irib’a7xik ‘to be shaken’
    b’irib’a7oon ~ b’irib’aan ‘(have) shaken’
    xatnb’irib’a7 ‘I shook you’

3.3.4 Derived transitive verbs in 7 (DT7).
DT7s all have polysyllabic stems which end in a vowel plus 7. They form the perfective with either -Vn or -oon (some verbs may have both forms while others only have one or the other). Both antipassives are formed with the suffix -n. DT7s have simple passives in -x, and no active infinitive has been recorded for DT7s. Three examples are given in (17).

4 Case and word order
The relation a nominal has with its predicate is indicated by (A) the person markers (discussed in Section 3.1), (B) case, and (C) word order. Case and word order are discussed briefly in this section.

4.1 The simple or direct case
All nouns or noun phrases in a direct relationship with a predicate are unmarked and therefore in the simple or direct case. Nouns in the direct case include (A) themes of basically one-place predicates, such as intransitive verbs, and adjectival and nominal predicates in copulative sentences,
and (B) agents and patients of transitive verbs. Additionally, they may also include instrumental nouns under a transitive verb in the instrumental voice (discussed in Section 5.7). See the examples in (18–26).

4.2 Oblique cases

Nouns which are not in a direct relationship with a predicate are overtly marked to be in an oblique case in Tzutujil. Nouns in an oblique case are marked in three different ways. First, they may occur in a prepositional phrase with one of the two prepositions pa(n) ‘in, on, to’ and ch(i) ‘at, to, with (an instrument)’. For example, jaay ‘house’ is in an oblique case in (18) and (19).

(18) Jar iixoq xuukoj ja chakach pa jaay.
         The woman put the basket in the house.

(19) Jar aachi xuutij chjaay.
         The man ate it at home.

Second, nouns in an oblique case may be marked with one of a set of relational nouns (RNs) which function like prepositions or case inflections in European languages. Normally, RNs are followed by their head noun and are possessed by it. However, head nouns may be deleted if they are given information, and may be fronted if they are topicalized. Some RNs occur optionally without possessive prefixes and have short forms. Some of the more important RNs are: k‘iin, (possessed form -uuk‘iin) ‘with, and’, xiin (-Vxiin) ‘of, for’, tza7n ‘with (instr.)’, ma (-umaal) ‘by, because of, on account of’, and majk ‘because of, on account of’.

(20) Xinb’an xin Aa Xwaan.
         I did it for (Sir) John.

(21) Jaa7 xuub’an way kuuk‘iin.
         She made tortillas with them.

Finally, nouns in an oblique case may be marked by a relational noun phrase (RNP). RNP also function like prepositions or case inflections. They consist of one of the two prepositions, pan or chi, followed by a relational noun which, in turn, is followed by the head noun (i.e., the noun in the oblique case). It should be noted that, generally, the preposition plus relational noun part of an RNP functions as a single semantic and structural unit, even though the parts, separately, may have independent meaning and function. For example, chpaan ‘inside of, in’ consists of chi plus obliterated ruu- ‘its/her/his’ and -pan ‘stomach, shit’; and pa rixkin ‘at/on the side of’ consists of pa, r- ‘its’ and ixkin ‘ear’. There are a large number of RNP; a few are given in (22), with sentence examples in (23) and (24).
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(22) chee ‘to, with (instr.)’:
  chwe ‘to me’,  chaawe ‘to you’,  chqe ‘to us’
chi kojol ‘between, among’:
  chqakojol ‘between us’,  chkikojol ‘between them’
chriij ‘in back of, behind, on, about’:
  chwiij ‘behind me’,  cheewiij ‘behind you all’
pan ijkiq’a7 ‘on/to the right of’:
  pa wijkiq’a7 ‘on my right’,  pan awijkiq’a7 ‘on your right’
pa rk’axwaach ‘instead of’:
  pa nk’axwaach ‘instead of me’

(23) Jar iinin xinya7 jun ya7 chaawe.
    I gave a drink to you.

(24) Jar iiixoq xb’e pa rk’axwaach jar aachi.
The woman went instead of the man.

4.3 Word Order

Word order is relatively free in Tzutujil, although there are certain restrictions, and every possible order has a somewhat different ‘meaning’ with respect to discourse factors such as new and old information, contrast, and topicalization.16 With one-place predicates the basic order is predicate followed by theme. However, the theme may precede the predicate and when it does, it is usually old information, topic, or in contrast. With transitive verbs the basic order is Verb Patient Agent. Other possible orders are A V P, A P V, and P V A. When an agent or patient occurs before the verb it is usually old information, topic, or emphasized somewhat.17 Impossible orders are *P A V and *V A P. In other words, the agent may not intervene between the verb and its patient. As the examples in (18–21), (23), and (24) indicate, normally, nouns in an oblique case follow the verb and any nouns in the direct case.

(25) Xb’e ja wixaayiil.
    left the my wife
    ‘My wife left.’

(26) Ja wixaayiil xb’e.
    the my wife left
    ‘My wife left.’

(27) Xuuch’ey jun ixoq jar aachi.
    hit a woman the man
    ‘The man hit a woman.’

(28) Jar aachi xuuch’ey jun ixoq.
    the man hit a woman
    ‘The man hit a woman.’
(29) Ja tz’i7 anij juun ja ak’ xuutij.
the dog entire the chicken ate
‘The dog ate the entire chicken.’

(30) Ka7i7 b’aa7 way xuutij ja yaawa7.
two pieces tortilla ate the sick one
‘The sick one ate two pieces of tortilla.’

5 Voices in Tzutujil

Since transitive verbs are basically two-place predicates, normally, there are two and only two arguments in a direct relationship with a transitive verb. In Tzutujil this means that normally there will only be two nouns or noun phrases, the agent and patient, in the direct case under a transitive verb, and any other nouns must be in an oblique case. However, this basic transitive relationship may be altered or modified for conversational or discourse purposes. When a modification in the basic transitive relationship occurs, there will be an overtly marked voice change. In this section the various voices in Tzutujil are described. Basically, they involve four operations on the normal (active) transitive relationship: (A) the removal of the agent from being in a direct relationship with the verb (the passive voices 5.2, 5.3, 5.4), (B) the removal of the patient from having a relationship with the verb (the absolutive antipassive voice 5.5), (C) putting the agent directly into focus (the focus antipassive voice 5.6), and (D) the addition of the instrument as an argument in direct relationship with the verb (the instrumental voice 5.7).

5.1 The normal or active voice

Verbs directly reflecting the basic transitive relationship are in the normal or active voice in Tzutujil and are overtly marked as transitive since finite forms require an ergative prefix marking the agent and an absolutive prefix marking the patient. Verbs in the DTJ class also require the suffix -Vj in the nonperfective active voice. In addition, RTVs have an active infinitive in the suffix -ooj (~-uuj) and DTJs have one in -Vn. Examples of transitive verbs in the active voice are found in (9), (11–13), (15–21), (23), and (27–30). Others are given in (31–35) with forms from each class of transitive verbs.

(31) RTV Ja nata7 xinruuch’ey iwiir.
My father hit me yesterday.

(32) RTV Jar Aa Te7k b’enaq ajisk chi q’oloj kape.
Diego has gone up to pick coffee.
5.2 The simple passive

Tzutujil has a number of passive voices, the most important of which is, perhaps, the simple passive. What the simple passive does is allow the removal of the agent from being in a direct relationship with the verb. A sentence with a verb in the simple passive may occur without an agent altogether, or it may contain an agent in an oblique case marked by the relational noun -umaal (short form ma) ‘by, because of, on account of’. In the latter case, the agent is usually ‘new’ information and the patient ‘old’ or ‘given’ information; in the former case the agent is either unknown or irrelevant to the discussion (cf. Chafe 1970, 1976). Because a verb in the simple passive has only one argument, the patient, in direct relationship with it, it is obligatorily intransitive in Tzutujil (cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1977).

In RTVs the simple passive is formed with the infix -j- which occurs after the vowel of the root and before the last consonant. -j- becomes -7- before another -j-, and -V- (infixed vowel length) before 7 (cf. xch’ejyi ‘it was hit’, xto7ji ‘it was paid’, and xyaa7i ‘it was given’, respectively from RTVs ch’ey ‘hit’, toj ‘pay’, and ya7 ‘give’). All DTVs form the simple passive with the suffix -x.

(36) RTV Jar ajqiij xwajch’ ma ch’ijch’.
The diviner was run down by (a) car.

(37) RTV Ja kamnaq xeemujqi.
The dead were buried.

(38) DTJ Ja wajkax xkamsaxi.
The cow was killed.

(39) DTJ Inin xinetzelaxi rmaal ja nata7.
I was scorned by my father.

(40) DT7 Xb’atab’a7xi ja pojp.
was rolled up the mat
‘The mat was rolled up.’
(41) DT7 Xjech’eb’a7xi ja jaay rmaal ja b’anol jaay.
    was made uneven the house by the maker of houses
    ‘The house was built uneven by the carpenter.’

Both RTVs and DTVs have passive infinitives built on the passive stems
with the suffix -ik (e.g. ch’ejiik ‘to be hit’, kamsaxik ‘to be killed’, and
b’irib’a7xik ‘to be shaken’). Passive infinitives may be inflected for person
with the ergative possessive prefixes. The person indicated is the patient
(e.g. nch’ejiyiik ‘my being hit’, i.e., ‘hitting me, to hit me’, akamsaxiik ‘your
being killed’, i.e., ‘killing you, to kill you’, and rb’irib’a7xiik ‘his being
shaken’, i.e., ‘shaking him, to shake him’). Under possession the vowel of
-ik is lengthened if it is not followed by an indefinite noun.

(42) RTV Jar Aa Liix b’enaq chi b’ajnik22 apóoda.
    the Sir Andrés has gone to its-being done pruning
    ‘Andrés has gone to do the pruning.’

(43) DTJ Jar aawaij tijko7m lawalo7 kik’ijtisixiik.
    the animals domesticated difficult their-being raised
    ‘The raising of domesticated animals is difficult.’

(44) DT7 Jar iixoq xuumaj nch’anab’a7xiik.
    the woman began my-being undressed
    ‘The woman began to undress me.’

5.3 The completive passive

Another important passive in Tzutujil is the completive passive. Like the
simple passive, the completive passive allows the agent to be taken out of
direct relationship with the verb, and, in sentences with the verb in the
completive passive, the agent may be absent altogether or may optionally
be present in the oblique case marked by -umaal. The completive passive is
formed with the suffix -(V)taj23 on RTVs and simply -taj on DTVs.24 Of
course verbs in the completive passive are intransitive since they have only
one argument, the patient, in direct relationship with them. Many comple-
tive passive verbs have an infinitive in the normal intransitive infinitive
suffix -eem. The difference between the simple and completive passives is
that the completive passive emphasizes or highlights the result of the action
on a patient whereas the simple passive simply defines or describes the
action.25

(45) RTV Jaqatajnaq ja b’eey rxin Tzolola7.
    has been opened already the road of Sololá
    ‘The Solola road has already been opened.’

(46) RTV Xch’eyetaji jar iixoq rmal rachajiil.
    got hit the woman by her husband
    ‘The woman got hit by her husband.’
(47) DTJ Xq’ipitaji ja jichab’
     ‘The comb got broken.’

(48) DTJ Ja masaat xekamsataj awmaal.
     The deer were finished being killed by you.

5.4 Marginal passives
A number of other passive or passive-like constructions are discussed in this section.

5.4.1 The ‘archaic’ passive.
A handful of transitive roots have passives based on the suffix -\(Vr\), the vowel of which is idiosyncratic depending on the root in question. In meaning and function passives formed in -\(Vr\) seem to be identical with the simple passive, and all verbs having a passive in -\(Vr\) may also take the simple passive as well. As with the simple passive, an agent may be overtly expressed in the sentence with the relational noun -\(umaal\). Only one of the four passives recorded in this construction has an infinitive in -\(eem\).

(49) jopireem ‘to be spilled/scattered’ < jop cf. DTVs jopixik ‘to spill/scatter’, jopopoxik ‘to spill/scatter a lot’
     k’amar- ‘be taken’ < k’amooj ‘to take’
     tojor- ‘be paid’ < tojooj ‘to pay’
     chapar- ‘be grabbed, reprehended, scolded’ < chapooj ‘to grab, reprehend, scold’

(50) Ja toq xinchapari xinb’ayab’07 jutz’iit.
     When I was scolded I got scared a little.

(51) Ja nuukeyej xk’amar eel rmal b’ijnel ya7.
     My horse was taken away by (the) river.

-\(Vr\) is a common suffix in Tzutujil but normally it is used to derive intransitive verbs from adjectives and nouns (e.g. nimareem ‘to get big’ < nim ‘big’, saqireem ‘to whiten’ < saq ‘white’, chikopireem ‘for grain to become infested with worms’ < chikop ‘animal’). It seems possible that passives in -\(Vr\) are a survival from an earlier stage in the language and at some time they were more productive. That the formation is old is attested by jopireem since today there is no RTV *jopooj, from which jopireem would be expected to come. Rather only the DTJs jopixik and jopopoxik based on the root jop occur. However, jop does exist as an RTV in Quiché (Brasseur de Bourbourg 1961). For this reason the label ‘archaic’ has been given to the passive in -\(Vr\).
5.4.2 Medio-passives.
There are a dozen or so intransitive verbs based on a monosyllabic root plus an infixed -7- or -j-, which seem to belong to a formation that, like the archaic passive, survives from an earlier stage in the language and is no longer productive. All of these verbs have a common semantic property: the distinction between agent and patient is somewhat obscure with respect to their themes or arguments. In each case the theme ‘does something’, but not in a true agentive way, and in some sense something happens to the theme as well. Let’s look at these verbs.

(52) b'07seem ‘to crack (of walls, wood, rock, etc.)’ < b'os
k07seem ‘to get tired’ < kos
k'i7seem ‘to come to an end, stop’ < k'is RTV ‘stop, finish’
n07jeem ‘to get full, filled up’ < noj
pa7jeem ‘to fall down’ < paj
pa7xeem ‘to break, split (of wood, rock)’ < pax
    cf. DTJ paxixik ‘break, split’ (in Quiche pax is an RTV)
qu7reem ~ qu7weem ‘for food to burn (too much while cooking)’ < qur ~ quw
jiq'ik ‘to drown’ < jiq'
k'a7teem ‘to burn’ < k'at (RTV in Quiche)
k'i7yeem ‘to grow’ < k'iy Adj. ‘many, much, a lot’
tzajqeem ‘to fall down’ < tzaq RTV ‘lose’
tz'ujkeem ‘to bud (of plants)’ < tz'uk

Semantically, these verbs are like medio-passive verbs found in languages which have a marked middle voice category (for example Greek and some Northern Uto-Aztecan languages, cf. Dayley 1970). It is noteworthy that formally these medio-passive verbs are like those in the simple passive construction of RTVs. It seems possible, then, that at some earlier stage in Tzutujil both simple passives and medio-passives were derived with an infixed -j- or -7- from monosyllabic roots.20 It should be noted, however, that medio-passives cannot have an agent expressed in the sentence at all (with or without the relational noun -umaal).

4.4.3 Adjectival passives
There is a common construction in Tzutujil which semantically and functionally acts like a passive voice but formally is not a true passive in that the forms in question are not intransitive verbs. Rather, they are past participial adjectives. The adjectival passive, thus, is based on the past participles of perfective transitive verbs (discussed in Section 3.2). As noted earlier, past participial adjectives are identical to the perfective stems of transitive verbs, but differ from them in that the participles are one-place predicates whereas the perfective stems are transitive and
therefore two-place. The theme of a past participle is always identical to the patient of the corresponding transitive verb and is marked by an absolutive stative pronoun.

The meaning of the adjectival passive is much like that of the completive passive since there is always emphasis on the result of the action received by a patient rather than on the action itself. However, with respect to aspect, adjectival passives are always perfective. Thus, for example, the adjectival passives in ch’eyoon and ee kamsaan could be translated, respectively, as either ‘I am hit’ and ‘they are killed’, or ‘I have been hit’ and ‘they have been killed’. As is the case with other passive constructions in Tzutujil, a sentence with an adjectival passive may or may not contain an agent in the oblique case marked with -umaał.

(53) RTV B’anoon reey ja kuchi7i chee liima
has been done its-blade the knife with file
‘The blade of the knife has been done (i.e., sharpened) with a file.’

(54) RTV Ja nuuwuuj b’otoon rmal nata7
My paper has been rolled up by my father.

(55) DTJ Inin in ajkuumaan rmal jar Aa Ra7p.
I I-have been bewitched by the Sir Rafael
‘I have been bewitched by Rafael.’

(56) DT7 B’ak’ab’aan kaan ja patz’am.
have been well tied left the cornstalks
‘The cornstalks have been left well tied.’

5.5 The absolutive antipassive
A construction common in ergative languages but one rarely occurring, if at all, in accusative languages, is the antipassive (for discussions of the antipassive see Ayres 1977, Comrie 1972 and 1978, Dixon 1972 and 1979, Heath 1976, Jacobsen 1969, Johnson 1976, Larsen and Norman 1979, Norman and Campbell MS, Postal 1976, Silverstein 1976, Smith-Stark 1976b). Tzutujil has two antipassive voices, the absolutive antipassive discussed in this section, and the focus antipassive discussed in 5.6.

The absolutive antipassive is, in some sense, the converse of the passive. What it does is allow the removal of the patient from being in direct relationship with the verb. In Tzutujil, a sentence with a verb in the absolutive antipassive voice may not contain a patient at all, not even in an oblique case. Because the patient has been removed from the basic transitive relationship, a verb in the absolutive antipassive is obligatorily intransitive. What the absolutive antipassive does in terms of discourse strategy is allow the speaker to concentrate on, or highlight, the action
performed by an agent without regard for the patient, or the effects of the action on the patient.

The absolutive antipassive is marked on RTVs with the suffix -oon \( (~-uun \) after root vowel \( u \)), on DTJs with -Vn, and on DT7s with -n (e.g. xinch'eyooni ‘I was hitting’, xinkamsaani ‘I was killing’, and xinq'ilol7ni ‘I was visiting’, from the TVs ch'eyooj, kamsaxik, and q'ilol7xik). Most transitive verbs have an intransitive absolutive infinitive built on the absolutive antipassive stem plus the intransitive infinite suffix -eem (e.g. ch'eyooneem, kamsaaneem, and q'ilol7neem).

(57) RTV Inin xinch'apooni ja toq xinchajpi.
    I pinched when I was grabbed.

(58) RTV Xuumaj chik chapoonem.
    she-began again to scold
    ‘She began to scold again.’

(59) DTJ Ja nuutz'ii7 ma xa k07 ḋkamsaani.
    the my dog a lot kills
    ‘My dog kills a lot.’

(60) DTJ Ja nata7 xuumaj chumaaneen.
    My father began to whitewash.

(61) DT7 Iiwiir xq'ilol7ni ja nata7.
    yesterday was visiting the my father
    ‘Yesterday my father was visiting.’

(62) DT7 Ja winaq xkeemaj k'ulula7neem rmaal ja k'aayiiij.
    The people began to annoy because of the sales.

5.6 The focus antipassive voice

The focus antipassive voice is unlike the passive, where the agent is removed from being in direct relationship with the verb, and it is unlike the absolutive antipassive, where the patient is removed altogether from having a relationship with the verb. In the focus antipassive both the agent and patient relations remain intact. So, in some sense, the basic transitive relationship is not fundamentally altered, as it is in the passive and absolutive antipassive. Rather, the ‘simplicity’ of the basic transitive relationship is disrupted. What the focus antipassive voice does is highlight the agent or put it directly into focus, and at the same time the patient is relegated to a peripheral position. In the normal active voice the agent and patient have more or less the same status, but in the focus antipassive the agent is overtly marked as having more status than the patient. Since the patient is relegated to a peripheral position in the focus antipassive, the verb obligatorily becomes intransitive, and since the agent is in focus it
must overtly appear in the sentence as a noun, noun phrase, or independent pronoun, which must occur before the verb.

The occasions in which an agent is put into focus and, therefore, the focus antipassive is required, are: (A) when an agent is questioned (i.e., Agt-Q, for example ‘who did it?’), (B) when an agent is relativized (i.e., Agt-Rel, for example ‘... the man who did it ...’), and (C) when an agent is contrastive or emphasized strongly (i.e., Agt-Cleft, for example ‘it was the man who did it’ or ‘the man was the one who did it’). Thus, one important feature of Tzutujil grammar that the focus antipassive entails is that an ergative noun per se can never be questioned, relativized, or clefted.

On RTVs the focus antipassive is marked with the suffix -ow (~ -uw after root vowel u), which becomes -o (~ -u) when not in phrase-final position and when not occurring before a definite noun or noun phrase (cf. (63-70), (72-85), (88-92)). Like the absolutive antipassive, the focus antipassive is marked by -Vn on DTJs and by -n on DT7s (cf. (71), (85), (86), (93-8)).

Because the focus antipassive is formally intransitive and because the patient is relegated to a peripheral position, we might expect that the absolutive person prefixes on the verb would automatically indicate the agent, and that the patient would automatically be put into an oblique case. However, this is not necessarily so; the situation is more complex. What happens is that the expected type of verb agreement is interfered with by the following person hierarchy: non-third person < third person plural < third person singular. Thus, under normal conditions, no matter what relation a noun has, whether it be agent or patient, a verb in the focus antipassive agrees with the noun higher up on the person hierarchy. Compare the following examples.

(63)    Inin xinch'eyowi jar aachi.
        I    I-hit the man
        ‘I was the one who hit the man.’

(64)    Jar aachi xinch'eyowi.
        the man me-hit
        ‘The man was the one who hit me.’

(65)    Inin xinch'eyo jule7 ixoqi7.
        I    I-hit some women
        ‘I was the one who hit some women.’

(66)    Jule7 ixoqi7 xinch'eyowi.
        some women me-hit
        ‘It was some women who hit me.’
(67) Je7ee7 xeech'eyowi.
they they-hit
‘They were the ones who hit him.’

(68) Je7ee7 xeech'ajo tzyaq.
they they-washed clothes
‘They were the ones who washed clothes.’

(69) Jar aachi xch'eyowi jar iixoq.
the man φ-hit the woman
‘The man was the one who hit the woman.’

(70) Jar iixoq xch'eyowi jar aachi.
the woman φ-hit the man
‘The woman was the one who hit the man.’

In the examples (63–70), it can be seen that neither the patient nor the agent is overtly marked as being in an oblique case, and the noun higher up on the person hierarchy is the one indicated on the verb with an absolutive prefix. The person hierarchy may be overridden, however, and when it is the verb agrees with the agent and the patient is put into an oblique case marked with the relational noun -Vxiin28 ‘of, for’. For example, compare (71) with (64), and (72) with (66).

(71) Jaa7 nilin wxiin.
she φ-serves (of) me
‘She is the one who serves me.’

(72) Je7ee7 xeech'eyo wxiin.
they they-hit (of) me
‘They were the ones who hit me.’

-Vxiin is also used to avoid ambiguities or misinterpretations of sentences, or when other factors in the grammar intervene. For example, if there are two non-third persons in the same sentence, -Vxiin must be used to mark the patient, as in (73) and (74).

(73) Inin xinch'eyo awxiin.
I I-hit (of) you
‘I was the one who hit you.’

(74) Atet xatch'eyo wxiin.
you you-hit (of) me
‘You were the one who hit me.’

-Vxiin is used here because of two different factors. First, the normal word order in focus antipassive sentences is A V P. But, in general, Tzutujil does not allow two non-third person independent pronouns to occur in the
same clause. So (75) and (76) are ruled out, even though they would not be ambiguous.

(75)  *Inin xinch’eyo atet.

(76)  *Atet xatch’eyo inin.

Second, the only other possibilities, (77) and (78), are ruled out because if the agent and the patient are on the same level in the person hierarchy, a focus antipassive verb must agree with the agent. Thus, since inin and atet, respectively, are the only overtly occurring arguments in (77) and (78), they must be the agents, but the verbs do not agree with them, so the two sentences are ungrammatical.

(77)  *Inin xatch’eyowí.

(78)  *Atet xinch’eyowí.

-Vxiin also marks a third person singular patient in a question like (81) where the interrogative word, naq taq ‘who all, what ones’, is plural, and where there is no overt singular noun appearing as the patient.

(79)  Naq xch’eyowí?
    who ø-hit
    ‘Who hit him?’

(80)  Naq xeech’eyowí?
    who them-hit
    ‘Who hit them?’

(81)  Naq taq xeecho’eyo rxiin?
    who pl they-hit (of) him
    ‘Who all hit him?’

(82)  Naq taq xeech’eyowí?
    who pl  ?they-hit
    ?them-hit
    ‘Who all hit them?’

The use of -Vxiin in (81) seems to be to avoid any possible ambiguity or confusion with (82). Actually, one would expect (82) to mean ‘Who all hit him?’ instead of ‘Who all hit them?’ because the person hierarchy should force the prefix ee- to be interpreted as the plural agent, naq taq, rather than a plural patient. The confusion probably arises from the fact that the plural interrogative is rarely used. In any event, there is no confusion if an overt noun occurs in the sentence.

(83)  Naq taq xeech’eyowí jar aachi?
    who pl they-hit the man
    ‘Who all hit the man?’
(84) Naq taq xeech’eyowi jar aachi7aa7?
who pl they-hit the men
‘Who all hit the men?’

-Vxiin is also used occasionally in sentences like (85–87), where an agent is acting on a human.29

(85) Jar Aa Léencho b’iis xkamsan rxiin.
the Sir Lencho sadness φ-killed (of) him
‘It was sadness that killed Lencho.’

(86) Inin xinlasan rxiin jar Aa Xep pa chee7.
I I-took out (of) him the Sir José from jail
‘I was the one who got Jose out of jail.’

(87) Ja wajkax ja xtoq’o rxin Aa Lu7 xkami.
the bull that φ-gored (of) him Sir Pedro died
‘The bull that gored Pedro died.’

Contrary to the normal word order in Tzutujil, focus antipassive sentences may have the order: P A V, as well as A V P. In the former case the patient is being contrasted at the same time that the agent is in focus. The P A V order occurring with focus antipassive verbs is the only situation in which an agent may intervene between a verb and its patient in Tzutujil.

(88) Jar iixoq jun aachi xch’eyowi.
the woman a man φ-hit
‘It was a man who hit the woman.’

(89) Ja warí7 inin in chojmarsanaq.
that I I-have fixed
‘I was the one who had fixed that.’

One example is given below of each of the three uses of the focus antipassive with each of the three classes of transitive verbs.

(90) RTV Cleft: Jaa ri7aab’aj xinsokowi.
that rock me-hurt
‘It was that rock that hurt me.’

(91) RTV Rel: Nim ja kumatz ja xinti7owi.
big the snake that me-bit
‘The snake that bit me was big.’

(92) RTV Q: Naq xoqtz’atowi?
who us-saw
‘Who saw us?’
Voice in Tzutujil

(93) DTJ Cleft: Jaa7 xitzelaani ja nk'ajool.
he Ø-hated the my son
‘He was the one who hated my son.’

(94) DTJ Rel: Jar aak’alaa7 ja xekamsaani ja ak’ xeeb’e.
the boys that they-killed the chicken went
‘The boys who killed the chicken took off.’

(95) DTJ Q: Naq xb’altiini ja yáanta?
who Ø-rolled the tire
‘Who rolled the tire?’

(96) DT7 Cleft: Atet xatjech’eb’a7ni ja chakach.
you you-twisted the basket
‘You were the one who twisted the basket up.’

(97) DT7 Rel: Qas jabe’l jar iixoq ja xch’anab’a7ni ja raal.
very pretty the woman that Ø-undressed the her child
‘The woman who undressed her child is very pretty.’

(98) DT7 Q: Naq xb’ak’ab’a7ni ja si7?
who Ø-tied up the firewood
‘Who tied up the firewood?’

5.7 The instrumental voice

Normally, an instrument in Tzutujil occurs in an oblique case indicated by either the relational noun tza7n ‘with (instr.)’ or the relational noun phrase chee ‘to, with (instr.)’, and occasionally it may be indicated simply with the preposition chi ‘at, to, with (instr.)’.

(99) Jar aachi xuuchoy chee7 tza7n chee machat.
The man cut wood with a machete.

(100) Jar aak’aal xkamsaaj ja chikop tza7n chee aab’aj
The boy killed the animal with a rock.

(101) Qas xuupoq chi tz’uum.
a lot her-he-beat with whip
‘He beat her a lot with a whip.’

The instrument may be contrasted or made emphatic by placing the relational noun or relational noun phrase and the instrument in front of the verb and after the agent (if one appears), but in this case the particle wi7 must occur after the verb, indicating that an oblique noun has been fronted.
(102) Jar aachi \(\{tza7^n\} \) machat xuuchoy wi7 chee7.

The man with a machete cut wood.

(103) Jar aak’aal \(\{tza7^n\} \) aab’aj xkamsaj wi7 ja chikop.

The boy with a rock, killed the animal.

An instrument may also be put into contrastive focus (i.e. clefted) with the instrumental voice. What the instrumental voice does is allow an instrument to be taken out of an oblique case and appear with a transitive verb as a third argument in the direct case, along with the agent and patient. The instrumental voice is marked on all transitive verbs with the suffix \(-b’e\) which forms a DTJ stem. An instrument in a sentence with a transitive verb in the instrumental voice occurs before the verb and after the agent, like the fronted instruments in relational noun phrases discussed in the preceding paragraph.

(104) Jar aachi machat xchoyb’eej ja chee7.

the man machete cut-with the wood

‘It was a machete that the man cut the wood with.’

(105) Jar aak’aal aab’aj xkamsab’eej ja chikop.

the boy rock killed-with the animal

‘It was a rock that the boy killed the animal with.’

Verbs in the instrumental voice apparently have all the characteristics of other DTJs, with the exception that they normally do not have freely occurring infinitives in \(-ik\). For example:

(106) Machat xachoyb’ej chee7.

machete you-cut-with wood

‘It was a machete that you cut wood with.’

(107) Machat achoyb’een chee7.

machete you-have-cut-with wood

‘It was a machete that you have cut wood with.’

(108) Machat xchoyb’ex chee7.

machete was-cut-with wood

‘It was a machete that wood was cut with.’

(109) Machat choyb’een chee7.

machete has-been-cut-with wood

‘It was a machete that wood has been cut with.’
In order to *question* an instrument in Tzutujil, that is, in order to ask with what instrument something is done, the verb is put into the instrumental voice, and the sentence begins with the interrogative *naq* 'what, which, who'.

(110) **Naq xab’anb’eej?**
what it-you-did-with
‘What did you do it with?’

(111) **Naq ab’anb’een?**
what it-you-have-done-with
‘What have you done it with?’

(112) **Naq xb’anb’exi?**
what it-was-done-with
‘What was it done with?’

Also, in order to *relativize* an instrument, the verb appears in the instrumental voice.

(113) **Ja nuutee7 xuuloq’ kokop nb’anb’ej chaqijya7.**
the my mother bought cacao she-makes-with chocolate
‘My mother bought cacao with which she makes chocolate.’

(114) **Inin xintz’at jar aachi ja xchoyowi ja chee7**
I saw the man that cut the tree
xb’anb’ej rtz’aalaam.
he-made-with his boards
‘I saw the man who cut the tree with which he made his boards.’

(115) **Ja wajsaroom nk’atzin chwe nch’ikb’ej rpaan éera.**
the my-hoe is useful to me I-dig-with its-inside garden
‘The hoe that I dig in the garden with is useful to me.’

From the examples above, it can be seen that the instrumental voice is to instruments as the focus antipassive is to agents. That is, for an instrument to be questioned (*Instr-Q*), relativized (*Instr-Rel*), or clefted (*Instr-Cleft*), the verb must occur in the instrumental voice. All of these are cases in which the instrument is in focus.

An interesting fact that should be noted is that an instrument may be fronted and put in focus, or clefted, at the same time. That is, the relational noun or relational noun phrase and the instrument are fronted, and the particle *wi7* occurs after the verb, and the verb is put into the instrumental voice.

(116) **Chee ala7 machat xinb’anb’ej wi7**
with that machete it-I-did-with
‘It was that machete that I did it with.’
(117) Chee bʼajibʼal nbʼoxbʼej wi7 ja rwi sbʼ07y.  
with hammer it-I-smash-with the its-head onion  
'It is a hammer that I smash (the heads of) onions with.'

There seems to be no detectable difference in meaning between instruments that are clefted and ones that are fronted and clefted at the same time.

A number of other examples of the instrumental voice are given in (118–22).32

(118) Kuchi71 xinsokbʼej wii7.  
knife I-hurt-with myself  
'It was a knife that I hurt myself with.'

(119) Jaa7 eskopéeta xkʼaqbʼeej ja chikop.  
he shotgun shot-with the animal  
'It was a shotgun that he shot the animal with.'

(120) Tzʼuum xchʼeybʼej jun ixoq jar aachi.  
whip hit-with a woman the man  
'It was a whip that the man hit a woman with.'

(121) Ja dʼubʼaqt utz njosqʼibʼex wachaaj.  
the wing-feather good it-is-cleaned-with eye  
'It is wing-feathers that eyes are cleaned well with.'  
or 'Wing-feathers are good to clean the eyes with.'

(122) Ja ri7aal pinyoon utz nkunabʼex sokotajik.  
the its-liquid piñon good it-is-cured-with wound  
'It is piñon sap that wounds are cured well with.'  
or 'Piñon sap is good to cure wounds with.'

6 Concluding remarks

Throughout this article voice has been viewed as an overt grammatical category, primarily pertaining to transitive verbs, which indicates the relations the arguments have with their verb. Changes in voice have been viewed as overtly marked modifications or alterations in the basic transitive relationship, Agent – Verb – Patient, which is indicated grammatically by the active or normal voice. Basically, voice changes involve operations such as: (A) the removal of an argument from having a direct relationship with the verb, (B) the addition of an argument to be in direct relationship with the verb, and (C) putting an element in the transitive relationship directly into focus.

Implicit in the discussion of voice presented here is the view that one voice is not derived syntactically from another,33 in the sense that there are
no stages or levels in the derivation of a sentence with respect to voice. But rather, the semantics and discourse environment in conjunction with the volition and style of speech of the speaker determine the particular category of voice used in a given speech act. Thus, for example, the passive sentence ‘my grandmother was killed’ is not viewed as having been derived from a sentence like ‘something/someone killed my grandmother’. Rather, the sentence is in (or starts out in) the passive voice precisely because there was no agent there in the semantic structure to begin with (perhaps because the agent is unknown or irrelevant). However, the sentence is grammatically marked by being put into the passive because semantically it is somewhat abnormal, since killing basically entails a transitive relationship, and therefore, to ignore the agent is to ignore a basic element of a transitive act or action. In other words, any voice category, other than the normal active voice which directly reflects the basic transitive relationship grammatically, is a marked category just because its function is to indicate the relationship of the argument(s) to a transitive predicate in a situation that is somewhat anomalous semantically, or that semantically deviates from the simple basic transitive relationship. In this view the markedness of voice categories, other than the normal active voice, is itself to be expected (or unmarked) since the purpose of voices like passive, antipassive, and instrumental, is to convey a semantically marked situation.

In (123–8), the semantic situations underlying the six major voices in Tzutujil are schematically presented. And an example of each voice is given using the verb ch‘eyooj ‘to hit’, the agent jar aachi ‘the man’, the patient jar iixoq ‘the woman’, and the instrument aab‘aj ‘rock’. In the diagrams, ‘-’ indicates a direct and obligatory relation, ‘( )’ indicates a peripheral or oblique relation, and bold type indicates a highlighted element or one in focus.

(123) **Normal active:** \( A - V - P \)

Jar aachi xuuch‘ey jar iixoq.
‘The man hit the woman.’

(124) **Simple passive:** \( (A) V - P \)

Jar iixoq xch‘ejyi (rmal jar aachi).
‘The woman was hit (by the man).’

(125) **Completive passive:** \( (A) V - P \)

Jar iixoq xch‘eyetaji (rmal jar aachi).
‘The woman got hit (by the man).’

(126) **Absolutive antipassive:** \( A - V \)

Jar aachi xch‘eyooni.
‘The man was hitting.’
(127) Focus antipassive:  \( A - V - (P) \)  
Jar aachi xch’eyowi jar iixoq.  
‘The man was the one who hit the woman.’

(128) Instrumental (active):  \( A - V - P - I \)  
Jar aachi aab’aj xch’eyb’eej jar iixoq.  
‘It was a rock that the man hit the woman with.’

It should be noted that, in (125), the patient of a completive passive verb is in bold type in order to indicate that the results or effects of the action on the patient are being highlighted. And in (127), the patient of a focus antipassive verb is indicated with both ‘-’ and ‘( )’ because it is obligatory, and usually, although not always, it is in the direct case, but nevertheless in a peripheral position.

NOTES

*Editors’ note. An earlier version of this paper was published in Journal of Mayan Linguistics I: 1 (1978).

1 My knowledge of Tzutujil was acquired while working for the Proyecto Lingüístico Francisco Marroquin in Guatemala from August 1973 to October 1976, and June through September 1977. While there I was ‘Asesor Técnico’ of the ‘Equipo Tzutujil’ and taught linguistics primarily to Mayan Indians. My students and I were preparing two dictionaries of Tzutujil, one of San Juan la Laguna and the other of Santiago Atitlán. In addition, much time was spent analyzing the grammar of Tzutujil (described in detail in Dayley 1982).

Here, I would like to express my indebtedness to my Tzutujil students (I was really more a student of theirs than they of mine) for the patience, insight, and generosity which they never ceased to display. I would also like to thank my students as well as other members of the PLFM for the inspiration I received from them and for virtually all I know about Mayan in general and Tzutujil in particular.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation to Glenn Ayres, Terrence Kaufman, Tom Larsen, Johanna Nichols, and Will Norman, all of whom read preliminary copies of this article and made invaluable comments and criticisms, all of which were taken into consideration and many of which were incorporated into the paper. However, I alone assume full responsibility for the contents of the paper.


3 That is, relative to some characterizations of agent and patient (cf. Chafe 1970, and Fillmore 1968).
4 Since the relations are, in fact, discernible we would expect some languages to mark the distinctions grammatically, but in general, languages tend to lump together relations like agent, experiencer, thinker, etc., and ones like patient, goal, and experienced. Certainly English and Tzutujil, for example, do not make these possible distinctions.

5 There is some reluctance to use the term 'subject' in this paper; for the problematic nature of 'subject' see Section 2.3. However, with intransitive verbs there doesn't seem to be a real problem since there is only one argument involved which, therefore, must be the subject. The notion of subject seems questionable, however, if it can only be applied accurately to the arguments of intransitive verbs.

The term theme is used herein as the name of the single argument in a direct relation with a one-place predicate. Semantically, themes may be agents, patients, or simply themes (i.e., arguments where the distinction between patient and agent is either ambiguous, obscured, or irrelevant). Compare the following:

(i) John ran. John = agent
(ii) John drowned. J = patient
(iii) John grew. J = patient and agent (?)
(iv) John fell down (accidentally/on purpose). J = patient or agent
(v) John is tall. J = theme
(vi) The wall cracked. wall = patient

6 The contrast between ergative languages and accusative languages is not the only one possible. There are languages which do not really belong to either group. For example, there are agent–patient languages like Dakota, topic–comment languages like Chinese, and languages like Motu which distinguish agents and patients of transitive verbs from each other, and these from themes as well (cf. Anderson 1976, Dixon 1979, Li and Thompson 1976, Foley and Van Valin 1977, Silverstein 1976, Van Valin 1977).

7 I think it is noteworthy that voice can be described in Tzutujil without reference to terms like subject and object.

8 Traditionally, in Mayan studies the ergative person markers have been called set A and the absolutive ones set B.

9 The independent pronouns are as follows: S1 inin, S2 atet, S3 jaa7, P1 ojoj, P2 ixix, and P3 jaa7ee7 or jee7ee7. As can be seen the first and second persons are reduplicated forms of the absolutive markers with some minor phonological changes.

The orthography used here to write Tzutujil was developed at the PLFM in Guatemala (Kaufman 1976). The alphabet is as follows: ʔ, a, aa, b’, ch, ch’, d’, e, ee, i, ii, j, k, k’, l, m, n, o, oo, p, q, q’, r, s, t, tz, tz’, u, uu, w, x, and y. Letters have their usual phonetic value with the following exceptions or explanations: ʔ = ?, VV = long vowel, ch = č, tz = e, x = š, and j = ę. Glottalized consonants (C') are exploded with the exceptions of b’ and d’, and sometimes q’, in which cases they are imploded. Stress occurs on the last syllable of a word unless marked otherwise with $\check{V}$.

10 Here, 'V' means a vowel identical with the last stem vowel. For example, the verb stems kuuna- 'cure', kaano- 'look for', siik'i- 'call (for)', and b'irib'a7- 'shake', plus -Vn become, respectively, kuunaan, kaanoon, siik'iin, and b'irib'aan. Note
also that the vowel of the suffix -oon of RTVs harmonizes when a verb root contains u, e.g. muq- ‘bury’ plus -oon becomes muquun.

11 There are a couple of intransitive verbs which take the suffix -ik instead of -eem (e.g. kamik ‘to die’). -ik is also the infinitive marker used on simple passive stems to form passive infinitives of transitive verbs (cf. examples in (15–17) and (42–44)).

12 The suffix -a7 is not only used with RTVs in the obligative/imperative and the directional imperative, but also with the two optional directional prefixes ee- ‘going’ and uj- ‘coming’ (e.g. xateench’eya7 ‘I went and hit you’ and xatujench’eya7 ‘I came and hit you’). As can be seen these prefixes follow the absolutive prefixes and precede the ergative ones. They may also occur on intransitive verbs (e.g. xineewari ‘I went and slept’ and xinujwari ‘I came and slept’).

13 The infinitive form in -Vn parallels the active infinitive of RTVs in -ooj. However, the DTJ form in -Vn always requires an overt patient while infinitives in -ooj do not (e.g. k’ayin ixiiim ‘to sell corn’ and aweb’en aweex ‘to replant corn-seedlings’, but ch’eyoj ixooq ‘to hit women’ and ch’eyooj ‘to hit’, while not *k’aayiim and *aweb’een, at least as infinitives).

14 pa occurs before consonants and pan before vowels (e.g. pa qaawi7 ‘on top of us’ and pan eewi7 ‘on top of you all’). The i of chi drops before vowels and monosyllabic stems and may optionally drop before polysyllabic stems as well.

15 Under normal conditions possessed nouns are followed by their possessor, for example:

(i) ruuch’iijch’ Aa Xwaan
    his-car Sir John
    ‘John’s car’

(ii) roochooch Aa Xwaan
    his-house Sir John
    ‘John’s house’

16 The details of word order are beyond the scope of this paper and justifications for the statements being made here will not be given.

17 The word ‘somewhat’ is important here because if the agent or patient is actually put into focus a voice change will occur (see Section 5).

18 Of course, nouns need not always overtly appear in a sentence and commonly do not if they are ‘given’ or ‘old’ information (cf. Chafe 1970, 1976). But since a transitive verb in the active voice is always marked with the ergative and absolutive prefixes for the two arguments in direct relationship with it, the deleted nouns are recoverable.

19 Usually, where appropriate, after the discussion of each voice at least three examples will be given illustrating the forms of the verb for the three classes of transitive verbs: RTV, DTJ, and DT7. Where possible, examples will be drawn from unelicited sentences rather than from ones elicited by the author. Literal translations are given in order to illustrate a particular point, or when the Tzutujil word order is different from that of the English translation.

20 It has been claimed that ergative languages are basically like accusative ones, but undergo an obligatory passivization rule (cf. Hale (1970), and an earlier
tradition beginning with Schuchart 1895). This is clearly false in the case of ergative languages in the Mayan family, which usually have elaborate optional passivization processes that clearly contrast with the normal or active voice. The same argument has been made for three other languages in which passives and ergative case marking co-occur: Georgian and Basque (Lafon 1971) and Greenlandic Eskimo (Woodbury 1975:5). Additional arguments against the obligatory passivization analysis are given in Kurylowicz 1949, Jacobsen (this volume) and Silverstein 1976.

21 If -umaal occurs with a one-place predicate or if it occurs before a passive verb it means 'because of, on account of'. If it occurs after a passive verb it means 'by' in the agentive sense. Rarely, given the appropriate context, it may also mean 'because of, on account of', if it occurs after a passive verb, especially if the head of -umaal is first or second person. Cf.

(i) Xch'ejyi ja nuutzij wmaal inin.
   was beaten the my girl friend by me I (or because of me)
   'My girl friend was beaten by me (or because of me).'

(ii) Wmaal inin xch'ejyi ja nuutzij.
    because of me was beaten the my girl friend
    'Because of me my girl friend was beaten.'

(iii) Awmaal xb'e jar awixaayiil.
     because of you left the your wife
     'Because of you your wife left.'

In (i) the first reading of -umaal is 'by' but a second reading may also be 'because of'. In (ii) and (iii) -umaal can only mean 'because of'.

22 b'ajnik here comes from rb'ajnik but the r- of the third person singular possessive prefix is always lost after the conjunction/preposition chi.

23 Here 'V' indicates a vowel identical with the vowel of the root of the RTV. Some RTVs require this reduplicated vowel, others do not (cf. ch'eyetajem 'to be hit (already)' and b'antajem 'to be done/made (already)').

24 No examples of the completive passive have been recorded with DT7s. This fact is probably fortuitous, i.e., an elicitation oversight on my part.

25 Usually, the best way to translate the distinction between the simple and completive passives is to use 'already' (or ya in Spanish) with the completive passive (e.g. xch'ejyi 'he was hit' and xch'eyetaji 'he was already hit'). Sometimes, it seems best to use 'finish being X-ed' with the completive passive (e.g. xjosq'ixi 'it was cleaned' and xjosq'itaji 'it was finished being cleaned'). However, to a certain extent, I think the distinction between the 'be' and 'get' passives in English parallels the one in Tzutujil. For example, the distinction between xkamsaxi and xkamsataji is like the one between 'he was killed' and 'he got killed', respectively. In other words, it seems to me that the 'get' passive emphasizes the result of the action somewhat more than the 'be' passive. My intuitions are not entirely clear here, however, and certainly the distinction between the two English passives is not as great semantically as that between the simple and completive passives in Tzutujil.

26 There are three other intransitive verbs which are formally like the medio-passives discussed here: qa7xeem 'to go down' < qaj, q'a7xeem 'to go by, pass by' < q'ax, and ti7leem 'to get close, move close to' < til. These three verbs may
belong to the medio-passive group, but they are distinct semantically in that their themes seem to be true agents and not patients or patient-like at all.

27 However, Quiché does allow a patient to be present in an oblique case in a sentence with a verb in the absolutive antipassive voice analogous to the one in Tzutujil (Mondloch and Hruska 1975).

28 'V' in -Vxiin indicates some unknown vowel which must be there in the underlying form since -Vxiiin takes the (short) prevocalic prefixes rather than preconsonantal prefixes (e.g. awxiin ‘for you’ but not *aaxiin or *axiin, and wxiin ‘for me’ but not *nuuxiin or *nxiin).

29 Actually, beside the person hierarchy, there is also a hierarchy of animacy: human > animate > inanimate, which plays a role in other parts of Tzutujil grammar not discussed here.

30 No DT7s have been recorded in the instrumental voice. As was the case with completive passives, this fact is probably fortuitous (see note 24).

For another discussion of the instrumental voice in Tzutujil see Craig 1978.

31 Note that 'clefing' is not the same as 'topicalization'.

32 It should be noted that -b'e, besides forming the instrumental voice on transitive verbs, is used to derive transitive verbs from both intransitive and transitive stems (e.g. warb'exik ‘to sleep on/in (something like a bed or sleeping bag)’ <waaraam ‘to sleep’, kamb'e- ‘die because of’ <kamik ‘to die’, b'eeb'een rwaay ‘to eat tortillas while walking’ <beenaan ‘to go’, rayib'exik ‘to desire a little bit’ <rayiixik ‘to desire’, izjob'exik ‘to talk to’ <izijoxik ‘to complain, talk’). These are idiomatic derivations and are outside of the paradigmatic verbal category of voice in Tzutujil.

All, or nearly all, of the suffixes discussed in this article that are voice markers also have other derivational functions in Tzutujil morphology.

33 Obviously, some voice categories are derived from others morphologically, as, for example, the simple passive stem ch'ejy, the completive passive stem ch'eyetaj, the absolutive antipassive stem ch'eyoyn, the focus antipassive stem ch'eyow, and the instrumental stem ch'eyb'e, are all derived from the normal active root ch'ey ‘hit’. However, I view these as paradigmatic voice markings, in some sense a type of inflection, rather than derivations per se.
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