

# FOCUS, AGENT FOCUS AND RELATIVE CLAUSES IN YUCATEC MAYA\*

RODRIGO GUTIÉRREZ-BRAVO

JORGE MONFORTE

*CIESAS, Mexico City and Academia de la Lengua Maya de Yucatán*

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we address the behavior of *agent focus* in Yucatec Maya, the Mayan language spoken in the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. In a number of Mayan languages, the verb displays a particular morphological mark when the transitive subject is focused and displaced to a preverbal position. The resulting form of the verb is known as the *agent focus* form of the verb (henceforth AF: see Stiebels (2006) for a recent survey). This is illustrated for Q'eqchi Mayan in (1).

- (1) Q'EQCHI: Berinstein (1985)

*Li c'anti' x-lop-o-c r-e li cuinik*  
DET snake REC.PAST-bite-AF-TAM 3E-DAT DET man  
'It was the snake that bit the man.'

Yucatec Maya (henceforth Yucatec) does not display a specific morpheme for the agent focus form. Instead, when the transitive subject is focused a defective form of the canonical transitive clause is observed. The canonical structure of the transitive clause in Yucatec is schematized in (2).<sup>1</sup> We assume that in this canonical structure the auxiliary and the Series A pronominal clitic form a single morphosyntactic unit that functions as the head of the IP.

---

\* This paper is a much revised version of a presentation made by the first author at the *IX Encuentro de Lingüística del Noroeste*, Hermosillo, Sonora, 2006. We are grateful to Judith Aissen for detailed feedback on that first version and to the Academia de la Lengua Maya de Yucatán for their help with the fieldwork and data collection reported here. All errors that remain are our own. This project was supported in part by the National Council for Science and Technology of Mexico (CONACYT), grant SEP-2004-CO1-47613.

<sup>1</sup> Following Gutiérrez-Bravo & Monforte (2008) we assume that the unmarked word order of transitive clauses in Yucatec is SVO and not VOS, as previously thought. This assumption has no effect in the analysis that follows, although it will be addressed again in the next section in relation to AF.

(2) <b>(Agent)</b>	<b>AUX</b>	<b>Set A</b>	<b>Verb-MOD-Set B</b>	<b>(Object)</b>
<i>Le máak-o'</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>poch'-aj-ø</i>	<i>le ko'olel-o'</i> .
DM person-CL	CP	A3	insult-MOD-B3	DM woman-CL
'The man insulted the woman.'				

When the agent is focussed, this canonical structure is altered. Although the focussed agent still occupies the preverbal position, the Series A proclitic, and the auxiliary particle that typically precedes it, no longer appear (Bricker (1978), Bohnemeyer (2002), Tonhauser (2003)).<sup>2</sup> This is shown in (3).

(3) <i>Agent Focus in Yucatec</i>	
<b>Agent</b>	<b>Verb-MOD-Series.B</b> <b>(Object)</b>
<i>Juan il-ik-ech.</i>	
Juan see-IND-B2	
'JUAN (not somebody else) sees you.'	(Tonhauser 2003: 221)

Since Bricker (1978), it has further been observed that the AF form is not only observed when the transitive subject is focused, but also in transitive subject interrogatives and relatives. Examples are presented in (4) and (5).

(4) <i>Máax il-ik-ø</i>	<i>María?</i>
who see-IND-B3	María
'Who sees María?'	

(5) <i>Le máax jats'-ik-ø</i>	<i>Juan-o'</i>
DM who beat-IND-B3	Juan-CL
'That person who hits Juan.'	
	(Briccer 1978: 121)

Since focussing, interrogative and relative fronting all correspond to instances of *wh*-movement in the sense of Chomsky (1977) it would appear that the data in (3), (4) and (5) instantiate the same kind of structural construction, that is, a *wh*-construction or alternatively an *Operator-variable* construction. This has led a number of works, most notably Bohnemeyer (2002) and Tonhauser (2003) to conclude that there is a structural unity (i.e. syntactic equivalence) between the different constructions in in (3), (4) and (5).

In this paper we show that, contrary to what is assumed in these works, the distribution of AF in Yucatec is in fact highly irregular and is consequently an unreliable diagnostic for operator fronting. Specifically, data from both our corpus and direct elicitation shows that in many instances of relative operator fronting, the AF form is actually not observed. As such, we argue that AF in Yucatec no longer seems to be a morphosyntactic cue signaling an *operator-variable* configuration. Rather, our results confirm Bricker's original observation that AF in relative clauses is used mostly to disambiguate subject relativization from object relativization. Our paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we make a brief description of AF in Yucatec. We

<sup>2</sup> Only transitive agents trigger this pattern when focused. It is not observed when intransitive subjects (unaccusative, unergative or otherwise) are focused. Agent focus further brings with it a change in the mood suffixes that immediately follow the transitive stem. See Bohnemeyer (2002) for details.

then discuss the analysis in Tonhauser (2003), an analysis that defends the structural unity of AF constructions, and provide evidence from relative clauses that makes this analysis problematic. In section 3 we argue that Yucatec relative clauses provide further evidence against any structural unity analysis of AF in Yucatec, since the distribution and function of AF in relatives appears to be unrelated to the behavior it displays in declarative clauses with agent focusing. In section 4 we present our overall conclusions.

## 2 Agent focus in Yucatec

### 2.1 Focus and Agent Focus in Yucatec.

We begin by sketching a brief description of the behavior of focus and agent focus in Yucatec. In most Mayan languages, AF is not the only morphosyntactic cue that signals focusing of the transitive agent. Since Norman (1977) it has been noted that foci in most Mayan languages are displaced to the immediate preverbal position (cf. example (1). Further work in Aissen (1992) identifies this focus position as the specifier of IP, an analysis we henceforth adopt.

In Yucatec, however, word order is not a cue for focusing of the transitive subject. This is because Yucatec differs from most Mayan languages in that SVO is the unmarked word order of its transitive clauses (see Briceño (2002), and Gutiérrez-Bravo and Monforte (2008) for the relevant evidence). Hence, we take the unmarked transitive subject in (6) and the focused subject in (7) to occupy the same structural position, namely, Spec-IP. As such, besides intonational prominence, what signals the focal nature of the transitive subject in (7) is the defective clause structure of AF described above.

(6) *le ko'olel-o' t-u ts'-aj-∅ u ma'alob nook'.*  
 DM woman-CL CMP-A3 put-MOD-B3 A3 good clothes  
 '...and the woman put on her good clothes...' (Si'ipil-51)

(7) *leti' ts'a-ik-∅ u mas kuxtal...*  
 3rd put-IND-B3 A3 more life  
 'It is THAT that gives more life...' (Cultivo-105)

When a constituent other than the subject is focused, it equally moves to Spec-IP. In this case the subject remains in the postverbal field in its VP-internal position (see Briceño 2002). The resulting structure is then just like that of verb-initial Mayan languages (Aissen 1992). These cases of focussing do not trigger AF and so we do not discuss them many further here. Now, it does not seem that all foci in Yucatec move to Spec-IP. Following the distinction between *contrastive focus* and *information focus* (as in Kiss (1998)), our data show that only contrastive foci surface in Spec-IP. Specifically, we applied an elicited survey with six speakers of Yucatec. Our results indicate that information focus (understood as the constituent providing new information in a clause that is a felicitous reply to a *wh*-interrogative) is not displaced to Spec-IP when its unmarked position is in the postverbal field. This is illustrated with an instance of object focus below.

- (8) *Ba'ax t-u maan-aj-ϕ le ko'olelo'?*  
 what CP-A3 buy-MOD-B3 DMwoman-CL  
 'What did the woman buy?'  
 a. *T-u maan-aj-ϕ bu'ul.*  
 CP-A3 buy-MOD-B3 beans  
 'She bought beans.'  
 b. # *Bu'ul t-u maan-aj-ϕ.*  
 beans CP-A3 buy-MOD-B3

The conclusion we arrive at from the results of our survey and from the examples of preverbal focus in our corpus is that preverbal foci in Yucatec are essentially contrastive foci. Of course, it is possible to find *wh-question/answer* pairs where the focus in the answer occupies the preverbal position. However, the contexts in which we have found those pairs indicate clearly that the focus in such cases is also being used contrastively.

This conclusion is worth highlighting because our proposal in this paper is that AF in Yucatec is not a unitary phenomenon. Specifically, our data shows that there is no structural unity between the contexts and conditions where AF is observed. AF instead appears to be triggered by different conditions that seem to us to be unrelated. One of these conditions is when the transitive agent bears a [contrastive] feature, as in (3) and (7). In the following section we discuss, in the context of the analysis in Tonhauser (2003), why it is problematic to instead assume that AF is triggered by a specific syntactic configuration shared by agent focusing, interrogative fronting, and relativization.

## 2.2 The Analysis in Tonhauser (2003)

Tonhauser (2003) proposes that the three constructions where AF is observed in Yucatec, transitive agent focussing (3), *wh*-interrogatives (4), and relative clauses (5) instantiate the same structure. The analysis in Tonhauser (2003) is similar in its essentials to Aissen (1992)'s original analysis, in that it assumes that the focus is in a sisterhood relation with an open proposition. The fundamental difference is that in Aissen's GB analysis the focus position is Spec-IP and the open proposition is the I' intermediate projection, whereas in Tonhauser (2003) the focus is taken to be a predicative phrase, as in (9).

- (9)
- |   |
|---|
| FOCUS CONSTRUCTION  |
| <pre> graph TD     A[FOCUS CONSTRUCTION] --- B[PREDP]     A --- C["[verbal clause]"]           </pre> |

It will not be contested here whether this is a plausible analysis for instances of agent focussing like (3). However, in order to maintain the hypothesis that all constructions that display AF have the same structure, Tonhauser extends the analysis in (9) to relative clauses. As such, in Tonhauser (2003) it is suggested that the relative clause in (10) shows AF because the head of the relative *máak* 'person' is a sister of the open proposition and hence it is internal to the relative clause.

- (10) ... [NP *jun túul* [RC *máak kanaan-t-ik-ø* in *chiib-o'ob*]].  
 one CNUM person take.care-TRNS-IND-B3 A1 goat-PLUR  
 ‘...a person who takes care of my goats.’ (Tonhauser 2003: 211)

Tonhauser's analysis relies on the observation that the head of the relative in Yucatec can alternatively be a relative pronoun. This can be seen in the cleft in (11), to be compared with the *wh*-interrogative in (4).

- (11) [NP *Le* [RC *máax kím-ø*]-*o'*, *Pedro*.  
 DM who die-B3-CL Pedro  
 ‘The one who died was Pedro.’

Crucially, referential nominal heads and relative operators appear to be in complementary distribution in this language. A relative clause in Yucatec can have a referential nominal head, as in (10), or a relative operator, as in (11), but not both. Hence they are taken to occupy the same structural position. In this analysis, the internal head can in turn be modified by numerals, determinants, and numerous other modifiers that are external to the relative clause, like those in (10) and (11).

### 2.3 Evidence against the Internal Head Analysis

Three facts point to the conclusion that the analysis of the nominal head as being internal to the relative clause in Yucatec cannot be correct. First, evidence against the internal head analysis can be found in extraposition. In (12), for instance, the relative clause ‘*that die*’ has been extraposed from the NP where it originated, leaving behind the head of the relative.

- (12) *Yaan* [NP *wúnik-o'ob* \_\_\_<sub>i</sub>] =*e'* *chen tsa'ay-ak-ø*  
 EX man-PLUR =TOP when stick+PASS-IRR-B3  
*ti'-ob=e'* [RC *k-u kím-il-o'ob*]<sub>i</sub>.  
 PREP-PLUR=TOP HAB-A3 die-IND-PLUR  
 ‘There are people, when it (disease) sticks to them, that die.’ (Sonámbulo-22)

We acknowledge that this first argument is somewhat controversial. As is discussed in detail in the following section, relatives in Yucatec have no complementizers. Furthermore, in contrast with many other Mayan languages, the Yucatec verb shows no special morphology when relativization has taken place. Because of this, there is an alternative analysis of (12) where the clause [*k-u kím-il-o'ob*] is not a relative clause but instead a conjunct of the matrix clause, i.e. ‘There’s some people and, when the disease strikes them, they die.’<sup>3</sup> We consider this alternative analysis possible but unlikely, given the example’s free translation. However, there are two other arguments that provide stronger evidence that the head is not internal to the relative.

The second argument against a head-internal analysis comes from relativization of locative expressions. As mentioned, an observation that apparently supports the internal head analysis is that the NP with the relative can show a referential nominal head, as in (10) or a relative

<sup>3</sup> Yucatec typically conjoins clauses simply by juxtaposition.

pronoun, as in (11), but not both. This apparent complementary distribution makes it reasonable to conclude that both elements occupy the same structural position inside the relative. However, this is the pattern observed when an argument or a possessor is relativized. When a locative adjunct is relativized, it is possible for both the referential head of the NP and the relative pronoun to co-occur, as shown in (13) and (14). In these cases it is clear that the head is external to the relative.

- (13) [NP *jun kúul che'* [RC *tu'ux kaja'an- $\phi$  jun túul x-ku'uk-i'* ]]...  
 one NUMC tree where inhabit-B3sg one NUMC FEM-squirrel-CL  
 '...a tree where a female squirrel lived ...' (Xlool-22)

- (14) [NP *jun p'éel kool* [RC *tu'ux pak'-a'an- $\phi$  leek-e'*]]...  
 one NUMC cornfield where plant-PART-B3s round.gourd-TOP  
 '... a cornfield where round gourds were planted.' (Piich-15)

Thirdly, the relative position of negation with respect to the head of the relative clearly shows that the head of the relative does not occupy the same position as the focus in (3) and (7). As noted in Aissen (1992), in many Mayan languages the sentential negation occupies a position immediately to the left of the focus position. This is also the case in Yucatec, as shown in (15).

- (15) *Ma' leti' páak-t-ik- $\phi$  u kool.*  
 NEG 3SG weed-TRNS-IND-B3A3 cornfield  
 'It is not HIM that weeds his cornfield.'

When the relative clause is negated, however, the negation instead appears to the right of the head of the relative, as in (16).<sup>4</sup>

- (16) [NP *Le máak* [RC *ma' t-u tukul-t-ik- $\phi$  wa jaaj ba'ax*  
 DM person NEG DUR-A3 think-TRNS-IND-B3 if true what  
*le k-u y-a'al-a'a-l ti']]-o' t-u y-a'al-aj- $\phi$ ...*  
 DM HAB-A3 EP-say-PASS-IND PREP-CL CP-A3 EP-say-MOD-B3  
 'The man [that did not believe that what was told to him was true] said...' (Piich-16)

This pattern is explained in a straightforward way in a standard analysis where the head is external to the relative and is in turn coreferential with a null operator inside the relative. As illustrated in (17), in this analysis the null operator can be taken to occupy the canonical focus position. In contrast, the proposal that the head of the relative actually occupies the same position as the focus is hard to reconcile with this fact about the distribution of negation.

- (17) [NP *Le máak<sub>i</sub>* [RC [*ma' Op<sub>i</sub> t-u tukul-t-ik- $\phi$ ...* ]]]].  
 DM person NEG DUR-A3 think-TRNS-IND-B3  
 'The man that did not believe...'

It is worth pointing out that negated *wh*-interrogatives show this same pattern. Specifically, in negated interrogatives the fronted *wh*-operator appears not to the right of the negation, but

<sup>4</sup> Further observe that the transitive subject relative in (16) shows no AF. We return to this point later in the paper.

instead to its left, and no AF is observed. This is illustrated in (18). We take this to be further evidence that it is not the case that all *Operator-variable* constructions make use of AF in Yucatec.

- (18) *Máax ma' t-u beet-aj-ϕ u meyaj-i'?*  
 who NEG CP-A3 do-TRNS-IND-B3 A3 work-CL  
 'Who didn't do his job/chores?'

Form the evidence presented above, we thus conclude that the head is external to the relative clause in Yucatec. In the following section we develop an analysis of the structure of relatives in this language that makes this conclusion compatible with the apparent complementary distribution between relative pronouns and the head of the relative.

### 3 Agent Focus and Relative Clauses

#### 3.1 The Structure of Relative Clauses in Yucatec Maya

We now develop an analysis of relative clauses in Yucatec that accounts for the apparent complementary distribution between nominal heads and relative pronouns previously discussed. The analysis we propose is compatible with the evidence that in Yucatec heads are external to the relative clause.

Observe first that Yucatec has free relatives, as illustrated in (19). Since, by definition, free relatives are relative clauses that are not associated with a nominal head, these data provide evidence that relative operators are indeed internal to the relative clause. As such, it seems equally undesirable to develop an analysis of relative clauses in Yucatec where the apparent complementary distribution results because the relative pronouns is external to the relative, and thus ends up occupying the same position as the nominal head.

- (19) [<sub>RC</sub> *máax u y-ojel*]=e' *k-u ts'ak-ik-ϕ xan.*  
 who A3 EP-know=TOP HAB-A3 cure-IND-B3s also  
 'Whoever knows, can cure it (sleepwalking).' (Sonámbulo-20)

Our claim is that the apparent complementary distribution is instead the result of the fact that, (a) Yucatec uses two different strategies for relativization, (b) Yucatec allows for the head of NP to be null, and (c) relatives in Yucatec have no complementizers. In order to consider how these three properties interact, we first consider the basic typology of relativization strategies in Comrie (1989). Languages display different strategies for relativization, the two most common ones being the *gap strategy* (where the relative shows a gap but no filler for this gap internal to the relative) and the *relative pronoun strategy*<sup>5</sup> (where an overt pronominal element inside the relative functions as the filler). As is well known, some languages show more than one relativization strategy (Comrie (1989), Kroeger (2005)). English, for instance, makes use of both the *gap strategy* and the *relative pronoun strategy*.

<sup>5</sup> We use these terms in italics to indicate their typological, theory-neutral definitions.

- (20) We listened to [<sub>NP</sub> the employee [<sub>CP</sub> that the boss fired \_\_\_\_ ]].  
 (21) We listened to [<sub>NP</sub> the employee [<sub>CP</sub> whom the boss fired]].

Technically both relatives involve filler-gap dependencies. However, in accordance with our purely typological discussion at this point, we use the underscore in (20) to illustrate the presence of a gap for which there is no overt filler, in contrast with what is observed in (21).

Now, there are languages which have the *gap strategy* and which further allow the head of the relative to be null (Lehmann (1984), Kroeger (2005)). As suggested in Rojas (2006), the head of the relative in such languages tends to be null when its referent is discourse-old. Spanish is in fact a language that can combine null relative heads and the *gap strategy*, as illustrated in (22) and (23), where  $\emptyset$  represents the null  $N^0$ .

- (22) *Escuchamos* [<sub>NP</sub> *al empleado* [<sub>RC</sub> *que el patrón despidió* \_\_\_\_ ]].  
 we.listened ACC-the employee that the boss fired  
 ‘We listened to the employee that the boss fired.’
- (23) *De los empleados, escuchamos* [<sub>NP</sub> *al*  $\emptyset$  [<sub>RC</sub> *que el patrón despidió* \_\_\_\_ ]].  
 of the employees we.listened ACC-the that the boss fired  
 ‘Of the employees, we listened the (one) that the boss fired.’

Even though there is no overt head and no overt relative operator in (23), the left edge of the relative in Spanish is none the less signaled by the presence of the complementizer *que* ‘that’. Yucatec, in contrast, has no complementizer for declarative subordinate clauses in realis mood, as shown in (24).<sup>6</sup> It can be observed in this example that the subordinate complement clause is just like the matrix clause schematized in (2).

- (24) *T-u y-a'al-aj- $\emptyset$  [ je'el u bin t-in w-éetel-e' ]*.  
 CP-A3 EP-say-MOD-B3s ASV A3 go PREP-A1s EP-company-CL  
 ‘She said she would definitely go with me.’ (Xotzilil-49)

Because of the absence of this kind of complementizer, it is not immediately obvious where the left edge of the relative is, as illustrated in (25). This example is almost identical to matrix clauses as schematized in (2). What indicates that it is a relative clause embedded in an NP is the presence of the deictic clitic *-o'*, which systematically attaches to the right edge of NPs.

- (25) ... [<sub>NP</sub> *le x-ch'úupal* [<sub>RC</sub> *k-u wen-el-i'*]]-*o'*...  
 DM FEM-girl HAB-A3 sleep-IND-LOC-CL  
 ‘The girl that was sleeping there.’ (Xlool-24)

As such, our proposal is that Yucatec is just like Spanish and English in that it has both the *gap strategy* and the *relative pronoun strategy* for relativization, and it is like Spanish in that it allows for the head of the NP to be null. However, when the head of the relative is a null N, the absence of a complementizer to signal the left edge of the relative makes it appear as Yucatec

<sup>6</sup> Yucatec does have interrogative, irrealis, and adverbial complementizers, but this fact is not relevant for the analysis of relative clauses.

has only one strategy for relativization and that the heads of relatives (10) and relative pronouns (11) occupy the same structural position.

All of this relates to a crucial difference between Yucatec and Spanish. In Spanish, when the head of the relative is overt the relative that follows can be either a *gap relative* or a *relative pronoun* relative.

(26) *Escuchamos* [<sub>NP</sub> *al empelado* [<sub>RC</sub> *que el patrón despidió* \_\_\_\_ ]].  
 we.listened ACC-the employee that the boss fired  
 ‘We listened to the employee that the boss fired.’

(27) *Escuchamos* [<sub>NP</sub> *al empelado* [<sub>RC</sub> *a quien el patrón despidió* ]].  
 we.listened ACC-the employee ACC whom the boss fired  
 ‘We listened to the employee that the boss fired.’

In sharp contrast with this, what is observed in Yucatec is that when the head of the relative is overt, the only relativization strategy that is allowed is the *gap strategy*, as illustrated in (28). Note that this is also what is observed in (10), (12), (16), and (25). In more technical terms, what this means is that when the head of the relative is overt, in Yucatec it is obligatory to make use of a null relative operator, as in (17).

(28) [<sub>NP</sub> *Le máak* [<sub>RC</sub> \_\_\_\_ *áant-ik-ø Carlos*]]-o’.  
 DMperson help-IND-B3 Carlos-CL  
 ‘The person that is helping Carlos.’

Alternatively, the head of the relative can be null, but in this case the *gap strategy* is not available. Instead, an overt relative operator must be used. This is shown in (29) and (30).

(29) ... *ti’* [<sub>NP</sub> *le ø* [<sub>RC</sub> *máax ts’a-ik-ø le kuxtal ti’*]]-o’.  
 PREP DM who give-IND-B3 DM life PREP-CL  
 ‘... to (the one) who had given life to him.’ (Gigante-6)

(30) *ka a’al-a’a-b-ø teen* [<sub>NP</sub> *tuláakal ø* [<sub>RC</sub> *ba’ax úuch-ij*]].  
 and say-PASS-CP-B3 1SG every what happen-B3.CP  
 ‘And everything that had happened was told to me.’ (Si’ipil-65)

Null Ns in our analysis, of course, are not expected to be specific to relative clauses, and indeed they are widespread in Yucatec (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2002). In (31) we present an example in which the null N is just modified by an AP. Observe that this is analogous to the way in which the demonstrative and the quantifier modify the null N in (29) and (30), respectively.

(31) [<sub>NP</sub> *Le boox ø* ]-a’  
 DM black CL  
 ‘The/this black one.’

Summing up, the crucial difference between Yucatec and a language like Spanish is the following. When the head of the relative is phonetically overt in Yucatec, the only relativization

strategy available is the gap strategy, as in (25) and (28). In contrast, the relative pronoun strategy is only available when the head of the relative is null, as in (29) and (30). Crucially, the presence of a null N in this case can be identified because these constructions still allow for a wide range of nominal modifiers. The one exception to this generalization is observed when *locations* are relativized. In this case, as previously observed in (13) and (14), the relative pronoun can (but need not) co-occur with an overt nominal head.

### 3.2 Back to Agent Focus

Now that the basic structure of relative clauses in Yucatec has been determined, we can turn to our original problem of the behavior of AF in relatives. In Section 2 we showed that the structural unity analysis in Tonhauser (2003) is problematic once we consider further details about the structure of Yucatec relative clauses. From this, however, it cannot yet be concluded that *any* unified analysis of AF constructions in Yucatec would be undesirable. We now present further evidence from Yucatec relatives that points to the conclusion that the distribution and function of AF in relatives is different from that observed in clauses that do display focusing of the transitive agent. From this we conclude that AF is not linked to a single and unique syntactic operation or configuration. In other words, AF in this Mayan language is not a unitary phenomenon and so it cannot be used as a diagnostic for *wh*-movement or *operator-variable* configurations.

The standard observation in contemporary literature is that relativization of the object (or relativization of an intransitive subject) does not bring with it any modification of the canonical structure of the transitive clause, as shown in (32). In contrast, relativization of the transitive subject triggers the obligatory presence of AF, as in (33).

- (32) *In k'ajóol* [<sub>NP</sub> *le máak<sub>j</sub>* [<sub>RC</sub> *k-u<sub>i</sub> y-áant-ik-ø<sub>j</sub> \_\_\_\_<sub>j</sub> Carlos<sub>i</sub>*]]-o'.
- A1 know DM person HAB-A3 EP-help-IND-B3 Carlos-CL
- 'I know the person that Carlos is helping.'

- (33) *In k'ajóol* [<sub>NP</sub> *le máak<sub>i</sub>* [<sub>RC</sub> \_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub> *áant-ik-ø<sub>j</sub> Carlos<sub>j</sub>*]]-o'.
- A1 know DMperson help-IND-B3 Carlos-CL
- 'I know the person that is helping Carlos.'

However, contrary to this claim, relativization of the transitive subject does not necessarily bring with it the presence of AF.<sup>7</sup> So, in contrast with what is observed in (33), in the relatives in (34) and (35) there is no agent focus form, and the canonical form of transitive clauses (2) is observed instead.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> As previously mentioned, this in fact was Bricker's (1978) original observation.

<sup>8</sup> Our impression is that agent relatives without AF are actually the most common in texts, but a more detailed study is still needed to confirm this.

- (34) ... *u pak'-m-aj-∅* [<sub>NP</sub> *jun túul wayúum* [<sub>RC</sub> *k-u ts'a-ik-∅*  
 A3 plant-PP-MOD-B3s one NUMC huaya HAB-A3 give-IND-B3  
*u y-ich láaj ja'ab*]].  
 A3 EP-fruit all year  
 'She had planted a huaya tree [that bore fruit all year long].' (Xotzilil-3)
- (35) [<sub>NP</sub> *Le máak* [<sub>RC</sub> *ma' t-u tukul-t-ik-∅ wa jaaj ba'ax*  
 DM person NEG DUR-A3 think-TRNS-IND-B3 if true what  
*le k-u y-a'al-a'a-l ti']]-o' t-u y-a'al-aj-∅...*  
 DM HAB-A3 EP-say-PASS-IND PREP-CL CP-A3 EP-say-MOD-B3  
 'The man [that did not believe that what was told to him was true] said...' (Piich-16)

In these relatives presumably a null operator corresponding to the transitive agent has undergone *wh*-movement, as in (17), but AF is still not observed. From this data, in conjunction with (16), we conclude that AF in Yucatec is not a valid diagnostic for *wh*-movement or *operator-variable* configurations. However, if this is not what triggers the presence of AF in (33), we still need to address the issue of why AF *can* appear in this context even though no contrastive focusing of the agent is involved.

We consider that a possible answer can be found in earlier work on AF in Yucatec. Bricker (1978) had already observed that the alternation between object and subject relatives illustrated in (32) and (33) is not the only possible alternation observed in this language. A widely observed alternative consists of making use of the canonical transitive structure for transitive subject relativization, as in (36), and instead using passivization for object/patient relativization, as in (37).

- (36) *In k'ajóol* [<sub>NP</sub> *le máak<sub>i</sub>* [<sub>RC</sub> *k-u<sub>i</sub> y-áant-ik-∅<sub>j</sub> Carlos<sub>j</sub>*]]-o'.  
 A1 know DMperson HAB-A3 EP-help-IND-B3 Carlos-CL  
 'I know the person that helps/is helping Carlos.'
- (37) *In k'ajóol* [<sub>NP</sub> *le máak<sub>i</sub>* [<sub>RC</sub> *k-u<sub>i</sub> y-áant-a'a-l tumen Carlos*]]-o'.  
 A1 know DMperson HAB-A3 EP-help-PASS-IND by Carlos-CL  
 'I know the person that is being helped by Carlos.'

Bricker notes that this alternation keeps subject and object relativization unambiguous. We now spell out this intuition in more detail. Yucatec is a strictly head-marking language. When both the subject and the object of any clause are 3<sup>rd</sup> person, it is not possible to tell which argument NP is the subject and which one the object on the basis of the pronominal series alone. If there is no contrast in animacy or definiteness to resolve the ambiguity, the interpretation of the subject and object functions is determined by word order alone, an observation already made in Durbin and Ojeda (1978). Specifically, clauses displaying an *argument-verb-argument* order are interpreted as SVO and clauses having a *verb-argument-argument* order are interpreted as VOS. Now, in relative clauses this last cue for interpretation is lost when either of the core arguments is relativized. This is because inversion is obligatory in Yucatec relatives. Consequently the order that results after relativization is the same (i.e. *verb-argument*) both when the subject is relativized, as in (36), and when the object is relativized, as in (32).

Our proposal is that AF in relatives is simply one of two possible mechanisms to avoid this ambiguity, the other one being passivization. The crucial point of our proposal is consequently that AF in Yucatec has no relation to *Wh*-movement or *operator-variable* configurations. In our view, AF appears to be simply a morphosyntactic quirk, which is obligatorily triggered when the transitive subject in Spec-IP bears the feature [+contrastive], but which carries out a completely different function (disambiguation) in relative clauses. As such, the data presented here leads us to reject a structural-unity account of AF in Yucatec. An altogether different question, of course, is whether AF was a systematic cue for *Wh*-movement of the transitive subject in an earlier stage of the language, in the way that it appears to be in other Mayan languages. This is an important question, but one that needs to be addressed in future research.

## 4 Conclusions

In this paper we have discussed Agent Focus in Yucatec Maya and have concluded that it is not a unitary phenomenon. Specifically, whereas focusing of the transitive agent does seem to always trigger the AF form of the verb in this language, the same cannot be said about relativization. Since relativization of the transitive agent does not necessarily trigger the presence of the AF form of the verb, we conclude that AF cannot be a diagnostic for operator-variable constructions in this language and that it is not a morphological instantiation for the semantics of these constructions. Rather, it appears that the function of AF in Yucatec relatives is to prevent ambiguity between subject and object relativization, since relative clauses are a context where the usual cues for distinguishing the subject and object grammatical relations in Yucatec are neutralized.

### Abbreviations

A	Set A	DM	demonstrative	IRR	irrealis	PP	present perfect
ACC	accusative	DUR	durative	LOC	locative	PREP	preposition
ASV	assurative	EP	epenthesis	MOD	mood	TOP	topic
B	Set B	EX	existential	NUMC	classifier	TRNS	transitive
CL	clitic	FEM	female	PART	participle		
CP	completive	HAB	habitual	PASS	passive		
DET	determinant	IND	indicative	PLUR	plural		

## References

- Aissen, Judith. 1992. Topic and Focus in Mayan. *Language* 68:43-80.
- Berinstein, Ava. 1985. *Evidence for Multiattachment in K'ekchi Mayan*. New York: Garland.
- Bohnemeyer, Jürgen. 2002. *The grammar of time reference in Yukatek Maya*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Briceño, Fidencio. 2002. Topicalización, enfoque, énfasis y adelantamiento en el maya yukateco. In *La organización social entre los mayas prehispánicos, coloniales y modernos*, eds. V. Tiesler Blos, R. Cobos and M. Greene Robertson, 374-387. Mexico City/Mérida: INAH/UADY.

- Bricker, Victoria. 1978. Wh-questions, relativization and clefting in Yucatec Maya. In *Papers in Mayan Linguistics*, ed. L. Martin, 107-136. Columbia, Missouri: Lucas Brothers.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Oxford: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On Wh-movement. In *Formal Syntax*, eds. Peter Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian, 71-132. New York: Academic Press.
- Durbin, Marshall, and Ojeda, Fernando. 1978. Basic word order in Yucatec Maya. In *Papers in Mayan Linguistics*, ed. Nora England, 69-77. Columbia: University of Missouri.
- Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo. 2002. Formas verbales incorporadas transitivas en maya yucateco. In *Del cora al maya yucateco: Estudios lingüísticos sobre algunas lenguas indígenas mexicanas*, ed. Paulette Levy, 131-178. Mexico City: UNAM.
- Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo, and Monforte, Jorge. 2008. La alternancia sujeto-inicial/verbo-inicial y la Teoría de Optimidad. In *Teoría de Optimidad: Estudios de sintaxis y fonología*, eds. Rodrigo Gutiérrez-Bravo and Esther Herrera Zendejas, 61-99. Mexico City: El Colegio de México.
- Kiss, É. Katalin. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74:245-273.
- Kroeger, Paul. 2005. *Analyzing Grammar*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1984. Progress in general comparative linguistics. *Studies in Language* 8:259-286.
- Norman, William. 1977. Topic and Focus in Mayan. Paper presented at *The Mayan Workshop II*, San Cristóbal de las Casas, México.
- Rojas, Rosa María. 2006. Construcciones relativas en el zapoteco de Santa Ana del Valle, Oaxaca. Paper presented at *Primer Coloquio de Exalumnos de la Maestría en Lingüística Indoamericana del CIESAS*, Mexico City.
- Stiebels, Barbara. 2006. Agent focus in Mayan languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24:501-570.
- Tonhauser, Judith. 2003. F-constructions in Yucatec Maya. In *The Proceedings of SULA 2*, eds. Jan Anderssen, Paula Menéndez-Benito and Adam Werle, 203-223. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.