ON OPTIONAL FOCUS MOVMENT IN K'ICHEE'*

DAN BRIDGES VELLEMAN
University of Texas at Austin

Most existing descriptions of K'ichee' treat it as a language with obligatory focus movement. This paper shows that focus movement is in fact generally optional — i.e. in-situ focus is generally permitted in addition to ex-situ — and is obligatory only under certain well-defined conditions. These conditions under which focus movement is obligatory form an ergative pattern. Ordinary transitive subjects must move when focused; for other focused constituents movement is optional. This pattern closely mirrors a well-known pattern of restrictions on *overt* syntactic movement in K'ichee', involving the so-called "Agent Focus" construction. I argue that it can be explained in a framework which treats in-situ focus as *covert* movement.[1]

1 Introduction

For the past several decades, work on focus in the Mayan languages has concentrated almost exclusively on its visible syntactic effects — that is, on the phenomenon of overt focus movement. Going back at least to the 1960s there has been debate as to what the basic word orders are in these languages and how the non-basic surface word orders are derived; Norman's (1977) proposal, now widely accepted, gives focus movement a crucial role. Around the same time, it was noted that movement in many Mayan languages is morphosyntactically interesting in its own right, due to what Ayres (1983) called "indexing" of syntactically extracted constituents — the use of distinctive morphology in clauses from which a transitive subject, an adverb, or a locative or instrumental adjunct has been overtly extracted. As a result, overt focus movement (along with other forms of syntactic extraction, such as WH-movement and relativization) is quite well-studied, especially in generally well-documented languages such as K'ichee'.

[1]Thank you to Judith Aissen for encouraging me to take a closer look at the covert movement approach to these data.

Less attention has been paid to the phenomenon of *in-situ* focus. Indeed, it is not widely acknowledged that foci *can* surface in situ in Mayan languages. A few authors have pointed out that in-situ focus is possible in Yucatec, Tseltal, Tsotsil, and recently too in K'ichee' (1).[2]

(1) *Context:* What is the man carrying?

U-q'alu-m   b'i   [jun kotz'i'j.]F
A3s-carry-PERF away [a   flower   ]F
He's carrying (*lit.* "he is going having picked up") [a flower]F

And archival data can be found demonstrating that it occurs throughout the Mayan family (2–5) — this is not an isolated phenomenon.[3]

(2) *Context*: So where will they start building them?

K-b'ant-eel   neej [tzi   poon.]F
B3s-be.done-POT then [next.to bridge]F
It will be done [next to the bridge.]F   Mam, England et al. 1974

(3) *Context*: And where did you have it done?

B'an-ij   [xe   nim kruus.]F
do-PERF [under big cross]F
It was done [in Xe Nim Kruus.]F   Awakateko, **?**

(4) *Context*: What did you eat in the mountains?

T-in-tij   [j-wiich=taq r-e   chee'.]F
INC-A1s-eat [A3s-fruit=PL A3s-of tree   ]F
I would eat [the fruits of the trees.]F   Uspanteko, Vicente and Chamatun 2006

(5) *Context*: The children — where have they gone?

Ixin-ob' [ta   chor.]F
go-B3p [PREP field]F
They went [to the fields.]F   Chorti, Fought 1972 (9:37–44)[4]

Nevertheless, it remains under-studied. In particular, past works have not discussed the conditions that determine when focus in situ is possible and when focus movement is required.

   This paper offers a detailed description of in-situ focus in K'ichee'. The first order of business is to confirm that it does indeed occur. With this established, I turn to the question of *when* it occurs. While there are no doubt a number of relevant factors, including performance factors with a statistical effect, I concentrate here on demonstrating a categorical effect of grammatical function.

---

   [2]See Kügler et al. 2007, Gussenhoven and Teeuw 2008 and Gutiérrez-Bravo and Monforte 2011 for Yucatec; Shklovsky 2012 (himself citing unpublished data from Gilles Polian) for Tseltal; and Aissen 2012a for Tsotsil, citing data from a number of much earlier publications including Laughlin 1980 and Haviland 1981. K'ichee' data in this paper is my own, but see also Baird 2010, Burdin et al. 2013 and **?**.

   [3]In addition to the examples given above, I have found examples of answering focus in situ in archival texts in Mocho' and Sakapultek; B'alam Mateo-Toledo (*p.c.*) mentions that it also occurs in Q'anjob'al, of which he is a native speaker. I do not yet know whether it occurs in Wastekan or Chujean, but these are currently the only branches of the family in which I have not found it attested.

   [4]The texts in Fought's collection are translated but not interlinearized, and are spelled rather idiosyncratically — the sentence in (6) was spelled `'i'xi"no?p 'ta"txor`. I have respelled and glossed the sentence; the translation for both the sentence and the preceding context is Fought's own.

In ordinary transitive clauses, the subject of the clause is absolutely prohibited from bearing focus in situ: compare the infelicitous example 6 with the felicitous example 1 above.

(6) *Context:* Who is carrying the flower away?

U-q'alu-m   b'i   [jun achih / le   achih.]$_F$
A3s-carry-PERF away [a   man   / the man.]$_F$
Intended: [A man / the man]$_F$ is carrying it away.

Various workarounds exist for this prohibition. For instance, if the clause is detransitivized, the former transitive subject — now another sort of argument or oblique — becomes focusable in situ. And there are certain types of what I will call *exceptional transitive clause* in which the prohibition does not apply; exceptional transitive subjects can be focused in situ with no need for any workaround. But in ordinary, non-exceptional transitive clauses, if no workaround is used, the prohibition on subject focus in situ is absolute.

This fact is striking because it closely mirrors a well-known pattern of constraints on overt syntactic movement in K'ichee'. A-bar movement — including focus movement, but also relativization and WH-movement — is also prohibited for the subjects of ordinary transitive clauses. Again, various syntactic workarounds exist for this prohibition, including straightforward detransitivization as above (as well as others to be discussed shortly). And again, precisely the same family of exceptional transitive clauses, the prohibition does not apply. But in ordinary transitive clauses, if no workaround is used, the prohibition is absolute.[5]

This suggests an analysis of in-situ focus as *covert movement*, following Chomsky 1976 and many later authors. On such an analysis we would claim that all focused constituents move to the same syntactic position — either overtly or covertly — and that the syntactic configuration in an ordinary transitive clause which blocks overt movement also blocks covert.

2   Background: focus and focus marking

In this paper I use the word "focus" to describe a pragmatic phenomenon. In a particular context of utterance, a constituent counts as focused if (a) it provides the answer to the question which the utterance addresses; (b) it is in contrast with a constituent in another utterance; or (c) it is associated with a focus-sensitive particle. Following Rooth (1992), we can subsume all three of these functions under a single description: focus *indicates the presence of alternative propositions* which must be taken into account in interpreting an utterance (Krifka, 2008). For brevity, in this paper, I will stick to examples involving *answering* focus. But the facts regarding contrastive, corrective and "associated" focus are the same — when one focus type can be realized in situ, the others can as well, and vice versa.

We must distinguish, here, between the universal abstract pragmatic phenomenon of focus, and the various concrete, overt phonological or morphosyntactic devices that are used to *mark* focus

---

[5]Actually, there seems to be significant dialect variation on this point. In Nahualá, where my data was gathered, ordinary transitive subjects are indeed strictly prohibited both from bearing focus in situ and from being extracted. But Murat Yasavul reports a variety of K'ichee' spoken in Playa Grande (in the municipality of Ixcán, in the far north of El Quiché) in which ordinary transitive subjects *can* be freely extracted. I have worked with a speaker from the K'ichee'-speaking aldea of Macalajao in the municipality of Uspantán and found similar results: subjects of at least some ordinary transitive clauses can be freely extracted, though the details appear to depend on the verb for this consultant. Unfortunately, I do not know what the facts are on focus in situ for Playa Grande or Macalajao K'ichee'.

in specific languages. If we label a constituent as *focused*, it will be on semantic or pragmatic grounds — namely, because the constituent bears one of the three functions above — and not merely because it exhibits a certain kind of overt movement (in K'ichee') or bears a certain kind of pitch accent (in English).[6] Having determined which constituents count as information-structural foci, we can then ask empirical questions about their marking — like "do these all, in fact, move?"

In most Mayan languages, including K'ichee', the canonical word order in broad-focus (i.e. "pragmatically unmarked" or "all-new") clauses is verb-initial (7). Focused constituents may be marked by A-bar movement into a position immediately to the left of the verb (8),[7] provided they are permitted to move at all (but recall that ordinary transitive subjects are not permitted to move).

(7) *Context:* What happened?

    X-u-tij   jun leej   ri   a   Xwaan.   V O A
    INC-A3s-eat a   tortilla DET youth Juan
    "Juan ate a tortilla."

(8) *Context*: What did he eat?

    [Jun leej   ]$_F$ x-u-tij-oh.   [O]$_F$ V *t*
    [a   tortilla]$_F$ INC-A3s-eat-FINAL
    "He ate [a tortilla.]$_F$"

And as this paper will show, in circumstances where focus movement is permitted, focus in situ is permitted as well.

In the remainder of this paper, I will stick with examples involving answering focus, in order to keep things simple and brief. But focused constituents with some other function — contrastive, corrective, or associated with a particle — are realized in the same way as answering foci in my data. That is, in any case where answering foci can be realized in situ, the other types of focus can be as well;[8] and in any case where answering foci cannot be realized in situ, neither can the other types.

3 Data

3.1 When movement is possible

Let us first consider the set of circumstances under which overt movement is possible. We will see that in all of these circumstances, covert focus movement (a.k.a. focus in situ) is also possible.

---

[6]This conflicts somewhat with older Mayanist usage, on which all leftward movement was sometimes referred to as "focus." Where a Mayanist of the 1970s would have said "answering constituents can be focused" and "relativized constituents are focused," modern terminology would have us say "focused constituents can undergo A-bar movement" and "relativized constituents also undergo A-bar movement, even though they aren't (necessarily) information-structurally focused."

[7]Topicalized constituents may also appear before the verb, but these will not concern us here.
  See Norman 1977 for the original statement of this proposal, and Aissen 1992 for an influential formalization.

[8]See Velleman 2011 for evidence that focus-sensitive particles can associate at a distance with an in-situ focus in K'ichee', and Burdin et al. 2013 and **?** for evidence that contrastive foci can occur in situ.

Absolutive arguments   Absolutive arguments — that is, transitive objects and intransitive subjects — can be freely extracted, either due to focus movement, WH-movement or relativization (Mondloch, 1981, Larsen, 1988).[9]

Absolutive arguments can also bear focus in situ. See example 1 above for the felicity of object focus in situ, and 9–10 for transitive subject focus.

(9) *Context:* Who left?

X-el   b'i   [ri   a   Xwaan.]F
CPL-exit away [DET youth Juan   ]F
"[Juan]F left."

(10) *Context:* Who is singing?

Ka-b'ixon [jun w-atz.   ]F
INC-sing [a   A1s-brother]F
"[One of my brothers]F is singing."

Obliques and adjuncts   All sorts of obliques and adjuncts can be extracted (Larsen, 1988). There is one special case. Locative adjuncts, if they are to be extracted, require the use of the clitic particle =*wi(h)* after the verb (Can Pixabaj, 2009).[10]

All obliques and adjuncts can be focused in situ. This includes locative adjuncts — and when locative adjuncts are focused in situ, =*wi(h)* is not required.

(11) *Context:* Where are you going?

K-in-b'ee   [pa   w-o'ch.   ]F
INC-B1s-go [PREP A1s-home]F
"I'm going [to my house.]F"

(12) *Context:* When did he arrive?

X-ul   [iwiir.   ]F
CPL-arrive [yesterday]F
"He arrived [yesterday.]F"

Exceptional transitive subjects   As we will see in the next section, ordinary transitive subjects cannot move. But there are several sorts of exceptional transitive clause from which subject movement is indeed possible. These include reflexive clauses (Mondloch, 1981), "extended reflexive" clauses, in which the subject is coindexed with the object's possessor (Mondloch, 1981), and clauses containing a nonspecific bare noun object (Aissen, 2012b) which is arguably pseudoincorporated into the verb (Coon et al., 2011).

In all of these exceptional clauses, too, subject focus in situ is possible.[11]

(13) *Context:* Who hurt himself?

X-u-sok   r-iib' [ri   a   Lu'.]F
CPL-A3s-wound A3s-self [DET youth Pedro]F
"[Pedro]F hurt himself."

(14) *Context:* Who$_i$ hurt his$_i$ (own) leg?

X-u-sok   r-aqan [ri   taat Wel.   ]F
CPL-A3s-wound A3s-leg [DET don Manuel.]F
"[Don Manuel$_i$]F hurt his$_i$ leg."

---

[9]For brevity, in the remainder of the paper, I will not give examples demonstrating when overt movement is felicitous and when it is not, since the basic facts here are quite well established and essentially uncontroversial.

[10]See also Henderson 2007 for an essentially identical phenomenon in Kaqchikel, and Ayres 1983 for a related one in Ixil.

[11]The sentence in 16 becomes bad if the firewood is interpreted in context as specific. At least one of my consultants is quite strict on the requirement of nonspecificity — for him, the question cannot be "Who is cutting the wood that we will use in our fire tomorrow?" or even "Who is doing [the culturally salient chore of] firewood-cutting?" but rather must be something like "Huh?! I hear chopping noises! I see woodchips flying! Who's cutting wood?"

(15)   *Context:* Who is cutting (*lit.* "making") wood?

   K-u-b'an   sii' [ri   nu-taat.   ]F
   INC-A3s-make wood [DET A1s-father]F
   "[My father]F is making wood."

3.2   When movement is impossible

In ordinary transitive clauses, by contrast, subjects cannot move. This has long been known as a matter of descriptive fact,[12] and has recently attracted renewed theoretical attention. Here I assume the style of account promoted by Coon et al. (2011) — and also by Campana (1992) and Aldridge (2004, 2008, 2012) in discussion of other languages — on which the problem is a syntactic roadblock: the subject cannot get out of the clause because some other constituent is in its way.[13]

   If the roadblock approach is basically correct, and in-situ focus is covert movement, then it is natural to expect in-situ focus to be blocked under the same circumstances. Sure enough, we find that in ordinary transitive clauses, subject focus in situ is also impossible.

(16)   *Context:* Who ate my lunch?

   #X-u-tij   [ri   aw-anab'.]F
   CPL-A3s-eat [DET A2s-sister]F
   Intended: "[Your sister]F ate (it)."

(17)   *Context:* Who wants ice cream?

   #Ka-w-aj   [in]F jun w-elaad.
   INC-A1s-want [1sg]F a   A1s-ice.cream
   Indended: "[I]F want an ice cream."

(18)   *Context:* (Pointing to a new sink) who put that in?

   #X-u-b'an   [jun plomero.]F
   CPL-A3s-make [a   plumber   ]F
   Intended: "[A plumber]F did it."

   Note that this is true regardless of the semantics or pragmatics of the intended subject focus. Though space precludes a full demonstration of the fact, the same prohibition occurs for total or partial answers; for answering, contrastive or particle-associated foci; and for less prototypically agentive subjects as well as more agentive ones.

   Too, the prohibition is independent of prosody — or at least cannot be explained away as a product of prosodic constraints, as the next section will show.

3.3   Syntax, not prosody

It has been hypothesized that all interactions between focus and syntax are mediated by prosodic constraints on the realization of focus — either constraints requiring focused constituents to be prosodically *prominent* (Büring, 2003) or constraints requiring focused constituents to be prosodically *aligned* (Féry, 2013). So it is worth asking whether this sort of prosodic constraint

---

[12]See Craig 1977, Smith-Stark 1978, England 1983 and Ayres 1983 for early descriptions in other Mayan languauges, and Mondloch 1981, Larsen 1988, Pye 1989, Davies and Sam Colop 1990, López Ixcoy 1997, England 1997, Stiebels 2006 and Can Pixabaj and England 2011 — among many others — for discussion touching on K'ichee'.

[13]Space limitations preclude full formal detail here; see Deal (2012) for a comparative discussion of theories of syntactic ergativity in A-bar movement.

could explain the K'ichee' data — and given what we currently know about K'ichee' prosody, the answer appears to be "no."

Of course, it would be reasonable to assume that prosodic constraints on focus realization do exist in K'ichee'. And prosodic experiments so far have confirmed this assumption, showing that in-situ narrow foci in K'ichee' do bear additional prosodic prominence (Baird, 2010, Burdin et al., 2013).[14] So I will not be arguing that K'ichee' foci are "prosodically unmarked," or that there are no prosodic requirements that focused constituents must meet.[15] What I will be arguing is that, under our current best model of K'ichee' prosody, any such prosodic requirements would be *insufficient to explain* the ban on in-situ focus of ordinary transitive subjects. We cannot simply say, for instance, "transitive subjects are prohibited from bearing focus in situ because they always occur in a prosodically weak position."

The reason is that VO and VA clauses are prosodically identical, but give rise to different possibilities for in-situ focus. All accounts of K'ichee' prosody agree that prosodic emphasis is consistently rightmost at every level — from default word stress up to emphasis within intonational phrases (Nielsen, 2005, Henderson, 2012). Henderson (2012) shows that patterns of segmental allophony and allomorphy can be used as diagnostics for the location of prosodic boundaries. Using these diagnostics, we can show that in both 19 and 20, the verb is followed by a prosodic word boundary but by no boundaries larger than that — since any larger prosodic boundary here would cause the verb root *-taa* to be realized as [tah] rather than [taa].

(19)   X-∅-in-taa   le ak'aal.
      CPL-B3s-A1s-hear D child
      I heard the child.

(20)   X-in-u-taa   le ak'aal.
      CPL-B1s-A3s-hear D child
      The child heard me.

In other words, in both examples, the prosodic structure is as follows:

```
(                    *   )
(                    *   )
(          * )   (        *   )
```
(19′)   X-in-taa   le   ak'aal.
(20′)   X-in-u-taa   le   ak'aal.

But in one case, the postverbal argument is a direct object which can bear focus (21), and in the other, it is an ordinary transitive subject which cannot (22).

(21)   *Context:* Who did you hear?

      X-∅-in-taa   [le ak'aal.]F
      CPL-B3s-A1s-hear [D child   ]F
      I heard [the child.]F

(22)   *Context:* Who heard you?

      #X-in-u-taa   [le ak'aal.]F
      CPL-B1s-A3s-hear [D child   ]F
      Intended: [The child]F heard me.

This distinction cannot be predicted based on any purely prosodic set of constraints, since the prosodic structures (19′–20′) are identical. Rather, the possibilities for focus must be determined

---

[14]I should note, though, that in the Clopper et al. experiment, the only significant effect of focus was a quite small difference in duration — a much less dramatic effect than they found in other languages in their study. Note, too, that in Yucatec, experiments have consistently found *no* significant phonetic effects of focus (Kügler and Skopeteas, 2006, 2007, Kügler et al., 2007). In other words, there is some indication that prosody has less of a role in marking focus in Mesoamerica than it does in Europe.

[15]Thank you to Scott AnderBois for helping clarify this point.

by rules that have access to the underlying syntax — such as, for instance, the syntactic principles governing covert movement.

And adding a focus projection rule (see e.g. Selkirk 1984, 1996) will not help here. Suppose we were to assume, as Selkirk does, that prosodic emphasis on an O argument can reflect broad focus on the whole clause, but prosodic emphasis on an A argument cannot. If we did this, we would predict an information-structural difference between the two examples above — but not the *right* information-structural difference. On a focus projection theory, a single prosodically emphasized word can always be treated as bearing narrow focus; projection only comes into play when we consider the options for broader focus. Thus we would predict that both O and A arguments could be construed as narrow focus (incorrectly in the latter case, as 22 shows) but that a clause containing an accented A argument could not be construed as bearing broad focus (also incorrectly, as shown by the felicity of 23).

(23)   *Context:* Why did you stop talking?
     [X-in-u-taa   le ak'aal.]$_F$
     [CPL-B1s-A3s-hear D child   ]$_F$
     [The child heard me.]$_F$

The only way to save a purely prosodic account here would be to posit an additional level of prosodic organization in K'ichee' beyond what is found in Henderson and Nielsen's acounts, or a degree of flexibility in prosodic headedness that they do not give evidence for. I am not aware of any independently motivated reason to do either of those things, though. And it would be a mistake to do either one with no independent motivation, just to save an admittedly elegant theory.

3.4   The effect of Agent Focus

The data so far has supported the descriptive generalization that in situ focus is possible where (and only where) movement is possible, and the informal explanatory generalization that this is because the syntactic configurations that block overt movement also block covert movement.

There is, though, one discrepancy between the constraints on in-situ focus and those on overt movement. The AF construction,[16] involving special voice morphology on the verb, permits the subjects of ordinary transitive verbs to escape from the clause.

(24)   *Context:* Who is carrying the flower away?
     [Jun achih]$_F$ q'alu-n-naq   b'i-k.
     [a   man   ]$_F$ carry-AF-PERF away-FINAL
     "[A man]$_F$ is carrying it away."

But it does not permit focus in situ.

(25)   *Context:* Who is carrying the flower away?
     *Q'alu-n-naq   b'i   [jun achih / le   achih.]$_F$
     carry-AF-PERF away [a   man / the man.   ]$_F$
     Intended: [A man / the man]$_F$ is carrying it away.

---

[16]Since the AF construction and the prohibition against transitive subject extraction are generally discussed together — the one being a sort of workaround for the other — the references in footnote 10 are also relevant here.

This is odd on the face of things: if overt movement is permitted here, then why not covert?

The solution is an observation made by Aissen (2012b): an Agent Focus verb does not merely *permit* the subject of the clause to move, it actually *forces* the subject to move — and to move overtly. Clauses like 25 are not merely infelicitous in a given context; they are actually outright ungrammatical, as WH-in-situ clauses would be in English (or indeed in K'ichee'). This suggests, as Aissen points out, that the Agent Focus verb does not merely remove a roadblock that was preventing movement, but also imposes the requirement that its subject will bear a feature combination which can only be checked if the subject bears overt movement.

In other words, we have three possibilities in two-participant clauses:

- In ordinary transitive clauses, all subject movement is blocked. This precludes both overt focus movement and covert focus movement (a.k.a. focus in situ).
- In exceptional transitive clauses, the block is gone. Subjects may undergo focus movement, may be focused in situ, or may indeed not bear focus at all. There is no pressure either way.
- In Agent Focus clauses, the block is gone — but what's more, the subject is forced to move *overtly*. This is consistent with overt focus movement; but it precludes in situ focus.

4 Discussion

We have seen that in situ focus is possible in K'ichee', and that the distribution of contexts in which it is possible can be explained by three assumptions: first, that in situ focus involves covert movement; second, that covert movement is affected by the same syntactic configurations that cause the well-known restrictions on overt movement in K'ichee'; and third, that AF clauses demand overt subject movement and thus prevent the subject from moving merely covertly.

In situ focus, on this account, is stuck in the middle between two sets of syntactic forces. Sometimes it is forbidden because it would go to far, asking a focused subject to undergo (covert) movement in a situation where a syntactic roadblock prevents subjects from moving at all. Sometimes it is forbidden because it would not go far enough, asking a focused subject to move *merely covertly* when it has been assigned features that would require it to move *overtly*.

Now, there is one thing that is odd about this account. It depends crucially on the idea that both overt and covert movement should be blocked in by the same syntactic configurations. But *in general, this is not the case.* Indeed, a major challenge for the development of covert movement accounts of focus has been that in situ focus often remains possible even when overt movement is blocked. In many languages, in situ focus can occur within islands, suggesting that whatever prevents overt movement out of an island can be circumvented or subverted in the case of covert movement. Various workarounds have been proposed that would explain the discrepancy here, allowing in-situ focus in contexts where overt movement is blocked. But this means that, in formalizing the account which I have sketched here, one challenge will be explaining why those workarounds do not apply in this situation. That is, we will need to point to a difference between islands (on the one hand), and the "syntactic roadblock" which is present in K'ichee' ordinary transitive clauses (on the other hand), in order to explain why covert focus movement can effect an escape from one but not from the other.

Here is one possible direction we could take. Proponents of covert movement have suggested that when focus in situ occurs within an island, it corresponds to *covert pied-piping* (Drubig, 1994, Krifka, 2006, Wagner, 2006). Rather than trying to extract the focus covertly from the

island, we let the entire island move covertly along with it. This is made more plausible by the parallel phenomenon of *overt* pied-piping, in which islands do visibly move along with a focused subconstituent. Suppose we adopt that idea here. Now, we have said that ordinary transitive subjects cannot be focused in situ because they cannot undergo covert movement, being trapped within the clause. The additional assumption which we must make, in order to square this with the idea of covert pied-piping, is now a fairly plausible one — namely, that a focused transitive subject *cannot covertly pied-pipe the entire clause along with it*. But the details remain to be worked out.

Let me close by pointing out a typological prediction made by this account. It strongly suggests that all syntactically ergative languages — that is, all languages with K'ichee'-like prohibitions on the overt movement of certain kinds of transitive subjects — should also have restrictions *at least as strong* on focus in situ. Of course, restrictions on focus in situ could be *stronger* than those on overt movement; for instance, certain constituents could be subject to additional syntactic pressures which prevent from surfacing in situ,[17] or there could be prosodic constraints which limit where in-situ foci occur, or pragmatic constraints which limit the interpretation of in-situ foci. What we *don't* expect to see is a syntactically ergative language where focus in situ is *less* constrained than focus movement.

Yucatec appears to confirm this prediction: Yucatec blocks overt focus-movement of transitive subjects in non-AF clauses much like K'ichee' does; and experiments have shown that while Yucatec allows focus in situ, speakers do not realize focused transitive subjects in situ (Kügler et al., 2007). On the other hand, Tseltal and Tsotsil conform to the prediction in the weaker sense that in these languages, both focus-movement and focus in situ are equally *unrestricted*. In these languages, transitive subjects can freely extract without special morphology,[18] and transitive subjects are also reported to be focusable in situ (Shklovsky, 2012, Aissen, 2012a). Based on a small sample of Mayan languages, then, things look good. But more data, in more detail, from more languages is still needed.

References

Aissen, J.L. 1992. Topic and focus in Mayan. *Language* 68:43–80.

Aissen, Judith. 1999. Agent focus and inverse in Tzotzil. *Language* 75:451–485.

Aissen, Judith. 2012a. El foco. Talk at *Taller sobre interogación, foco, y tópico*, CIESAS.

Aissen, Judith. 2012b. On the syntax of agent focus in K'ichee'. In *Proceedings of FAMLi 1*.

Aldridge, Edith. 2004. Ergativity and word order in austronesian languages. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell.

Aldridge, Edith. 2008. Minimalist analysis of ergativity. *Sophia Linguistica* 55:12–142.

Aldridge, Edith. 2012. Antipassive and ergativity in tagalog. *Lingua* 122:192–203.

Ayres, Glenn. 1983. The antipassive "voice" in ixil. *The International Journal of American Linguistics* 49:20–45.

Baird, Brandon O. 2010. Focus in K'ichee' (Mayan). Ms., University of Texas.

Burdin, Rachel, Cynthia Clopper, Sara Phillips-Bourass, Judith Tonhauser, and Murat Yasavul. 2013. Variation in the prosody of contrastive focus in head- and edge-marking languages. Presentation at the 35th annual Conference of the German Linguistics Society (DGfS).

---

[17] As we saw in K'ichee' with the subjects of AF clauses.

[18] Tseltal has lost the AF construction; Tsotsil has reinterpreted it as a sort of inverse construction (Aissen, 1999), but does not impose restrictions on movement when AF morphology is absent.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:511–545.

Campana, Mark. 1992. A movement theory of ergativity. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University.

Can Pixabaj, Telma. 2009. The particle "wi" in K'ichee': a focus marker. Presentation at SSILA (Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas).

Can Pixabaj, Telma, and Nora C. England. 2011. Nominal topic and focus in K'ichee'. In *Representing language: Essays in honor of judith aissen*, ed. Rodrigo Gutiérrez-Bravo, Line Mikkelsen, and Eric Potsdam, 15–38. UC Santa Cruz: Linguistics Research Center.

Chomsky, Noam. 1976. Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2:303–350.

Coon, Jessica, Pedro Mateo Pedro, and Omer Preminger. 2011. The role of case in A-bar extraction asymmetries: Evidence from Mayan. Manuscript, Harvard University.

Craig, Colette Grinevald. 1977. *The structure of Jacaltec*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Davies, William D., and Luis Enrique Sam Colop. 1990. K'iche' and the structure of the antipassive. *Language* 66:522–549.

Deal, Amy Rose. 2012. Ergativity. In *International handbook on syntactic contemporary research, 2nd edition*, ed. A. Alexiadou and T. Kiss.

Drubig, Hans Bernhard. 1994. Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus. In *Arbeitspapiere des sonderforschungsbereichs 340: Sprachtheoretische grundlagen der computerlinguistik 51.*.

England, Nora C. 1983. *A grammar of mam, a mayan language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

England, Nora C. 1997. Topicalización, enfoque y énfasis. *Cultura de Guatemala* XVIII:273–288.

England, Nora C. (researcher), Juan Ordóñez Domingo, and Juan Maldonado Andrés (speakers, recorders, transcribers, translators). 1974. *Sobre agua potable*. Nora C. England collection. The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America: www.ailla.utexas.org.

Féry, Caroline. 2013. Focus as alignment. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31.

Fought, John. 1972. *Chorti (mayan) texts*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gussenhoven, Carlos, and Renske Teeuw. 2008. A moraic and a syllabic H-tone in Yucatec Maya. In *Fonología instrumental: Patrones fónicos y variación.*, ed. Esther Herrera and Pedro Martín Butrage no. Mexico City: El Colegio de México.

Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo, and Jorge Monforte. 2011. Focus, agent focus and relative clauses in Yucatec Maya. In *New perspectives on mayan linguistics*, ed. Heriberto Avelino, Jessica Coon, and E. Norcliffe.

Haviland, John Beard. 1981. *Sk'op sotz'leb: El tzotzil de san lorenzo zinacantan*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Henderson, Robert. 2007. A "wi" problem: the syntax of adjunct extraction in Kaqchikel. Honors thesis, University of Texas.

Henderson, Robert. 2012. Morphological alternations at the intonational phrase edge. Ms., to appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Krifka, M. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55:243–276.

Krifka, Manfred. 2006. Association with focus phrases. In *The architecture of focus*, ed. Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, 105–136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kügler, Frank, and Stavros Skopeteas. 2006. Interaction of lexical tone and information structure in yucatec maya. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international symposium on tonal aspects of languages*, 83–88. La Rochelle.

Kügler, Frank, and Stavros Skopeteas. 2007. On the universality of prosodic reflexes of contrast: the case of Yucatec Maya. In *Proceedings of icphs 16*.

Kügler, Frank, Stavros Skopeteas, and Elizabeth Verhoeven. 2007. Encoding information structure in Yucatec Maya: On the interplay of prosody and syntax. In *Isis 8*, ed. S. Ishihara, S. Jannedy, and A. Schwarz, 187–208.

Larsen, Thomas W. 1988. *Manifestations of ergativity in Quiché grammar*. University of California, Berkeley.

Laughlin, Robert. 1980. *Of shoes and ships and sealing wax*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

López Ixcoy, Candelaria Dominga. 1997. *Ri ukemiik ri k'ichee' chii': Gramatica k'ichee'*. Guatemala: Cholsamaj.

Mondloch, James L. 1981. Voice in Quiché-Maya. Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York, Albany.

Nielsen, K. 2005. Kiche intonation. In *UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics 104*, 45–60.

Norman, William. 1977. Topic and focus in Mayan. Presentation at the Mayan Workshop II, San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas, Mexico.

Pye, Clifton. 1989. The focus antipassive in Quiché Mayan. *Kansas University Working Papers in Linguistics* .

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.

Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: the relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge: MIT press.

Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1996. Sentence prosody: intonation, stress and phrasing. In *The handbook of phonological theory*, ed. John Goldsmith. London: Basil Blackwell.

Shklovsky, Kiril. 2012. Tseltal clause structure. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Smith-Stark, Thom. 1978. The mayan antipassive: some facts and fictions. In *Papers in mayan linguistics*, ed. Nora C. England. Columbia: Museum of Anthropology, University of Missouri.

Stiebels, B. 2006. Agent focus in Mayan languages. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 24:501–570.

Velleman, Daniel B. 2011. 'También,' 'hasta' e 'incluso' en el K'ichee'. Presentation at CILLA 5.

Vicente Méndez, Miguel Angel (researcher, recorder), and Leandro Chamatun Castro (consultant). 2006. *Li sub'oy*. Oxlajuuj Keej Maya' Ajtz'iib' Mayan Languages Collection. The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America: www.ailla.utexas.org.

Wagner, Michael. 2006. Association by movement: evidence from npi-licensing. *Natural language semantics* 14.