

Nominalized antipassive constructions in Kaqchikel

Irina Burukina (*isbms27@gmail.com*)

DELG, Eötvös Loránd University

Overview. The paper examines antipassive under *-ik* nominalization in Kaqchikel (Mayan, ergative), based on novel field data, and demonstrates that it behaves similarly to passive promoting an internal argument instead of the external one. I argue that these constructions, together with canonical uses of antipassive, can be accounted for by adopting the idea that antipassive does not directly affect argument structure but merely blocks ergative case assignment (contrary to analyses in terms of internal argument demotion or incorporation). The data support Imanishi's (2014) claim that (all) nominalized verbs in Kaqchikel must lack a syntactically projected external argument, concurring with Alexiadou's (2001) proposal.

The data. In the canonical antipassive constructions in Kaqchikel, an antipassivized transitive predicate becomes intransitive, the remaining external argument is encoded via an absolutive marker and an internal argument is either implicit or realized as a PP (1).

- (1) a. Rïn x-at-**in**-tz'ët rat. b. Rïn x-**i**-tz'et-**on** (aw-ichin rat)
1S CMPL-B.2S-A.1S-see 2S 1S CMPL-B.1S-see-AP A.2S-for 2S
'I saw you.' 'I saw (with respect to you).'

However, this is not the only environment where the antipassive marker *-Vn* can appear. In Kaqchikel *-ik* nominalization applies only to intransitivized predicates (Patal Majzul 2007, a.o.). Passivization under nominalization proceeds as expected: the internal argument survives and gets eventually encoded via a Set A marker (2).

- (2) N-∅-inw-ajo' ri **ru**-kan-**ox**-ik ri llave.
CMPL-B.3S-A.1S-want DET A.3S-search-PASS-NMZ DET key
'I want (someone) to look for the key.'

Importantly, the data received from native speakers of Kaqchikel from Patzún, Guatemala, show that in case of antipassivization in *-ik* nominalizations either both arguments are implicit (3a) or the external one (3b, 3c), although an approach to AP as an operation on argument structure would predict that the internal argument should be demoted.

- (3) a. N-∅-inw-ajo' ri kan-**on**-ik.
CMPL-B.3S-A.1S-want DET search-AP-NMZ
'I want to look for something.'
- b. N-∅-inw-ajo' ri **ru**-kan-**on**-ik ri llave.
CMPL-B.3S-A.1S-want DET A.3S-search-AP-NMZ DET key
'I want (someone) to look for the key.'
- c. N-∅-inw-ajo' ri **nu**-kan-**on**-ik.
CMPL-B.3S-A.1S-want DET A.1S-search-AP-NMZ
Only: 'I want someone to look for me.'
Not available: 'I want to look for the key.'

Background assumptions. The structure for a simple clause in Kaqchikel is given in (4), where ABS is assigned by Infl^0 and, in order to get licensed, an internal argument raises to Spec,vP (Coon et al. 2014); ergative is assigned by $\text{v}^0/\text{Voice}^0$ (Aldridge 2004; Legate 2008).

- (4) $[_{\text{IP}} \text{Infl}^0 [_{\text{VP}} \text{v}^0 [_{\text{VoiceP}} [\text{Subject}] [_{\text{Voice}'} \text{Voice}^0 [_{\text{VP}} \text{V}^0 [\text{Object}]]]]]]]$

The analysis. I propose that a unified analysis for Kaqchikel antipassive can be developed based on a single assumption: antipassive is a Voice-type functional head that does not interact directly with the arguments of a predicate but merely blocks ergative case assignment. Within a simple clause only ABS remains available and only the external argument get licensed, while an internal argument is either implicit or (pseudo-)incorporated.

Following the discussion of nominalized passive constructions in Kaqchikel by Imanishi & Mateo Pedro (2013), Imanishi (2014), and Coon & Carolan's (2017) analysis for ergative case assignment in Chuj, I propose the following structure for *-ik* nominals derived from both passivized and antipassivized predicates (5), where ergative (genitive) is licensed by n^0 . In the complete version of this paper I will demonstrate that 'antipassive' *-ik* forms exhibit both nominal and verbal properties (based on their morphology, distribution, allowed modifiers) (see Borsley & Kornfilt (2000), Alexiadou (2001, 2010), a.o., for the diagnostics).

- (5) $[_{\text{nP}} \text{DP}_i [_{\text{n}'} \text{n}^0 [_{\text{VP}} \text{v}^0 [_{\text{VoiceP}} \emptyset [_{\text{Voice}'} \text{Voice}^0 [_{\text{VP}} \text{V}^0 [\text{PRO}_i]]]]]]]]]$

I argue that, while passive Voice in Kaqchikel directly interacts with argument structure, prohibiting merge of an external argument in Spec,VoiceP, AP simply removes the internal source for a case. As proposed by Imanishi (to appear), nominalized verbs in Kaqchikel must lack a syntactically projected external argument (restriction on nominalization). The data in (3) extend the range of Imanishi's examples and suggest that either both arguments remain implicit or the internal one eventually gets encoded as a set A morpheme, and an AP construction gets a passive interpretation.

The question remains: If, according to the proposed analysis, an internal argument can survive antipassivization under nominalization, why cannot it survive antipassivization in a finite clause (6)?

- (6) Rin x-i-tz'et-on.
1S CMPL-B.1S-see-AP
'I saw something.' Not available: 'I was seen.'

I propose to explain unavailability of a passive interpretation in (6) in contrast with grammaticality of (3c) in terms of the minimal distance restriction. In a simple clause, the structurally higher external argument intervenes between Infl⁰ and the internal argument and gets licensed first, leaving the object case-less, while under nominalization, the external argument cannot be syntactically present.

Abbreviations: A – set A (ergative / genitive, same paradigm), AP – antipassive, B – set B (absolutive), CMPL – completive, ICMPL – incompletive, NMZ – nominalization, P – plural, PASS – passive, S – singular.