

Ditransitive constructions in Tlapanec

Søren Wichmann

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology & Leiden University

0. Introduction

Tlapanec, which is an Otomanguean language of Guerrero, Mexico, has several constructions that fit the semantic definition of ditransitives given in the introductory article to this volume. One of them, however, stands out as basic to the language because of its consistent way of encoding A and R, its frequency, the basic nature of verbs appearing in this construction (which include ‘to give’), and the tight integration of the morphosyntactic means which are in play with the grammar of the language at large. This construction, which I shall dub the Tlapanec Ditransitive – using a capital D to signal that it is defined language-specifically – involves a verb-marked dative case indexing the R in a secundative pattern (this simplified description will be qualified further). The paper will mainly focus on this construction but will also introduce other, semantically ditransitive constructions (note my use of small ‘d’ for these other types of ditransitive). The paper treats all questions in the questionnaire included in this volume except questions which concern categories that are irrelevant; marginally relevant questions are treated cursorily.¹

Fieldwork specifically directed at the questionnaire was carried out in the town of Azoyú July-August 2007, but the report also draws upon data collected during various stays in this town in the period 1990-2004. Please refer to the Abbreviation and Conventions section immediately before the References for information of importance for interpreting glosses and translations.

1. The Tlapanec Ditransitive

In (1) I illustrate the basic Ditransitive construction.² The verb illustrated is ‘to give’, but nine other verbs have been recorded which enter into this construction (these other verbs mean ‘to sell’, ‘to show’, ‘to teach’, ‘to say, tell’, ‘to ask for’, ‘to lend’, ‘to remove, take away’, ‘to steal’, and ‘to borrow’; cf. section 6 below for the list and more detail). The Ditransitive involves a number of categories that are unusual cross-linguistically and need some introduction.

- (1) *mà-ʃn-é?* *bùhká*
 FUT-give-3SG.G>1SG.DAT money
 ‘She will give me money.’

First a few words about the morphological segmentation. The verbal suffix we see in (1), just as all other verbal suffixes, is vowel-initial and clashes with the vowel of the verb root. The verb root is ʃNA and the *a* of this root is lost because of suffixation. Thus, an alternative segmentation of the verb would have been *mà-ʃné?* and the glossing would then be FUT-give.3SG.G>1SG.DAT.

¹ Questions concerning nominalization, possessive reflexives, quantifier float, incorporation, antipassive, external possession, and valency-affecting derivation are all irrelevant since none of these various phenomena is present in Tlapanec.

² In this particular example only one argument is expressed by an NP. This is the normal pattern, and therefore best serves as an introductory example. Atypical examples involving two overt NP’s are illustrated elsewhere, e.g., in section 4 on word order.

Although hyphenation is problematical because root and suffix merge, I use it as a help for the reader to focus on the suffixes (additionally segmentation is rendered problematical by the fact that the tonal inflection³ defies segmental boundaries)

The grammatical categories exhibited by the Ditransitive in (1) also need an introduction. Here I briefly summarize the basic facts. All will be repeated and examples will be given in ensuing sections.

The degree of transitivity of a Tlapanec verb is equal to the number of animate participants in its valency. It makes more sense to speak about nonpersonal, monopersonal, dipersonal, and tripersonal verbs than to speak about intransitive, transitive, etc. verbs since the presence or absence of an inanimate ‘argument’ makes no formal difference with regard to the indexing of arguments. In contrast, animate arguments are indexed on the verb through portmanteau suffixes that express both person-number and case role. Since it is nevertheless useful to distinguish the situation where an inanimate undergoer is present in the predication from the situation where this is not the case, I also use the terms mono-, di- and trivalent to qualify non-, mono-, di-, and tripersonal. For instance, the predicate of a sentence meaning ‘she saw it’ would be divalent monopersonal, while the predicate of a sentence meaning ‘she slept’ would be monovalent monopersonal.

Monopersonal verbs fall into four different classes distinguished by the suffix paradigms they take. In Wichmann (2005, *forthc.*) I argued that the suffixes encode case relations, and named the four cases absolutive, ergative, dative, and pegative. An example of a verb taking the dative is *-ǵú* ‘to be happy, content’. This behaves morphologically exactly as *-gahngó?* ‘to swallow (something)’ even though the latter may appear in a sentence associated with an inanimate undergoer (I use the terms ‘actor’ and ‘undergoer’ rather than ‘subject’ and ‘object’ since there is no evidence for grammatical relations).

When turning to dipersonals, the motivation for analyzing the suffix paradigms in terms of cases becomes clearer. There are two types of dipersonal. One encodes the undergoer through the absolutive paradigm. These verbs describe events where the undergoer is directly affected (such as ‘to kill’ and many others). Another kind of dipersonals describes events where the undergoer is less directly affected, and includes Ditransitives such as ‘to give’ and others. These generally encode the undergoer (the P in monotransitives, the R in Ditransitives) through the dative paradigm, but have a paradigmatic split: when a third person singular undergoer is involved the actor rather than the undergoer is encoded through the verbal suffixes, and now the suffixes are those of the pegative paradigm. This clearly demonstrates that the pegative and the dative are mirror-images of one another, respectively encoding the actor and the undergoer role in one and the same relation. Cross-linguistically we are used to relations such as ergative-absolutive (or nominative-accusative) and ergative-dative (or nominative-dative). Where Tlapanec behaves differently is simply that it in a sense has two ergatives – one being the counterpart of

³ There are three level tones and four contour tones. In the verb shown in (1) the low-high melody is the end result of complex interactions among tones coming from at least three different sources: (i) the verb root carries a lexical tonal melody which extends over two syllables; if the verb root is monosyllabic, as in example (1), the first tone attaches to the prefix; (ii) a floating tone attaches to the root indicating ‘irrealis’ (a language-specific category comprising the affirmative future, the negative future, and the negative perfective – for economy’s sake this is not indicated in the glossing); (iii) a tone is attached to the suffix. Since verbs always appear in inflected forms it is extremely difficult, if not sometimes impossible, to tease apart the lexically specified tones, the tone marking irrealis, and the tone attached to the suffix, and then to establish the internal sandhi rules that lead to the final melody. Therefore no attempts are made here to spell out the different contributions to the final tonal melody.

absolutives, which is the one I label ‘ergative’, and one being the counterpart of datives, which is the one I label ‘pegative’.

A final category exhibited in (1) is the one glossed ‘G’. This abbreviation stands for ‘given’ and refers to a reference-tracking mechanism relevant for third person animate participants. This category is not crucial to the issue of ditransitives, but I will nevertheless return to it later in this paper.

Because of the central importance of verbal indexing and case marking to the Tlapanec Ditransitive I go on to provide more background detail on these issues in the next section.

2. Basic clause types

As mentioned, Tlapanec distinguishes two case relations, the ergative-absolutive relation and the pegative-dative relation. ‘Pegative’ is a type of case indicating low effect of the actor, and ‘dative’ correspondingly indicates low affect with respect to the undergoer. The ergative and absolutive respectively indicate stronger effect and affect. Inanimate arguments are not case-marked, but via the marking of the degree of effect of the actor the degree of affectedness on the part of the undergoer is indirectly indicated. In the following I illustrate some basic patterns.

2.1. Monovalent monopersonals

The first example illustrates a nonpersonal predicate. There is no case marking or other verbal indexing (in rare cases plurality of inanimates are marked through the use of suppletive forms, but never by inflectional means).

- (2) *ni-ŋgahtáʔ* *ǫʒamà*
 PFV-fall banana
 ‘The banana fell.’

For monovalent monopersonals (‘intransitives’), predicates may either encode the absolutive or the dative, never the ergative or pegative.

- (3) *ʃabù* *ra* *ni-ŋgah-á*
 man TOP PFV-fall.to.side-3SG.G.ABS
 ‘As for the man, he fell to the side.’

- (4) *baf-ó*
 nude.3SG.G.DAT
 ‘She is nude.’

Monopersonals that employ the dative include verbs of mental state and action (e.g., *-kagúʔ* ‘to be crazy’), bodily state (e.g., *-krámúʔ* ‘to be cold’, e.g.), being (e.g., *ʃohkóʔ* ‘to be like’), appearance (cf. 4), bodily position and action (e.g., *-miʔǫʒũʔ* ‘to swarm’), incorporation (e.g., *-ʔʃúʔ* ‘to suckle’), excretion (e.g., *-mifúʔ* ‘to urinate’), wanting (e.g., *-yũ* ‘to not want anymore’), ability (e.g., *-máýũ* ‘to be able to, learn’), possessing socially given characteristics (e.g., *mahahŋgó* ‘to be a nice person’), dependency on time (e.g., *-rà múʔ* ‘to turn (years of age)’), carrying (*stáyóʔ* ‘to carry’), and a few others. The majority do not entail an inanimate undergoer,

but some do. Monopersonals taking the absolutive are more frequent and essentially include all other semantic verb classes.

2.2. Divalent monopersonals

For monopersonal involving an inanimate undergoer predicates either encode the ergative (typically, when the inanimate undergoer is highly affected) or more rarely the pegative (when there is a lower affect).

- (5) *ni-hkam-é* *ʃtí*
 PFV-hang.up-3SG.G.ERG clothes
 ‘She hung up the clothes.’
- (6) *ni-ʃiáh-ù?* *mba* *iyì?*
 PFV-send-1SG.PEG a paper
 ‘I sent a letter.’

2.3. Divalent dipersonals

For canonical dipersonals where the degree of affect is high the undergoer is marked on the verb in the absolutive, as in (7). In the ergative-absolutive relation it is always the undergoer which is assigned case.

- (7) *ni-guhprâ?-á*
 PFV-kick-3SG.G>3SG.ABS
 ‘She kicked him.’

For less canonical dipersonals where the affect is lower the pegative-dative relation comes into play. If the undergoer is non-third person singular this undergoer is case-marked in the absolutive and if it is third singular the actor is case-marked in the pegative, as in (8).

- (8) *ni-raʔn-ú*
 PFV-meet-3SG.G.PEG>3SG
 ‘She met him.’

Divalent dipersonals encoding the dative are not numerous, but solidly attested and include verbs of physical impact (e.g., *-ruʔú?* ‘to mount someone’), obstruction (e.g., *-rekó* ‘to block the way of someone’), communicative interaction (e.g., *-reʔyó?* ‘to answer someone’), position or movement involving someone else (e.g., *-ɲgiʔtú?* ‘to wait for someone’, cf. also 8), perception (e.g., *-ʔyó* ‘to see someone’), and caused action (e.g., *-ʃkanàʔfo* ‘to hurry up someone’).

2.4. Trivalent dipersonals (‘Ditransitives’)

Ditransitives involving an inanimate undergoer are a special case of these less canonical dipersonals. An example is given in (9).

- (9) *ni-tsahm-ú* *(iyìʔ)*
 PFV-show-3SG.G.PEG>3SG *(paper)*
 ‘She showed it/the paper to him.’

Structurally the only difference between (8) and (9) is that an inanimate T may occur in the latter construction. It is doubtful whether the T should be assigned argument status even if semantically it is clearly a T.⁴ Later in this section, after having reviewed the basic morphological facts concerning case marking, we return to Ditransitives and complex, noncanonical dipersonal constructions.

2.5. Indexing patterns

As said, monopersonals may encode all four cases: the ergative, absolutive, the pegative, and the dative. The ergative is not marked by any segmental suffix, whereas the absolutive is marked by the following paradigm:

(10) The absolutive paradigm

1SG	- <i>uʔ</i>
2SG	- <i>qʔ</i>
3SG	- <i>a</i>
1PL, 2PL	- <i>q</i>
3PL	- <i>i</i>

In the dipersonal paradigm these suffixes mark the undergoer. Unlike in the pegative-dative relation there is no split when a third person singular undergoer is involved: it is always and only the undergoer which is case-marked.

The two paradigms of pegative and dative suffixes as they occur on monopersonals are:

(11) The pegative and dative paradigms⁵

	Pegative	Dative
1SG	- <i>u</i> ~ - <i>o</i>	- <i>uʔ</i> ~ - <i>oʔ</i>
2SG	- <i>a</i> / - <i>i</i>	- <i>aʔ</i>
3SG	- <i>u</i> ~ - <i>o</i>	- <i>u</i> ~ - <i>o</i>

⁴ For animate T's there is evidence for argument status since their presence in the predication triggers verbal marking, cf. the discussion of examples (19-20) below. One could postulate a corresponding zero agreement marker for inanimate T's, as suggested by an anonymous commentator, but one would then lose the important generalization that inanimate constituents, whatever their function in the clause, simply do not trigger agreement.

⁵ The alternation between *u* and *o* vowel qualities is partly predictable. A high vowel *i* or *u* in the preceding syllable gives rise to *u* in the suffix and a non-high vowel *e* or *o* gives rise to *o* in the suffix. However, when the preceding vowel is *a* or when the verb is monosyllabic it is not possible to predict the quality of the suffix vowel and different speakers may actually prefer different vowels. With regard to the *a/i* alternation the rule of thumb is that an underlying final stem vowel *u* gives rise to *i* when the suffix is added and replaces the stem vowel. Stem vowels *i* and *a* give rise to *a* (few verbs have final stem vowel *e* and *o*; these vowels are mostly the historical product of vowel clashes). The suffix vowels carry tones which are influenced by patterns of word-internal sandhi (where the tone of the penultimate stem syllable plays an important role) such that different tonal paradigms arise. These patterns of word-internal tone sandhi have yet to be completely worked out (but cf. Wichmann 2006). As can be seen, the pegative and dative paradigms are not very different in shape. If there is a final glottal stop in the lexical root this carries over to the suffix. In such cases, and when the underlying stem vowel is not *u*, the pegative paradigm becomes segmentally identical to the dative paradigm except in the third person plural. Tones will often distinguish members of the two paradigms, but since the pegative and the dative each subdivide into at least five tonal paradigms it is not straightforward to make use of the information provided by tones.

1PL, 2PL	-a / -i	-aʔ
3PL	-a / -i	-u

The paradigm for the pegative-dative relation of bipersonal verbs is composed of two paradigms, as shown in (12); the pegative paradigm is used when a third person singular undergoer is present and the dative paradigm elsewhere, in a kind of split ergative pattern where the split operates in the person dimension. In addition, there is a suffix *-eʔ* for the relation between a third person given actor and a first person singular undergoer. Thus, the total bipersonal paradigm is as follows. (Relations involving non-third person are restricted to first vs. second persons; in case of coreferentiality between actor and undergoer the paradigm of reflexive pronouns is used, as discussed in section 5.5 below).

(12) The pegative-dative paradigm of dipersonals

Und\Act	1SG	2SG	3SG.G	1-2PL	3PL
1SG	-	-uʔ ~ -oʔ	-eʔ	-uʔ ~ -oʔ	-uʔ ~ -oʔ
2SG	-aʔ	-	-aʔ	-aʔ	-aʔ
3SG	-u~-o	-a/-i	-u~-o	-a/-i	-a/-i
1-2PL	-aʔ	-aʔ	-aʔ	-aʔ	-aʔ
3PL	-u	-u	-u	-u	-u

This paradigm only indicates how the undergoer (e.g., the R in Ditransitives) is indexed. It does not amount to a full inflectional paradigm. The A is indicated by means of tones. Distinctions within the realm of non-third plural, i.e. first person plural inclusive, first person plural exclusive, and second person plural, are indicated by means of the enclitics =*luʔ* (1PL.INCL), =*lòʔ* (1PL.EXCL), and =*làʔ* (2PL). Some examples of members of a dipersonal pegative-dative paradigm, which by means of minimal pairs, illustrate the importance of tones, are given in (13).

- (13) *diya kàʔyĩ* ‘you took it from him’
diya kaʔyĩ ‘they (new topic) took it from him’
diya kaʔyâʔ ‘I took it from you’
diya kaʔyaʔ ‘she took it from you’
diya kàʔyũ ‘I took it from them’
diya kaʔyũ ‘she (new topic) took it from them’
diya kàʔyó ‘I took it from him’
diya kàʔyô ‘she (new topic) took it from me’

2.6. Deviant instances of indexing

The normal pattern is for the R to be indexed through the dative paradigm. Ten Ditransitive verbs have been found which behave in this way. Four ditransitive (but not Ditransitive) verbs behave exceptionally in that they index R through the absolutive. Two of these, ‘to charge (payment)’ and ‘leave something for someone’, are illustrated in (14).

- (14) a. *na-rum-ãʔ* *ʃkàmba*

IPFV-charge-3SG.G>2SG.ABS all
di *ʃtaʔd-ǎ* *in-ú*
REL.INAN have-2SG.PEG face-3SG.G.POSS
‘She charges you everything you owe her.’

b. *ni-niniahm-á* *gùʔwa*
PFV-leave-3SG.G>3SG.ABS house
‘She left the house to him.’

The exceptional behavior of these two verbs may relate to their etymologies. The first, ‘to charge’, may derive from the Spanish word *tomin*, a coin and monetary unit of the epoch of Colonial Mexico, and would seem to mean ‘to money someone’ (Wichmann 2007a). The etymology of the second cannot be firmly established, but the long stem suggests that is originally a compound.

The other two ditransitives that index R through the absolutive both mean ‘to cover’, and are illustrated in (15-16).

- (15) *ni-mbraʔ-á* *ʃtî* *adà* *tahwîʔ*
PFV-cover-3SG.G>3SG.ABS cloth boy small⁶
- (16) *ni-ʃtruw-í* *ʃtî* *adà* *tahwîʔ*
PFV-cover-3SG.G>3SG.ABS cloth boy small
(both:) ‘She covered the little boy with the blanket.’

These are one step further from the canonical case since they not only index R through the absolutive but also seem to treat T semantically as an instrument rather than a true theme. But as in the canonical case there is no flagging of the constituents.

2.7. Animacy effects

An inanimate T is not indexed. However, when a Ditransitive construction involves an animate T, a suffix *-y* is inserted between the lexical stem and the case-person suffix to indicate the presence in the predication of the animate T. If this entity is different from third person a possessed auxiliary has to be used to further specify the person and number of the T. The paradigm for this auxiliary is given in (17).

- (17) *nendʒòʔ* ‘1st person sg theme’
 nendʒáʔ ‘2nd person sg theme’
 nendʒó ‘3rd person (given topic) theme’
 nendʒàʔ=luʔ ‘1st person pl inclusive theme’
 nendʒàʔ=lòʔ ‘1st person pl exclusive theme’

⁶ A proper analysis and gloss for this would be *tahw-îʔ* small-3SG.N.ABS. There are no adjectives in Tlapanec since property concepts are expressed as stative verbs. These carry lexically fixed case roles, here the absolutive. The expression *adà tahwîʔ* reveals its origin in a more extended expression *adà tʃi tahwîʔ* ‘boy who is small’ through ‘new’ marking on the stative verb: relativized pivots are always marked as ‘new’ independently of the order of argument and verb.

<i>nənɕàʔ=láʔ</i>	‘2nd person pl theme’
<i>nənɕû</i>	‘3rd person pl (given topic) theme’

The auxiliary is related to a verb meaning ‘impersonate, to act as, be’, which is different from the normal existential-copular verb YAHV̄ and much less frequent. The verbal use is illustrated in (18).

(18)	<i>na-neg-òʔ</i>	<i>na-nənɕ-òʔ</i>	<i>indīʔ</i>
	IPFV-like-1SG.DAT	IPFV-impersonate-1SG.DAT	jaguar
	‘I like to impersonate the jaguar.’		

Examples (19a-b) illustrate the contrast between a dipersonal Ditransitive and a tripersonal Ditransitive, where in the latter the increased valency is signalled through *-y* and the auxiliary specifies the person and number of the animate T. Note that *nənɕòʔ* in (19b) is indexed as a third person singular animate on the ‘give’ verb. Although it is an abstract, grammatical element we may think of its meaning as being something like ‘my person’. Although the auxiliary does not occur as a noun with this sort of meaning the formally related verb meaning ‘to impersonate’ supports such an interpretation. All the forms of the auxiliary listed in (17), including non-third and plural forms, are indexed as third person singulars, requiring that the actor is case-marked in the pegative whenever the auxiliary appears in a sentence as undergoer (again, they can be thought of as meaning ‘my person’, ‘your person’, ‘her person’, ‘our person’, etc.).

(19)	a.	<i>mà-ʃn-ú</i>	
		FUT-give-3SG.G.PEG>3SG	
		‘She will give it to him.’	
	b.	<i>mà-ʃn-y-ú</i>	<i>nənɕ-òʔ</i>
		FUT-give-AN-3SG.G.PEG>3SG	AUX-1SG.POSS
		‘She will give me to him.’	

The *-y* suffix indicates the presence of an incremental animate theme and does not distinguish person and number. It does not occur in a canonical dipersonal construction (such as ‘he kicked me’). Five additional verbs have been found which allow for the sort of tripersonal Ditransitive construction that we saw in (19). These are illustrated in (20). The suffix *-y* is inaudible following *ʃ* or *y*. Its putative underlying presence in these cases is indicated in the glosses.

(20)	a.	<i>mà-ʃnàʃ-ú</i>	<i>nənɕ-òʔ</i>
		FUT-hand.over(-AN)-3SG.G.PEG>3SG	AUX-1SG.POSS
		‘She will hand me over to him.’	
	b.	<i>ma-mbày-ó</i>	<i>nənɕ-òʔ</i>
		FUT-sell(-AN)-3SG.G.PEG>3SG	AUX-1SG.POSS
		‘She will sell me to him.’	
	c.	<i>ma-tsahm-y-ú</i>	<i>nənɕòʔ</i>
		FUT-show-AN-3SG.G.PEG>3SG	AUX-1SG.POSS

‘She will show me to him.’

- d. *ma-teʔy-ǝ́* *nenǝòʔ*
 FUT-borrow(-AN)-3SG.G.PEG>3SG AUX-1SG.POSS
 ‘She will borrow me from him.’
- e. *ma-ʃna-teʔy-ǝ́* *nenǝòʔ*
 FUT-give-borrow(-AN)-3SG.G.PEG>3SG AUX-1SG.POSS
 ‘She will lend me to him.’

The construction involving *-y* and the root *NENǝV* is a general mechanism for augmenting the valency of the predication with an animate participant when the relation involved is the pegative-dative relation. This need not be a Ditransitive situation as in the above examples. For instance, there is a verb meaning ‘to use’ which encodes the pegative-dative relation and requires *-y* and the auxiliary when that which is being used is an animate. Although the translation of the verb standardly given is ‘to use’ it is easier to understand the way that the arguments are encoded if the verb is translated ‘for X to serve Y’ rather than ‘for Y to use X’ since Y is encoded in the dative. In other words, the auxiliary is the actor and the ‘user’ the undergoer. The monopersonal predication involving this verb is illustrated in (21) and the dipersonal predication in (22).

- (21) *na-hm-uǝʔ* *čìlu mō* *na-yiʔtù* *hmā ʃùwiʔ*
 IPFV-use-1SG.DAT knife because IPFV-cut.1SG.ERG with.it meat
 ‘I use the knife (or: it serves me) because I cut meat with it.’

- (22) a. *ni-hm-y-éʔ* *nenǝ-ó*
 PFV-use-AN-3SG.G>1SG.DAT AUX-3SG.POSS
 ‘I used him (or: he served me).’
- b. *ni-hm-y-ǝʔ* *nenǝ-òʔ*
 PFV-use-AN-1SG.PEG>3SG.G AUX-1SG.POSS
 ‘She used me.’

With regard to the glossing of case relations in (22a-b), i.e. 3SG.G>1SG.DAT in (22a) and 1SG.PEG>3SG.G in (22b), the reader who has not yet absorbed the peculiarities of Tlapanec case marking is reminded again of the facts summarized in relation to the paradigm in (11) above: for predicates involving an actor and a dative-like undergoer case is assigned to the undergoer when this is non-third person singular and to the actor when the undergoer is third person singular. The case roles are different: the one assigned to actors is the pegative and the one to undergoers is the dative, but each of the corresponding semantic roles entails the other, and the relation is in both cases the same. Thus there is not some sort of reversal of case roles involved; rather, it is simply a morphological fact of the language that predicates can only encode one case at the time; for third person singular undergoers it is the actor’s case which is specified, and for other undergoers it is the undergoer’s case which is specified. It is not possible to express the case role of a third person singular undergoer in the pegative-dative relation.

2.8. Summary of basic patterns

Apart from an iterative derivation Tlapanec has no productive derivational mechanisms. However, morphosyntactic effects achieved in other languages by means of derivation may be

achieved by inflectional means: one and the same verb may inflect for different cases, for animate vs. inanimate arguments, and for one vs. two animate arguments. This is also generally true of the verbs that enter into the Ditransitive construction; the range of inflectional frames in which the verbs may occur nicely illustrates the central importance of the case system. By now enough background has been given for the reader to appreciate the range of inflectional possibilities illustrated in (23) for one of the verbs which may occur in the Ditransitive as well as in other constructions. The pattern of inflection is productive, even if not all Ditransitives exhibit all four possibilities (for instance, one cannot ‘teach’ someone to someone else).

- (23) a. Monopersonal divalent predicate; animate ergative actor:
ma-ʃnateʔy-e
 FUT-lend-3SG.G.ERG
 ‘she (ERG) will lend it’
- b. Dipersonal predicate in a divalent construction;
 animate ergative actor, animate absolutive undergoer:
ma-ʃnateʔy-ǫ́
 FUT-lend-3SG.G>3SG.ABS
 ‘she will lend him (ABS)’
- c. Dipersonal predicate in a Ditransitive (trivalent) construction;
 animate pegative actor, animate dative undergoer:
ma-ʃnateʔy-ǫ́
 FUT-lend-3SG.G.PEG>3SG
 ‘she (PEG) will lend it to him’
- d. Tripersonal predicate in a Ditransitive (trivalent) construction;
 animate pegative actor, animate dative R undergoer;
 animate T expressed through an auxiliary:
ma-ʃnateʔy-ǫ́ *nənǫ́-òʔ*
 FUT-lend(-an)-3SG.G.PEG>3SG AUX-1SG.DAT
 ‘she (PEG) will lend me to him’

2.9. A note on emotion predicates

For completeness’ sake another resource for augmenting the valency of a predicate will be shown. Emotion predicates or ‘psych verbs’ are monopersonal and encode the experiencer in the dative. In order to also encode an animate stimulus a dipersonal auxiliary verb is used which indicates both the experiencer and the stimulus through the pegative (experiencer) – dative (stimulus) relation. The main verb, then, encodes the experiencer in the dative and the auxiliary verb encodes the stimulus in the dative (switching to encoding the experiencer in the pegative for third person singular stimuli).

- (24) *na-mahk-òʔ* *kay-ó* *hwá* *di*
 IPFV-admire-1SG.DAT AUX-1SG.PEG>3SG.G Juan SUB
natsi-ũ *yũʔ* *aʔg-y-õ*
 be.beautiful-3SG.DAT very woman-CL-3SG.G.POSS
di-ʔy-áʔ
 PFV-find-3SG.G>3SG.ABS

avoid misunderstandings. Using the gloss ‘1SG.DAT’ might lead readers more familiar with dependent-marking languages to think that the dative relation pertains to the sister as a recipient of the letter.

There is also a true preposition, which is not inflected: *ɲgwâ*. This has broad application to indeterminate spatial relations and can usually be translated ‘at’ or ‘where’.

In (27), the word *hmâ* is not inflected and functions much as its English translational equivalent *with*. But it may also be inflected to yield forms such as *hmũ?* ‘with me’, *hmq̃?* ‘with you’, *hmă* ‘with him/her (given topic)’, etc. The paradigm is that of the absolutive, with the exception of an irregular form for ‘with them’: *hmyũ* (the expected form is **hmĩ*). Thus, the comitative comes in two variants; one which behaves as a preposition (which is the one illustrated in example 27), and one which behaves morphologically as a verb. All the inflected forms have functionally equivalent but phonologically longer versions containing a preposed syllable *ga* (e.g., *gahmũ?*, *gahmq̃?*, *gahmă*, etc.). Thus, if the identity of the recipient in (27) were known to the hearer the phrase *hmâ ɖahò?* ‘with my sister’ could be replaced with *hmă* or *gahmă*, both meaning ‘with her/him’. The form *hmâ* in (27) is ambiguous because the same inflectional shape is found for ‘with it’ (i.e. inanimate companion) and ‘with him/her (new topic)’. Structurally the form meaning ‘with him/her (new topic)’ would fit the context of (27) since there is an animate companion immediately following the relational expression, which is the position for new topics. However, the form *hmâ* is also found preceding pronouns that do not refer to third person animates or to inanimates, e.g. *hmâ ikũ?* ‘with me’. Thus, the inanimate form has an extended function similar to English *with* where the companion is not encoded in the relational expression. In the analysis given in (27) it is assumed that *hmâ* has its extended function.

In (28) we see the use of the preposition *pa* borrowed from Spanish *para*. This is not inflected for person/number. Both *pa* and *para* occur. It is not a particularly frequent kind of construction; and Spanish function words do not play as important a role in Tlapanec as in so many other Mesoamerican languages.

There is no flagging of T’s.

In (26-28) the different ways of flagging R in semantically ditransitive constructions were illustrated. If pronouns are used for the R in these types of sentences they are redundant, since information regarding person and number is already encoded in the relational expressions translated ‘to’ and ‘with’. Nevertheless, pronouns can potentially occur in this position.

(29) *ni-fiàh-ù?* *mba* *iyi?* *in-ù?* (*ikũ?*)
 PFV-send-3SG.G.PEG a paper face-1SG.POSS 1PRON
 ‘She sent a letter to me.’

(30) *ni-niy-ù?* *stabùsa* *hm-ù?* (*ikũ?*)
 PFV-leave-3SG.PEG bag with-1SG.ABS 1SG.PRON
 ‘She left the bag with me.’

In the construction in (31) which involves Spanish *pa* or *para* it is normal, however, to use both pronouns and full NPs since *pa* ~ *para* does not encode information about the R.

(31) *ma-ʔka* *káyò?* *bùhká* *pa* *iká / ikí / ikã?* / etc.

FUT-go.1SG carry⁸.1SG.DAT money for him / them/ you
 ‘I will bring money for him / them / you etc.’

Thus, whether a full NP or a free pronoun occurs has no influence on flagging.

The three constructions illustrated in (26-28) and (29-31) are influenced by Spanish. (26) and (29) translate sentences that are common in Spanish due to the modern world of long-distance communication; (27) and (30) translate a construction using the Spanish preposition *con*; and (28) and (31) more directly reveal Spanish influence by directly using a Spanish borrowing. In contrast, the Ditransitive illustrated in (25) is not influenced by Spanish.

4. Word order

In monotransitives the basic word order is V-A-P. In the Ditransitive the neutral order of core arguments is in postverbal position. Other than that firm statements about the order of R and T are difficult to make since word order is rather free and since sentences involving two overt NPs – especially sentences where R and T have the same information-structural status – are somewhat artificial. However, one speaker ventured the judgment that in both of the sentences in (32) the only possible interpretation is that R precedes T.

- (32) a. *ni-tсахm-y-ǔ* *aʔgù* *hwá'*
 PFV-show-AN-1SG.PEG>3SG.N woman Juan
 ‘I showed Juan to the woman.’
 *‘I showed the woman to Juan.’
- b. *ni-tсахm-y-ǔ* *hwá'* *aʔgù*
 PFV-show-AN-1SG.PEG>3SG.N Juan woman
 ‘I showed the woman to Juan.’
 *‘I showed Juan to the woman.’

Such judgments tend to vary and should be taken with a grain of salt. Possibly V-R-T is the unmarked neutral order for full animate NPs, but the V-T-R order is also possible where world knowledge clarifies the identification of T and R. Thus, the same speaker who offered (32a-b) also provided (33) where the interpretation is in both cases the same – an interpretation that corresponds to the pragmatically expected one.

- (33) a. *ma-ʃn-y-û* *aʔd-y-oʔ* *hwá'*
 FUT-give-AN-1SG.PEG>3SG.G son/daughter-CL-1SG.POSS Juan
 ‘I will give my daughter to Juan (in marriage).’
- b. *ma-ʃn-y-û* *hwá'* *aʔd-y-oʔ*
 FUT-give-AN-1SG.PEG>3SG.G Juan son/daughter-CL-1SG.POSS
 ‘I will give my daughter to Juan (in marriage).’

For full NPs, either R or T may occur in the preverbal focus position but not both. All of the four sentences in (34) have the same meaning or intended meaning, ‘I will sell the animal to Juan’, but

⁸ The gloss ‘to carry’ is inferred; the form does not occur in isolation from the complex verbal expression meaning ‘to bring’.

in the two first Juan and the animal respectively are focused and the last two sentences are not possible. The given vs. new topic category discussed in Wichmann (2007b) comes into play in (34a) vs. (34b). The category involves third person ‘primary objects’, i.e. the R in this case. Since, in (34a), *hwá'* appears before the predicate ‘given’ marking occurs; in contrast, since, in (34b), *hwá'* occurs postverbally new’ marking occurs there. The categories of ‘given’ and ‘new’ are not defined discourse-pragmatically; ‘given’ marking is mechanically triggered by the occurrence of the pivot prior to the predicate, either in an earlier clause or within one and the same clause; thus, in rare cases a pivot may be discourse-pragmatically new and introduced in the focal preverbal position, and yet it will trigger ‘given’ marking in the language-specific sense of the Tlapanec referent-tracking system. Normally, however, the grammatical categories of ‘given’ and ‘new’ will behave as one would expect from a discourse-pragmatic point of view. Sentences like (34a-b) are rarely encountered in natural discourse since Tlapanec spoken discourse, as spoken discourse in general, shows a preference for not packing too much information into single clauses.

- (34) a. *hwá' mà-mbay-ó* *ʃkùʔ*
 Juan FUT-sell(-AN)-1SG.PEG>3SG.G animal
 ‘It is Juan (not someone else) that I’ll sell the animal to.’
 Or: ‘As for Juan, I’ll sell him the animal.’
- b. *ʃkùʔ màmbayõ* *hwá'*
 animal FUT-sell(-AN)-1SG.PEG>3SG.N Juan
 ‘It is the animal (not something else) that I’ll sell to Juan.’
 Or: ‘As for the animal, I’ll sell it to Juan.’
- c. **hwá' ʃkùʔ màmbayó*
- d. **ʃkùʔ hwá' màmbayó*

5. Behavioral properties

5.1. Passive

Tlapanec does not have a canonical passive that promotes the patient of any transitive verb to subject. Indeed, there is no evidence for grammatical roles. It does, however, have resultative parallels to change-of-state verbs as illustrated in (35) (cf. Wichmann 2008a: 26-29 for a longer list and some discussion). For roots having an initial glottal stop the normal perfective marker *ni-* is replaced by *wi-*; in other cases there is only a shift in tones, and in one exceptional case a *wa-* occurs.

- (35) Examples of non-resultatives (left-hand column) and their corresponding resultatives (right-hand column)

a.	<i>ni-maʔt-ó</i> PFV-open-3SG.G.PEG ‘she opened it’	<i>ni-maʔtô</i> PFV-open.RES ‘it opened’
b.	<i>ni-ʔdí</i> PFV-sow.3SG.G.ERG ‘she sowed it’	<i>wi-ʔdu</i> PFV.RES-sow ‘it got sown’
c.	<i>ni-mb-ó</i> PFV-finish-3SG.G.DAT	<i>wà-mba</i> PFV.RES-finish

‘she finished it’

‘it got finished’

Interestingly, resultatives are also found for some verbs of change-of-position/motion, cf. (36), although far from all – for instance not for the verbs meaning ‘to throw’, ‘sprinkle’, ‘throw inside’, ‘carry’, ‘bring’, ‘put on top of’, ‘move’. The verbs that occur in the resultative frame involve some Ditransitives, cf. (37), which may then be interpreted as belonging to the class of change-of-position verbs.

(36) Resultatives involving verbs of motion/change of position and their corresponding non-resultatives

a.	<i>ni-hndraʔé</i> PFV-scatter.3SG.G.ERG ‘she scattered it’	<i>ni-hndraʔà</i> PFV-scatter.RES ‘it got scattered’
b.	<i>ni-séʔŋgá</i> PFV-remove.3SG.G.ERG ‘she removed it’	<i>ni-séʔŋgô</i> PFV-remove.RES ‘it got removed’
c.	<i>ni-htangá</i> PFV-turn.over.3SG.G.ERG ‘she turned it over’	<i>ni-htangá</i> PFV-turn.over.RES ‘it got turned over’

(37) Resultatives involving Ditransitive verbs

a.	<i>nì-ʃné</i> PFV-give.3SG.G.ERG ‘she gave it’	<i>wì-ʃna</i> PFV.RES-give ‘it was given’
b.	<i>nè-ʔté</i> PFV-say.3SG.G.ERG ‘she said it’	<i>wì-ʔta</i> PFV.RES-say ‘it was said’

None of the other Ditransitives, such as ‘to sell’, ‘show’, ‘ask for’, ‘lend’, occurs in the resultative frame. While the single argument associated with the resultative is normally T, the verb ‘to say/tell’ can take dative inflection, indexing the R, as with the verb *wiʔtuʔ* ‘I was told’ in the (constructed) dialogue in (38), which demonstrates both the active and the resultative uses of ‘to say/tell’.

(38) A:	<i>ná</i>	<i>ni-ta-ɕ-û</i>	<i>ʃtaŋô</i>	<i>di</i>	<i>nì-ʔtuʔ</i>
	Q	PFV-2AG-hear-2SG.ERG	message	REL.INAN	PFV-3SG.G.PEG>3SG
		‘Have you heard the message that she told him?’			
B:	<i>ǎ</i>	<i>dâmă</i>	<i>wì-ʔt-ɯʔ</i>		
	yes	PART	PFV.RES-say-1SG.DAT		
	‘Yes, I’ve already been told.’				

There is no shift in case role of the experiencer as would have been expected for a promotional passive.

5.2. Relative clauses

5.4 Suppletion

The only Ditransitive verb to exhibit suppletion is the verb ‘to sell’, which shows one stem when inflected for the pegative-dative relation and another for the ergative-absolutive.

- (41) a. *ma-mbày-ó*
 FUT-sell-3SG.N.PEG>3SG
 ‘she will sell it to him’
- b. *ma-ηgohw-é*
 FUT-sell-3SG.G.ERG
 ‘she (ERG) will sell it’
- c. *ma-ηguh-w-á*
 FUT-sell-3SG.G>3SG.ABS
 ‘she will sell him (ABS)’

5.5 Reflexives and reciprocals

It appears that only T’s, not R’s may be targets of reflexives. Reflexives are formed by means of a form of the verb uninflected for person followed by a reflexive pronoun. (42) provides an example.

- (42) *pàwlu ni-tsàhma men-e? in-ũ fabù*
 Pablo PFV-show REFL.3SG.G face-3PL.POSS.N people
 ‘Pablo showed himself to the people.’

It is not possible to say ‘Pablo showed himself to himself’ or ‘Pablo showed María to herself.’

Targets of Ditransitive reciprocal constructions can be either R, as in (43) or T, as in (44). Morphologically the reciprocal is identical to the reflexive.

- (43) *hwá hmâ maría ni-nì bàfi mehn-é*
 Juan with María PFV-CAUS.AUX nude RECIP-3PL.G
mi ni-tsahmà mehné fnd-ũ
 and PFV-show RECIP.3PL.G egg.3PL.POSS.G
 ‘Juan and María undressed each other and showed each other their private parts.’

Example (43) works equally well without *fndũ*, in which case it will carry the interpretation that Juan and María showed each other to one another. The target *mehné* would then be both T and R. An example where the target of the reciprocal is unambiguously the T is given in (44).

- (44) *n-ahm-ĩ ni-tsahma mehn-é hm-u?*
 DEF-be.two-Abs.3PL.G PFV-show REFL-3PL.G with-1SG.ABS
 ‘The two showed each other to me.’

5.6. Topicalization

Topicalization in Tlapanec can be achieved by fronting the topicalized constituent and marking it with the particle *ra*. Example (45) shows a normal construction contrasted with versions containing a topicalized constituent. As can be seen, it is possible to topicalize both T and R (but not both at the same time).

- (45) a. *ni-mbay-ǒ* *fabù mba gùʔwa*
 PFV-sell-1SG.PEG>3SG.N man a house
 ‘I sold the man a house.’
- b. *hwá’ ra ni-mbay-ó* *mba gùʔwa*
 Juan TOP PFV-sell-1SG.PEG>3SG.G a house
 ‘As for Juan, I sold him a house.’
- c. *gùʔwa ra ni-mbay-ǒ* *hwá’*
 house TOP PFV-sell-1SG.PEG>3SG.N Juan
 ‘As for the house, I sold it to John.’

5.7. Focusing

Contrastive focus is achieved by constituent fronting, possibly combined with an emphatic stress on the contrasted constituent. The example in (46a) could be a corrective response to the question ‘did you sell the house to Pedro?’ and the example in (46b) could be a corrective response to the question ‘did you sell him the land?’ Other than the negative particle *aʔà* the morphemes are the same as in (45b) and are therefore not glossed.

- (46) a. *àʔa, hwá’ ni-mbay-ó* ‘no, I sold it to *Juan*’
 b. *àʔa, gùʔwa ni-mbay-ó* ‘no, I sold him the *house*’

Thus, both T and R may be topicalized, but (again, as with focusing) not both at the same time.

5.8. Reference-tracking

Tlapanec has a reference-tracking mechanism that operates on third person animate pivots. The pivot will be the actor if a third person animate actor is present in the clause and the undergoer (T for dipersonals and R for tripersonals) will be the pivot if the actor is non-third person and the undergoer third person. The mechanism involves differential marking on the verb relating to whether a pivot has been introduced prior to the verb – typically in a prior clause – or is introduced after the verb – which is the typical position for new participants. Pivots that already have been introduced may be called ‘given’ and pivots introduced following the verb within the same clause may be called ‘new’. Since only one pivot at a time can be treated as given, another participant already introduced will have to be reintroduced as new. As already seen in many examples above I use the glosses G and N for given and new.

To appreciate the ensuing examples it is important to understand (47). The marking of ‘new’ (which is achieved by the contour tone) induces a unique interpretation, namely that Juan is actor (A) and María undergoer (R). How does this interpretation come about? As explained, ‘new’ marking will pertain to the actor if two or three third persons compete for pivot status and

The fact that the book is being given again is stressed by use of the iterative (the iterative verb has not been glossed for case role since I have yet to study this phenomenon for iteratives).

- (51) *maría ni-sn-ú mbõ iyi? hwá,*
 María PFV-give-3SG.PEG.G>3G one paper Juan
hwá ra ni-sn-á li tʃehfina
 Juan TOP PFV-give-3SG.G>3SG ITER Josefina
 ‘María gave the book to Juan; Juan, then, passed it on to Josefina.’

6. Verb lexemes

A rather thorough search returned the lists of Ditransitive verbs shown in (52-53) (the inflectional form is the given – as opposed to new – third person; the aspectual form elicited was the perfective, the complete form of which includes a *ni-* prefix, which is stripped off here for the sake of brevity).

- (52) Tlapanec Ditransitives included in the questionnaire
 `-fnú ‘to give’, -mbàyó ‘to sell’, -tsahmú ‘to show’, -ʔsɲgó ‘to teach’, -ʔtu´ ‘to say, tell’,
 -ndoʔó ‘to ask for’.
- (53) Tlapanec Ditransitives not included in the questionnaire
 -fnatéʔyó´ ‘to lend’, -ya kaʔyó ‘to remove, take away’, -ʔni koʔóʔ ‘to steal’, -téʔyó´ ‘to
 borrow’.

The verbs meaning ‘to offer’, ‘to bring’, ‘to buy’, ‘to send’, ‘to throw’, ‘to carry’, ‘to push’, and ‘to feed’ are mentioned in the questionnaire but do not behave as Ditransitives inasmuch as they cannot index animate recipients.

As mentioned above there are also four verbs, -rumă ‘to charge’, -niniahmá ‘to leave (something to someone)’, -mbraʔá ‘to cover’, and -ʃtruwí´ ‘to cover’ which index an R but assign absolutive case to it. These may be considered atypical ditransitives.

7. Beneficiary

There is no morphological encoding of beneficiaries and little overlap with Ditransitives. One strategy for encoding beneficiaries is to introduce them as the possessor of an object which transfers to the beneficiary, as in (54); (this is ambiguous and could also mean ‘she will buy my house’). A similar encoding of R in the Ditransitive is not found.

- (54) *ma-ʔtsí gòʔ-oʔ*
 FUT-buy.3SG.G.ERG house.1SG.POSS
 ‘She will buy me a house.’

If the benefit lies in some action that the beneficiary receives the possibility to perform, a verb may be introduced to express this, as in (55).

- (55) *a-tá-ni mbö àhmu ma-ǵ-û*
 IMP-2AG-do one song FUT-hear-1SG.ERG
 ‘Sing me a song!’ (lit.: ‘do a song, I’ll hear it’)

Finally, the Spanish preposition *pa* or *para* may introduce a beneficiary. This goes for some semantic ditransitives as well—indeed, beneficiaries and semantic R’s are not neatly distinguished for this type of construction, and an example similar to the one in (56) was cited above as an example of a semantic ditransitive.

- (56) *ma-fyah-úʔ gùma para ikũʔ*
 FUT-send-3SG.PEG.G tortilla to 1PRON
 ‘She sent me tortillas.’

8. Source

Tlapanec Ditransitives include both verbs where R is a recipient and where it is a source. The first group includes the canonical Ditransitives encoding the pegative-dative relation *-fnú* ‘to give’, *-mbàyó* ‘to sell’, *-tsahmú* ‘to show’, *-ʔsɲgó* ‘to teach’, *-ʔtuʔ* ‘to say, tell’, *-fnateʔyóʔ* ‘to lend’ as well as the atypical ditransitives that take the absolutive: *-ninhámá* ‘to leave (something to someone)’, *-mbraʔá* ‘to cover’, and *-ftruwí* ‘to cover’. The second group, where R is a source, includes four verbs encoding the pegative-dative: *-ndoʔ* ‘to ask for’, *-ya káʔyó* ‘to remove, take away’, *-ʔni koʔóʔ* ‘to steal’, *-téʔyóʔ* ‘to borrow’; as well as the atypical ditransitive *-rum-ǎ* ‘to charge’. For most of the members of the second group the source role is a consequence of the semantics of the verbs and does not require any special encoding, as illustrated in (57a-d).

- (57) a. *na-ndoʔ-ó bùhká ruʔd-ũ*
 IPFV-ask-3SG.G.PEG>3SG money mother-POSS.N
 ‘She_i is asking her_j mother for money.’⁹
- b. *ba-ya káʔy-éʔ gùʔwa (ikũʔ)¹⁰*
 FUT-take carry-3SG.G>1SG.DAT house (1PRON)
 ‘She will take the house away from me.’
- c. *ni-ʔni koʔ-óʔ sabù*
 PFV-do steal-3SG.G.PEG>3SG man
 ‘She will steal it from the man.’
- d. *ikũʔ ni-rum-ǎ sabù mbidùʔ*
 1PRON PFV-charge-1SG>3SG.N.ABS man one.peso
 ‘I charged the man a peso.’

9. Conclusion

⁹ The lack of coreferentiality between the A of the verbs and the possessor of ‘mother’ is a consequence of ‘new’ rather than ‘given’ possessor marking on the possessed noun (encoded by tonal affixation).

¹⁰ The pronoun is optional, and most commonly left out.

Morphosyntactically Tlapanec Ditransitives operate on a secundative basis. In the normal situation where the T is inanimate, the arguments indexed on the verb are A and R, or better said, the verb indexes the relationship between A and R. Only when the T is animate does it trigger agreement, through the *-y* suffix, but the further specification of person and number of T is relegated to a special auxiliary. A higher prominence of R than of T is also seen in the reference-tracking mechanism for 3rd persons, where R and not T will be the pivot when the two compete for this status. Finally, the preferred verb-actor-undergoer word order in the monotransitive construction has a parallel in the preferred V-R-T order of the Ditransitive; in both cases the more prominent argument precedes the less prominent one (evidence for a greater prominence of actors than undergoers again comes from the referent-tracking system which, when more than one third person argument is present, assigns pivot status to actors rather than undergoers).

Syntactic phenomena such as relativization, constituent questions, topicalization, and focus do not show a secundative bias, however; all constituents can be relativized, questioned, topicalized, and focalized.

The Ditransitive verbs are a subclass of dipersonals encoding the pegative-dative relation, and only distinct from these in that they allow for an inanimate adjunct (the T) to occur in the sentence. A few of them show a behavior parallel to change-of-position verbs in that they may be turned into resultatives. Both of these connections are natural consequences of their semantics, which entails a mildly affecting actor (the A) and a mildly affected undergoer (the R) and which also entails a change of position or transfer of the T.

Although this paper has focused on the language-specifically defined Ditransitive there are also various other, more marginal ditransitive constructions. These differ by requiring flagging of the R through relational nouns or preposition or by specifying the R as a possessor of the T or as the argument of a verb expressing the event of receipt. These constructions sometimes show influence from Spanish, they do not exhibit a single consistent way of introducing the R, and they are infrequent. For this reason this paper has focused more on the language-specifically defined Tlapanec Ditransitive.

Abbreviations and Conventions

In general IPA is used for segments, except for the 5 vowels which have qualities similar to the Spanish ones. Also, “mb”, “nd”, and “ng” are unit phonemes. There are 3 level tones and 4 contour tones, which are marked in the following way (using *a* to stand for a generic vowel):

á high; *a* mid; *à* low; *ǎ* low-mid; *â* mid-low; *ǎ̃* mid-high; *ẫ* high-mid

Usually (except for some compounds, for instance) tones are restricted to the last two syllables of words. Within the domain of the two last syllables an unmarked vowel means a mid tone; outside this domain, an unmarked vowel means absence of phonological tone (the phonetic tone tends to be mid when the penult is mid or high, and low when the penult is low).

Non-standard abbreviations

AG	agentive (only marked for 2SG and 3PL; Wichmann 1996)
AN	agreement with an added animate participant
CL	possessive classifier (for entities having life or force)
G	given topic (Wichmann 2007b)
INAN	inanimate
N	new topic (Wichmann 2007b)
PEG	pegative (Wichmann 2005, 2008b)

POSS possessor

Gender is not encoded in verbal indices or pronouns. As a convention I use female actors and male undergoers in glosses. Verbal suffixes are shown with a hyphen even though the suffixes represent mergers with stem-final vowels (whose qualities are not always known).

References

Wichmann, Søren

- 1996 The degrammaticalization of agentivity in Tlapanec. In: Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen, Michael Fortescue, Peter Harder, Lars Heltoft and Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen (eds.), *Content, Expression and Structure: Studies in Danish Functional Grammar*, 343-360. (Studies in Languages Companion Series). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 2005 Tlapanec cases. In: Beam de Azcona, Rosemary and Mary Paster (eds.), *Conference on Otomanguan and Oaxacan Languages, March 19-21, 2004, University of California at Berkeley*, 133-145. (Report 13, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages). Berkeley: Survey of California and Other Indian Languages.
- 2006 Sandhi tonal interno en la morfología verbal tlapaneca. In Rosa María Ortiz Ciscomani (ed.), *Memorias del VIII Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noroeste*, vol. 2, 337-55. Hermosillo: Editorial UniSon.
- 2007a On turning sixty from a Tlapanec perspective. In: *Bernard's Birthday Book. Die etwas andere Festschrift*. [In the CD-ROM accompanying the book, which is published in just one copy]. <http://email.eva.mpg.de/~wichmann/WichmannComrieFS.pdf>.
- 2007b The reference-tracking system of Tlapanec: between obviation and switch reference. *Studies in Language* 31 (4): 801-827.
- 2008a Valency-reduction in event-oriented languages. In: Zarina Estrada Fernández, Søren Wichmann, Claudine Chamoreau, and Albert Álvarez González (eds.), *Studies in Voice and Transitivity (Estudios de voz y transitividad)*, 33-51. München: Lincom Europa.
- 2008b Case relations in a head-marking language: verb-marked cases in Tlapanec. In: Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (eds.), *The Handbook of Case*, 797-807. Oxford: Oxford University Press.