Apparent Voice mismatches in K'iche' ellipsis:

Consequences for the Syntactic Identity Condition

Maša Bešlin, University of Maryland

mbeslin@umd.edu

FAMLi VII

February 22, 2024

Introduction

- In K'iche', sentences like (1) are possible:

(1) a.
Ri	nan	Juana	na	k-∅-tz'ib'-an	taj,	xow
DET	CLF	Juana	NEG	NPST-B3SG-write-AAP	IRR	just

we	je'lik	taq	tzij.
DET	pretty	PL	words

'Doña Juana doesn't (ever) write, only poetry.'

b.
Ixno'j	na	k-∅-kem-on	taj,	xow	we	pas.
Ixno'j	NEG	NPST-B3SG-weave-AAP	IRR	just	DET	sash

'Ixno'j doesn't (ever) weave, just traditional sashes.'

Introduction

- I will show evidence from Bešlin 2023 that (1) involves sluicing/TP ellipsis, with the underlying structure in (2):

(2) a. Ri   nan   Juana   na   **k-∅-tz'ib'-an**   taj, xow
         DET   CLF   Juana   NEG   **NPST-B3SG-WRITE-AAP**   IRR   just

         we   je'lik   taq   tzij   <**k-∅-u-tz'ib'-aj**>.
         DET   pretty   PL   words   **NPST-B3SG-A3SG-write-TR**

         'Doña Juana doesn't (ever) write, only poetry <she writes>.'

    b. Ixno'j   na   **k-∅-kem-on**   taj, xow   we   pas
        Ixno'j   NEG   **NPST-B3SG-weave-AAP**   IRR   just DET   sash

        <**k-∅-u-kem-o**>.
        NPST-B3SG-A3SG-weave-TR

        'Ixno'j doesn't (ever) weave, just traditional sashes <she weaves>.'

Introduction

- (2)/(3) involves an apparent Voice mismatch (active/antipassive)

- Voice mismatches between the antecendent and the ellipsis site have been argued to be impossible in TP ellipsis (Merchant 2013)

(3)   Ri   nan   Juana   na   **k-∅-tz'ib'-an**   taj,   xow
    DET   CLF   Juana   NEG   **NPST-B3SG-write-AAP**   IRR   just

    we   je'lik   taq   tzij   <**k-∅-u-tz'ib'-aj**>.
    DET   pretty   PL   words   **NPST-B3SG-A3SG-write-TR**
    'Doña Juana doesn't (ever) write, only poetry <she writes>.'

- I will propose an analysis of the K'iche' *absolutive antipassive* (AAP) which states that the AAP differs from the transitive version of the verb only in that it lacks the feature responsible for selecting the internal argument (e.g., [uD])

Introduction

- The mismatch can then be accommodated if the Syntactic Identity Condition on Ellipsis is formulated as in (4a), essentially disallowing **feature clashes**, but not under the alternatives in (4b-c) which require feature identity

(4) a. **Ranero 2021**: The antecedent and material properly contained in the ellipsis site must be featurally non-distinct; roots must match one-to-one.

b. **Merchant 2013**: The heads in the verbal spine of the elided constituent must be syntactically identical to the corresponding heads in the antecedent.

c. **Rudin 2019**: The heads in the eventive core (=highest vP that is associated with an event introducing predicate) of the elided constituent must be syntactically identical to the corresponding heads in the antecedent.

For the ellipsis enthusiasts only...

The same kind of AAP–transitive mismatch in K'iche' is also allowed in "more traditional" sluicing examples, such as (5)

(5) Ri   nan   Juana   **k-∅-k'ay-in**   pa   k'ayib'al.
     DET   CLF   Juana   **NPST-B3SG-sell-AAP**   at   market

Ch-a-ch'ak-a'   jas   uwoch   <**k-∅-u-k'ay-ij**>?
IMP-B2SG-guess-TR.IMP   what   kind   **NPST-B3SG-A3SG-sell-TR**

'Doña Juana sells at the market. Guess what <she sells>?'

The nature of the gap: SPELLING IT OUT

- Firstly, in the sentences we have seen, the *xow*-phrases *can* be extended into full clauses, and the mismatching transitive version is the only option:

(6) Ixno'j   na   **k-∅-kem-on**   taj,   xow   we   pas
Ixno'j   NEG   **NPST-B3SG-weave-AAP**   IRR   just   DET   sash

     k-∅-u-kem-o   /   ***k-∅-kem-on**.
     NPST-B3SG-A3SG-weave-TR   **NPST-B3SG-weave-AAP**
     'Ixno'j doesn't (ever) weave, just traditional sashes she weaves.'

The nature of the gap: CONSTITUENCY

- Multiple exceptions are possible with *xow*-phrases, even those that do not form a constituent except together with the (elided) verb:

(7) Konojel le ach-ab' x-e-xojow k'uk konojel le
 every DET man-PL PST-B3PL-dance with every DET

 ixoq-ib', **xow ri Lu' r'uk Tolor** no.
 woman-PL **just DET Pedro with Dolores** NO
 'Every boy danced with every girl, just Pedro didn't (dance) with Dolores.'

The nature of the gap: AMBIGUITY IN SLUICING

- It has been observed that ambiguity in the interpretation of exceptive-like
  constructions arises only when the exceptive phrase is underlyingly clausal

- The exceptive supplies the antecedent in (8b) thanks to its hidden clausal
  structure (9) (Potsdam & Polinsky 2019, see also Stockwell & Wong 2020)

  (8)   Nobody liked the movie, except John, but I don't know why.

        a.   but I don't know why <nobody liked the movie except John>.

        b.   but I don't know why <John liked the movie>.

  (9)   Nobody liked the movie, except John [l̶i̶k̶e̶d̶ ̶t̶h̶e̶ ̶m̶o̶v̶i̶e̶].

The nature of the gap: AMBIGUITY IN SLUICING

- The equivalent K'iche' sentences are also ambiguous; the availability of the interpretation in (10b) suggests that the *xow*-phrase is part of an (elided) clausal structure (11)

(10) Ma   jun   utz   k-∅-u-na'   ri   wa,   xow
      no   one   good   NPST-B3SG-A3SG-taste   DET   food only

      Ixkem. Na   w-eta'm   taj   jacha'.
      Ixkem   NEG   know   IRR   why
      'No one likes the food, just Ixkem. I don't know why.'

      a. I don't know why no one likes the food (just Ixkem).

      b. I don't know why Ixkem likes the food.

(11) ...xow Ixkem utz kuna' ri wa.

The nature of the gap: CONCLUSION

- The behavior of xow-phrases in sentences like (12) suggests they are underlyingly clausal and involve TP-ellipsis

- See Bešlin 2023 for further evidence that *xow*-phrases involve ellipsis, and evidence that the deletion operation is TP ellipsis, rather than e.g., gapping

(12) Ri   nan   Juana   na   **k-∅-tz'ib'-an**   taj,   xow
      DET CLF   Juana   NEG   **NPST-B3SG-WRITE-AAP**   IRR   just

      we   je'lik   taq   tzij   <**k-∅-u-tz'ib'-aj**>.
      DET   pretty   PL   words **NPST-B3SG-A3SG-write-TR**
      'Doña Juana doesn't (ever) write, only poetry <she writes>.'

→ What is the syntactic relationship between the antecedent and the ellipsis site, such that it can accommodate (12)?

→ First, what is the structure of the AAP?

AAP is intransitive: absolute case

- AAP only tracks absolutive case, a hallmark of intransitive constructions; overt objects are disallowed with AAP:

(13) K-∅-kem-on   (*we   pas)   lxno'j   ronojel   q'ij.
      NPST-B3SG-weave-AAP   DET   sash   lxno'j   every   day
      'Ixno'j weaves (sashes) every day.'

AAP is intransitive: implicit objects

- (Semi-)definite implicit objects are allowed with transitive verbs (14a), but
  not with AAP (14b), suggesting that AAP lacks a syntactic internal
  argument:

(14) **Context**: Konojel ri   ixoq-ib'   x-e-ki-tzer
                   all   DET   woman-PL   PST-B3PL-A3PL-tear

                   ri   ki-po't.
                   DET   A3PL-huipil
                   'All the women tore their huipiles.'

   a. Ri   nim-a'q   taq   ixoq-ib'   x-e-ki-tis-o.
       DET   big-PL   PL   womanPL   PST-B3PL-A3PL-repair-TR
       'The old women repaired them.'

   b. #Ri   nim-a'q   taq   ixoq-ib'   x-e-tis-oman-ik.
       DET   big-PL   PL   woman-PL   PST-B3PL-repair-AAP-SS
       '#The old women repaired.'

AAP is intransitive: resultatives/depictives

- Modification of implicit objects by a depictives/resultatives is available for transitives (15a), but not for AAP (15b)

- This is easily accommodated if AAP is syntactically intransitive since there is nothing for the depictive/resultative to modify

(15) a. K'atinaq   x-∅-u-b'an   ri   ak'al.
        burnt   PST-B3SG-A3SG-make.TR   DET   child
        'The child made it (e.g., the tortilla) burnt.'

   b. *K'atinaq   x-∅-b'an-on   ri   ak'al.
        burnt   PST-B3SG-make-AAP   DET   child
        'The child made it (e.g., the tortilla) burnt.'

AAP is intransitive: conclusions

- The K'iche' AAP is syntactically intransitive; how can it serve as an antecedent for TP-ellipsis which contains a transitive verb (cf. 16)?

(16) Ixno'j na **k-∅-kem-on** taj, xow we pas
    Ixno'j NEG **NPST-B3SG-weave-AAP** IRR just DET sash

    <**k-∅-u-kem-o**>.
    NPST-B3SG-A3SG-weave-TR

    'Ixno'j doesn't (ever) weave, just traditional sashes <she weaves>.'

Another look at SIC

- Let's take another look at the various formulation of the Syntactic Identity Condition on Ellipsis...

(17) a. **Ranero 2021**: The antecedent and material properly contained in the ellipsis site must be featurally non-distinct; roots must match one-to-one.

   b. **Merchant 2013**: The heads in the verbal spine of the elided constituent must be **syntactically identical** to the corresponding heads in the antecedent.

   c. **Rudin 2019**: The heads in the eventive core (=highest vP that is associated with an event introducing predicate) of the elided constituent must be **syntactically identical** to the corresponding heads in the antecedent.

The SIC and the structure of AAP

- The only formulation of the SIC that stands a chance is the one from Ranero 2021, since it is the only one that does not require syntactic **identity**, but rather **non-distinctness**

- In other words, the requirement in Ranero 2021 is that there be **no feature clashes** between the antecedent and the ellipsis site

- Can we accommodate our data under Ranero's SIC?

The SIC and the structure of AAP

- The data can be accommodated under Ranero's SIC (but not others) if we assume the structure in (18a) for the AAP; cf. the transitive in (18b)

- The transitive contains an extra [D] and the internal argument, but the structure is otherwise identical

- In our ellipsis examples, there is no feature clash: the ellipsis site simply has one extra [D] feature that is absent in the antecedent

  (18) a. ***AAP:***   [$_{VoiceP}$ EA Voice [$_{vP}$ v [$_{rootP}$ root]]]

        b. ***transitive:*** [$_{VoiceP}$ EA Voice [$_{vP}$ **IA** v**[D]** [$_{rootP}$ root]]]

→ Do we have any independent evidence that the EA in the K'iche' AAP is still in Voice, and not, e.g., in vP?

Evidence for the proposed structure of the AAP

- Burukina & Polinsky 2023: In Kaqchikel, causativization of intrasitives (unaccusative/unergatives) is possible, but one cannot causativize transitives, passives or reflexives

- vCAUS in Kaqchikel can take another vP as its complement (vP recursion) but it cannot be added on top of VoiceP

- The same facts obtain in K'iche' → K'iche' vCAUS takes a vP complement

- ⋆ **PREDICTIONS:**

- If the AAP is a vP (with the external argument introduced in spec, vP), then we should be able to causativize the AAP

- If the AAP is a VoiceP (with the external argument introduced in spec, VoiceP, like in transitives), then we should not be able to causativize the AAP

Evidence for the proposed structure of the AAP

- As predicted on the proposed VoiceP analysis of AAPs, causativization of AAPs is impossible (19)

(19) a. *X-e-qa-su'-un-sa-j.
      PST-B3PL-A1PL-wash-AAP-CAUS-TR
      intended: 'We made them dance.'

   b. *X-e-qa-k'ay-in-sa-j   pa   k'ayib'al.
      PST-B3PL-A1PL-sell-AAP-CAUS-TR   at   market
      intended: 'We made them sell at the market.'

- **NB:** Kaqchikel shows distinct behavior in this respect, supporting a vP analysis of Kaqchikel AAPs (see Burukina & Polinsky 2023). Also, Kaqchikel AAPs cannot serve as antecedents for ellipsis sites containing transitive verbs (Ranero 2021).

Wrapping up

- I have shown that K'iche' AAP can serve as an antecedent for an ellipsis site containing a transitive verb, an apparent Voice mismatch in ellipsis

- I argued instead that AAP-transitive is essentially a transitivity alternation

- The K'iche' AAP has an identical structure to the transitive (VoiceP), the only difference being that AAP v lacks [D] selecting the internal argument

- This ellipsis mismatch can be accommodated under Ranero's approach to the SIC, but not under the alternatives (Merchant 2013, Rudin 2019)

- Microvariation in K'ichean and the exact structure of the Kaqchikel AAP vs. transitive (feature clash?)

- Consequences for theories of features

- The biggest thank you goes to my main consultant Sindy Fabiola Can Pixabaj and her family, who welcomed me in their home in Xesampual (Sololá, Guatemala)

Maltyox! Gracias! Thank you!

References

Bešlin, Maša. 2023. Exceptives in K'iche'. Variation in Exceptive Structures. Zenodo. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.8059592.

Burukina, Irina & Maria Polinsky. 2023. Implicit objects in Kaqchikel, with a special emphasis on antipassives. In Conference presentation at NOCroDeP, Frankfurt Edition, .

Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. Linguistic Inquiry 44(1). 77–108.

Potsdam, Eric & Maria Polinsky. 2019. Clausal and phrasal exceptives. In Conference presentation at Generative Linguistics in the Old World (GLOW), vol. 42, .

Ranero, Rodrigo. 2021. Identity conditions on ellipsis: University of Maryland dissertation.

Rudin, Deniz. 2019. Head-based syntactic identity in sluicing. Linguistic Inquiry 50(2). 253–283.

Stockwell, Richard & Deborah JM Wong. 2020. Sprouting and the structure of except-phrases. In Proceedings of NELS, vol. 50, 169–183.