



HAL
open science

Predication in Ixcatec (Otomanguen)

Evangelia Adamou

► **To cite this version:**

| Evangelia Adamou. Predication in Ixcatec (Otomanguen). 2017. halshs-02119953v2

HAL Id: halshs-02119953

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-02119953v2>

Preprint submitted on 20 Dec 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

citation : Adamou, Evangelia. 2019. Predication in Ixcatec (Otomanguean). In Mettouchi, Frajzyngier & Chanard (eds), *Corpus-based cross-linguistic studies on Predication (CorTypo)*. <http://cortypo.huma-num.fr/resources.html> Accessed on DD/MM/YYYY.

Predication in Ixcatec (Otomanguean)

Adamou, Evangelia

CNRS, LACITO

Introduction

This paper presents the relationships that exist between a predicate, whether verbal or non-verbal, and a noun phrase (NP) in Ixcatec. The so-called *predications* were identified only when the language disposed of formal means to code them, such as inflectional marking, on the predicate or the NP, specialized predicates, or linear order, when applicable (see Frajzyngier & Shay 2016). The predications are presented by the name of their function to achieve better cross-linguistic comparability, but each predication is introduced by a language specific definition. Under "constructions", I present the formal means that code this predication in Ixcatec and under "contrasts" the relevant predications with which the predication is in contrast. Up to four examples are presented in order to illustrate each predication, some of them being the prototypical examples, in accordance with the definition, and others more peripheral or problematic. The examples are extracted through the spontaneous conversations and the data elicited through the Pear Stories films (Chafe 1975). All the data were annotated using IPA. Glosses follow the standardized glossing rules elaborated within the project and significantly expanding the Leipzig glossing rules.

Language information

IXCATEC



Name and ISO code : $j^hwa^2ni^3$, better known in the literature under the name Ixcatec (IXC), ixcateco (in Spanish), based on Nahuatl *ichcatl* 'cotton' + *-teca/-tecatl* 'inhabitant of a place (whose name ends in -tlan or -lan)'.

Speakers : Ten identified speakers, of whom only four are fluent. Most of them -with one exception- are in their late 80s. All are bilingual in Spanish. They have had little formal education in Spanish and no formal education in Ixcatec.

Region : Ixcatec is spoken in the municipality of Santa María Ixcatlán in the state of Oaxaca, in Mexico. Today, Santa María Ixcatlán has some 400 inhabitants but at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards in 1522 it was an important centre for the Mixteca zone with an estimated population of 10,000 to 30,000 people.

Classification : Ixcatec belongs to the Popolocan branch of the Otomanguean stock together with Ngiba/Ngigua (also known as Chocho), Popoloc, and Mazatec.

Dialectology : There are no known dialects.

Status : Ixcatec is a critically endangered language, with less than ten speakers. An orthography was developed in the 1950s by a native Ixcatec speaker, Doroteo Jiménez, in collaboration with linguists of the Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, the Mexican branch of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Doroteo Jiménez's orthography uses the Latin script and relies on the graphic correspondences with Spanish with some additions when necessary.

Main typological features : Ixcatec is a tone language, with three lexically contrastive tones: a high tone, transcribed with a superscripted¹, a mid tone, transcribed with², and a low tone, transcribed with³. Its phonology is complex and not yet well understood. The existence of stress is under discussion. Consonant inventory ranges from 24 to 52 depending on whether glottalized and aspirated consonants are analyzed as clusters of two segments, complex single

segments or simple onsets followed by simple nuclei. It has five vowels which may be oral, /a e i o u/, or nasal /ã ĕ ĩ õ ù/. Ixcatec makes a clear distinction between verbs and nouns; some adjectives may also function as predicates. It is a head-marking language, i.e., grammatical relations are marked on the verb. It has accusative alignment in indexing ($A = S \neq P$), i.e., only the single argument of intransitive verbs (S) and the agent-like argument of transitive verbs (A) are indexed on the verb through suffixes. A dozen experience predicates take a different coding, namely through possessive suffixes. Ixcatec is a pro-drop language, i.e., free pronouns are optionally used for all functions, and NPs are generally omitted. It has a VS/SVO unmarked order. When an S argument is moved to the preverbal position, a cross-reference morpheme is suffixed on the verb. The Ixcatec cross-reference morphemes (-da² ‘male’, -k^wa² ‘female’, and -βa³ ‘animal’) cofer to nouns formed with the *noun classifiers*, di²- ‘man’, k^wa²- ‘woman’, ʔu²- ‘animal’, to some animate nouns even though they have no classifier, and to the masculine and feminine third singular pronouns which bear the same suffixes as those used for the cross-reference morphemes, i.e., su¹wa¹-da² ‘he’ and su¹wa¹-kwa² ‘she’. Noun classifiers are distinct from so-called class terms which partake in word formation for inanimates but are not associated with any cross-reference morphemes.

Functions in the domain of Predication for the language Ixcatec (Otomanguean)

1.1. existential and equational

Definition	The existential predicate encodes the general existence of an entity X. It is also used as an equational predication indicating that an entity A is identical with an entity B (no occurrences in the corpus).
Construction	The existential predicate si ¹ .

▶ si¹ku¹ tʃi²tse¹ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_01_JSB-RRM_064)

```
si1ku1      tʃi2tse1 //
si1      -ku1 tʃi2tse1 //
EXS      -ANT party //
PRED     TAM  N    //
```

There was a party

▶ si¹ ʔu¹tʃa¹ tsu¹t^he² si¹ / (IXC_LEA_CONV_02_JSB-RRM_065)

```
si1      ʔu1tʃa1 tsu1the2 si1 /
si1      ʔu1tʃa1 tsu1the2 si1 /
EXS      much  garbage EXS /
PRED     QUANT N    PRED /
```

there's a lot of garbage,

▶ βe²g# βa²ni²nga²ʔa¹na³ ndi²ʃe²ra² la² nda¹ ʃta¹ si¹ <ma²ma²si¹ta²> // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_007)

```
βe2g# βa2ni2nga2ʔa1na3          ndi2ʃe2ra2 la2      nda1 ʃta1 si1 ma2ma2si1ta2 //
β-          a2ni2nga2 -ʔa1na3      ndi2ʃe2ra2 la2      nda1 ʃta1 si1 ma2ma2si1ta2 //
FS          PROG-          upset -POSS.1SG because COMP what ugly EXS mummy //
TAM          PRED          PRO      CONJ      COMP PRO.Q ADJ PRED N.BORR //
```

I'm getting upset because it's so ugly <woman>.

1.2. negative existential

Definition	The negative existential denies the existence of an entity.
Construction	The negative existential is expressed through the non-verbal predicate ka ² ʔa ² .
Contrasts	The negative existential contrasts with the existential predicate si ¹ .

▶ ka²ʔa²na² tʃi²ka² he²e² ʔi¹a²na² / (IXC_LEA_CONV_02_JSB-RRM_055)

```
ka2ʔa2na2      tʃi2ka2 he2e2 ʔi1a2na2 /
ka2ʔa2      -na2 tʃi2ka2 he2e2 ʔi1a2 -na2 /
NEG.EXS      -FOC like now no -FOC /
PRED          ADP ADV PTL PTL /
```

Not like now, no,

▶ ka²ʔa²na² tʃi²ka² ka²ndi² ʃu²hu²na³ kwi²ʔku²na³ ndi² si¹ tʃi²wi¹ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_196)

```
ka2ʔa2na2      tʃi2ka2 ka2ndi2 ʃu2hu2na3      kwi2ʔku2na3      ndi2 si1 tʃi2wi1 //
ka2ʔa2      -na2 tʃi2ka2 ka2ndi2 ʃu2hu2      -na3 kw-      i2ʃku2 -na3 ndi2 si1 tʃi2wi1 //
NEG.EXS      -FOC like when come -1SG PFV-      see -1SG what EXS clean //
PRED          PTL ADP ADV V      PRO TAM      V PRO PRO.Q PRED ADV //
```

Not like when I come, I see it is clean.

▶ ka²ʔa² hu²ku²ti²pa² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_273)

```
ka2ʔa2      hu2ku2ti2pa2 //
ka2ʔa2      hu2ku2ti2pa2 //
NEG.EXS      NP //
PRED          N //
```

It's not Hukutipa.

1.3. presentational

Definition	The presentational predication is used to introduce a referent in a deictic situation.
Construction	The presentational predication involves the presentational predicate <i>je</i> ² .
Contrasts	The presentational predicate is distinct from verbs because it does not receive any S or A suffixes. It is distinct from the other non-verbal predicates because of its form.

▶ *tja²ndjo² kwa²je² ʔndʒe¹na³na³ la² ki¹i² la² ti¹nda¹hna³ //* (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_161)

tja²ndjo² kwa²je² ʔndʒe¹na³na³ la² ki¹i² la² ti¹nda¹hna³ //
 tja²ndjo² kwa²- je² ʔndʒe¹ -na³na³ la² ki¹i² la² ti¹nda¹hna³ //
 therefore? PFV- PRST child -POSS.1SG LOC.DIST LOC LOC.DIST municipality //
 ADV TAM PRED N DET ADV PRED ADV N //

So, my son is there at the municipality.

▶ *kwi²hi² ka² tʃ⁰mī¹ je² ku²rʃi² //* (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_015)

kwi²hi² ka² tʃ⁰mī¹ je² ku²rʃi² //
 kwi²- hi² ka² tʃ⁰mī¹ je² ku²rʃi² //
 PFV- arrive all fruit PRST seems //
 TAM V QNT N PRED V //

He arrives, there is all the fruit, it seems.

▶ *hngu² kwa² je² //* (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_088)

hngu² kwa² je² //
 hngu² kwa² je² //
 one woman PRST //
 INDF N PRED //

There is a woman.

1.4. possessive

Definition	The possessive predication indicates that an entity X owns/has an entity Y.
Construction	The possessive predication involves the possessive predicate <i>ja</i> ¹ . It is followed by an NP and can be preceded by another NP: (NP) <i>ja</i> ¹ NP.
Contrasts	The possessive predicate is distinct from verbs for not receiving the S or A suffixes. It is distinct from the locative and existential predicates because of its form.

▶ *kwa²tsu² fta¹hū²ku¹ tʃa²hmi² me¹nda² ja¹ tʃh⁰ //* (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_087)

kwa²tsu² fta¹hū²ku¹ tʃa²hmi² me¹nda² ja¹ tʃh⁰ //
 kwa²- tsu² fta¹hū² -ku¹ tʃa²hmi² me¹nda² ja¹ tʃh⁰ //
 PFV- say be.scared -ANT people for.this POSS blood //
 TAM V V TAM N CONJ PRED N //

One says, people got scared, that's why it has blood.

▶ *ja¹ ka² tʃ⁰mī¹ ʔa²ku³ ra²ʃku²ʔe¹ βa²ka²hu³ tʃ⁰mī¹ //* (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_021)

ja¹ ka² tʃ⁰mī¹ ʔa²ku³ ra²ʃku²ʔe¹ βa²ka²hu³ tʃ⁰mī¹ //
 ja¹ ka² tʃ⁰mī¹ ʔa²ku³ ra²- ʃku²ā¹ -ʔe¹ βa²ka²hu³ tʃ⁰mī¹ //
 POSS all fruit in CLS.OBJ- bag -POSS.3SG carry fruit //
 PRED QNT N ADP AFFX N DET V N //

He has all the fruit in his bag. He carries the fruit.

▶ *ja¹ ʔu²ʃi¹ku³ //* (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_039)

ja¹ ʔu²ʃi¹ku³ //
 ja¹ ʔu²- ʃi¹ku³ //
 POSS CLF.AN- goat //
 PRED AFFX N //

He has a goat.

1.5. stative locative

Definition	The stative locative predication indicates the presence of an entity at the place X or of an event that occurs at the place X.
Construction	The stative locative predication involves the stative locative predicate <i>ki</i> ¹ i ² which is preceded by an NP and can be followed by another NP: NP LOC (NP)
Contrasts	The stative locative predicate is distinct from verbs for not receiving the S or A suffixes and distinct from other non-verbal predicates because of its form.

▶ [la² ki¹i² ndi¹ʔe¹ me¹nda² la² βa²tu¹φi² //](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_01_JSB-RRM_088)

la² ki¹i² ndi¹ʔe¹ me¹nda² la² βa²tu¹φi² //
 la² ki¹i² ndi¹ -ʔe¹ me¹nda² la² βa²tu¹= φi² //
 LOC.DIST LOC house\place -POSS.3SG for.this COMP PROG.PL- go //
 ADV PRED N DET CONJ COMP TAM V //

There, he is in his house. That's why they are going.

▶ [ku² li² ki¹i² ʰngu² nda²tsi² //](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_027)

ku² li² ki¹i² ʰngu² nda²tsi² //
 ku² li² ki¹i² ʰngu² nda²tsi² //
 COORD/INS LOC.PROX LOC one outside //
 CONJ ADV PRED INDF ADV //

And here there is a square.

▶ [si¹si²ka² ske¹ʔe¹ ki¹ʔu²se²ʔe² ndi¹ra² ki¹i² nda² ʔu²ra² //](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_113)

si¹si²ka² ske¹ʔe¹ ki¹ʔu²se²ʔe² ndi¹ra² ki¹i² nda² ʔu²ra² //
 si¹si²ka² ske¹ -ʔe¹ ki¹= ʔu²se²ʔe² ndi¹ra² ki¹i² nda² ʔu² -ra² //
 stand head -POSS.3SG PROG.3SG- look where LOC what animal -DEM.DIST //
 V N DET TAM.PNG V Q PRED PRO.Q N DET //

it stands, looks around, where is that animal.

2.1. human antipassive

Definition	The antipassive triggers the suppression of the patient-like (P) and the recipient-like (R) arguments which are pragmatically identifiable. With stative predicates it indicates that the state is particularly affecting the participant.
Construction	The antipassive morpheme -mi² is suffixed on the verbs and stative predicates.

▶ [ni²ka² kwi²rha²na³mi² ndi²la² //](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_01_JSB-RRM_106)

ni²ka² kwi²rha²na³mi² ndi²la² //
 ni²ka² kwi²rha²na² -na³ -mi² ndi²la² //
 as.soon.as meet -1SG -ANTIP SUB //
 ADV V PRO CONJ //

I just met (with him/them) that...

▶ [kwi²hi² kwi²hi² βa²a²mi² la² kwa²hi²ri² la² /](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_01_JSB-RRM_131)

kwi²hi² kwi²hi² βa²a²mi² la² kwa²hi²ri² la² /
 kwi²- hi² kwi²- hi² βa²a² -mi² la² kwa²- hi² -ri² la² /
 PFV- arrive PFV- arrive (IPFV)take -ANTIP LOC.DIST PFV- arrive -HON LOC.DIST /
 TAM V TAM V V AFFX ADV TAM V PRO ADV /

They came to bring (me). There, they came there...

▶ [ndri² ʔmi²ke² βi²hi² ʔu²se²ʔe²mi² tu¹φi² //](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_171)

ndri² ʔmi²ke² βi²hi² ʔu²se²ʔe²mi² tu¹φi² //
 ndri² ʔmi² -ke² βi²hi² ʔu²se²ʔe² -mi² tu¹= φi² //
 how call -ITER arrive look -ANTIP PROG.PL- go //
 Q V TAM V V AFFX TAM.PNG V //

what is it called, she arrives to see how we are doing.

2.2. causative

Definition	The causative introduces a new argument, semantically a causer and syntactically an A argument. In several cases, the causative has been lexicalized, e.g. tse²k-/tse²- 'sell' < 'do-go'.
Construction	The causative tse²k-/tse²- attaches to verbs.
Contrasts	The causative derives from the verb tse² "to do", which is still used as a verb and an auxiliary. Note the use of tse² as a light verb with Spanish verb borrowings. As a valency-increasing suffix, the causative contrasts with the valency-decreasing antipassive and can co-occur with it suppressing the causee.

▶ [aj me¹ ku¹tse²ʔiā¹ūku¹ tja²hmi² me¹nda² //](#) (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_078)

aj me¹ ku¹tse²ʔiā¹hū²ku¹ tja²hmi² me¹nda² //
 aj me¹ ku¹- tse²- ʔiā¹hū² -ku¹ tja²hmi² me¹nda² //
 INTJ therefore PFV- CAUS- be.scared -ANT people for.this //
 EXCLM ADV TAM V TAM N CONJ //

Oh, therefore, it made people scared, that's why.

▶ [ku¹tse²ngu²se¹ ka² ʔmī¹ //](#) (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_216)

ku ² tse ² ngu ² tse ¹	ka ²	tʃ ¹ mī ¹	//
ku ² -	tse ² ngu ² tse ¹	ka ²	tʃ ¹ mī ¹
PFV-	CAUS:gather	all	fruit
TAM	V	QNT	N

He has gathered all the fruit.

2.3. instrumental

Definition	The instrumental serves to add a prototypically non-human argument, often indicating that the action is realized with an instrument.
Construction	The instrumental is expressed in two ways: 1) The applicative-instrumental -ʃi ² attaches to verbs or experience predicates (note some lexicalized uses). However, the applicative-instrumental does no longer seem very productive in its prototypical uses. 2) The coordinating conjunction ku ² e.g. "talk with the microphone", "clean with the scarf".
Constraints	For the applicative-instrumental to be used, the object has to be in a marked position, i.e., preverbal.
Contrasts	The instrumental contrasts in particular with the comitative ka ² hu ² , which indicates that the agent executes the action with a human co-agent.

▶ la² ki¹i² ʰngu² na²?nde² la² ndi¹ra² βa²tu¹βa²ni²tʃ¹a² ku² mi²kro²φo²no² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_02_JSB-RRM_246)

la ²	ki ¹ i ²	ʰngu ²	na ² ?nde ²	la ²	ndi ¹ ra ²	βa ² tu ¹ βa ² ni ² tʃ ¹ a ²	ku ²	mi ² kro ² φo ² no ²	//		
la ²	ki ¹ i ²	ʰngu ²	na ² ?nde ²	la ²	ndi ¹ ra ²	βa ² tu ¹ =	βa ² -	ni ² tʃ ¹ a ²	ku ²	mi ² kro ² φo ² no ²	//
LOC.DIST	LOC	one	ground	LOC.DIST	where	PROG.PL-	IPFV-	talk	COORD/INS	microphone	//
ADV	PRED	INDF	N	ADV	Q	TAM.PNG	TAM	V	CONJ	N.BORR	//

there is one field, there where they talk with the microphone,

▶ he²e² ka²ndi² kwa²φi² di²a²le²ja¹ndro²na² ?mē¹?ō² nda¹ra² βa²tsu²ke² ti²mā¹hū¹ke²na² ku² su¹wa³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_094)

he ² e ²	ka ² ndi ²	kwa ² φi ²	di ² a ² le ² ja ¹ ndro ² na ²	?mē ¹ ?ō ²	nda ¹ ra ²	βa ² tsu ² ke ²	ti ² mā ¹ hū ¹ ke ² na ²	ku ²	su ¹ wa ³	//					
he ² e ²	ka ² ndi ²	kwa ² -	φi ²	di ² -	a ² le ² ja ¹ ndro ²	-na ²	?mē ¹ ?ō ²	nda ¹ ra ²	βa ² -	tsu ²	-ke ²	ti ² =	mā ¹ hū ¹	-ke ²	-na ²
now	when	PFV-	go	CLF.M-	NP	-FOC	also	what	PROG-	say	-ITER	PROG.SG-	sweep	-ITER	-FOC
ADV	ADV	TAM	V	AFFX	N	PTL	ADV	PRO.Q	TAM	V	TAM	TAM.PNG	V	TAM	PTL
ku ²	su ¹ wa ³	//													
ku ²	su ¹ wa ³	//													
COORD/INS	hot	//													
CONJ	ADV/ADJ	//													

Now when Alejandro came, he again said how I sweep in the heat.

▶ ki¹βe²he³ ku² pa²ni¹tu²?e¹ ku² ki¹βe²he³ // (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_023)

ki ¹ βe ² he ³	ku ²	pa ² ni ¹ tu ² ?e ¹	ku ²	ki ¹ βe ² he ³	//			
ki ¹ =	βe ² he ³	ku ²	pa ² ni ¹ tu ²	-?e ¹	ku ²	ki ¹ =	βe ² he ³	//
PROG.3SG-	clean	COORD/INS	scarf	-POSS.3SG	COORD/INS	PROG.3SG-	clean	//
TAM.PNG	V	CONJ	N.BORR	DET	CONJ	TAM.PNG	V	//

He is cleaning with his scarf, he is cleaning.

2.4. comitative

Definition	The comitative indicates that the agent executes the action with a human co-agent.
Construction	An uninflected comitative morpheme, ka ² hu ² , is used as a free morpheme. It can also be found in lexicalized verbs, e.g. φi ² ka ² hu ² 'bring' < 'come-with'.
Contrasts	The comitative contrasts with the instrumental, which applies to non-human arguments.

▶ ?i¹na³na³ ka²hu² na²la² na²?tʃi² ta¹?tʃi² kwa²tu¹tse² nda¹ra² βa²tsu¹ ndi² βa²tu¹φi² ka² tsi²kū³?e¹ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_02_JSB-RRM_187)

?i ¹ na ³ na ³	ka ² hu ² na ²	la ²	na ² ?tʃi ²	ta ¹ ?tʃi ²	kwa ² tu ¹ tse ²	nda ¹ ra ²	βa ² tsu ¹	ndi ²	βa ² tu ¹ φi ²	ka ²	tsi ² kū ³ ?e ¹					
?i ¹ na ³	-na ²	ka ² hu ²	-na ²	la ²	na ² ?tʃi ²	ta ¹ ?tʃi ²	kwa ² tu ¹ =	tse ²	nda ¹ ra ²	βa ² tsu ¹	ndi ²	βa ² tu ¹ =	φi ²	ka ²	tsi ² kū ³	-?e ¹
fine	-FOC	COM	-FOC	COMP	grandmother	grandfather	PFV.PL-	do	what	belmake	what	PROG.PL-	go	all	money	-POSS.3SG
ADV	PTL	ADP	PTL	COMP	N	N	TAM.PNG	V	Q	V	Q	TAM.PNG	V	QNT	N	DET
//																
//																
//																
//																

It's fine with the grandmothers, the grandfathers, they do, they go for their money

▶ tʃi¹ʰngu² ʌ²?i¹ ki¹u²ʃta¹ma² ku² ki¹u²ʃta¹ma² ka²hu² ku² tʃ¹mī¹ ki¹i² // (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_119)

tʃi ¹ ʰngu ²	ʌ ² ?i ¹	ki ¹ u ² ʃta ¹ ma ²	ku ²	ki ¹ u ² ʃta ¹ ma ²	ka ² hu ²	ku ²	tʃ ¹ mī ¹	ki ¹ i ²	//			
tʃi ¹ ʰngu ²	ʌ ² -	?i ¹	ki ¹ =	u ² ʃta ¹ ma ²	ku ²	ki ¹ =	u ² ʃta ¹ ma ²	ka ² hu ²	ku ²	tʃ ¹ mī ¹	ki ¹ i ²	//
other.one	CLS.boy-	small	PROG.3SG-	play	COORD/INS	PROG.3SG-	play	COM	COORD/INS	fruit	LOC	//
PRO	AFFX	N	TAM.PNG	V	CONJ	TAM.PNG	V	ADP	CONJ	N	PRED	//

Another boy is playing with... he is playing together with the fruit. He is there.

2.5. sociative

Definition	The sociative is used to express an action realized together with other participants, e.g. "go together", "meet". Some examples indicate a passive use, where the patient is promoted as a subject, e.g. "he is hot" = "the heat affects him". Examples not attested in the corpus indicate a reciprocal meaning.
Construction	The sociative $-te^3?e^3$ attaches to the verb.

▶ ju¹hu² na² ja²tu²te³?e³ la² // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_126)

ju ¹ hu ² na ²	ja ² tu ² te ³ ?e ³	la ²	//
ju ¹ hu ²	-na ²	ja ² tu ²	-te ³ ?e ³ la ² //
two	-FOC	meet	-SOC LOC.DIST //
NUM	PTL	V	PRO ADV //

the two of them meet there.

▶ la² tu¹hi²te³?e³ // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_152)

la ²	tu ¹ hi ² te ³ ?e ³	//
la ²	tu ¹ =	hi ² -te ³ ?e ³ //
SUB	PROG.PL-	arrive -SOC //
COMP	TAM.PNG	V PRO //

The others are going together.

▶ ja²tu²ku¹te³?e³ la² / (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_129)

ja ² tu ² ku ¹ te ³ ?e ³	la ²	/
ja ² tu ²	-ku ¹ -te ³ ?e ³	la ² /
meet	-ANT -SOC	LOC.DIST /
V	TAM	PRO ADV /

They met each other there.

3. experiencer

Definition	The experiencer predication encodes that a participant is affected by the event, e.g. emotion 'be upset', 'be lazy'; bodily experience 'be sick', 'bathe', but also posture 'sit'.
Construction	The experiencer predication consists of a non-verbal predicate (not a noun or a verb) that receives the series of possessive suffixes.
Contrasts	Other non-verbal predications.

▶ βe²g# βa²ni²nga²?na¹na³ ndi²?e²ra² la² nda¹ fta¹ si¹ <ma²ma²si¹ta²> // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_007)

βe ² g#	βa ² ni ² nga ² ?na ¹ na ³	ndi ² ?e ² ra ²	la ²	nda ¹	fta ¹	si ¹	ma ² ma ² si ¹ ta ²	//
FS	β-	a ² ni ² nga ²	-?na ¹ na ³	ndi ² ?e ² ra ²	la ²	nda ¹	fta ¹ si ¹	ma ² ma ² si ¹ ta ² //
	PROG-	upset	-POSS.1SG	because	COMP	what	ugly	EXS mummy //
	TAM	PRED	PRO	CONJ	COMP	PRO.Q	ADJ	PRED N.BORR //

I'm getting upset because it's so ugly <woman>.

▶ me¹nda² ?i²na¹na³ ?mē¹?ō² sja¹?na³na³ tsi² tsu² ku²tse²na³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_099)

me ¹ nda ²	?i ² na ¹ na ³	?mē ¹ ?ō ²	sja ¹ ?na ³ na ³	tsi ²	tsu ²	ku ² tse ² na ³	//
me ¹ nda ²	?i ² na ¹ na ³	?mē ¹ ?ō ²	sja ¹	-?na ³ na ³	tsi ²	tsu ² ku ² -	tse ² -na ³ //
for.this	1SG	also	idleness	-POSS.1SG	?	say PFV-	say -1SG //
CONJ	PRO	ADV	PRED	PRO	?	V TAM	V PRO //

that's why to do this I'm lazy, I told him.

4. spatial specification

Definition	Spatial specification codes the position of a referent X with respect to a referent Y, e.g., X inside Y, X above Y, etc. Some spatial specifiers derive from body part terms.
Construction	The spatial specifiers combine with TMA markers, but not with S or A suffixes. They generally precede the NP: SPCF.SPC NP

▶ tʃi²ka² ti¹nda¹h¹na³ ?mē¹?ō² ?a²ku² h¹ngu² to²ne¹ le² ʃe¹ / (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_146)

tʃi ² ka ²	ti ¹ nda ¹ h ¹ na ³	?mē ¹ ?ō ²	?a ² ku ²	h ¹ ngu ²	to ² ne ¹	la ²	ʃe ¹ /
tʃi ² ka ²	ti ¹ nda ¹ h ¹ na ³	?mē ¹ ?ō ²	?a ² ku ²	h ¹ ngu ²	to ² ne ¹	la ²	ʃe ¹ /
like	municipality	also	inside	one	barrel	REL	big /
ADP	N	ADV	SPCF.SPC	INDF	N.BORR	COMP	ADJ /

Like at the municipality also in a barrel that is big...

▶ aj ki¹nda²?ju²e³na² ?u²?e³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_039)

aj	ki'nda ² tʃu ² e ³ na ²		ʔu ² je ³		//
aj	ki'=	nda ² tʃu ² e ³	-na ²	ʔu ² -	je ³ //
INTJ	PROG.3SG-	behind	-FOC	CLF.AN-	snake //
EXCLM	TAM.PNG	SPCF.SPC	PTL	AFFX	N //

Oh, the snake is behind (him)!

▶ ndi²la² si'nga² nde²hi²βa² si'hi³ ndi²la² tsu²ʔa²na²βa² tse²nde¹ʔe²βa² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_052)

ndi ² la ²	si'nga ²	nde ² hi ² βa ²		si'hi ³	ndi ² la ²	tsu ² ʔa ² na ² βa ²		tse ² nde ¹ ʔe ² βa ²		//	
ndi ² la ²	si'nga ²	nde ² hi ²	-βa ²	si'hi ³	ndi ² la ²	tsu ²	-ʔa ²	-na ²	-βa ²	tse ² nde ¹ ʔe ²	-βa ² //
SUB	inside/on	tangle	-CO.AN	feet	SUB	want	-NEG	-FOC	-CO.AN	release	-CO.AN //
CONJ	SPCF.SPC	V	PRO	N	CONJ	V	AFFX	PTL	PRO	V	PRO //

Because the animal got tangled in (his) feet, because it didn't want to let go.

Synthesis & Discussion

To summarize, I have identified the following predications: existential and equational, presentative, possessive, stative locative, negative existential, human antipassive, causative, instrumental, comitative, sociative, experiencer, and spatial specification. However, note that the syntactic analysis is still ongoing.

Ixcatec presents a number of typologically interesting predications. In particular, the human antipassive verbal suffix, $-mi^2$, is typologically rare in many respects (Adamou 2014). Unlike most languages with antipassive constructions (Polinsky 2005), Ixcatec antipassive constructions target highly individuated arguments, namely humans who are also generally speech-act participants. This is due to the origin of $-mi^2$, which most likely developed from the Proto-Popolocan $**hmi$ 'person' (reconstructed in Veerman-Leichsenring 2004: 433 following Gudshinsky) and is still productive in compound word formation, i.e. mi^2 - nda^2wa^2 'man', mi^2 - $tʃa^2$ 'woman', $tʃa^2h-mi^2$ 'people'. The Ixcatec antipassive triggers the suppression of the patient-like (P) and the recipient-like (R) arguments. We also note the use of the antipassive suffix with stative predicates, indicating that the state is particularly affecting the participant. Within the Otomanguean stock, one can also draw attention to the equivalent 'object-suppressive' voice in Totonac which also occurs with states and nominal roots for atelic reading (Beck 2004).

Cross-reference morphemes are of typological interest, in relation to the lexical classifiers (see Adamou 2017a for an overview of their uses in relative clauses and methodological challenges for a systematic analysis of a critically-endangered language).

Another interesting feature is the so-called "experiencer" predication. Unlike in other Popolocan languages, as Chocholtec (Ngigua/Ngiba) and Popoloc, I consider that this predication cannot be described as a case of semantic alignment in Ixcatec as it is not a pervasive feature but rather characterizes a small number of verbs (Wichmann 2008: 3 offers the following definition of semantic alignment: "an agentive S is encoded, through case marking, verbal agreement, or both, in the same way as A and non-agentive S in the same way as P" and "the agentive vs. non-agentive distinction is a pervasive feature of the grammar").

Among under-described features of Ixcatec that deserve future research is the so-called "sociative", which presents a rather wide range of uses that defy easy characterization.

Conclusion

To conclude, Ixcatec is a previously undescribed and critically-endangered language. Although it shares a number of features that characterize the Popolocan languages and more broadly the languages of the Otomanguean stock and the Mesoamerican area, Ixcatec also shows a number of interesting developments that can be of interest to typologists. Clearly, much work remains to be done and the present paper is aimed as an introduction to the complexity of this language.

References

- Adamou, Evangelia. 2017a. Subject preference in Ixcatec relative clauses. *Studies in Language*.
- Adamou, Evangelia. 2017b. Spatial language and cognition among the Ixcatec-Spanish bilinguals (Mexico). K. Bellamy, M. Child, A. Muntendam & M. C. Parafita Couto (eds), *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Bilingualism in the Hispanic and Lusophone World*, 175–209. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Adamou, Evangelia. 2014. L'antipassif en iccatèque. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 109(1): 373–396.
- Adamou, Evangelia & Denis Costaouec. 2013. El complementante *la* en iccateco: marcador de clausula relativa, completiva y adverbial. *Amerindia* 37(1):193–210.
- Beck, David. 2004. *A Grammatical Sketch of Upper Necaxa Totonac*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1975. *The Pear Story film*. University of California.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt & Erin Shay. 2016. *The role of functions in syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2005. Antipassive constructions. In Dryer, Matthew and Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. Accessed March 25, 2015 at <http://wals.info/chapter/108>.
- Veerman-Leichsenring, Annette. 2004. Popolocan noun classifiers: a Reconstruction. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70 (4): 416–451.
- Wichmann, Søren. 2008. The study of semantic alignment: retrospect and state of the art. In Donohue, Mark and Søren Wichmann (eds.), *The Typology of Semantic Alignment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.