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TOPIC AND FOCUS IN TZOTZIL LANGUAGE
A GOVERNMENT BINDING GRAMMAR PERSPECTIVE

Darsita*

Abstract: Tzotzil in one of Mayan Languages spoken in Mexico. This language basically predicate-initial, but various phrases occur before predicate when they are focused or topicalized. Aissen (2006) describes the framework of Chomsky 1986 and presents a phrase-structural analysis of topic and focus for three Mayan languages (Tzotzil, Jakaltek, Tz'utujil). In this language there are three distinct entities are distinguished: the focus and two types of topic, term here 'internal' and 'external'. Each is argued to occupy a distinct structural position.

Kata Kunci: Tzotzil, Jakaltek, Tz'utujil, predicate-initial.

This paper presents a phrase-structural analysis of preverbal word orders in Tzotzil one of indigenous Mayan language in Mexico. To understand government binding grammar theory, I refer to Aissen's (2006) study at Tzotzil language and pay attention to his explanation carefully. He explained some ideas about phrase structure that have been widely adopted in the Government-Binding literature. He assumed first that phrases are built around an element which their head, and that such phrase come in two levels.

1. The first, lower, level is called $X_{\text{bar}}$ (represented $X'$).

$X_{\text{bar}}$ consist of a head ($X$-zero, represented as $X^0$ or simply $X$) plus $X$’s subcategorized COMPLEMENTS.

$X$ may be instantiated by a lexical item from a major word class, e.g: N, V, or A or by a so-called FUNCTIONAL element

INFLECTION (abbreviated INFL or simply $I$) or COMPLEMENTIZER (Comp or C).
II. The second, higher, level is called $X_{\text{DOUBLEBAR}}$ (represented $X''$ or simply XP). It consists of:

$X'$ just define plus a phrase that is not sub categories, but it refers to as the SPECIFIER of $X'$. XP is the MAXIMAL PROJECTION of $X$, its head. Elements that have been analyzed as specifiers of various $X'$ categories include subject, geratives and WITH-WORDS. Specifiers and complements are both assumed to be maximal projections. These assumptions are summarized such as:

In the rules 1 (cf. Chomsky, 1986: 3): these rules abstract away from the order of elements, which has to be established on a language by language basis.

(1) a. $X' \rightarrow X$, $YP$ ($YP$ a subcategorized complement of X)
   b. $XP \rightarrow X'$, $YP$ ($YP$ the specifier of $X'$)

Where the head is a lexical category, like N, V, or A, these rules yield what are called SMALL CLAUSES, illustrated for $X = V$ in 2 (The order of element is appropriate for a VOS language like Tzotzil).

In the rules 2, $V'$ is the predicate phrase, NP₁ is the direct object, NP₂ is the subject, interpreted here as specifier of $V'$. Ss and S bars of earlier work are integrated into this system by interpreting each as the maximal projection of a functional category. Specifically, S is interpreted as the maximal projection of Infl, i.e. $S = IP$, and S bar as the maximal projection of Comp, i.e. $S \text{ bar} = CP$. The small clause in 2 can function as an independent clause once it is embedded as complement to Infl, and IP can function as a (type of) embedded clause when embedded as complement to Comp. The diagram in 3 represents the way in which He assume the various categories are structured in Mayan. Note that Infl' and Comp' define specifier.
Position, per 1b. Negation occurs only in clauses with an Inf1 element and is presented as adjoined to IP. The order of elements in 3 follows three principles of Mayan word order:
position occupied by the trace. A second claim is that there are two distinct topic structures. In 6b, the topic function as specifier of binding a coindexed trace.

These are INTERNAL TOPIC structure, represented in 6c, the topic is outside the basic clause schema represented here by E[XPRESSION] (Banfield, 1973, Emonds, 1985). This position is not a landing site for movement, so a topic in that position must be base-generated there by the rule expanding E. Nor is there any binding requirement, though such topic maybe co indexed with a co referential pronoun. This structure is appropriate for the topics of Tzotzil, Jekaltek, and probably Tojasal. There is evidence that these topics are 'outside' CP and that they do not move to their surface position. This construction is similar to what is usually termed LEFT-DISLOCATION in the literature (Ross, 1967:23ff., Chomsky, 1977., McCloskey, 1990:224-226). The idea that left-dislocated elements occur outside of CP (=S) is not novel (see Chomsky, 1977 on English and McCrey, 1982 on German; see also van Valin, 1990 for an analogous proposal in a different framework, including a discussion of Tzotzil topics).

There are two differences, then, between focus and internal topic, on the one hand, and external topic on the other. The external is outside the highest CP, while focus and internal topic are inside; and while focus and internal topics must bind an element in the sentence, external topics need not.

It is worth explaining why Aissen (2006: 48) has adopted two recent proposal about phrase structure – the idea that Infl and Comp head phrasal categories, and the idea that subjects originate not in IP, but in the small clause complement to it.

He assume that Infl and Comp head phrases with specifiers because this provides precisely the range of positions needed to describe predicate NPs in Mayan and, combined with other assumptions, correctly account for various properties of these pre predicate NPs. As for the second assumption, it is useful to separate aspect in Mayan, which I identify with Infl, from the constituent containing the predicate and its subject. First: of all, many Mayan languages have aspectual particles and those precede the clause.
and are morphologically separate from it, consistent with 3. But more significantly, there is a class of complement structure, widely attested in Mayan, which do not express aspect. These complements, often termed ‘aspectless complements’, do, however contain an overt subject that is cross referenced on the verb. Given the structures in 3, these facts suggest that the top node of aspectless complements is a lexical projection, e.g. VP, not IP or CP. There are few detailed descriptions of these complements, but they suggest that aspectless complements can not express negation, they cannot contain preverbal subject, and they cannot contain certain other prepredicate elements which plausibly occur in Infl or specifier of I’. All this is predicated by 3, together with idea that subject originate within the maximal projection of the predicate and that preverbal NPs function as specifiers of I’ and C’.

FOCUS AND TOPIC IN TZOTZIL AND JAKALTEK

Distinguishing focus and topic in Tzotzil, Aissen (2006: 48) starts by presenting various diagnostics for distinguishing topic and foci in Tzotzil, a VOS language spoken in Chiapas, the southern most state of Mexico. Like other Mayan languages, it has an ergative verb agreement system and no case-marking on NPs. Tzotzil is a pro-drop language; nonemphatic pronouns are not pronounced. In fact, there are no overt third-person personal pronouns. There are several surface differences between Tzotzil topic and foci, namely:

1) a particle a usually precedes the topic, but never the focus.
2) The topic is almost always opened by a definite determiner, while the focus cannot be.
3) Topics are always closed by enclitic –e, while foci never are.

The text fragment in 7 contains several instances of the topic construction and illustrated some of these features. (Throughout, He uses bold face for that part of the example which is relevant to the discussion at hand, here the topic.

(7)a. There are was a man and a woman, newlyweds.

b. a ti vinik-e ta = xlok’ ech’el, ta = xbat ta = xxaanav.

TOP DET man-ENC exits away goes travels
'The husband leaves, he goes, he travels'

c. a ti antz-e

TOP DET women-ENC happily stays

'The wife stays at home happily'

Line 7a opens the story. The NP ti vinike 'the man' is topicalized in the second line 7b. It is introduced by the particle a, contains the determiner ti, and is closed by the enclitic -e. It the third line, 7c, the NP ti antze 'the women is in turn topicalized. It too is introduced by the topic marker a, contains the determiner ti, and is closed by the enclitics -e.

Compare an example of focus. The following passage comes from the middle of a text, where on individual, walking aling, meet another working in a field. The lateer opens with 8a and the narrative continues as in 8b:

(8) a. 'I'm planting. I'm planting stones, I'm planting trees'

b. Pero chobtik izz:un un

but corn he plants ENC

'But it was corn he was planting'

The NP chobtik is focused in 8b. It is not preceded by the particle a and contains no determiner and no enclitic -e; nor are any of these possible under the focus interpretation. Here the lack of a determiner could be because chobtik is a mass noun, but personal pronouns and proper names, which routinely take definite determiner, cannot do so when they are focussed.

He turn now to the function or interpretation of focus and topic. The semantics of the focus construction has two essential parts, a presupposition and an assertion. The presupposition of a focus construction can be generated by transiting the focused element by a variable. Thus, the presupposition of 8b is roughly 'he (the man in question) was planting something', a presupposition which is well-supported by what precedes it in 8a. Because it is a presupposition, it persists as a presupposition under negation and questioning. Both 9 a and 9 b continue to presuppose that 'the man' was planting something'
(9) a. *Mu chobtik-uk iz' un.*

NEG CORN-UK he.plants

'It wasn't corn that he was planting.'

b. *Mi chobtik iz' un?*

Q CORN he.plants

Was it corn that he was planting?

What the focus construction asserts is that the focused constituent denotes an entity which satisfied the variables of the presupposition, and further that entity is the only one in the current discourse which satisfied it. Thus 8b assert that the man was planting corn and only corn. It is this 'uniqueness' part of the assertion that amounts in 8 to a denial of the first man's claim that he was planting stones or trees.

The topic construction in Tzotzil does not lend itself to a logical characterization. It is used to turn the attention of the hearer to some identifiable participants in the discourse, and then to assert something of that participants. This participant is the 'topic' of the current stretch of discourse, until some other entity is introduced as topic. The first line of 7 introduces two participants into the discourse. The second line turns our attention to the husband and asserts of him that he goes out, leaves, travels and so on; the third line shifts attention to the wife and assert of her that she stays home happily. There is an implied contrast in this example between that man and the woman, but it is not the contrast of focus, where the focus is contrasted with all other entities that might have satisfied the variable of the presupposition, but didn't. There is no presupposition in 7b-c that there is a unique someone who goes out or stays home, and therefore no assertion that individual is the husband or wife.

There various differences between topic and focus are illustrated in the text fragment in 10:

(:10). a. Something had landed at the foot of the tree; they went to look.

There was a straw mat. 'Hell what could it be? Come on let's untie the straw mat!' the two men said to each other. They untied it. You know what?
b. *Tzeh san-antezc lo te stalk un*
girl San. Andres Cl there they found ENC
't was a girl from San Andres that they found there.
c. *A ti tzeh san-antezc un-e, lytk’ik la ech’el un*
TOP DET girl San Andres ENC ENC they took CL away ENC
'They took the San Andres girl with them.'

In the 10b the NP *tzeh san-antez* is focused, while in 10c the same NP, now with a determiner, is topicalized. The focus construction (10b) presupposes that the men found something in the mat, a presupposition amply supported by the preceding text (10a), and it asserts that what they found was a girl from San Andres. In effect, 10b asserts that of all the things the men might have found in the mat, the only thing that they in fact did find was a girl from San Andres. The focus NP has the expected form: no introductory particle *a*, no determiner, no enclitic *-e*. The San Andres girl having been introduced into the discourse, the narrative turns our attention to her in 10c by topicalizing the NP *ti tzeh san-antez* un and the San Andres girl. Now topicalized, the NP is introduced by *a*, contains the determiner *ti*, and is closed by the enclitic *-e*.

Tzotzil topics are always new or shifted topics. Once a participant has been established as topics, it is generally not referred to again by an overt nominal unless the topics shift. Thus, the six sentences that follow the narrative in 10 all contain a covert pronoun referring to the San Andres girl ("they went and lit their fire for her, they let her warm up, they gave her tortillas...").

**RELATIVE ORDER OF TOPIC AND FOCUS.**
The Structure proposed in 6 make several straightforward predictions about the relative (linear) order of topic and focus. First, if two NPs precede the predicate in Tzotzil, their interpretations and their morphosyntactic properties should be strictly determined by the order in which they occur. The first NP will be the topic and the second the focus. Example 11 illustrated the point.
(11) a. Once there was an orphan. The orphan suffered greatly. Whatever the master's children ate, they ate first. The drunk first.
b. A ti prove tzeb-e sovra ch'ak'bat
   TOP DET poor girl-ENC leftovers was given
   'It was leftovers that the poor girl was given'.

By our account, ti prove tzeb, 'the poor girl' must be topic and sovra 'leftovers' must be focus. The morphosyntactic properties of the two NPs are consistent with this, as are their interpretations. The topic, ti prove tzeb is introduced by e, it has a determiner, and it is closed before e, while the focus has none of these properties.

The girl is already a participant in the discourse, and line 11b turn our attention to her by topicalizing the NP that refers to her. If sovra is focused in 11b, 11b must presuppose that the girl was given something a presupposition supported by the preceding lines in 11a, and it must assert that she was given leftovers and only leftovers. The next line continues, of the things that they ate, she was only given the leftovers'.

The structure in 3 and 6, together with the assumption that the negative element is adjoined to IP in Mayan, predict that the negative (mu in Tzotzil) should follow the topic but precede the focus. The example in 9a shows that it precedes the focus, which is under the scope of negation. Examples like 12 show that the topic precedes sentence negation:
(12) Pero li vo'ón-e mu xs'amal
    but DET l-ENC NEG 1. walk
    'But me, I don't walk'

A third fact that should follow from the structures in 3 and 6 is the position of the interrogative marker mi. Like negation, mi always follows the topic and precedes the focus. In sentences with mi fronted NPs, mi occurs clause-initially, both in main and embedded clauses:
(13) Mi batem xa li Xun-e?
    Q left CL DET Xun-ENC
    'Has Juan left already?'
(14) Mu jna' mi batem xa li Xun-e
(4) a. The head $X'$ of phrase $X$ precedes its complement; e.g., $V$ precedes its object, Inf and Comp precede their sisters.

b. The specifier of a functional category $X'$ precedes $X'$; i.e., specifier of $I'$ and $C'$ precede $I'$ and $C'$, respectively.

c. The specifier of a lexical category $X'$ follows $X'$; e.g., subject follows $V'$, genitive follows $N'$.

A relation of government can also be defined in terms of structure 3:

(5) A governs B if:

a. A is $X^n$

b. A in-commands B, and

c. No maximal projection intervenes between A and B.

The effect of 5 is roughly that $X^n$ governs everything inside its own maximal projection. For instance, InfA governs both its specifier and its complement $X^n$; the verb $(X-V)$ governs both its specifier (the subject) and its complement (the object).

This paper argues for the analyses represented in 6 for several Mayan constructions:

(6) a. FOCUS

b. INTERNAL TOPIC

c. EXTERNAL TOPIC

The structure in 6 embodies the following claims. First, the focus (probably) also WH-question words functions as specifier of $I'$, and binds a coindexes trace, represented here and below as tj (see 6a). We can think of the focus as moving in specifier of $I'$ from the
(1) Tzotzil language is basically verb initial is reflected in the structure on the small clause. X2 in 3. In that domain, the smallest domain containing the predicate and the subject, the predicate precedes the subject.

(2) This follows from general principles that specifiers to lexical categories occur on the right. As for deviation from the basic pattern, we can certainly put aside the case of external topics. They are positioned outside the maximal clause, and fall entirely outside the scope of any principles of word order that depend on relations defined in terms of Xbar theory. Internal topics and foci are positioned by a principle that depends on Xbar theory (specifiers of the functions, projection occur to the left of their heads), but they are also outside the minimal clause (XP in 5).

(3) Finally, the conclusion that external topics lie outside the structures generated by the Xbar schema has interesting cross-linguistic support. In examining the cross-linguistic relation between basic word order type and the position of the topic, Aissen (2006) conclude that, while the position of continuing topics does correlate with word order type, that of new or switched topics does not, with the latter occurring sentence-initially regardless of the word-order type of the language.
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