Predication in Ixcatec (Otomanguean)

Evangelia Adamou

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 Leipzing glossing rules.

Language information

IXCATEC

Name and ISO code : ʃʰwa²ni³, 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 ẽ ĩ õ ũ/. 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 ≠ 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^{W}a² 'female', and -βa³ 'animal') corefer to nouns formed with the *noun classifiers*, di²- 'man', k^{W}a²- '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 si¹.

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 tsu¹tʰe² 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# βa²ni²nga²ɲa¹na³ ndi²ʃe²ra² la² nda¹ ʃta¹ si¹ <ma²ma²si¹ta²> // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_007)

βe²g#	βa²ni²nga²ɲa¹na³			ndi²ʃe²ra²	la²	nda¹	ʃta¹	si¹	ma²ma²si¹ta²	//
FS	β-	a²ni²nga²	-ɲa¹na³	ndi²ʃe²ra²	la²	nda¹	ʃta¹	si¹	ma²ma²si¹ta²	//
	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 ka²ʔa².
Contrasts	The negative existential contrasts with the existential predicate si¹.

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 kwi²i²ʃku²na³ ndi² si¹ tj?wi¹ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_196)

ka²ʔa²na²		tʃi²ka²	ka²ndi²	ʃu²hu²na³		kwi²i²ʃku²na³			ndi²	si¹	tj?wi¹	//
ka²ʔa²	-na²	tʃi²ka²	ka²ndi²	ʃu²hu²	-na³	kw-	i²ʃku²	-na³	ndi²	si¹	tj?wi¹	//
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 ʃe².
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.

tʃa²ndjo² kwa²ʃe² ʔndʒe¹ɲa³na³ la² ki¹i² la² ti¹nda¹hɲa³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_161)

tʃa²ndjo²	kwa²ʃe²		ʔndʒe¹ɲa³na³		la²	ki¹i²	la²	ti¹nda¹hɲa³	//
tʃa²ndjo²	kwa²-	ʃe²	ʔndʒe¹	-ɲa³na³	la²	ki¹i²	la²	ti¹nda¹hɲa³	//
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 tʃʰmĩ¹ ʃe² ku²rʃi² // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_015)

kwi²hi²		ka²	tʃʰmĩ¹	ʃe²	ku²rʃi²	//
kwi²-	hi²	ka²	tʃʰmĩ¹	ʃe²	ku²rʃi²	//
PFV-	arrive	all	fruit	PRST	seems	//
TAM	V	QNT	N	PRED	V	//

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

ʰngu² kwa² ʃe² // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_088)

ʰngu²	kwa²	ʃe²	//
ʰngu²	kwa²	ʃe²	//
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 ja¹. It is followed by an NP and can be preceded by another NP: (NP) ja¹ 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 ʃtãʰũku¹ tʃa²ʰmi² me¹nda² ja¹ tjhĩ³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_087)

kwa²tsu²		ʃta¹hũ²ku¹		tʃa²hmi²	me¹nda²	ja¹	tjhĩ³	//
kwa²-	tsu²	ʃta¹hũ²	-ku¹	tʃa²hmi²	me¹nda²	ja¹	tjhĩ³	//
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 ka³ tʃʰmĩ¹ ʔa²ku³ ra²ʃku²ʔe¹ βa²ka²hu³ tʃʰmĩ¹ // (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_021)

ja¹	ka²	tʃʰmĩ¹	ʔa²ku³	ra²ʃku²ʔe¹			βa²ka²hu³	tʃʰmĩ¹	//
ja¹	ka²	tʃʰmĩ¹	ʔa²ku³	ra²-	ʃku²ã¹	-ʔe¹	βa²ka²hu³	tʃʰmĩ¹	//
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 ki¹i² 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 nda²tsĩ² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_027)

ku²	li²	ki¹i²	ʰngu²	nda²tsĩ²	//
ku²	li²	ki¹i²	ʰngu²	nda²tsĩ²	//
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 tu²ϕi² // (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. tse²hi² ‘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 ku¹tse²ʃtãʰũku¹ tʃa²hmi² me¹nda² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_078)

aj	me¹	ku¹tse²ʃta¹hũ²ku¹				tʃa²hmi²	me¹nda²	//
aj	me¹	ku¹-	tse²-	ʃta¹hũ²	-ku¹	tʃa²hmi²	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.

ku²tse²ngu²tse¹ ka² tʃʰmĩ¹ // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_216)

ku²tse²ngu²tse¹		ka²	tʃʰmĩ¹	//
ku²-	tse²ngu²tse¹	ka²	tʃʰmĩ¹	//
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 protoypically 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 -ʃi² 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 ku² 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 ka²hu², which indicates that the agent executes the action with a human co-agent.

la² ki¹i² ʰngu² na²ʔnde² la² ndi¹ra² βa²tu¹βa²ni²tʃʰa² ku² mi²kro²ϕo²no² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_02_JSB-RRM_246)

la²	ki¹i²	ʰngu²	na²ʔnde²	la²	ndi¹ra²	βa²tu¹βa²ni²tʃʰa²			ku²	mi²kro²ϕo²no²	//
la²	ki¹i²	ʰngu²	na²ʔnde²	la²	ndi¹ra²	βa²tu¹=	βa²-	ni²tʃʰa²	ku²	mi²kro²ϕo²no²	//
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 ʔmẽ¹ʔõ² nda¹ra² βa²tsu²ke² ti²mã¹hũ¹ke²na² ku² su¹wa³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_094)

he²e²	ka²ndi²	kwa²ϕi²		di²a²le²ja¹ndro²na²			ʔmẽ¹ʔõ²	nda¹ra²	βa²tsu²ke²			ti²mã¹hũ¹ke²na²				
he²e²	ka²ndi²	kwa²-	ϕi²	di²-	a²le²ja¹ndro²	-na²	ʔmẽ¹ʔõ²	nda¹ra²	βa²-	tsu²	-ke²	ti²=	mã¹hũ¹	-ke²	-na²	
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	

ku²	su¹wa³	//
ku²	su¹wa³	//
COORD/INS	hot	//
CONJ	ADV/ADJ	//

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

ki¹βe²he³ ku² pa²ni¹tu²ʔe¹ ku² ki¹βe²he³ // (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_023)

ki¹βe²he³		ku²	pa²ni¹tu²ʔe¹		ku²	ki¹βe²he³		//
ki¹=	βe²he³	ku²	pa²ni¹tu²	-ʔe¹	ku²	ki¹=	βe²he³	//
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, ka²hu², is used as a free morpheme. It can also be found in lexicalized verbs, e.g. ϕi²ka²hu² 'bring' < 'come-with'.
Contrasts	The comitative contrasts with the instrumental, which applies to non-human arguments.

ʔi¹ɲa¹na³ ka²hu² na²la² na²ʔtʃi² ta¹ʔtʃi² kwa²tu¹tse² nda¹ra² βa²tsu¹ ndi² βa²tu¹ϕi² ka² tsi²kũ³ʔe¹ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_02_JSB-RRM_187)

ʔi¹ɲa¹na³		ka²hu²na²		la²	na²ʔtʃi²	ta¹ʔtʃi²	kwa²tu¹tse²		nda¹ra²	βa²tsu¹	ndi²	βa²tu¹ϕi²		ka²	tsi²kũ³ʔe¹	
ʔi¹ɲa³	-na²	ka²hu²	-na²	la²	na²ʔtʃi²	ta¹ʔtʃi²	kwa²tu¹=	tse²	nda¹ra²	βa²tsu¹	ndi²	βa²tu¹=	ϕi²	ka²	tsi²kũ³	-ʔe¹
fine	-FOC	COM	-FOC	COMP	grandmother	grandfather	PFV.PL-	do	what	be\make	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 lĩ²ʔĩ¹ ki¹u²ʃta¹ma² ku² ki¹u²ʃta¹ma² ka²hu² ku² tʃʰmĩ¹ ki¹i² // (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_119)

tʃi¹ʰngu²	lĩ²ʔĩ¹		ki¹u²ʃta¹ma²		ku²	ki¹u²ʃta¹ma²		ka²hu²	ku²	tʃʰmĩ¹	ki¹i²	//
tʃi¹ʰngu²	lĩ²-	ʔĩ¹	ki¹=	u²ʃta¹ma²	ku²	ki¹=	u²ʃta¹ma²	ka²hu²	ku²	tʃʰmĩ¹	ki¹i²	//
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 -te³ʔe³ attaches to the verb.

ju¹hu² na² ʃa²tu²te³ʔe³ la² // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_126)

ju¹hu²na²		ʃa²tu²te³ʔe³		la²	//
ju¹hu²	-na²	ʃa²tu²	-te³ʔe³	la²	//
two	-FOC	meet	-SOC	LOC.DIST	//
NUM	PTL	V	PRO	ADV	//

the two of them meet there.

la² tu¹hi²te³ʔe³ // (IXC_LEA_NARR_01_PEARSTORY-PSG_152)

la²	tu¹hi²te³ʔe³			//
la²	tu¹=	hi²	-te³ʔe³	//
SUB	PROG.PL-	arrive	-SOC	//
COMP	TAM.PNG	V	PRO	//

The others are going together.

ʃa²tu²ku¹te³ʔe³ la² / (IXC_LEA_NARR_02_PEARSTORY-RRM_129)

ʃa²tu²ku¹te³ʔe³			la²	/
ʃa²tu²	-ku¹	-te³ʔe³	la²	/
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# βa²ni²nga²ɲa¹na³ ndi²ʃe²ra² la² nda¹ ʃta¹ si¹ <ma²ma²si¹ta²> // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_007)

βe²g#	βa²ni²nga²ɲa¹na³			ndi²ʃe²ra²	la²	nda¹	ʃta¹	si¹	ma²ma²si¹ta²	//
FS	β-	a²ni²nga²	-ɲa¹na³	ndi²ʃe²ra²	la²	nda¹	ʃta¹	si¹	ma²ma²si¹ta²	//
	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 ʔi²na¹na³ ʔmẽ¹ʔõ² sja¹ɲa³na³ tsi² tsu² ku²tse²na³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_099)

me¹nda²	ʔi²na¹na³	ʔmẽ¹ʔõ²	sja¹ɲa³na³		tsi²	tsu²	ku²tse²na³			//
me¹nda²	ʔi²na¹na³	ʔmẽ¹ʔõ²	sja¹	-ɲa³na³	tsi²	tsu²	ku²-	tse²	-na³	//
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 ti¹nda¹ʰɲa³ ʔmẽ¹ʔõ² ʔa²ku² ʰngu² to²ne¹ le² ʃʰe¹ / (IXC_LEA_CONV_03_JSB-RRM_146)

tʃi²ka²	ti¹nda¹ʰɲa³	ʔmẽ¹ʔõ²	ʔa²ku²	ʰngu²	to²ne¹	la²	ʃʰe¹	/
tʃi²ka²	ti¹nda¹ʰɲa³	ʔmẽ¹ʔõ²	ʔa²ku²	ʰngu²	to²ne¹	la²	ʃʰe¹	/
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 ki¹nda²tʃu²e³na² ʔu²je³ // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_039)

aj	ki¹nda²ʧu²e³na²			ʔu²je³		//
aj	ki¹=	nda²ʧu²e³	-na²	ʔu²-	je³	//
INTJ	PROG.3SG-	behind	-FOC	CLF.AN-	snake	//
EXCLM	TAM.PNG	SPCF.SPC	PTL	AFFX	N	//

Oh, the snake is behind (him)!

ndi²la² si¹nga² nde²hi²βa² si¹hi³ ndi²la² tsu²ʔa²na²βa² tse²nde¹ʔe²βa² // (IXC_LEA_CONV_04_JSB-RRM_052)

ndi²la²	si¹nga²	nde²hi²βa²		si¹hi³	ndi²la²	tsu²ʔa²na²βa²				tse²nde¹ʔe²βa²		//
ndi²la²	si¹nga²	nde²hi²	-βa²	si¹hi³	ndi²la²	tsu²	-ʔa²	-na²	-βa²	tse²nde¹ʔe²	-βa²	//
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, *–mi²* , 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 *–mi²*, 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. *mi²-nda²wa²* 'man', *mi²-ʧʔa²* 'woman', *ʧa²h-mi²* '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 ixcatèque. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 109(1): 373–396.

Adamou, Evangelia & Denis Costaouec. 2013. El complementante *la* en ixcateco: 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.