



---

Ayutla Mixtec, Just in Case

Author(s): Robert A. Hills and William R. Merrifield

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Oct., 1974), pp. 283-291

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1265003>

Accessed: 29/08/2010 02:47

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of American Linguistics*.

## AYUTLA MIXTEC, JUST IN CASE

ROBERT A. HILLS AND WILLIAM R. MERRIFIELD

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS

0. Introduction
1. Agent
2. Patient
3. Source and goal
4. Instrument
5. Experiencer
6. Summary

0. This paper presents in brief outline the major ways in which certain semantic case relations are realized in the (surface) syntactic structure of Ayutla Mixtec.<sup>1</sup> It attempts to apply certain insights expressed in a number of articles by Fillmore<sup>2</sup> on this

<sup>1</sup> Ayutla Mixtec is spoken in the state of Guerrero, Mexico. Robert Hills began fieldwork in the town of Tepango in January 1972 and has profited greatly from the extensive field notes and personal guidance given him by Leo Pankratz to whom grateful acknowledgment is hereby expressed. This study was carried out in collaboration with William Merrifield at the linguistic center of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Mitla, Oaxaca, Mexico, in the fall of 1972. The principal informant during this period was Sr. Cresencio Martínez of Tepango. The orthography used is that presented in L. Pankratz and E. V. Pike, "Phonology and Morphotonemics of Ayutla Mixtec," *IJAL* 33 (1967): 287-99, except that tone is indicated as follows: low tone (unmarked), mid tone by a grave accent (˘), and high tone by an acute accent (´).

<sup>2</sup> C. Fillmore, "A Proposal Concerning English Prepositions," *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* 19 (1966): 19-33; "The Case for Case," in *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, ed. E. Bach and R. Harms (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968); "Types of Lexical Information," in *Semantics*, ed. D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969); "The Grammar of 'Hitting' and 'Breaking'," in *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, ed. R. Jacobs and P.

subject, as well as those of Grimes.<sup>3</sup> The approach taken here to semantic study is that recently expressed by Hockett:

In descriptive analysis, [Bloomfield] pointed out that the procedure must always be to go from form to meaning . . . If we try to go from meaning to form we are fooling ourselves. We are, in fact, really interpreting all languages as though they were at tap bottom just like Latin, or at bottom just like English—a hundred years ago it was Latin, now it is English—or at bottom just like some other point of departure of languages whose workings we have most thoroughly internalized.<sup>4</sup>

To be valid for a particular language, a semantic category must have relevance to the understanding of the syntactic structure of that language. We have thus taken the suggestion that certain case relations—agent, experiencer, instrument, patient, source, goal—are useful categories for the description of language and have made a preliminary search through Mixtec structure to see how they may help in the description of Mixtec. We have not tried to be innovative, but within the bounds of our study, at least one point emerges that

---

Rosenbaum (Waltham, Mass.: Ginn & Co., 1970); "Some Problems for Case Grammar," *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* 24 (1971): 35-36; and "Verbs of Judging: An Exercise in Semantic Description," in *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, ed. C. Fillmore and T. Langendoen (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971).

<sup>3</sup> J. Grimes, "The Thread of Discourse," National Science Foundation Technical Report no. 1 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972).

<sup>4</sup> C. Hockett, "What Next in Linguistics?" (Paper delivered at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Campus, Chicago, Illinois, May 10, 1972).

[*IJAL*, vol. 40, no. 4, pt. 1, October 1974, pp. 283-91]  
© 1974 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

seems worthy of further investigation; namely, that the difference between some of the cases proposed may, at least in some languages, be handled as a difference in the semantics of predicates, rather than as differences of case. In particular, source and goal may differ only in the polarity of the predicator with which they occur, and experiencer may be nothing other than patient collocated with a "psychological event" or "mental state" verb.

The cases are discussed below in the order they tend to occur following a predicator in the surface syntax of Mixtec: Agent, Patient, Source and Goal, and Instrument. The exception to this is Experiencer, which is discussed last.

1. Agent: the problem of defining this case is left unresolved by Fillmore, who says only that an agent is the "instigator" of an action. Grimes further states that the agent "performs" the action, and that causative agents need not be considered distinct from agents in general.<sup>5</sup>

An agent, in Mixtec, normally occurs as the first constituent following a predicate (though not every constituent in first position is an agent). Sentences (1) and (2) are typical agentive sentences.

(1) *kasa<sup>2</sup>a-ra tēi make-he chair, He will make a chair.*

(2) *šiká<sup>2</sup>-ra ičí<sup>2</sup> walks-he path, He is walking along the path.*

Not all verbs occur with agents, but an agent may be introduced by the use of one of two agentive verbs, *saa* *make, do* or *čip'i* *thrust in*. *Saa* may have a clause like that of (3) as complement, as in (4), with the embedded clause always preceding it. The embedded clause may be nonagentive, as in

(4), or it may be agentive, as in (5). In either case, this use of *saa* has the effect of adding a causative agent, which, following Grimes and Frantz, we consider to be the same semantically as other agents.

(3) *yí<sup>2</sup>ví pélú afraid Peter, Peter is afraid.*

(4) *yí<sup>2</sup>ví pélú nišaa bétú afraid Peter make Bob, Bob made Peter afraid.*

(5) *nidava-ra nišaa bétú ran-he made Bob, Bob made him run.*

The class of clauses which may be embedded as complements of *saa* in this manner is a very large class. A more restricted set of verbs occurs with a phonologically reduced form of *saa* as a derivational prefix. The derivational use of *saa*, as one might expect, results in forms which tend to be semantically exocentric; and though it is possible to see the addition of an agent in each case, it is usually not just an agent that is added, but also an idiosyncratic shift of meaning in the derived verb. Three pairs of sentences will illustrate this construction. They show that the basic verbs may themselves be agentive or not.

(6) *yí<sup>2</sup>ví bétú afraid Bob, Bob is afraid.*

(7) *sa-yí<sup>2</sup>ví-ra bétú make-afraid-he Bob, He will frighten Bob.*

(8) *kaší<sup>2</sup>-ra čitya eat-he banana, He will eat a banana.*

(9) *sa-kaší<sup>2</sup>-ra bétú čitya make-eat-he Bob banana, He will feed Bob a banana.*

(10) *kunu-ra flee-he, He will flee.*

(11) *sa-kunu-ra bétú make-flee-he Bob, He will chase Bob.*

*Čip'i* is also used derivationally, in reduced phonological form, in a way similar to *saa*, but with a different, closed set of forms, both nouns and verbs. Three pairs of examples illustrate this use.

(12) *ikí<sup>2</sup>-a<sup>2</sup> bone-she, her bone.*

(13) *či-ikí<sup>2</sup>-ra-a<sup>2</sup> thrust-bone-he-she, He punched her.*

(14) *da<sup>2</sup>á<sup>2</sup>-ra hand-he, his hand.*

(15) *niči-da<sup>2</sup>á<sup>2</sup>-ra tēi past-thrust-hand-he chair, He pushed the chair.*

<sup>5</sup> Following D. Frantz, *Toward a Generative Grammar of Blackfoot*, Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, no. 34 (Norman, Okla.: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1971).

- (16) *dyee<sup>2</sup>-ra strong-he, He is strong.*  
 (17) *niči-dyee<sup>2</sup> tàta<sup>2</sup>-ra past-thrust-strong  
 medicine-he, The medicine strengthened  
 him.*

2. Patient: Grimes considers this the unmarked case that "tells who or what is affected by an action," that which is "changed or moved, depending upon the meaning of the predicate."<sup>6</sup> Fillmore's definition is similar, though he prefers the label "object," a term which we avoid here because of its common use as a surface-structure category.

In Mixtec, there are several kinds of predicators which are nonagentive and which take patients as the first argument following them. The simplest examples are those of stative verbs like those of (18).

- (18) *ndakú-ra straight-he, He is at atten-  
 tion.*  
*va<sup>2</sup>a-ra good-he, He is good.*  
*šiša-ra old-he, He is old.*

Active verbs may also be nonagentive and have patients as their first argument (19).

- (19) *nikųų mángú ti-kaa<sup>2</sup> fell mango  
 animal-that, The mango fell on the  
 animal.*

In an equative construction, the Mixtec "be" verb serves merely as a vehicle for marking aspect. This verb also takes a patient in first position, as in (20).

- (20) *te-čųų dúú-ra man-work is-he, He is  
 the president.*

Agentive predicators take patients in the second position, following the agent, as in (21).

- (21) *ndasi-ra ye<sup>2</sup>é<sup>2</sup> close-he door, He will  
 close the door.*  
*nisata<sup>2</sup>-ra rádúú bought he radio, He  
 bought a radio.*

Certain predicators allow object-incorporation which has the effect of changing

the order of clause elements. In object incorporation, the patient is made to follow the predicator immediately as a part of the verb phrase. Adverbial elements may follow an incorporated patient, giving evidence that it is indeed part of the verb phrase, as in (22), which is synonymous with (23).

- (22) *nisuku<sup>2</sup> ářó-ka bétú nùú<sup>2</sup> yivi<sup>2</sup> fell  
 rice-again Bob face mat, Bob thrashed  
 rice again onto the mat.*  
 (23) *nisuku<sup>2</sup>-ka bétú ářó nùú<sup>2</sup> yivi<sup>2</sup> fell-  
 again Bob rice face mat, Bob again  
 thrashed rice onto the mat.*

Of the several Mixtec verbs of impingement, there is at least one which presents the same kind of problem for analysis as Fillmore finds in English with what he calls verbs of "impact" and of "pressure" like *hit* and *push*.<sup>7</sup> This is the verb cited in (22) and (23). It may occur with or without an agent but always requires a patient and a goal, as in (24) and (25).

- (24) *nisuku<sup>2</sup> itú<sup>2</sup> pélú fell wood Peter, The  
 tree fell on Peter.*  
 (25) *nisuku<sup>2</sup>-ra itú<sup>2</sup> pélú fell-he wood  
 Peter, He hit Peter with a stick of wood.*

Though in (25), *itú<sup>2</sup>* translates like an instrument, it is a patient, both syntactically—it occurs in second position following the predicator—and semantically. A more literal translation of (25) might be *He cause that the wood fell on Peter*. On the other hand, its clear affinity to an instrument is recognized in Mixtec by the fact that the instrument constituent of the clause may be in coreference with it. Thus, *itú<sup>2</sup>* may occur twice in the clause with the verb of impingement, once as patient and once as instrument, with reference to the same entity. Sentence (26) is synonymous with (25).

- (26) *nisuku<sup>2</sup>-ra itú<sup>2</sup> pélú šjǐ<sup>2</sup> itú<sup>2</sup> fell-he  
 wood Peter with wood, He hit Peter  
 with a stick of wood.*

<sup>6</sup> Grimes, pp. 148ff.

<sup>7</sup> Fillmore, "Some Problems for Case Grammar," pp. 45ff.

The patient is not always coreferential with instrument with this verb, as is attested by sentences (27) and (28).

- (27) nisuku<sup>?</sup>-ra-ri<sup>?</sup> ñu<sup>?</sup>ú<sup>?</sup> šj<sup>?</sup> itú<sup>?</sup> *fell-he-animal ground with wood, He knocked the animal to the ground with a stick.*  
 (28) nisuku<sup>?</sup>-ra itú<sup>?</sup> ñu<sup>?</sup>ú<sup>?</sup> šj<sup>?</sup> itú<sup>?</sup> *fell-he wood ground with wood, He knocked the tree to the ground with a stick.*

In his desire to account for the largest possible number of verbs with the least number of cases, Fillmore considered *cane* a patient in *John pushed against the wall with his cane*. This may seem somewhat counterintuitive to some, but the Mixtec data also yield to this kind of interpretation.

3. Source and goal: according to Fillmore, "depending on the type of predicator the source and goal are interpreted as earlier and later locations, earlier and later states, or earlier and later time points . . . A 'sentence' embedded as goal . . . is one which identifies the resulting state or event in a causative construction."<sup>8</sup>

The distinction between source and goal in Mixtec is a matter of polarity in the semantics of particular predicators. Consider sentences (29) and (30).

- (29) niketa-ra vi<sup>?</sup>e-ra *left-he house-he, He left his house.*  
 (30) dí<sup>?</sup>ví-ra vi<sup>?</sup>e-ra *enters-he house-he, He enters his house.*

Verbs of motion occur with a constituent which in most contexts is taken as goal, but which in other contexts, where a different goal is made explicit, is taken as source. Thus in (31), *yé<sup>?</sup>é<sup>?</sup> Acapulco* might be taken as goal, but in (32), it is clearly source.

- (31) nikiši-ra yé<sup>?</sup>é<sup>?</sup> *He came to Acapulco.*  
 (32) nikiši-ra yé<sup>?</sup>é<sup>?</sup>, nišaa-ra *He came from Acapulco and arrived here.*

Certain verbs which do not themselves imply motion and, therefore, do not nor-

mally occur with source or goal, may occur with one or the other when modified by a motion verb as auxiliary. Sentence (33) illustrates the use of such a verb, sentence (34) that of a typical motion verb, and sentence (35) that of the modified non-motion verb of (33). When motion verbs occur as auxiliaries, they occur in a phonologically reduced form, as can be seen by a comparison of (34) and (35).<sup>9</sup>

- (33) kuši bétú išta<sup>?</sup> *eat Bob tortillas, Bob will eat the tortillas.*  
 (34) kù<sup>?</sup>ʔ bétú vi<sup>?</sup>e pélú *go Bob house Peter, Bob will go to Peter's house.*  
 (35) kʏ-kuši bétú išta<sup>?</sup> vi<sup>?</sup>e pélú *go-eat Bob tortillas house Peter, Bob will go eat the tortillas at Peter's house.*

Next, consider sentences (36) and (37).

- (36) nisata<sup>?</sup> bétú ñunu<sup>?</sup> nù<sup>?</sup> pélú *bought Bob bag face Peter, Bob bought a net bag from Peter.*  
 (37) nišiko<sup>?</sup> bétú ñunu<sup>?</sup> nù<sup>?</sup> pélú *sold Bob bag face Peter, Bob sold a net bag to Peter.*

Semantically, source and goal are both present in each of the sentences. Only one, however, in each case, occupies the position in the sentence syntactically marking it as either goal or source. The other constituent, in each case, is simultaneously an agent as well as source or goal and takes on the syntactic garb of an agent; namely, it occurs in first position after the predicate.

The normal syntactic position for source and goal is third position after the predicate, following agent and patient, as can be seen in (34) and (35). A further characteristic of source and goal is that they often occur with one of the subclass of possessed nouns which name body parts, but which, in these cases, have a prepositionlike function. Particular verbs have specific limita-

<sup>9</sup> For a fuller treatment of verbs of motion in a related Mixtec language, see A. Kuiper and W. Merrifield, "Diuxi Mixtec Verbs of Motion and Arriving" (1972).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., pp. 41-42.

tions regarding which nouns function with them in this way. The verb of (38) and (39) requires *daʔáʔ* *hand* with nouns of source which name certain kinds of entities, but *nùʔ* *face* with others. The verb of (40), on the other hand, requires no noun at all in this prepositional function.

(38) *nitaši pélú tòto daʔáʔ bétú gave Peter clothes hand Bob, Peter gave the clothes to Bob.*

(39) *nitaši pélú kwétú núʔ bétú gave Peter story face Bob, Peter told Bob the story.*

(40) *nisamaniʔ pélú bétú tòto gifted Peter Bob clothes, Peter gave Bob the clothes as a gift.*

Verbs of striking are like the verb of (40) in not requiring a prepositionlike noun with goal. Such a noun is taken literally, as a body part, when occurring with such a verb. This is illustrated in sentences (41) and (42).

(41) *nikuy-<sup>ra</sup> yùʔ bétú struck-he rock Bob, He hit Bob with a rock.*

(42) *nikuy-<sup>ra</sup> yùʔ núʔ bétú struck-he rock face Bob, He hit Bob in the face with a rock.*

4. Instrument: this is the case of the “immediate cause of an event, or, in the case of a psychological predicator, the ‘stimulus’, the thing reacted to.”<sup>10</sup> Grimes further suggests that it “represents something that is used inanimately to perform an action . . . It stands in a causal relation to the action. Just as the agent and experiencer roles attribute animateness to anything in those relationships, instrument attributes inanimateness, so that if a person, for example, is used as instrument, that person’s body as a passive object is meant rather than his active collaboration.”<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Fillmore, “Some Problems for Case Grammar,” p. 41.

<sup>11</sup> Grimes, pp. 151–52.

The instrument normally occurs in the fourth position following the predicator and may be preceded by agent, patient, or goal constituents. (The predicator, however, is rarely found with more than two or three arguments in any one sentence.) In this position, the instrument always occurs with preposed *šjʃʔ* *with*.<sup>12</sup> Sentences (43) through (45) illustrate the occurrence of instruments with other clause constituents. As the examples show, an agent is always present when there is an instrument.

(43) *AgIn: nišika te-šiša šjʃʔ itúʔ walked he-old with wood, The old man walked with a cane.*

(44) *AgGoIn: nikuy-<sup>ra</sup>-riʔ šjʃʔ yùʔ hit-he-animal with stone, He hit the animal with a stone.*

(45) *AgPaGoIn: kuy-naʔ-i-aʔ ñaʔmi viʔe-aʔ šjʃʔ ñunuʔ-aʔ go-take-she yam house-her with bag-her, She will carry yams to her house in her bag.*

As in the case of patients, an instrument may be incorporated into the verb phrase. Apart from matters of focus, sentence (46) is essentially synonymous with (45).

(46) *kuy-naʔ-i šjʃʔ ñunuʔ-aʔ ñaʔmi viʔe-aʔ go-carry with bag-she yams house-her, She will carry in her net bag yams to her house.*

It was mentioned in 2 above that the instrument may be coreferential with a patient with certain verbs of impingement. A further example is given in (47). It is synonymous with (44).

(47) *nikuy-<sup>ra</sup> yùʔ-riʔ šjʃʔ yùʔ hit-he stone-animal with stone, He hit the animal with a stone.*

As all the foregoing illustrations show, an instrument is usually clearly marked by the occurrence of *šjʃʔ* *with*. When incorporated into the verb phrase, however, it is possible in at least some instances to

<sup>12</sup> As with other prepositionlike elements in Mixtec, *šjʃ* is derived from the name of a part of the body: *šjʃʔ* *side*.

suppress šjjʔ, as in (48), which is essentially synonymous with (49).

- (48) *nikʷu martiyu-ra kaa nùʔ itúʔ hit hammer-he nail face wood, He drove the nail into the wood with a hammer.*  
 (49) *nikʷu šjjʔ martiyu-ra kaa nùʔ itúʔ hit with hammer-he nail face wood, He drove the nail into the wood with a hammer.*

Not all occurrences of šjjʔ *with* mark the instrumental case. It has at least two other uses, the most frequent of which is co-ordination, as in (50) through (52).

- (50) *vaši-ra yéʔéʔ šjjʔ bétú came-he Acapulco with Bob, He and Bob have come to Acapulco.*  
 (51) *nidiʔvi-ra šjjʔ bétú viʔe kaa entered-he with Bob house iron, He and Bob went to jail.*  
 (52) *šaʔniʔ-ra ikwá šjjʔ yani-ra killed-he John with brother-he, He killed John and his brother.*

When semantically coordinate with another constituent of a sentence, a šjjʔ phrase may occupy the fourth position after the predicate (i.e., following source), as in (50), or it may be shunted to immediately follow the constituent with which it is coordinate, as in (51). Both (50) and (51) illustrate coordination of the agent constituent. In (52), there is a conjoined patient.

As mentioned above, šjjʔ is only one of several nouns which have a prepositional function. Other nouns of this set occur frequently in the third position following the predicator, marking source or goal. Šjjʔ may also occur in this way. A comparison of sentences (53) and (54) illustrates the difference between the use of šjjʔ to mark goal and instrument.

- (53) *saa saa-i šjjʔ bétú what? do-I with Bob, What shall I do to/for/with Bob?*  
 (54) *saa saa-ʷʔ šjjʔ martiyu what? do-you with hammer, What will you do with the hammer?*

Sentence (53) may not normally be interpreted as including an instrument because of the animateness of bétú, but it does ambiguously include either a goal or a conjoined agent. Conversely, if inanimate, a šjjʔ phrase may ambiguously mark a goal or instrument, as in (55).

- (55) *saa saa-ʷʔ šjjʔ hamaika what? do-you with jamaica, What will you do to/with the jamaica plant?*

5. Experiencer: this case is inevitably defined by investigators in relation to “psychological event” or “mental state” verbs, and sentences like (56) and (57) seem to support the view that some case other than agent is needed, since the subject of (57) combines two role relationships, that of agent as well as that of the subject of (56).

- (56) *I heard what he said.*  
 (57) *I listened to what he said.*

Grimes reports that perception and psychological involvement “involve a role that is neither Agent or Patient,”<sup>13</sup> but he does not document the contrast between experiencer and patient as he does between experiencer and agent. Fillmore distinguishes patient and experiencer on the basis of the kind of verb involved: “Where there is a genuine psychological event or mental state verb, we have the Experiencer; where there is a nonpsychological verb, we have the Object”<sup>14</sup>—what we here term patient.

<sup>13</sup> Grimes, p. 151.

<sup>14</sup> Fillmore, “Some Problems for Case Grammar,” p. 42. Frantz (n. 5 above) apparently also had a problem in working with experiencer and patient in his work on Blackfoot. His definitions are as follows: Patient: “the entity which is affected (in a very broad sense) by the predication, but for which animateness of the entity is not a prerequisite (the reason for the latter qualification is to distinguish [patient] from experiencer . . .).” Experiencer: “the participant which is affected by or undergoes the predication; the ‘experience’ must be of a kind ascribed only to animate entities.” Since Frantz does not use concepts like

At this early stage of analysis, we do not wish to prejudge the case; but, on the basis of our initial examination of Mixtec, in which we find that the same rules needed to account for the surface realizations of patients appear adequate for what we might otherwise consider to be experiencers, we tentatively consider the difference between the “two” cases to be centered in the semantic structure of verbs with which they occur and that as cases they may be considered one and the same. The discussion of our findings will focus on several “psychological” verbs and will proceed by taking up one verb at a time, beginning with *yíʔví* *fear*. Consider sentences (58) and (59). (58) *káʔnúʔ yóʔó big you, You are important.*

(59) *yíʔví yóʔó afraid you, You are afraid.*

There seems to be no interesting grammatical difference between the two sentences except to make the observation that the subject of *big* is usually considered a patient, while that of *fear* is usually thought of as an experiencer. Either sentence can undergo certain transformations. Thus, for example, an agent can be added to either by the use of *saa do* (1 above), as in (60) and (61).

(60) *sa-káʔnúʔ-ra yóʔó make-big-he you, He will honor you.*

(61) *sa-yíʔví-ra yóʔó make-afraid-he you, He will frighten you.*

It would seem that for *yíʔví*, it is sufficient to postulate a semantic predicate which we will name SENSE-FEAR, in which the idea of experience is a part of the meaning of the predicate itself, thereby allowing us to consider its subject to be a patient parallel to that of a predicate like BE-BIG with which the verb *káʔnúʔ* is associated. Consider now sentences (62) through (65).

(62) *iyo-ra afraid-he, He is afraid.*

(63) *yíʔví-ra afraid-he, He is afraid.*

(64) *yíʔví-ra te-kaaʔ fear-he he-that, He will fear that man.*

(65) *niyiʔvi-ra kaka-ra feared-he walk-he, He was afraid to walk.*

The predicate SENSE-FEAR is here seen to be associated with two lexical items, in an intransitive stative<sup>15</sup> verb *iyo*, as well as *yíʔví* which is now seen to be active and transitive. The case frame for SENSE-FEAR includes [\_\_\_\_ + Patient ( + Source)], with the further specification that either the patient or its possessor be animate. This latter situation—that of an animate possessor of the patient—occurs in figurative usage only, as illustrated by sentences (66) and (67).

(66) *yíʔví ini-ra kàʔa-ra šjʔ betú fear center-he speak-he with Bob, He is afraid to converse with Bob.*

(67) *yíʔví dučʔiʔ nùʔ-ra koto-ra nùʔ ñuʔu fear beans face-he (i.e., his eyes) look-he face sun, He cannot look at the sun.*

We have assumed that the case relation of the second argument in the above sentence is source. This is important to the question of whether or not the first argument can be considered a patient, since someone might wish to suggest the case frame [\_\_\_\_ + Experiencer ( + Patient)] as an alternative to that which we have proposed above for SENSE-FEAR. It could be argued that definitions proposed to date for source—with reference in most contexts to motion or a change of state of some sort—do not cover the contexts being considered here. Since the definitions are incomplete and incorrect in any case, this does not seem to be an insurmountable problem. In fact, the close relationship of

<sup>15</sup> A stative verb is one which may not be inflected directly for potential, continuative, or completive aspect. An active verb may be so inflected, though not all active verbs may be inflected for all three.

“psychological event” in his definition, it is not clear how he would distinguish between experiencer and patient in the case of an animate entity.



source and goal, which we consider to differ only as to polarity, is particularly felicitous to the analysis of complements like those of the psychological verbs of (56) and (57), since the addition of an agent in (57) seems to add a new role to the complement as well, both source and goal!

Mixtec has a generic verb of "sensing" whose semantic content encompasses knowledge or perception received through any of the senses. Inflected for aspect, it has the following forms: *kuni* (*potential*), *šíní* (*continuative*), and *nišini* (*completive*). In sentences (68) through (72), there is no explicit reference to the particular sense through which perception is attained, though the object perceived in some cases (esp. 70–72) leaves little doubt.

- (68) *šíní-ra tuʔu saʔaʔ senses-he word Spanish, He understands Spanish.*  
 (69) *kuni-ra yoo dúú te-yíviʔ sense-he who is he-person, He will learn who it is.*  
 (70) *nišini-ra saa káʔá-ra sensed-he how talks-he, He heard how he talks.*  
 (71) *šíní-ra saa šáʔá-a senses-he how smells-it, He perceives how it smells.*  
 (72) *kuni-ra àsiʔ-a sense-he delicious-it, He will realize it is delicious.*

It is possible to make explicit which sense is involved in perception by encoding the name of the member associated with a particular sense as a possessed noun subject whose name possessor is the experiencer. Sentences (73) through (76) are semantically equivalent to (69) through (72), except that they explicitly mark the particular sense involved in each case.

- (73) *kuni nùuʔ-ra yoo dúú te-yíviʔ sense face-he who is he-person.*  
 (74) *nišini sòʔo-ra saa káʔá-ra sensed ear-he how talks-he.*  
 (75) *šíní istjʔ-ra saa šáʔ á-a senses nose-he how smells-it.*  
 (76) *kuni yaa-ra àsiʔ-a sense tongue-he delicious-it.<sup>16</sup>*

<sup>16</sup> In (76), *yuʔúʔ* *mouth* may substitute for *yaa*.

The analysis given above for SENSE-FAEAR seems equally adequate for the more general verb as well. The semantic predicate associated with the latter, which we will name SENSE, can thus be considered to have the case frame [\_\_\_\_ + Patient, + Source]. The meaning of the predicate itself results in the patient being interpreted as an experiencer.

This argument can be illustrated further by the use of the intransitive stative verb *iʔníʔ* *hot*. Consider sentences (77) through (80).

- (77) *iʔníʔ-ra hot-he, He is hot.*  
 (78) *iʔníʔ nùuʔ-ra hot face-he, His face is hot.*  
 (79) *iʔníʔ šíní-ra hot senses-he, He feels hot.*  
 (80) *iʔníʔ šíní nùuʔ-ra hot senses face-he, His face feels hot.*

In (77) and (78), the subject clearly is, in each case, a patient. The person, or his face, is hot to the touch. In (79) and (80), however, heat is something sensed apart from touch—in (79) by a certain individual, in (80) by an individual with the sensation being localized in just one part of his anatomy. Sentences (79) and (80) are syntactically constituted of the verb *iʔníʔ* functioning as modifier of *šíní*, and are semantically constituted of a predicate BE-HOT functioning as source of the predicate SENSE. Either the patient of SENSE or its possessor must be [+ Animate]. Sentence (81) is acceptable, but (82) is not.

- (81) *iʔníʔ soʔo kaa hot ear metal, The metal container's handle is hot.*  
 (82) *\*iʔníʔ šíní soʔo kaa hot feels ear metal, The metal container's handle feels hot.*

The concept of "thirst" is usually considered to involve an experiencer, but consider the following sentences.

- (83) *šíkáʔ-ra walks-he, He is walking.*  
 (84) *iʔči-ra dry-he, He is dry.*  
 (85) *šíkáʔ ini-ra walks-he center-he, He is sobbing.*

(86) *iʔčí ini-ra dry center-he, He is thirsty.*

The subject of *šíkáʔ*, an active intransitive verb, is an agent, that of *iʔčí*, a stative intransitive verb, a patient. The noun *ini center*, one of two Mixtec nouns used to refer to the seat of the emotions, is figuratively introduced as a patient in (86) to produce the indirect semantic effect of an experiencer. It is not entirely clear, but the subject of (85) apparently remains an agent.

As a final example of verbs which are usually associated with an experiencer, we may consider *kuni want*. It occurs both transitively and intransitively, as in (87) through (90).

(87) *kúni jj pésú wants one peso, One peso is needed.*

(88) *nikuni kùʔu-ra yaʔvi wanted go-he market, He needed to go to the market.*

(89) *kúni-ra jj pésú wants-he one peso, He wants one peso.*

(90) *nikuni-ra kùʔu-ra yaʔvi wanted-he go-he market, He wanted to go to the market.*

The subject of (87) and (88) is here considered, in each case, a goal (or source?)

and that of (89) and (90) a patient. For the purpose of our analysis of Mixtec, we have discovered no grammatical or semantic significance to the fact that a "need" might in some instances be of a psychological nature.

6. This paper has explored the ways in which certain semantic case relations are realized in the surface structure of Ayutla Mixtec. It was found that agents tend to follow the predicator in first position, followed by patients, source or goal, and instrument, in that order. Source and goal are found to differ only in what may be considered polarity in the semantic structure of predicates, and experiencer seems easily identified with patients in the context of verbs which have to do with psychological events or mental states. Though the study is only preliminary in nature, the strong similarities between source and goal, and between experiencer and patient, suggest that the possibility of these cases being equatable in languages other than Mixtec should be a matter for further investigation.