## Direct affix borrowing: Evidence from two Mayan perfect suffixes

James Tandy (University of Texas at Austin) Keywords: Mayan languages, contact, morphology, participles

This paper will discuss the phenomenon of direct affix borrowing with reference to two suffixes, -bil and - $ma\chi$ , which mark the perfect participle in several Mayan languages of Mesoamerica. Direct affix borrowing is assumed to be rare crosslinguistically; affixes are normally thought to diffuse indirectly by way of loanwords (Weinreich 1953, Winford 2005). However, distributional evidence shows that -bil and - $ma\chi$  spread through direct affix borrowing over a wide area. I will show how linguistic and social factors permitted this normally rare type of borrowing to happen so widely. This research will contribute to our knowledge of when and how morphological borrowing can occur.

The first suffix considered here is -bil, which creates a perfect participle of transitive verbs in many Mayan languages. Due to its wide distribution, Kaufman (2015) reconstructs \*-bil to proto-Mayan. However, the languages that have -bil fall into a contiguous area that is consistent with the Maya Lowlands contact area described in prior literature (Justeson et al. 1985; Law 2014, 2017). Another suffix, -Vm, forms perfect participles in two geographically disconnected subgroups, Wastekan and Eastern Mayan. This suggests that \*-Vm is the older suffix and that -bil later diffused in the Lowlands. As further evidence of contact, the only Eastern Mayan language with participial -bil is Q'eqchi', which also has high levels of lexical borrowing from Lowland languages (Wichmann and Brown 2003).

The second suffix, -max, diffused on a smaller scale within the Eastern Mayan subgroup. I argue that in the Eastern Mayan language Poqom, perfect \*-Vm combined with a passive suffix \*-x, creating the perfect participle suffix -max. -max then spread westward into Uspanteko, Sakapultek, Sipakapense, and northern Mam. These languages fall along a known salt trade route (Hill and Monaghan 1987). In northern Mam, this contact actually led to double-marking of the perfect participle: the regular reflex of proto-Eastern Mayan participial \*-Vm in Mam is -?n (Kaufman 2015), but northern Mam uses -?n interchangeably with -?n-max, where the latter is more emphatic (England 1983). Reinforcing an inherited morpheme with a borrowed morpheme has been observed in other languages (Harris 2017), but the Mam case is distinctive in that both affixes are cognate.

Seifart (2015) proposes that direct and indirect affix borrowing form a scale: both can be involved for a given affix, but may vary in how salient each process is. If the affix appears frequently in loanwords, then this suggests that loanwords were a major vehicle of transfer. However, if the affix is productive with native roots, but there are very few loanwords, this suggests more direct transfer that relies on speakers' knowledge of the donor language affix. In Mayan, -6il and - $ma\chi$  are fully productive in the languages that have them, applying freely to native verb roots. Crucially, this is true in languages like Tsotsil, which has borrowed very few verbs from other Mayan languages (Brown 2009) as well as languages like Q'eqchi' with many loan verbs (Wichmann and Hull 2009). This strongly points to direct affix borrowing.

Structural and social factors in Mayan languages create a plausible environment for this kind of diffusion. Structural similarity between the source and target construction facilitates direct affix borrowing (Winford 2005, Thomason 2015). This condition is met: in all Mayan languages, the perfect participle is expressed by a suffix that attaches directly to the verb root. Recipient language speakers must have some competence in the donor language, beyond knowledge of isolated words (Seifart 2015); this was clearly the case in the Maya Lowlands, since other syntactic patterns have diffused (Law 2014). A factor that can block affix borrowing is language loyalty, which is often signaled through morphology (Matras 2015). Law (2014), in discussing other Lowland areal innovations, suggests that in the Maya area before the Spanish conquest, language boundaries were less salient: one's identity was more closely tied to one's town or larger political unit than to one's language. These factors render direct affix borrowing very plausible in the Maya area.

- Brown, Cecil H. 2009. "Loanwords in Zinacantán Tzotzil, a Mayan language of Mexico." In Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, eds., *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, 848-872. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- England, Nora C. 1983. *A Grammar of Mam, a Mayan language*. Austin: University of Texas Press. Harris, Alice C. 2017. *Multiple exponence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, Robert M. II, and John Monaghan. 1987. *Continuities in Highland Maya Social Organization: Ethnohistory in Sacapulas, Guatemala*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Justeson, John, William Norman, Lyle Campbell, and Terrence Kaufman. 1985. *The foreign impact on lowland Mayan languages and script*. (Middle American Research Institute, publication 53.) New Orleans: Tulane University.
- Kaufman, Terrence. 2015. Mayan Comparative Studies. Unpublished working paper; version July 2015. Available from <a href="https://www.albany.edu/ims/PDLMA\_publications\_new.html">https://www.albany.edu/ims/PDLMA\_publications\_new.html</a> (accessed Feb 18, 2019).
- Law, Danny. 2014. *Language Contact, Inherited Similarity and Social Difference: The story of linguistic interaction in the Maya lowlands*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Law, Danny. 2017. "Language contacts with(in) Mayan." In Judith Aissen, Nora C. England, and Roberto Zavala Maldonado, eds., *The Mayan Languages*, 112-127. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Matras, Yaron. 2015. "Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred?" In Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev, & Nino Amiridze, eds., *Borrowed Morphology*, 47-80. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Seifart, Frank. 2015. "Direct and indirect affix borrowing." Language Vol. 91 No. 3, 511–532.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2015. "When is the diffusion of inflectional morphology not dispreferred?" In Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev, & Nino Amiridze, eds., *Borrowed Morphology*, 27-46. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. Languages in contact. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Wichmann, Søren, and Cecil H. Brown. 2003. "Contact among some Mayan languages: inferences from loanwords." *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 45 No. 1, 57-93.
- Wichmann, Søren, and Kerry Hull. 2009. "Loanwords in Q'eqchi', a Mayan language of Guatemala." In Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor, eds., *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, 873-896. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Winford, Donald. 2005. "Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes." *Diachronica* Vol. 22 No. 2, 373-427.