Content, Expression and Structure

Studies in Danish functional grammar

Edited by Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen,
Michael Fortescue, Peter Harder,
Lars Helftoft and Lisbeth Falster Jakobse

Offprint

Is there a passive in Nahuatl?

Una Canger
University of Copenhagen

1. Introduction

The title of this paper is polemically naive. But a more appropriate one: "Do
we gain or lose by calling a certain construction in Nahuatl a passive? And
what is it that we gain or lose?" is much too long for a title of any short paper.

The passive is a construction that has received no little attention in the last
forty years since Noam Chomsky attempted to teach us that a passive sentence
is a transform from an active sentence. And a number of scholars have since
then dealt cross-linguistically with the passive and related constructions and
have tried — with meagre success — to arrive at a definition of the passive.
Let me quote a few. In the final summary of her book from 1984 Siewierska
finds that:

> The passive may therefore be characterized as a construction:
> a) which has a corresponding active the subject of which does not function as
> the passive subject
> b) the event or action expressed in the passive is brought about by some person
> or thing which is not the passive subject, but the subject of the correspond-
> ing active
> c) the person or thing if not overt is at least strongly implied.
> (Siewierska 1984:256)

and she concludes that:

> The term *passive* can only be valid and useful for purposes of language description
> if it refers to the same type of structure in all languages in which this construction
> is said to be displayed. The discussion here has shown that the constructions called
> passive have very little in common. [...] Whether the three properties that they
> share warrant a common passive label is debatable.
> (Siewierska 1984:259)

Shibatani comments that:

> the familiar controversy over whether a given construction should be considered passive is pointless; rather, a description must be offered in terms of how such a construction is similar to or different from the prototypical passive.
>
> (Shibatani 1985:822)

and in the article he constantly returns to "defocusing of an agent" as "the primary pragmatic function of the passive prototype".

The aims of the present paper are twofold: first I wish to demonstrate that Nahuatl spoken in the 16th century did not have a passive. The Nahuatl constructions which are traditionally called passive and impersonal are more appropriately described — not as impersonals — but as having an unspecifiable subject; and in fact, the traditional distinction between passives and impersonals is mainly confusing.

To my knowledge, no one — neither typologists (Siewierska 1984) nor specialists of Nahuatl (Olmos 1547; Carochi 1645; Andrews 1975; Launey 1976, 1979, 1986; Langacker 1976, 1977; Langacker & Munro 1975) — has seriously questioned the existence of passive in Nahuatl. However, formulations such as "no specifiable referent in the nonlinguistic world" (Andrews 1975:79), "effacement du sujet" (Launey, e.g. 1981:21), etc. are commonly found; it is therefore surprising that this insight has led no one to take the final step.

Secondly, as a corollary to the first aim, I wish to suggest that we reserve the term passive for the best known, but apparently exceptional constructions, namely those that include an optional agent.

2. The situation in Nahuatl from the 16th century

In Nahuatl, nouns are not marked for case. Verbs are with prefixes marked for person and number of subject and object (see Table 1). The marking is obligatory and thus occurs also when a nominal subject and object are present in the clause.[1]

(1)   *ni-yo:li*
         1SG:SUBJ-live
         'I live'

Table 1: *Subject and object prefixes in 16th century Nahuatl*

	SUBJECT	OBJECT
SG		
1.	ni-	ne:č-
2.	ti-	mič-
3.	Ø	ki-, te:-, λa-
PL		
1.	ti- .. '	te:č-
2.	am- .. '	ame:č-
3.	Ø .. '	kim-

(2)   *Ø-yo:li-'*   in   *či:či:me:ka-'*
         3:SUBJ-live-PL:SUBJ the   Chichimec-PL
         'the Chichimecs (they) live'

(3)   *ti-yo:li-'*
         1PL:SUBJ-live-PL:SUBJ
         'we live'

(4)   *ni-k-itta*   in   *koyo:λ*
         1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-see   the   coyote
         'I see (it) the coyote'

(5)   *Ø-ne:č-itta-'*   in   *či:či:me:ka-'*
         3:SUBJ-1SG:OBJ-see-PL:SUBJ   the   Chichimec-PL
         'the Chichimecs see me'

The distinction between intransitive and transitive is an important feature in the language; a transitive verb **must** have an object prefix. If there is no specifiable object one of two prefixes occurs, *te:-* 'human', *λa-* 'nonhuman':

(6)   *ni-te:-itta*
         1SG:SUBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:HUM-see
         'I see (humans)'

(7)   *ni-λa-kʷa*
         1SG:SUBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-eat
         'I eat'

The independent words meaning 'something', *iλa'*, and 'someone', *aka'*, are — as opposed to *te:-* and *λa-* — syntactically specifiable and demand the regular 3. person singular specifying object prefix:

(8)   *kʷiš*   *iλa'*   *ti-k-kʷa*
      QUESTION   something   2SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-eat
      'do you eat something?'

There is only one set of specifying object prefixes; the object marking thus gives no evidence for distinguishing between indirect and direct object:

(9)   *ni-k-λa-maka*   *no-ta'ćin*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-give   1SG:POSS-father
      'I give (him/her) my father "things"'

(10) *ni-k-te:-maka*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:HUM-give   the   flower
      'I give (it) the flower away'

According to an exceptionless rule only one specifying object marker is permitted per verb. If there are two specifiable objects, only one of them is marked on the verb:

(11) *Ø-ne:č-Ø-maka*   *no-ta'ćin*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
      3:SUBJ-1SG:OBJ-3SG:OBJ-give   1SG:POSS-father   the   flower
      '(he/she) my father gives me the flower'

(12) *ni-k-Ø-maka*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*   *no-ta'ćin*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-3SG:OBJ-give   the   flower   1SG:POSS-father
      'I give (it) the flower to my father'

Maka 'give' is a ditransitive verb, and the **absence** of an unspecifying object prefix (*te:-* or *λa-*) in examples (11) and (12) indicates that both objects are specifiable; nothing in the language indicates a distinction between our concepts of direct and indirect object, but if a first or second person object co-occurs with a third person object, then third person yields to first or second person. Since two specifying object prefixes never co-occur in one verb form, the place of the *Ø* is arbitrary, and example (11) may just as well be written this way: *Ø-Ø-ne:č-maka*. Table 1, which shows positions of the prefixes, should probably have one more position for the other object that just never appears.

A nominal object may be incorporated, appearing in the position immediately preceding the verb; the restrictions on object prefixes do not apply to an

incorporated object, so in ditransitive verbs it may co-occur with a specifying object prefix:

(13) *ni-k-šo:či-maka*   *no-ta'ćin*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-flower-give   1SG:POSS-father
      'I give (him/her) flowers to my father'

There is also a set of reflexive prefixes which have their position after the specifying object prefixes and before *te:-* and *λa-*:

(14) *ni-no-mik-tia*
      1SG:SUBJ-1SG:REFL-die-CAUS
      'I kill myself'

(15) *Ø-mo-mik-tia*
      3:SUBJ-3SG:REFL-die-CAUS
      'he kills himself'

(16) *ti-to-mik-tia-'*
      1PL:SUBJ-1PL:REFL-die-CAUS-PL:SUBJ
      'we kill ourselves'

The order of prefixes is: subject prefix, specifying object prefix, reflexive prefix, unspecifying human object prefix, and unspecifying nonhuman object prefix (see Table 2).

Table 2: *Verbal prefixes and their positions*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	SUBJ	SPEC.OBJ	REFL.PREF	UNSP.OBJ		
1	ni-	ne:č-	-no-			
2	ti-	mič-	-mo-			
3	Ø	k(i)-	mo-	te:-, λa-	incorp. N	stem
1	ti- ..'	te:č-	-to-			
2	am- ..'	ame:č-	-mo-			
3	Ø ..'	ki-im-	mo-			

A whole array of derivational suffixes derive transitives from intransitives and ditransitives from transitives, with varying content and functions of the new arguments according to choice of derivational suffix:

(17)　*ni-k-yo:li-tia*　　(from *yo:li* 'live')
　　　1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-live-CAUS
　　　'I revive him'

(18)　*ni-k-λa-kʷa-ltia*　　(from *kʷa* 'eat')
　　　1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-eat-CAUS
　　　'I feed him'

(19)　*ni-k-λa-kʷa:-lia*　　(from *kʷa* 'eat')
　　　1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-eat-"APPLICATIVE"
　　　'I eat from/for him'

The markings of subject and object on the verbs do not express semantic roles. The following examples show how the syntactic subject disregards the semantic role of its referent:

(20)　*Ø-miki*　　　'he dies'

(21)　*Ø-we:iya*　　'he becomes big'

(22)　*Ø-weči*　　　'he falls'

(23)　*Ø-kʷi:ka*　　'he sings'

(24)　*Ø-ičteki*　　'he robs'

(25)　*Ø-k-a:na*　　'he takes it'

(26)　*Ø-k-mik-tia*　'he kills him'

3. Constructions traditionally called impersonals and passives

The constructions that are traditionally called impersonals and passives are centered around verbs derived with two derivational suffixes, -*wa* and -*(l)o*, from intransitive and transitive verbs, respectively; historically the two suffixes can be shown to have the same origin (cf. Launey 1981). Basically, intransitive verbs take the suffix -*wa*, and transitives take the suffix -*(l)o*. However, this distribution is not absolute; the suffix -*wa* also occurs with a few transitive verbs; and the suffix -*(l)o* is found with some intransitive verbs. For the present discussion the distribution of the two suffixes is of no consequence.

The translation of the following examples is in agreement with the traditional interpretation of the constructions:

(27)　*ni-koči*
　　　1SG:SUBJ-sleep
　　　'I sleep'

(28)　*koči:-wa*
　　　sleep-"IMPERSONAL"
　　　'"people" sleep'

(29)　*ni-k-kʷa*
　　　1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-eat
　　　'I eat it'

(30)　*ni-kʷa:-lo*
　　　1SG:SUBJ-eat-"PASS"
　　　'I am eaten'

(31)　*λa-kʷa:-lo*
　　　UNSPEC:NONHUM-eat-"IMPERSONAL"
　　　'something is eaten'

(32)　*ni-k-λa-maka*　　　　　　　　　　　　*no-ta'čin*
　　　1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-give　1SG:POSS-father
　　　'I give (him/her) my father "things"'

(33)　*Ø-λa-mak-o*　　　　　　　　　　　　*no-ta'čin*
　　　3SG:SUBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-give-"PASS"　1SG:POSS-father
　　　'my father is given something'

(34)　*te:-λa-mak-o*
　　　UNSPEC:HUM-UNSPEC:NONHUM-give-"IMPERSONAL"
　　　'someone is given something'

The Jesuit Horacio Carochi, who in 1645 wrote an impressively insightful grammar of Nahuatl, makes an interesting distinction between passive and impersonal based on the specifiability of arguments. Forms within the sphere of impersonals and passives that have no specifiable argument he calls impersonals, whereas those that have at least one specifiable argument are named passives. He would thus call (28), (31), and (34) impersonals and (30) and (33) passives.

The derivation of verbs with the suffixes -*wa* and -*(l)o* was productive in the 16th century; however, it was subject to some general constraints con-

nected with the feature human versus nonhuman. These constraints have been analyzed and described in detail by Launey (1976, 1979, 1986) to whom I owe much of this insight. In *wa*-verbs the unspecifiable subject must be human (see example (28)); unspecifiability of a nonhuman subject of intransitive verbs does not involve the suffix *-wa*, but is expressed with the prefix λ*a-*:

(35)   *Ø-wa:ki*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
         3:SUBJ-dry   the   flower
         'the flower dries'

(36)   λ*a-wa:ki*
         UNSPEC:NONHUM-dry
         'everything dries'

Lo-verbs derived from transitive verbs have either a subject marker referring to a human (see examples (30) and (33)) or a nonhuman, unspecifying object marker that translates as subject (see example (31)); in the case of *lo*-verbs derived from ditransitives the second option involves two unspecifying object prefixes of which *te:-* is the one that translates as subject (see example (34)).

If the promoted object is nonhuman and specifiable, then a different construction — e.g. a reflexive one — will be chosen:

(37)   *Ø-mo-kʷa*
         3:SUBJ-3SG:REFL-eat
         'it is eaten'

(38)   *Ø-mo-te:-maka*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
         3:SUBJ-3SG:REFL-UNSPEC:OBJ:HUM-give the   flower
         'flowers are given away'

This description of the constructions in focus has so far not revealed anything that makes them significantly distinct from passive constructions in other languages. However, *lo*-verbs display a number of features that suggest a different analysis.

It was observed already in the first Nahuatl grammar, in that of Fray Andrés de Olmos from 1547, that the agent cannot be expressed: *Ni tampoco rescibe persona agente expressa* 'Neither does it receive an expressed agent' (Olmos 1547:99). The aforementioned Jesuit grammarian Horacio Carochi says:

> Los verbos passiuos no tienen persona, que haze, que en latin se pone en ablatiuo con *a.* vel *ab.* por que no se dize en esta lengua yo soy amado de Pedro, lo qual es menester dezir por actiuo, *nĕchtlaçòtla in Pedro.* (The passive verbs do not

have a person that acts, the one which in Latin is given in the ablative with *a* or *ab,* because in this language one does not say I am loved by Pedro, this it is necessary to express with the active, *nĕchtlaçòtla in Pedro* [Pedro loves me].)
                                                     (Carochi 1645:433)

This observation has been repeated in all later descriptions of the language.

Now, the lack of agent in the constructions called passives is cross-linguistically not such a rare feature. However, Nahuatl *lo*-verbs deviate markedly in another respect: they can be derived from reflexive verbs. The verb meaning 'run' is inherently reflexive in Nahuatl:

(39)   *ni-no-λaloa*
         1SG:SUBJ-1SG:REFL-run
         'I run'

When *lo*-verbs are derived from reflexive verbs, an unspecifying reflexive prefix, *ne-,* occurs: *ne-λalo:-lo* 'everyone runs'. In Nahuatl — just like in other languages — the characteristic feature of a reflexive form is that the referents of subject and object are identical. Reflexive constructions thus presuppose a subject. To explain the reflexive form of *lo*-verbs with the unspecifying reflexive prefix I therefore propose that these verbs have an unspecifiable subject:

(40)   *ne-λalo:-lo*
         UNSPEC:REFL-run-UNSPEC:SUBJ
         '"people" run'

This leads me to suggest a different analysis of *lo*-verbs in general, namely that they all have an agent, but an unspecifiable one. Example (30) will thus receive the following analysis and a different translation:

(30')   *ni-kʷa:-lo*
         UNSPEC:SUBJ-1SG:OBJ-eat-UNSPEC:SUBJ
         'someone unspecifiable eats me'

This also clarifies the apparent lack of agent: the agent cannot be expressed because it is already there, although unspecifiable and expressed by zero.

According to this analysis the sentence has two subjects, an unspecifiable agentive subject and a specifiable human subject, expressed by the regular subject marker, promoted from object status. None of the two can be explained away and analyzed as something else; the one has the regular shape of a subject prefix, and the other, the unspecifiable one, is presupposed as subject by the unspecifying reflexive prefix.

In discussions about causatives — and passives — and the hierarchy of grammatical relations Comrie has touched in general terms upon the possibility of "two subjects in a single clause". He says:

> Since the English passive involves two processes — OBJECT PROMOTION and SUBJECT DEMOTION or SUBJECT DELETION — a reasonable question to ask is whether, in other languages, these two exist independently, i.e. whether there are languages with passives involving only Subject Demotion, or involving only Object Promotion. The latter possibility would give rise to a derived structure with two subjects, and while I am not convinced that such a structure must be excluded from linguistic theory, I know of no languages where the passive illustrates this possibility.

(Comrie 1977:47-48)

This description applies quite accurately to Nahuatl constructions with *lo*-verbs: the object is promoted, and the subject is not deleted, but unspecifiable.

The analysis that posits an unspecifiable subject in constructions with *lo*-verbs receives support from other cases of unspecifiability in Nahuatl: I have already shown that 'unspecifiable object' is expressed by the prefixes, *te:*- and *λa*- (see examples (6) and (7)). Unspecifiability is found also in connection with nouns: an 'unspecifiable possessor' is expressed by the prefix *te:*-. In Nahuatl, nouns are explicitly marked as unpossessed or possessed, whereas the noun referring to the possessor has no marking:

(41) *siwa:-λ*
      woman-UNPOSSESSED
      'woman'

(42) *no-siwa:-w*
      1:SG:POSS-woman-POSSESSED
      'my woman'

(43) *i:-siwa:-w*   *ićcoaλ*
      3:SG:POSS-woman-POSSESSED   Itzcoatl
      'Itzcoatl's woman'

(44) *te:-siwa:-w*
      UNSPEC:POSS:HUM-woman-POSSESSED
      'someone's woman'

With this comprehensive occurrence of the concept of unspecifiability, unspecifying object prefixes, an unspecifying reflexive prefix, and an unspeci-

fying possessor prefix, one is tempted to say that an unspecifiable subject is even expected.

A further implication of this analysis is that *wa*-verbs and *lo*-verbs will be given the same description: both types have an unspecifiable subject. The verb *koči:-wa* will then be understood to mean 'someone unspecifiable sleeps', and it is appropriately translated 'everyone or people sleep':

(28') *koči:-wa*
       sleep-UNSPEC:SUBJ
       'everyone sleeps'

Additional support for the unspecifiable subject is provided by the above mentioned exceptionless rule that permits only one specifying object marker per ditransitive verb. The rule was exemplified by examples (11) and (12) that were shown to contrast with examples (9) and (10) in that the latter have one specifying and one unspecifying object prefix:

(11) *Ø-ne:č-Ø-maka*   *no-ta'ćin*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
      3:SUBJ-1SG:OBJ-3SG:OBJ-give   1SG:POSS-father the flower
      'my father gives me the flower'

(12) *ni-k-Ø-maka*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*   *no-ta'ćin*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-3SG:OBJ-give   the   flower   1SG:POSS-father
      'I give (it) the flower to my father'

(9)   *ni-k-λa-maka*   *no-ta'ćin*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-give   1SG:POSS-father
      'I give (him/her) my father "things"'

(10) *ni-k-te:-maka*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
      1SG:SUBJ-3SG:OBJ-UNSPEC:OBJ:HUM-give   the   flower
      'I give (it) the flower away'

Lo-verbs derived from ditransitives likewise permit only one specifying prefix, namely one that refers to the promoted object which has acquired subject form; or — expressed differently — they permit no specifying object marker at all.

(11') *ni-Ø-mak-o*   *in*   *šo:čiλ*
       "1SG:SUBJ"-3SG:OBJ-give-UNSPEC:SUBJ   the   flower
       'someone unspecified gives me the flower'

(9')   *Ø-λa-mak-o*
       "3SG:SUBJ"-UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-give-UNSPEC:SUBJ
       'someone unspecified gives him "things"'

In other words, precisely like in the active ditransitive constructions, the absence of an unspecifying object prefix indicates that there *is* a specifiable object; thus instead of the expected form **ni-k-mak-o* we get the form in (11').

It may seem problematic to assign object function to prefixes that elsewhere indicate subject. However, whichever way *lo*-verbs are analyzed there will be some overlap in functions between subject and object prefixes. According to the traditional analysis the unspecified nonhuman object prefix λa- may be assigned subject function as in example (31'):

(31')   λ*a-kʷa:-lo*
         UNSPEC:SUBJ:NONHUM-eat-UNSPEC:SUBJ
         'something is eaten'

whereas according to my analysis it continues to function as an unspecifying, nonhuman *object* marker:

(31")   λ*a-kʷa:-lo*
         UNSPEC:OBJ:NONHUM-eat-UNSPEC:SUBJ
         'someone unspecified eats something'

4. Conclusion

My claim is that *lo*-verbs in Classical Nahuatl are not passive forms and that *wa*-verbs are not impersonals, but that both are active forms that have an unspecifiable subject, indicated by the two suffixes, *-lo* and *-wa*, and that the nouns referred to by specifying subject prefixes in *lo*-verbs function as objects. I shall now sum up the arguments on which this claim is based:

1.   *lo*-verbs can be formed from reflexive verbs and have an unspecifying reflexive prefix;
2.   the agent cannot be expressed in constructions with *lo*-verbs;
3.   unspecifiability is a pervasive feature in the language; unspecifiable object and unspecifiable possessor are expressed systematically;
4.   an exceptionless rule that restricts the number of specifying object prefixes to one applies also to *lo*-verbs — if the prefix for promoted object is counted as an object prefix;
5.   *lo*-verbs and *wa*-verbs will now receive the same analysis.

The concept of the unspecifiable subject that I find so exceptionally clearly illustrated in Nahuatl from the 16th century is definitely embraced by the

characteristics of passives and related constructions established through cross-linguistic studies. And my analysis is not fundamentally different from other treatments of *wa*-verbs and *lo*-verbs in Nahuatl. Demotion of subject, and "effacement du sujet" (Launey 1981), is completely in consonance with my "unspecifiable subject". In his book on *Non-Distinct Arguments in Uto-Aztecan* Langacker (1976) demonstrates the extension of the discussed phenomena for the whole language family.

What I object to in those analyses is the use of the term passive; and terminology is not a matter to be treated lightly. I question the usefulness of lumping together quite diverse constructions from a great many of the languages of the world under the term passive.

Such lumping is a reflection of the age and tremendously deep roots of the traditional European linguistics; and the foundation of this our only linguistics with its attitudes has not been changed substantially by more recent studies of non-Indo-European languages, studies that are often used simply to confirm the appropriateness of our traditional inventory of concepts.

Discussions of "near universals" are dangerous; we find what we look for, or, in other words, our expectations influence our analysis, we distort data to make them fit the model; and with every exemplification of a "near universal" it is confirmed and fuel is added to the vicious circle.

In order to progress in our understanding of human language we need to focus on the specific phenomena in individual languages and test the few concepts that so far appear to be universal, but we want to be specifically cautious about the firmly cemented concepts that appear natural to us because they are so deeply rooted in our culture.

Let me conclude by answering my original question: what is it that we gain or lose by calling a certain construction in Nahuatl a passive? We gain little since the concept of passive contributes nothing to the description of Nahuatl.

On the contrary, we gain in our understanding of Nahuatl by analyzing it in accordance with the unique morphology of that language and by recognizing the systematic way of expressing the unspecifiable as something particularly characteristic of Nahuatl. And at least as important: by restricting and clarifying the definition and domain of the concept of passive to include only those that permit an optional agent we also here sharpen our insight.

Notes

1. None of the examples are taken from existing texts from the 16th century. They are all typical linguist's examples, out of context; and the translations are equally unreal and in many cases unacceptable as English sentences.

References

Andrews, J. Richard. 1975. *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Canger, Una. 1975. Brief comments on passive - impersonal: *-ni/-o:-ni*, and *-l/-λi* in Classical Aztec. Mimeographed manuscript.

Carochi, Horacio. 1645. *Arte de la lengva Mexicana con la declaración de los adverbios della*. México. Reprinted in *Colección de gramáticas de la lengua Mexicana* 1.395-538, supplement to Anales de Museo Nacional, 1a época. Tomo 5. 1892.

Comrie, Bernard. 1977. In defense of spontaneous demotion: The impersonal passive. *Grammatical Relations* (= *Syntax and Semantics*, 8.) ed. by Peter Cole & Jerrold Sadock, 47-58. New York: Academic Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The cognitive organization of information*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dakin, Karen. 1982. *La evolución fonológica del protonáhuatl*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1976. *Non-Distinct Arguments in Uto-Aztecan* (= *University of California Publications in Linguistics*, 82.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. *An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar* (= *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar*, 1.). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Langacker, Ronald W. & Pamela Munro. 1975. Passives and their meaning. *Language* 51.789-830.

Launey, Michel. 1976. Deux sources du passif d'après la morphologie nahuatl. *42nd International Congres of Americanists, Proceedings*, 471-484. Paris.

Launey, Michel. 1979. *Introduction à la langue et la littérature aztèques*. Tome I: *Grammaire*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Launey, Michel. 1981. Une interprétation linguistique des schémas relationnels: passifs-impersonnels et causatifs en nahuatl classique. *Amerindia* 6.17-58.

Launey, Michel. 1986. Catégories et opérations dans la grammaire nahuatl. Thèse d'Etat, Université Paris 4. Unpublished.

Olmos, Fray Andrés de. 1547. *Arte para aprender la Lengva Mexicana*. [First published by Rémi Siméon as *Grammaire de la langue Nahuatl ou Mexicaine*. Paris 1875.]

Perlmutter, David & Paul Postal. 1977. Toward a universal characterization of passivization. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 3.321-71.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and related constructions. *Language* 61.821-848.

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The Passive: A comparative linguistic analysis*. London: Croom Helm.

In the STUDIES IN LANGUAGE COMPANION SERIES (SLCS) the following volumes have been published or are scheduled for publication:

14. BENSON, Morton, Evelyn BENSON & Robert ILSON: *Lexicographic Description of English.* Amsterdam, 1986.
15. JUSTICE, David: *The Semantics of Form in Arabic, in the mirror of European languages.* Amsterdam, 1987.
16. CONTE, M.E., J.S. PETÖFI, and E. SÖZER (eds): *Text and Discourse Connectedness.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
17. CALBOLI, Gualtiero (ed.): *Subordination and other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1-5 April 1985.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
18. WIERZBICKA, Anna: *The Semantics of Grammar.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1988.
19. BLUST, Robert A.: *Austronesian Root Theory. An Essay on the Limits of Morphology.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1988.
20. VERHAAR, John W.M. (ed.): *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Pidgins and Creoles on Melanesia.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
21. COLEMAN, Robert (ed.): *New Studies in Latin Linguistics. Proceedings of the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics,* Cambridge, April 1987. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
22. McGREGOR, William: *A Functional Grammar of Gooniyandi.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
23. COMRIE, Bernard and Maria POLINSKY (eds): *Causatives and Transitivity.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1993.
24. BHAT, D.N.S. *The Adjectival Category. Criteria for differentiation and identification.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994.
25. GODDARD, Cliff and Anna WIERZBICKA (eds): *Semantics and Lexical Universals. Theory and empirical findings.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994.
26. LIMA, Susan D., Roberta L. CORRIGAN and Gregory K. IVERSON (eds): *The Reality of Linguistic Rules.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994.
26. LIMA, Susan D., Roberta L. CORRIGAN and Gregory K. IVERSON (eds): *The Reality of Linguistic Rules.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994.
27. ABRAHAM, Werner, T. GIVÓN and Sandra A. THOMPSON (eds): *Discourse Grammar and Typology.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1995.
28. HERMAN, József: *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected papers from the 6th international colloquium on Latin linguistics, Budapest, 2-27 March, 1991.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994.
29. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, Elisabeth et al. (eds): *Content, Expression and Structure. Studies in Danish functional grammar.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.
30. HUFFMAN, Alan: *The Categories of Grammar. French lui and le.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
31. WANNER, Leo (ed.): *Lexical Functions in Lexicography and Natural Language Processing.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.
32. FRAJZYNGIER, Zygmunt: *Grammaticalization of the Complex Sentence. A case study in Chadic.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.

A full list of titles published in this series is available from the publisher.