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Classic Mayan texts exhibit a variety of inflectional affixes that are used on positional roots, roots that refer to “positions, such as sitting, standing, or lying down, that objects or people can assume” (Bricker 1986:160). MacLeod (1984) was the first to demonstrate the presence of positional verbal morphology in Classic Mayan texts. She identified two suffixes, transcribed as -la-ja ~ -la-ji-ya and -wa-ni ~ -wa-ni-ya, and she argued that the first represented Yukatekan -laj, a completive status suffix of positionals, while the second represented the Ch’olan positional suffix -wan, which she suggested had roughly the same function as Yukatekan -laj (1984:241, 247-248). Since then, various authors have contributed to the study of the functions, distribution, and history of these two suffixes in Classic Mayan texts (Justeson 1985, Bricker 1986, Justeson and Fox 1989, Lacadena and Wichmann 2002[1999], Hruby and Child 2004[1999], Mora-Marín 2003, Lacadena 2004[1996]).

For their part, Kaufman and Norman (1984) have reconstructed *-laj(-i) to Pre-Ch’olan as ‘completive status of positionals’ and *-wan(-i) to Proto-Ch’olan as ‘completive status of positionals’. Justeson (1985) soon followed with a rough distribu-
tional and comparative analysis of -wan(-i) and -laj(-i). He analyzed the spellings as -wa-n(i) and -la-AH2 for *-wan and *-laj, respectively, but suggested that -laj could correspond to Kaufman and Norman’s proposed Pre-Ch’olan *-laj(-i) ‘comple-
tive status of positionals’, which they argued was replaced by *-wan(-i), rather than to the Yukatekan suffix -laj proposed by MacLeod (1984). Kaufman (1989) has re-
vised his earlier position of Proto-Ch’olan *-wan, given that in Chontal the suffix is *wän, and thus it points to Proto-Ch’olan *wän, assuming the proposal by Kaufman and Norman (1984) that Proto-Ch’olan had a six vowel system, with the sixth vowel being *ä from Pre-Ch’olan *a.

Recently, Houston et al. (2000) have defined the latter as ‘intransitivizer of Position-
als’, based on the use of the suffix -wan in Ch’orti’, a definition I agree with based on the evidence presented by Knowles (1983). Knowles (1983:12-14) points out that in Chontal -wän is used to form a base upon which a positional can be used as an in-
transitive with any status suffix (e.g. -i ‘completive status of intransitives’, -el ‘incompletive status of intransitives’): *chum-wän-el-on sit-POS.IVZR-INC.ST-1sABS ‘I am seated’, 7a *chö'n-wän-Ø-on CMP.ASP squat-POS.IVZR-CMP.ST-1sABS ‘I squatted’. Given that the same is true for Ch’orti’, as illustrated by Pérez Martínez (1994:77, 79) with forms like wa‘-wan stand-POS.IVZR for ‘se paró (s/he stood (up))’ and ‘pararse (to stand)’, and given that Ch’ol does not preserve productive uses of this suffix, it seems unproblematic to suggest that Proto-Ch’olan *-wän was an ‘intransitivizer of positional roots’.

Given this evidence, and the likelihood that the spelling -la-ja ~ -la-ji-ya corresponds to Pre-Ch’olan *-l-aj(-i), I favor a redefinition of this latter suffix as well, as *-l-aj ‘intransitivizer of positionals’. The -i ‘completive status of intransitives’ provided the sense of completion on its own when added to *-l-aj, which can be analyzed as -(Vt)l-aj. Houston et al. (2000:332) have suggested that the l of -l-aj originated in the stative suffix -(Vt)l, a suggestion I agree with here. Kaufman and Norman (1984:106) reconstruct the “lexical stem” of positional verbs in Proto-Ch’olan-Tzeltalan (the same as Proto-Greater Tzeltalan) as *CVC-l, but do not discuss the origin of the -l stem-forming suffix, which I take to be based on -(Vt)l. The second part of -(Vt)l, Houston et al. (2000:333) have argued, is originally the second morpheme of the bipartite affix *-h-...-aj ‘intransitivizer of positionals’, which they reconstruct to the common ancestor of Ch’olan and Tzeltalan languages. Given that *-l-aj presumably was also an ‘intransitivizer of positionals’, given that it was replaced by *-wän ‘intransitivizer of positionals’, it is possible that the -aj suffix was simply originally based on *-aj ‘generic intransitivizer’, also reconstructed by Kaufman and Norman (1984:107, 109, Table 14) to Proto-Ch’olan-Tzeltalan and Proto-Ch’olan, though this is just a tentative hypothesis that requires detailed testing which I do not provide here.

Interestingly, additional positional suffixes have been identified, such as the -(Vt)l ‘stative’ suffix, attested in spellings like CHUM-mu-l(i) for chum-ul sit-STA ‘sitted’, as seen in Figure 1. Another example is the -(ib)l ‘instrumentalizer of positionals’ suffix, attested in spellings like ‘e-(k)e-li-b’(i) for (h)ek-l-ib’ (Wichmann 2002). Thus, there are already four well attested suffixes of positional verbs.

Interestingly, additional positional suffixes have been identified, such as the -(Vt)l ‘stative’ suffix, attested in spellings like CHUM-mu-l(i) for chum-ul sit-STA ‘sitted’, as seen in Figure 1. Another example is the -(ib)l ‘instrumentalizer of positionals’ suffix, attested in spellings like ‘e-(k)e-li-b’(i) for (h)ek-l-ib’ (Wichmann 2002). Thus, there are already four well attested suffixes of positional verbs.

Figure 1: Example of CHUM[mu]-li for chum-ul sit-STA ‘seated’ from Copan Hieroglyphic Stair Step 8 (Schele 1989:81). Drawing by B. W. Fash.

There is yet another suffix of positional verbs attested in Classic Mayan texts. On vase K2784 shows a secondary text (Figure 2a) where one finds the spelling ti-CHUM[mu]-ta-li (Figure 2b) following the collocation *'u-B'AH for u-b'ah(-il) ‘(it is) his face/portrait’.
This **ti-CHUM[mu]-ta-li** expression is undoubtedly an example of a *ti*-construction (Josserand et al. 1985), and interestingly one that attests to a suffix -tal or -täl. Kaufman and Norman (1984:107) reconstruct Proto-Ch’olan *-täl* as ‘non-stative incompletive status of positionals’. Given that the expression alludes to a portrayed lord shown in a seated posture an expression *ti chum-täl* PREP sit-INC ‘sitting’ makes perfect sense. The *ti chum-täl* phrase is followed by the name of the person who is ‘a-sitt-ing’. In other words, the suffix -täl clearly is used here as a ‘nominalizer’, as one would expect in the context of the *ti*-construction; and given that the Proto-Ch’olan nominalizing suffix used with transitive and intransitive stems in this construction was *-e/l* (Mora-Marín 2004), also the ‘incompletive status of intransitives’, was originally a ‘nominalizer’, it makes sense that -täl would be used as a ‘nominalizer’ in the same context, given that it also was the ‘(non-stative) incompletive status of positionals’. In other words both -e/l and -tä/l may have started out as ‘nominalizers’, the former of transitive and intransitive roots, the latter of positional roots, and were subsequently extended to incompletive status marker.

Also interestingly, Stuart (2005:73) has recently provided a similar example only showing **ti-CHUM[mu]-li** instead of **ti-CHUM[mu]-ta-li**, as seen in Figure 3.

Thus, the suffix attested in this second example is the stative suffix -V₁l. This identification then adds one more to the attested positional suffixes: -laj, -wän, -V₁l, -l-ib’, and -täl.
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