Questions and Inversion in Ocotepec Mixtec*

Roy Eberhardt

Yes/No questions, Wh-questions, and embedded questions in Ocotepec Mixtec are described and analyzed within the Government and Binding framework. Questions involving prepositional phrases are unique in that the whole prepositional phrase must be fronted and then the question word is subsequently fronted again. Similar inversion occurs when a possessive phrase is questioned. Smith Stark (1988) documents this phenomenon as occurring across language families throughout Meso-America. Aissen (1996) analyzes it for Tzotzil, a VOS language, as secondary movement to the specifier of PP or DP. This analysis is not possible for Mixtec, a VSO language, so I posit adjunction to the moved phrase, following Black (1994) for Zapotec.

1. Introduction

Mixtec languages are characterized by VSO word order. In the past VSO languages have been described in the literature with flat structures, making the relationships between Infl, the external argument, and the verb cumbersome to describe and characterize. In this paper I posit a deep structure SVO ordering with the subject as the specifier of the VP, following the Internal Subject Hypothesis (Koopman & Sportiche 1991, McCloskey 1991, among others). Verb movement to Infl derives the surface VSO order. When analyzed in this manner, the VSO word order of Mixtec complies with language universals such as the close relationship between a verb and its object, which has been shown to hold in other VSO languages (Chung 1983, McCloskey 1991, Black 1994).

Most of this paper is then devoted to describing Yes/No questions, Wh-questions, and embedded questions and to giving an analysis for the fronting which occurs. Finally, there is an interesting inversion of the Wh-word with its preposition after fronting in a question. I analyze this as Pied-Piping of the PP[+wh] with a secondary raising of the Wh-word. A similar secondary raising accounts for the inversion which occurs in a questioned possessive phrase. The analysis is presented within the Government and Binding framework (Chomsky 1981, 1982, 1986).

2. Basic Clause Structure

This section covers basic word order, focus constructions, nominal phrases, and prepositional phrases. This provides the necessary background for understanding the analysis of questions.

---

*This paper was originally done as a squib for a Government and Binding class taught by Cheri Black at UND. I am grateful for her invaluable aid in assembling and editing this paper, but I remain totally responsible for its content.
2.1. Basic Word Order

The basic word order of Ocotepec Mixtec is VSO, as shown in (1). Example (2) shows the normal unfronted position of adverbials.

(1) xíhi chílū ndùtè
CON:drink cat water
The cat is drinking water.

(2) sàitäñú de mìtàn
CON:work he:RES now
He is working now.

Woolford (1991) proposed an analysis for Jacaltec, a genetically unrelated Mayan language which is like Mixtec in that it also has VSO order. If it were applied to Mixtec, example (1) would be diagrammed as in (3).

(3)

An alternative analysis, which I posit here, claims that the subject occupies the specifier position of the VP in the D-structure, following the Internal Subject Hypothesis (Koopman & Sportiche 1991, McCloskey 1991, etc.). Movement of the verb up to I (Infl), which is filled by the Aspect marking morpheme, accounts for the VSO order. This verb movement is motivated by the

---

1 Bradley and Hollenbach (1988) give the following background information: “The Mixtecan language family is one branch of the Otomanguean stock that has spread through central and southern Mexico. This family includes Mixtec, Trique, and Cuicatec, ... . It is found primarily in the western half of the state of Oaxaca, but extends over its western border into the state of Guerrero and over its northern border into the state of Puebla. The most prominent member of the Mixtecan group today is Mixtec, at least in terms of numbers of speakers, (almost 250,000) and area occupied (roughly 10,000 square miles). Furthermore, it is not the single language that its name suggests, but a collection of perhaps twenty mutually unintelligible languages” (p. 1). “Ocotepec Mixtec is spoken by approximately 8000 people living in Santo Tomás Ocotepec, Santa Cruz Nundaco, and Santa María Cuquila, all in the district of Tlaxiaco, Oaxaca, Mexico” (p. 157).

2 Interlinear examples use the orthography and punctuation of Alexander’s 1988 article.

3 Abbreviations used, following Bradley and Hollenbach (1988:xii): ADD additive, COM completive, CON continuative, FAM familiar, INC incompletive, INT interrogative, ME male ego, NEG negative, PL plural, POT potential, REP repetitive, RES respect, SG singular, SPEC specifier, UN unspecified third person.

4 Note that Ocotpec Mixtec has an aspectual system that is marked by a prefix, or a tone, or both.
morphological subcategorization of the aspect marker to attach to V (Rizzi and Roberts 1989). See figure (4) for example (1).

2.2. Focus Construction

One of the variations on the basic VSO order which can occur is due to focus. Subjects, as in (5), objects, as in (6), and adjuncts, as in (7), can be fronted. This focus fronting is analyzed as movement to the specifier of IP, as shown in (8) for example (5).

(5) teè ñúkwán kihin (Alexander 1988:172)
man that POT:go
THAT MAN will go.

(6) ndìkà xehè ñà nuu de (Alexander 1988:173)
banana COM:give she face his:RES
She gave him A BANANA.

(7) xehe tàtá de shí:kó de nuni (Alexander 1988:173)
foot father his:RES CON:sell he:RES corn
He sells corn FOR THE SAKE OF HIS FATHER.

(8)
2.3. Nominal Phrases

Mixtec nominal phrases are not marked for case. A number of distinct positions are needed, most of which follow the noun. These first two examples show first a noun noun compound and second a noun modifier compound.

(9) yōhō ká:à
    rope     metal
    wire

(10) ndūtē shéēn
    water   fierce
    white rum

Examples (11)-(17) show that determiners and quantifiers occur before the head noun. Note that quantifiers always come before the determiners màá and ndá. See (26) for the ndá example.

(11) màá vèhē
    SPEC   5
    the very house

(12) kumi màá teè
    four    SPEC man
    four of only men

(13) ndá de
    PL  he:RES
    they

(14) kumi teè
    four man
    four men

(15) kwaha kìtì
    many animal
    many animals

(16) kwaha ña
    many she
    many of them

(17) ùn ndivi
    one egg
    an egg or one egg

---

5 Alexander in this case uses SPEC as a grammatical category: “There are two elements that precede the nucleus, specifier and quantifier; the specifier occurs next to the nucleus.” (Alexander 1988: 212). The màá or ndá are both described as specifiers in Alexander’s work. They mean “that very one” or in the case of the plural, “those very ones.” The term SPEC as used by Alexander has nothing to do with Government and Binding’s use of the same word.
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Quantifiers in adjectival position, following the noun, are interpreted as ordinals.

(18) kivi úshi  
    day   ten  
    the tenth day

The demonstrative pronoun follows the head noun, as shown in (19)-(20).

(19) sāhmā yāhá  
    cloth  this  
    this cloth

(20) tīna ñúkwán  
    dog    that  
    that dog

The following four examples introduce two degree words and show their position in relation to the head noun and to each other. The order is noun, adjective, and then degree words. The nī always follows the ka when they are both present. The degree words function as phrase-level clitics modifying the entire phrase preceding them.

(21) ndikā nī  
    banana LIM  
    just a banana

(22) sāhmā ñukwán nī  
    cloth  that LIM  
    just that cloth

(23) ndika ka  
    banana ADD  
    more bananas

(24) ìta nī ka  
    flower LIM ADD  
    just more flowers

Examples (25)-(26) show a combination of all the elements introduced thus far. Note the ndá plural marker preceding the head noun, the adjective following it and the demonstrative ñúkwán after the adjective.

(25) ndá sāhmā lūlí ñúkwán  
    PL cloth little LIM  
    those little cloths

(26) uu ndá ndikā náhnú ñúkwán nī ka  
    two PL banana big:PL that LIM ADD  
    just those two big bananas

Simple possession, with the possessor following the head noun, is shown in (27)-(28).

(27) shini tī:ñí  
    head mouse  
    the mouse's head

(28) shini vétu  
    hat Robert  
    Robert's hat
The following two examples show the position of the possessor in relation to the other elements previously introduced. Note specifically that the possessor follows the adjective in (29) and it also follows the degree words in (30).

(29) uu sehë lülü tina
    two child little dog
    the dog’s two little pups

(30) uu vëhë nî ka tëë ŋúkwán
    two house LIM ADD man that
    that man’s only two houses

This last example illustrates possessor nesting.

(31) [[[tina] sehe] ŋāni] tëë ŋúkwán
    dog child brother:ME man that
    that man’s brother’s child’s dog

In order to accommodate all the distinct positions required, I use a version of the DP hypothesis (Abney 1987, Stowell 1989) as shown in the following tree diagram. Quantifiers and/or determiners head the DP. The possessor occupies the specifier of DP on the right and Degree words adjoin to D'. The NP complement has the demonstrative in its right specifier position, and adjectives right-adjoin to N'. The only required element is N°.

(32)
2.4. Prepositional Phrase

As expected for VSO languages, the P comes before its complement NP.

(33) xiín ndá sehē de
    with PL child his:RES
    with his children

(Alexander 1988:242)

(34) mahñú vēhe
    between house
    between the houses

A simple tree for (34) is given below in (35)

(35) PP
    |
    P′

    P
      mahñú
      between

    DP
      vēhe
      house

Body part nouns are also used as prepositions, as shown in (36)-(37).

(36) ìni ñùnu
    insides net:bag
    in a net bag

(Alexander 1988:301)

(37) nuu ñāhān
    face woman
    in front of the woman or to the woman
3. Yes/No questions.

3.1. Main clause Yes/No questions.

Yes/No Questions in Ocotepec Mixtec are very simple. Any declarative sentence can be made into a Yes/No Question by simply preceding it with the interrogative marker $á$. This marker is placed in the $C_{+[q]}$ position in the tree structure, as is shown in (39) for example (38).

(38) $á$ kíshin nu (Alexander 1988:181)

INT CON:sleep you:FAM

Are you sleeping?

(39)

(40) $á$ n-taán (Alexander 1988:181)

INT COM:quake

Was there an earthquake?

(41) $á$ màéstru kúù de (Alexander 1988:182)

INT teacher CON:be he:RES

Is he a teacher?

Example (41) shows that focus movement may occur in Yes/No questions. The tree for (41) is given in (42).

(42)
3.2. Embedded Yes/No questions.

Embedded Yes/No questions have the same internal structure as main clause Yes/No questions. The $\text{CP}_{[+q]}$ is subcategorized for by the matrix verb and is thus connected at the $V'$ node. Example (43) illustrates such a sentence, and its tree structure is shown in (44).

(43) $\text{k}a\text{tu}h\text{ú}n \; n\text{í} \; d\text{e} \; \acute{\text{a}} \; n\text{ë\text{nd}å} \; \acute{n}n\text{ä}n\text{í} \; d\text{e}$

$\text{POT:ask you:RES him:RES INT COM:return brother:ME his:RES}$

*Ask him if his brother has returned.* (Alexander 1988:187)

(44)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\quad \text{I'} \\
\quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{L-}k\text{a}u\text{tu}h\text{ú}n \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{ni} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{you:RES} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{de} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{him:RES} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{C'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{CP}_{[+q]} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{á} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{INT} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{I'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{L-}n\text{ë\text{nd}å} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{COM-return} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{tj} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{brother:ME} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{de} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{his:RES}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Colons are Alexander’s way of expressing vowel length.}\]
4. Content Questions.

4.1. Main Clause

The Wh-questions are formed in a manner similar to English questions. That is, the Wh-phrase starts in its subcategorized position in the clause and then is fronted. The subject, object or any nominal complement as well as adverbials can be questioned, as shown in the following examples.

*Questioning subjects and objects.*

(45) naá chóho  
what CON:cook
What is cooking?

(46) naá ki:kü ñã  
what CON:sow she
What is she sewing?

(47) na ñãhän n-kùnũ shikin yáhá  
what woman COM:weave tunic this
Who wove this tunic?

(48) ní kúü xa váxí  
who CON:be UN INC:come
Who is coming?

(49) na njìvi n-kà:nã de  
what person COM-COM:call he/him;RES
Whom did he invite? or Who invited him?

(50) ní kúü xa: n-kà:nã de  
who CON:be UN:COM COM-COM:call he/him:RES
Whom did he invite? or Who invited him?

*Questioning verbal complements.*

(51) naá kúü ñã  
what CON:be she
What is she?

(52) naá teē kúü de  
what man CON:be he:RES
Who is he?

(53) na sehē kúü xin  
what child CON:be he:FAM
Whose child is he?

The translation of *na* as *what*, and *ní* as *who*, or *where* is somewhat misleading perhaps. Ruth Mary Alexander tells me that they are really less specific and more specific counterparts of the same function. *na* is a general questioning word: any of many, *ní* is more specific. It is like English *which*, a selection from a known group.

*naá* is an interrogative pronoun. *na* is an interrogative demonstrative.

Without a context there is no way of knowing which argument raised.

Com-Com is used because the aspect is represented here both by a tone and a prefix. This type of glossing is used in the source.
**Questioning adjuncts.**

**When** nama

(54) nàmà n-kuù de présidénte  \(\text{(Alexander 1988:186)}\)

*when COM-COM:be he:RES president*

When was he president?

(55) na kwiya n-kuù de présidénte  \(\text{(Alexander 1988:186)}\)

*what year COM-COM:be he:RES president*

What year was he president?

**Why** nuku

(56) nukù sákwhná de ndàtíñú ñāni de  \(\text{(Alexander 1988:186)}\)

*why CON:steal he:RES thing brother:ME his:RES*

Why does he steal his brother’s things?

**Where** ní

(57) ní kwahan de  \(\text{(Alexander 1988:185)}\)

*where INC:go he:RES*

Where did he go?

(58) ní kúù nuu kikù ñà sàhmà  \(\text{(Alexander 1988:185)}\)

*where CON:be face POT:sew she cloth*

Where will she sew the cloth?

For now, we will assume that this fronting is the normal movement of a [+wh] phrase to the Specifier of the CP \(\text{CP}_{+[q]}\) as shown in (59) for example (46). (In section 5.5 we provide a different analysis.)

\(\text{(59)}\)
Similarly the tree in (60) illustrates example (54) with an interrogative adjunct.

\[(60)\]

```
CP[+q]
/    \
|     |
ADVP  C'
|     |
  /    |
  |     |
 nāmā  IP
  |     |
  /    |
  |     |
C[+q]  I'
  |     |
  /    |
  |     |
  I    VP
  |     |
  /    |
  |     |
 n-ku*ūj COM-be de ni VP présidente tuj he:RES president
  |     |
  /    |
  |     |
  |     |
  prèsiènt
```

The following examples with the Wh-phrases in situ are ungrammatical. 11

\[(61)\] *n-kunft na nāhān shikin yāhā
COM-COM:weave what woman tunic this
(Who wove this tunic?)

\[(62)\] *n-kānà de na njivi
COM-COM:call he/him:RES what person
(Whom did he invite?)

\[(63)\] *n-kānà na njivi de
COM-COM:call what person he/him:RES
(Who invited him?)

11 Personal conversation with Ruth Mary Alexander, July 1996.
4.2. Embedded Wh questions.

Example (64) demonstrates that embedded Wh-questions parallel main clause Wh-questions. Its tree structure is given in (65)

\[
\text{(64) } \text{xíni } nā \text{ naá ndóhō } \text{ de } \quad \text{(Alexander 1988:187)}
\]

CON:know she what CON:suffer he:RES

She knows what is the matter with him. or She knows what has happened to him.

\[
\text{(65)}
\]

In the following example a question word appears in a nonfronted position. Notice that this is a declarative clause, not interrogative. That means the function of the interrogative is carried in the position of the CP[+q] specifier and not in the Wh-word alone.

\[
\text{(i) } \text{dē } \text{ ndūú } \text{ ná } \text{ īnī } \text{ yáhá } \quad \text{(Alexander 1988:297)}
\]

and NEG:CON:be what CON:stand here

and there hasn’t been anyone standing here.

The following utterance is an interesting exception that seems to be reminiscent of Polish since it looks like more than one Wh-word is fronted.

\[
\text{(ii) } \text{na } \text{ ní } \text{ nuu } \text{xīkā } \text{ ki } \text{ tū } \text{nú } \quad \text{(Alexander 1988:303)}
\]

what where face CON:walk recently REP you:FAM

Where were you walking just now?

This is part of a text elicited from a native speaker. The free translation only gives a single question, making the function of these two question words unclear. Ruth Mary Alexander (p.c., July 1996) explained that she was uncertain whether this was normal speech. Until a native speaker of the language can be asked, or other data found, nothing else can be done to test or analyze this particular example.
5. Inversion in Questions

Inversion occurs in two constructions: interrogative prepositional phrases and interrogative possessive phrases. The phenomenon of inversion in question formation is shared by various language families throughout Meso-America (Smith Stark 1988). Data is presented in the first two sections, and then analyses which have been proposed for other languages are discussed. My proposal for Mixtec follows in section 5.5.

5.1. Pied-Piping with Inversion in interrogative prepositional phrases.

The following data illustrates the fact that interrogative prepositional phrases must front and invert. It is ungrammatical to extract just the Wh-phrase and leave the preposition in situ. Example (68) demonstrates that the final inversion is necessary.

(66) ní nuu ndée ñā
   where face CON:sit she
   Where does she live?

(67) na nuu xehē de tūtu
   what face COM:give he:RES paper
   To whom did he give that paper?

(68) *nuu na xehē de tūtu
   face what COM:give he:RES paper
   (To whom did he give that paper?)

5.2. Inversion in interrogative possessive phrases.

Interrogative possessive phrases also must front and invert much like the data in 5.1.

(69) na sehē kūū xīn
   what child CON:be he:FAM
   Whose child is he?

The published data on Ocotepec Mixtec had only this example for whose. In Ocotepec Mixtec, na is used for what and who. In order to clarify that these are indeed possessors, I also included here data from two other Mixtec languages which illustrate this fronting and inversion. In (70) the noun phrase shō ñaha what person acts as the possessor of doo cloth, and in (71) the possessor is yō who and it has fronted from after the adjective.

(70) shō ñaha doo
    what person cloth
    whose clothes?
    (Small 1990:359)

(71) yō tinā lōhō
    who dog small:SG
    whose little dog?
    (Shields 1988:368)

13 Personal conversation with Ruth Mary Alexander, January 2000.
14 Note that na what as a demonstrative would start in specifier of NP position and also undergo inversion.
15 Although (70) and (71) are not complete sentences, the sources that contain them clearly state that they are ordered before the verb (Small 1990:357, Shields 1988:367).
5.3. Aissen’s proposal for Tzotzil.

For both interrogative prepositional phrases and possessive phrases in Tzotzil, Aissen (1996:464, 471) assumes movement of the whole phrase to the specifier of CP with secondary movement to either the specifier of DP or PP. See (72) for an example with DP and (73) for an example of PP.

\[(72)\]
(72) CP
     \[\begin{array}{c}
     \text{DP}_i \\
     \text{DP}_j \\
     \text{D}' \\
     \text{N}' \\
     \text{x-ch'amal} \\
     \text{A3-son} \\
     \end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{buch'u} \\
\text{who} \\
\text{t}_j \\
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{C}_{[+\text{wh}]} \\
\text{IP} \\
\end{array}\]

\[(73)\]
(73) CP
     \[\begin{array}{c}
     \text{PP}_i \\
     \text{PP}_j \\
     \text{P'} \\
     \text{D} \\
     \text{C}_{[+\text{wh}]} \\
     \text{IP} \\
     \end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{buch'u} \\
\text{who} \\
\text{t}_j \\
\text{ta} \\
\text{(to)} \\
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\end{array}\]

Aissen (1996:464) claims these movements are motivated by the need for abstract agreement. In (72) \textit{buch'u} agrees with D and \textit{DP}_i through specifier-head agreement and the projection of a head to its phrase. \textit{DP}_i agrees with \textit{C}_{[+\text{wh}]} because it is in the specifier of CP. By transitivity, \textit{C}_{[+\text{wh}]} agrees with \textit{buch'u}. Similarly in (73) \textit{buch'u} agrees with P and therefore PP. PP agrees with \textit{C}_{[+\text{wh}]}.

Transitivity again applies and \textit{buch'u} agrees with \textit{C}_{[+\text{wh}]}.

This analysis works for Tzotzil since it is a VOS language. Specifiers of lexical phrases are on the right side, but functional specifiers are on the left side.

However in Mixtec, which is a VSO language, the specifier of the DP on the right is already filled with possessor, as shown in section 2.3. The case is not as clear for the PP, but Mixtec appears to follow Zapotec where all [-V] specifiers are on the right, with [+V] specifiers and extensions of V, like IP and CP, on the left (Black 1994:299-300).

Therefore movement to the specifier of PP and DP is not an option for Mixtec languages.

---

A3 is third person singular absolutive agreement (Aissen 1996:Appendix).
5.4. Black’s proposal for Zapotec.

At least some Zapotecan languages have an overt C\textsuperscript{+[q]} before the Wh-word or phrase, so Black (1994) argues that the Wh-phrase adjoins to the phrase immediately below C\textsuperscript{+[q]} (either IP or NegP), in a minimal government relationship. This leaves two options available for the secondary movement needed for inversion: to the Spec of CP\textsuperscript{+[q]} or adjoined to the moved Wh-phrase below C\textsuperscript{+[q]}. Black (1994:170) provides the following examples and analyses.

(74) a. In Specifier of CP

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DP}_i & \quad \text{[+wh]} \\
C' & \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{txu} & \quad \text{who} \\
P' & \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{[+wh]} \\
\text{lo} & \quad \text{face} \\
t_i & \quad .
\end{align*}
\]

(75) b. Adjoined to the moved phrase below C\textsuperscript{0}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CP} & \quad \text{C}\textsuperscript{0} \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{C}\textsuperscript{0} & \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{PP}_j & \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{txu} & \quad \text{who} \\
P' & \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{[+wh]} \\
\text{lo} & \quad \text{face} \\
t_i & \quad .
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the adjunction option would also be possible if the whole phrase occupies the specifier of CP\textsuperscript{+[q]}. position.
5.5. Proposed analysis for Mixtec

I have not found any cases in Mixtec of an overt $C^{[+q]}$ co-occurring with a Wh-phrase. However, examples (76)-(77) show that focused phrases and Wh-phrases cannot co-occur in Mixtec. The focused phrase must be in situ after the verb.

$$\text{(76) } \text{nī tee shı:kó nuni xehe tātā de}$$

which man CON:sell corn foot father he:RES

Who sells corn FOR THE SAKE OF HIS FATHER?

$$\text{(77) } *\text{nī tee xehe tātā de shı:kó nuni}$$

which man foot father his:RES CON:sell corn

(Which man, for the sake of his father, sells corn?)

Example (78) shows that a focused phrase may occur in a yes/no question. It is clear that the position of the focus phrase is below $\text{CP}^{[+q]}$.

$$\text{(78) } \text{á xehe tātā de shı:kó de nuni}$$

INT foot father his:RES CON:sell he:RES corn

Does he sell corn FOR THE SAKE OF HIS FATHER?

Therefore, I propose that Wh-phrases and focus phrases both occupy the specifier of IP position. I choose the adjunction option for the secondary movement, since the movement to specifier of CP requires an extraction that is not allowed from its original position, as shown by the fact that pied-piping is required.

Tree (79) gives the tree for example (67) with a fronted prepositional phrase.

17 Examples (76) and (77) are from correspondence with Ruth Mary Alexander, December 1999.
Tree (80) shows the proposed analysis for an interrogative possessive phrase, example (69).

Note that abstract agreement can still hold in the adjoined structure. It does not explain why the movement must take place in the possessive phrases, however, since the possessor already occupies the specifier of the DP [+wh] on the right, so abstract agreement would hold before the inversion. Some other constraint requiring Wh-phrases to be peripheral must be involved.

---

18 Black (1994:171-2) suggests that a ranking of the Wh-Criterion over the ECP may be involved. Broadwell (1999) provides an Optimality Theory account to allow for the variation from the normal order of specifiers, heads, and complements seen in these inversion constructions.
6. Conclusion

I have shown that the VSO surface order of Ocotepec Mixtec can be analyzed in such a way that it falls within the constraints and universals of Government and Binding Theory. I have done this by positing an SVO D-structure with the subject internal to the VP, then raising the verb to the Infl position.

I have then illustrated how Mixtec Yes/No questions are formed, and analyzed the word order in content questions as arising from required movement of the Wh-phrase.

The analysis of Pied-Piping with Inversion accounts for the unique word order required when the Wh phrase is a PP: the whole PP [+wh] must front, then the DP [+wh] object fronts again. Similar fronting with inversion occurs in interrogative possessive phrases. Due to differences in word order and phrase structure between Tzotzil and Mixtec, I was not able to directly utilize Aissen’s (1998) analysis of movement to the specifier of the functional projection. Instead, I propose that the secondary movement adjoins the minimal Wh-phrase to the pied-piped phrase, which occupies the specifier of IP position directly below C [+q] (similar to Black’s (1994) analysis of Zapotec).

Though this proposal provides a structural account for the inversion, an explanation for what motivates the inversion across language families throughout Meso-America is still lacking.
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