

Yaqui relative clauses

Lilián Guerrero

Universidad de Sonora

1. Introduction. Relative clauses have been the topic of many grammatical studies. On the one hand, relativization is a helpful mechanism to distinguish grammatical relations, e.g., subject from object, direct object from indirect object, and so on. On the other hand, relative clauses involve two events, one of which (the dependent one) provides specific information about a participant of the other event (the main one). The dependency is not structural, as in complement clauses, nor temporal, as in adverbial clauses, but in terms of participant sharing. Most languages distinguish the morpho-syntactic structure of relative clauses from other subordinated constructions. Some others may use the same construction type to express relatives and completive clauses. This paper is the first attempt to describe relative clauses in Yaqui, a Uto-Aztecan language from the Sonoran branch. The goals are twofold. It first looks to determine the strategies of relativization in Yaqui in terms of Keenan & Comrie's Accessibility Hierarchy (1977). Second, it seeks to distinguish truly relative clauses from other related phenomena, specifically, complementation. In this language, some complement-taking predicates take a complement unit very similar to relative clauses.

2. Simple clauses in Yaqui. Yaqui is a synthetic/agglutinant type of language with a nominative-accusative case system (Lindenfeld 1973; Escalante 1990; Detrick & Casad 1999). In nouns, the nominative is unmarked and the accusative is marked by the suffix *-ta*, as shown in (1a). There is no dative case. Postpositions indicate oblique arguments, such as the 'indirect' object of *nooka* 'to talk' in (1b), as well as adjuncts. The clause in (1c) shows that accusative and plural marking on nouns are mutually exclusive.¹

- (1) a. U jamut-Ø Peo-ta bicha-k.
the woman-NOM Pedro-ACC see-PRFV
'The woman saw Pedro.'
- b. U o'ou-Ø jamut-ta-u nooka-k.
the man-NOM woman-ACC-DIR talk-PRFV
'The man talked to the woman.'
- c. U goi-Ø u-me chu'u-im ke'e-kan.
the coyote-NOM the-PL dog-PL bite-PASTC
'The coyote was biting the dogs.'

Although core arguments tend to precede the verb, i.e., the nominative NP precedes the accusative NP in the examples in (1), it is possible for a core argument to appear in the post-core slot, following the predicate without an intonation break. When the nominative NP follows the verb (2a), nothing happens. When the accusative (2b) or postpositional

(2c) NPs follow the verb, a clitic pronoun co-indexed to the NP must be attached to the verb. Notice that the clitic pronoun keeps the relevant case and number coded in the extraposed NP.

- (2) a. Peo-ta bicha-k U jamut-Ø.
 Peo-ACC see-PRFV the woman-NOM
 ‘Saw Pedro, the woman.’
- b. U jamut-Ø a = bicha-k Peo-ta.
 the woman-NOM 3SG:ACC = see-PRFV Peo-ACC
 ‘Pedro, the woman saw him.’
- c. U o’ou-Ø au = nooka-k jamu-ta-u.
 the man-NOM 3SG:DIR = talk-PRFV woman-ACC-DIR
 ‘To the woman, the man talked to her.’

3. Yaqui relative clauses and the Accessibility Hierarchy. Relative clauses [henceforth RC] introduce or further establish people, objects, time and locations in discourse, by linking them to known referents and situations (cf. Fox & Thompson 1990). As defined by Lehmann (1984: 276), a RC is a construction consisting of a nominal and a subordinate clause interpreted as attributively modifying that nominal. The nominal is referred as the head, and the dependent unit as the relative or restricting clause. The information coded in the dependent unit may either be essential to understanding who the designated entity is (restrictive), or non essential, merely specifying in further detail some information about that noun (non-restrictive). In this vein, RCs are a subspecies of attributive (adjective) clauses, and their core function is to restrict the referent of a head noun (Bickel 2005).

Two main aspects have been widely documented from the viewpoint of typological variation. First, the fact that there is an argument (the head noun), that plays two roles, one in the main clause and one in the RC. Generally, the head noun appears in a modified or reduced form, or is completely omitted in one of the two units (Comrie 1989, 2003, 2005). One of the aims on the study of relativization is to determine the function of the head in the clause in which it does not occur: if the head is outside the RC (externally-headed), we look for its function in the relative clause; if the head is inside the RC (internally-headed), we search for its function in the matrix clause (Van Valin 2005).

Second, languages vary with respect to which syntactic argument can be subject of relativization. Keenan & Comrie found out that different languages exhibit different constraints with respect to which the roles are accessible to relativization, and each language can also use different strategies for a particular role. Keenan & Comrie (1977) proposed the Accessibility Hierarchy illustrated in (3).

(3) Accessibility Hierarchy (AH; Keenan & Comrie 1977: 66)

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique > Genitive >
Object of comparison

This hierarchy has been the object of much debate since its original formulation, even on the part of the authors themselves (cf. Comrie & Keenan 1979; Keenan 1985). For the purpose of this paper, the syntactic role of the notional head in the RC, help us to distinguish different RC strategies in Yaqui. Except for genitives and objects of comparison, the rest of the grammatical positions are accessible to relativization, by means of particular strategies at certain points of the hierarchy.

As in most Uto-Aztecan languages (Langacker 1977), Yaqui has two RCs types. The first type is marked by the clause linkage marker *-m(e)* and it is used when the head noun functions as the subject argument within the RC, as illustrated in (4b). The second type is marked by *-u* and it is used when the head noun functions as a non-subject argument within the RC, as shown in (4c). As in many languages, the RC is often incomplete (something is missing), since the head noun occurs as an argument of the matrix clause.

(4) a. Aapo siika.

3SG:NOM leave(SG):PRFV
'He/she left.'

b. U [enchi bicha-ka-me] siika.

the 2SG:ACC see-PRFV-CLM leave(SG):PRFV
'The one_i who ___i saw you, left'

c. U-me [em bicha-ka-'u] saja-k.

the-PL 2SG:GEN see-PRFV-CLM leave(PL)-PRFV
'The ones_i who you saw ___i, left.'

d.* [Em u-me bicha-ka-'u] saja-k.

'The ones_i who you saw ___i, left.'

In (4b), the head noun functions as the agent participant of the dependent verb *bicha* 'see'; in (4b), it serves as the theme participant. The heads (determiners) *u* 'the/one (sg)' and *ume* 'the/ones (pl)' are outside the RCs. Clauses where the notional head is inside the RCs or where there is not a missing (shared) argument as in (4d), are ruled out.

Martínez & Langendoen (1996: 453-4) proposed that RCs marked by *-m(e)* are an instance of nominalization, whereas clauses marked by *-u* are truly subordinated constructions. Among the evidence presented for the non-subordinated status of *-me* clauses are the following: (i) they may occur by itself as a NP or may occur as an adjunct of a noun; (ii) they may appear as the predicative phrase in copulative clauses; and (iii) they may function as a complement of complement-taking predicates, the later being the

strongest evidence. It is true such as NPs like *bwa'ame* 'food' in (5a) are often derived from verbs using the suffix *-me*, and it is also true that they may function as a complement unit, as shown in (5b). But it seems to me that it is the sharing of a participant between the main and the dependent units which motivates the formation of a referential term from predicative expressions. In Section 4, I will address in detailed the distinction between RCs and complement units. In what follows, the syntactic role of the notional head in the dependent unit is described.

- (5) a. [Ini'i bwa'a-me] kia!
 this eat-CLM tasty
 'This food is tasty (lit. what is eaten)'
- b. Aurelia-Ø [enchi laaben-ta pona-m-ta] jikka-k.
 Aurelia-NOM 2SG:ACC violin-ACC play-CLM-ACC hear-PRFV
 'Aurelia heard you play the violin.'

The subject participant inside the RC is easily accessible to relativization. The head noun *u yoeme* 'the man' in (6a) functions as the dependent subject in (*the one*) *who stood there*. The head noun *misita* 'cat' in (6b) is also the subject of (*the one*) *who is around*. Because the notional heads act as the dependent subject, the RC is then marked by *-me*. Notice that the RCs may be overtly marked by accusative or relevant postpositions, depending on the syntactic/semantic function of the notional head within the matrix clause. For instance, *misita* in (6b) is the direct object of the matrix predicate *miika* 'give', and the RC modifying that noun is also marked by the accusative suffix *-ta*. In these examples, the dependent unit is missing a core argument, its subject, meaning they are externally-headed RCs. Notice that there is no reference to the syntax/semantic function of the head noun inside the RC.

- (6) a. U yoeme-Ø [aman weye-ka-me] ripti.
 the man-NOM there stand-PRFV-CLM blind:STA
 'The man who is stood there is blind.'
- b. Jipi'ikim misi-ta miiika-Ø [pa'aku weama-m-ta]
 milk-PL cat-ACC give-PRES outside be around-CLM-ACC
 'Give milk (to) the cat that is outside.'

Non-subject arguments within the dependent verb are relativized using the clause linkage marker *-'u*. The examples below show the relativization of direct objects. In (7a), *jamut* 'the woman' is the direct object of the dependent verb *waata* 'love'. In (7b) *u bisikleta* 'the bike' is the object of *jinu* 'buy'. In (7c) *ume tiikom* 'the wheat' is the object of *echa* 'to sow'. Again, the notional head noun is a core argument of the matrix predicate, and there is a missing argument in the dependent unit. Notice that the RC in (7c) agrees in number with the head noun *tiikom* 'wheat', i.e. the plural marking *-m* is following the clause linkage marker *-'u*.

- (7) a. Jamut-ta-u [nim waata-'u] ne waate-Ø.
 woman-ACC-DIR 1SG:GEN want-CLM 1SG:NOM miss-PRES
 'I miss the woman that I love.'
- b. U bisikleeta-Ø [in jinu-ka-'u] sikili.
 the bike-NOM 1SG:GEN buy-PRFV-CLM red
 'The bike that I bought is red.'
- c. U-me tiikom [itom echa-ka-'u-m] si amue-k.
 the-PL wheat:PL 1PL:ACC sow-PRFV-CLM-PL a lot produce-PRFV
 'The wheat that we sowed produced very well.'

Thus, RCs in Yaqui referring to the dependent subject and direct object are externally-headed. There is nothing inside the RC coding the syntax/semantic function of the notional head noun besides, maybe, the distribution of the clause linkage markers. The situation is more complicated when the head noun functions as the indirect object within the RC. Apparently, there are three strategies: a missing core argument in (8a), a resumptive pronoun in (8b), and the occurrence of the notional head noun inside the RC in (8c).

- (8) a. U jamut-Ø [Joan-ta ili usi-ta makka-ka'u] Maria
 the woman-NOM Joan-ACC little child-NOM give-PRFV-CLM Maria
 'The woman to whom Juan gave a child is Mary.'
- b. U jamut-Ø_i [Joan-ta ili usi-ta a-u_i
 the woman-NOM Joan-ACC little child-ACC 3SG:DIR
 bittua-ka-'u] siika.
 send-PRFV-CLM leave:PRFV
 'The woman to whom Juan sent (her) the child left.'
- c. [Kajlos-ta jamut-ta-u nooka-ka-'u] Maria-tu-kan.
 Carlos-ACC woman-ACC-DIR talk-PRFV-CLM María-be-PASTC
 'Maria was the woman to whom Carlos talked.'

In (8a), the notional head *u jamut* 'the woman' is the indirect object of *maka* 'give' and it appears as a core argument of a matrix unit, while there is a gap inside the RC. In (8b), the *u jamut* functions as the indirect object of the verb *bittua* 'send' but here there is a pronoun inside the RC co-indexed to the head noun. Notice that the pronoun *au* 'to her/him' explicitly codes the syntax and semantic roles of the head noun within the RC. In (8c), the head noun occurs inside the RC, i.e., internally-headed. Although more data is necessary, the second strategy seems to be the most common one, and it is observed in more complex structures.

Yaqui shows a predominantly primary/secondary object pattern in ditransitive and derived verbs, but it also shows a direct/indirect object pattern with certain predicates (Guerrero & Van Valin 2004). For the set of predicates where the theme and the recipient are both marked as accusative, as *miika* ‘give’, the RC has equally access to both arguments, the accusative theme (9b) and the accusative recipient (9c).

- (9) a. Peo-Ø jamut-ta toto’i-ta miika-k.
 Peo-NOM woman-ACC hen-ACC give-PRFV
 ‘Pedro gave the woman a hen.’
- b. U toto’i-Ø_i [Peo-ta jamut-ta a_i miika-ka-’u]
 the hen-NOM Peo-ACC woman-ACC 3SG:ACC give-PRFV-CLM
 ‘The hen that Pedro gave (it) to the woman.’
- c. U jamut-Ø_i [Peo-ta toto’i-ta a_i miika-ka-’u]
 the woman-NOM Peo-ACC hen-ACC 3SG:ACC give-PRFV-CLM
 ‘The woman to whom Pedro gave (her) the hen.’

For those ditransitive verbs where the theme is marked accusative and the recipient/goal is marked by a postposition, such as *nenka* ‘sell’, both core arguments can be relativized in the same way that above, meaning that relativization cannot distinguish between the theme and the recipient. In (10b), the head noun *toto’ita* ‘the chicken’ remains in the main clause, whereas the dependent verb takes an accusative resumptive pronoun. In (10c), the resumptive pronoun is marked by the directional postposition.²

- (10) a. Peo-Ø jamut-ta-u toto’i-ta neenka-k.
 Peo-NOM woman-ACC-DIR hen-ACC sell-PRFV
 ‘Pedro sold the hen to the woman.’
- b. U toto’i-ta_i [Peo-ta jamut-ta-u a_i nenka-ka-’u]
 the hen-NOM Peo-ACC woman-ACC-DIR 3SG:ACC sell-PRFV-CLM
 ‘The hen that Pedro sold (it) to the woman.’
- c. U jamut-ta_i [Peo-ta toto’i-ta a-u_i nenka-ka-’u]
 the woman-NOM Peo-ACC hen-ACC 3SG:DIR sell-PRFV-CLM
 ‘The woman to whom Pedro sold the hen (to her).’

The same strategy of pronoun retention is used for oblique arguments. In (11), the head noun *kuchi’im* ‘knives’ acts as an instrument within the dependent verb *chukta* ‘cut’. Inside the RC, there is a pronoun *amea* ‘with it’ marked with the relevant postposition. Notice that in this particular example, the dependent verb not only agrees in number with the head noun, but it also takes the instrumental postposition *-mea* ‘with’.

- (11) Kuchi'i-m_i ne maka-'e [wakaj-ta em a-mea_i
 knife-PL 1SG:ACC give-IMPER meat-ACC 2SG:GEN 3SG-INSTR
 chuk-chukta-'u-m-mea].
 RED-cut-CLM-PL-INST:PL
 'Give me the knives that you chop the meat with.'

To sum up, there are two main strategies to express the relative notions in Yaqui. In the first one, the notional head noun acts as a core argument of the matrix predicate; there is no morphological coding on the syntax/semantic roles of the head noun within the RC, i.e. the gap strategy. In the second one, the RC shows a non-subject pronoun coding the syntax/semantic functions of the notional head noun, i.e. pronoun retention strategy. The distribution of the clause linkage markers *-me* and *-'u* only distinguishes subject and non-subject relativization. Direct object, indirect object and adjuncts are all relativized using the suffix *-'u*, although the occurrence of certain postpositions are also attested. It is hard to get RCs modifying genitives and objects of comparisons; because of this, I don't have convinced data about these positions. Let's move now to the comparison of RCs and other related phenomena in Yaqui.

4. Relative clauses vs. complement constructions. Languages sometimes use the same or a very similar construction for relatives and other subordinate relations such as complementation (cf. Cristofaro 2003). This seems to be the case in Yaqui. There are four complement types: a syntactic type, a nominalized type, a periphrastic type, and a morphological type (Guerrero 2004). The first two are structurally similar to RCs. The syntactic complement type takes the clause linkage marker *-'u*, and it is selected by most cognitive and mental verbs, as well as certain jussives and psych-action complement-taking predicates. In (12a), the matrix predicate *jikka* 'to hear' takes a syntactic complement to express indirect perception, e.g. *Maria heard that Ivan cried*. The nominalized type takes the clause linkage marker *-me* and its occurrence is restricted to perception predicates, *teenku* 'dream', and *te'a* 'find'. In (12b), the same predicate takes a nominalized complement expressing direct perception, e.g. *Maria heard Ivan cry*. In contrast to the *-'u* type, the *-me* type requires the main subject and the dependent subject to be different, i.e., non-correferential. The construction in (12c) is a relative clause.

- (12) a. Maria-Ø [Ivan-ta bwana-ka-'u] jikka-k.
 Maria-NOM Ivan-ACC cry-PRFV-CLM hear-PRFV
 'Maria heard that Ivan cried.'
- b. Maria-Ø [Ivan-ta bwana-m-ta] jikka-k.
 Maria-NOM Ivan-ACC cry-CLM-ACC hear-PRFV
 'Maria heard Ivan cry.' / *'Maria heard the Ivan who cried.'

- c. Maria-Ø ili uusi-ta [bwana-m-ta] jikka-k.
 Maria-NOM little child-ACC cry-CLM-ACC hear-PRFV
 ‘Maria heard the child who cried.’ / ‘Maria heard the child cry.’

There are, at least, six major differences between a RC and complement clauses. First, whereas the head noun of a RC tends to be a common noun, the subject of a complement unit is usually a proper name or a personal pronoun. The complement in (12a-b) cannot be derived from a restrictive RC because proper names and unique noun phrases may not be heads of restrictive relatives (Akmajian 1977). In other words, whereas a RC refers to a particular entity, complements do not refer to any particular individual but rather expresses a state of affairs regarding that individual. However, when the participant involved in a state of affairs is a common noun as in (12c), we would be in a borderline area in which it may be interpreted as the perception of an entity modified by a restrictive RC, e.g., *I heard [a child] [crying]*, or a direct perception of a situation, e.g. *I heard [a child crying]*.

Second, as Langacker (1977) points out, the subject inside the RC may occur in its genitive or accusative form in most Uto-Aztecan languages; in complementation, they are primarily marked as accusative. In Yaqui, there are only two consistent differences between the two pronominal paradigms: the genitive pronouns for the first person singular *ni* ~ *nim* and second person singular *em*, as compared to the accusative pronouns for first person *ne* and second person *enchi*, respectively. All other pronouns are the same for genitives and accusatives. In the RCs in (13a-b), the pronominal subjects must be genitive. In the completive clause in (13c), the pronominal subject must be accusative. When nominal, the subject is marked by the suffix *-ta* in both cases.

- (13) a. Jamut-ta-u [nim / *ne waata-’u] ne waate-Ø.
 woman-ACC-DIR 1SG:GEN / 1SG:ACC want-CLM 1SG:NOM miss-PRES
 ‘I miss the woman that I love.’
- b. [Em / *enchi bwika-’u] ne yi’i-ne.
 2SG:GEN / 2SG:ACC sing-CLM 1SG:NOM dance-EXPE
 ‘I will dance whatever you sing.’
- c. Maria-Ø [enchi / *em bwana-m-ta] jikka-k
 Maria-NOM 2SG:ACC 2SG:GEN cry-CLM-ACC hear-PRFV
 ‘Maria heard you cry.’

There are some instances in complementation where the embedded subject may be marked genitive. This seems to happen with cognitive predicates, such as *forget* and *remember*, and only when the matrix subject and the dependent subject are co-referential, as in (14a). Otherwise, the construction is inaccurate, as shown in (14b).

- (14) a. Ne [ne / nim_i Vicam-u ya'a-ne-'u] wawaate-k.
 1SG:NOM 1SG:ACC/1SG:GEN Vicam-DIR make-EXPE-CLM remember-PRFV
 'I remembered what I have to do in Vicam.'
- b. Ne [enchi / *em_i Vicam-u ya'a-ne-'u] wawaate-k.
 1SG:NOM 2SG:ACC/2SG:GEN Vicam-DIR make-EXPE-CLM remember-PRFV
 'I remembered what you have to do in Vicam.'

Third, RCs may take nominal categories such as number, case and even postpositions, whereas complement units can not. On the one hand, we saw examples where RCs marked by *-me* take the suffix *-ta* when the head noun functions as the accusative argument within the matrix unit; see the example in (6b) above. The nominalized complement in (15) is also marked as accusative but not because of agreement, but because it serves as a core argument of the matrix predicate *te'a* 'find'.

- (15) Nim achai [jaibu enchi siika-m-ta] te'a-k.
 1SG:GEN father already 2SG:ACC go:PRFV-CLM-ACC find-PRFV
 'My father found/discovered that you already left.'

On the other hand, a RC marked by *-'u* tends to agree with its notional head noun when plural; see the example in (7b) above and (16a) below. Regardless of the number of the participants involved in complementation, number agreement is completely disallowed, as demonstrated in (16b-b').

- (16) a. Min-Ø kaba'i-m bicha-k [Anselmo-ta jinu-ka-'u-m]
 Min-NOM horse-PL see-PRFV Anselmo-ACC buy-PRFV-CLM-PL
 'Fermín saw the horses that Anselmo bought.'
- b. Min-Ø [Anselmo-ta kaba'i-m jinu-ka-'u] bicha-k
 Min-NOM Anselmo-ACC horse-PL buy-PRFV-CLM see-PRFV
 'Fermín saw that Anselmo bought the horses.'
- b'. *Min-Ø [Anselmo-ta kaba'i-m jinu-ka-'u-m] bicha-k
 'Fermín saw that Anselmo bought the horses.'

Fourth, we have seen cases where there is a one verbal slot left empty in a RC when modifying subjects and objects, which the head noun may fill. For clarity, this gap is indicated in (17a) by a blank space. In contrast, all of the slots required by the dependent verb in a complement unit must be overtly expressed, as shown in (17b). The clause in (17b') is ruled out since the embedded subject serves as an argument of the matrix core, something that is fine for RCs.

- (17) a. Mu'u-ta_i empo bichak [____i ito-t wam ne'e-ka-m-ta].
 owl -PL 2SG:NOM see-PRFV 1PL-LOC over fly-PRFV-CLM-ACC
 'Did you see the owl that flew over us.'
- b. Min-Ø bicha-k [ne kaba'i-ta jinu-ka-m-ta].
 Min-NOM see-PRFV 1SG:ACC horse-ACC buy-PRFV-CLM-ACC
 'Fermín saw me buy the horse.'
- b'. *Min-Ø ne bicha-k [____i kaba'i-ta jinu-ka-m-ta].
 'Fermín saw me buying the horse.'

Fifth, regarding the position of the linked unit, the RC goes after the head noun, whereas the complement unit tends to appear extraposed to the right. Usually, the RC immediately follows the head noun, but it may also occur apart, especially when modifying a non-subject notional head. This is illustrated in (18a). In complementation, the linked unit may appear embedded in the main clause as in (18b), but the preferred position is to be extraposed to the right, following the matrix predicate, as in (18c).

- (18) a. Luisa-Ø tajo'o-ta bicha-k [____i nim baksia-ka-'u]
 Luisa-NOM cloth-ACC see-PRFV 1SG:GEN wash-PRFV-CLM
 'Luisa saw the clothes that I washed.'
- b. Luisa [tajo'o-ta ne baksia-ka-'u] bicha-k
 Luisa-NOM cloth-ACC 1SG:ACC wash-PRFV-CLM see-PRFV
 'Luisa saw that I washed the clothes.'
- c. Luisa a_i bicha-k [tajo'o-ta ne baksia-ka-'u]_i
 Luisa-NOM 3SG:ACC see-PRFV cloth-ACC 1SG:ACC wash-PRFV-CLM
 'Luisa saw it, that I washed the clothes.'

And six, pronoun retention. We found that the strategy of pronoun retention recalls the syntactic/semantic role of the head noun inside the RC, and it is more likely to be found towards the right end of the hierarchy than towards the leftward end. Relativized nouns functioning as subjects and transitive objects do not allow this strategy. One more example is presented below. In (18a), the head noun *wikiata* 'the lasso' functions as an instrumental oblique argument within the RC; since the RC is extraposed, it takes a resumptive pronoun *a-e* 'with it' referring to the head noun. Complementation involves another kind of pronoun retention. When the complement unit marked by *-u* is extraposed to the right, the main clause takes a resumptive pronoun co-indexed to the complement as a whole. In (18b), the main predicate takes an accusative singular pronoun *a*, but there is nothing inside the dependent unit to which *a* may agree with.

- (18) a. Inepo u-ka wikia-ta_i tamachia-Ø [in a-e_i
 1SG:NOM the-ACC lasso-ACC measure-PRES 1SG:GEN 3SG-INST
 kaba'i-ta jicho'ola-bae-'u].
 horse-ACC rope-DESID-CLM
 'I am measuring the lasso with which I will rope the horse.'
- b. Aurelia-Ø a_i jikka-k [enchi laaben-im pona-ka-'u]_i
 Aurelia-NOM 3SG:ACC hear-PASTP 2SG:ACC violin-PL play-PASTP-CLM
 'Aurelia heard it, that you played the violins.'

5. Final remarks. This paper has described the morpho-syntactic strategies to express relative clauses in Yaqui and has introduced the major differences between relative clauses and complement constructions. The fact that a 'pseudo'-relative clauses may serve as the complement of perception and other knowledge predicates has been observed in other languages; see Lambrecht (1981), Koenig & Lambrecht (1999), van der Auwera (1985) for French; Miller (1989) for Huaraz Quechua; Guasti (1992) and Borgonovo (1996) for Spanish. In Yaqui, verbs coding direct perception, as well as mental predicates such as *te'a* 'find, discover' and *teenku* 'dream, imagine' seem to be the only complement-taking predicates allowing a dependent unit marked by *-me*. Verbs coding acquisition of knowledge, such as indirect perception and cognitive, as well as speech act verbs, take a clausal complement marked by *-u* but never a nominalized clause.³

The question then arises as to what is the association between relative relations and perception and cognition predicates. A possibility may be the sharing of a participant. On the one hand, in RCs the dependent unit only provides a specification or attributive property about a single participant of it. This property is used to uniquely identify this entity within a set of possible referents (Cristofaro 2003: 197). On the other hand, an act of perception involves a state of affairs as a whole, the perceived event, but it also involves the entity bringing about this state of affair. That is, we simultaneously see, hear, or otherwise perceive not only the event going on but also the entities bringing them about. As a result, the dependent unit may be construed as a property attributed to the entity bringing it about.

Notes

¹ Abbreviations: ACC = Accusative, CLM = Clause Linkage Marker, DIR = Directional, EXPE = Expected, GEN = Genitive, INSTR = Instrumental, LOC = Locative, NEG = Negation, NOM = Nominative, PASS = Passive, PASTC = Past Continuative, PRFV = Perfective, PL = Plural, PRES = Present, SG = Singular.

² Although more data is necessary, I found examples where the relativization of the goal involves the passivization of the dependent verb. In this case, the RC is missing a

syntactic argument, i.e. no-reduction strategy. Below, two versions of a RC provided by different speakers.

- a. U misi- \emptyset [chu'u-ta nenki-wa-ka-'u chikul-ta]
 the cat-NOM dog-ACC sell-PASS-PRFV-CLM mouse-ACC
 'The cat to whom the dog sold a mouse left.'
- a'. U misi- \emptyset_i [chu'u-ta chikul-ta a-u_i nenka-ka-'u]
 the cat-NOM dog-ACC mouse-ACC 3SG-DIR sell-PRFV-CLM
 'The cat to whom the dog sold a mouse.'

³ Yaqui is also more restrictive in marking a complement clause as accusative, compared to other Uto-Aztecan languages. According to the examples in Langacker (1977), cognition and propositional attitude predicates used to take an accusative complement clause in Luiseño, Cahuilla, Serrano, Cupeño, Tulatulabal, among others.

References

- Akmajian, Adrian. 1977. 'The complement structure of perception verbs in an autonomous syntax framework.' *Formal Syntax*, ed. by P. W. Culicover, T. Wason, and A. Akmajian (eds). New York: Academic press, 427-460.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2005. 'On the typological variables of relativization.' Paper presented at On the Typology, Acquisition & Processing of Relative Clauses. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Borgonovo, Claudia. 1996. 'Gerunds and perception verbs.' *Langues et Linguistique* 22: 1-19.
- Comrie, Bernard and Edward L. Keenan. 1979. 'Noun phrase accessibility revisited.' *Language* 55: 649-664.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2005. 'Further thoughts on the Japanese-type relative clauses, and its implications for the general typology of relative clauses.' Paper presented at On the Typology, Acquisition & Processing of Relative Clauses. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- 2003. 'Tipología sintáctica: ¿Hasta qué punto son exóticas las oraciones de relativo de las lenguas de tipo europeo?' *En torno a Los Universales Lingüísticos*, ed. By Ricardo Maizal and Juana Gil. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination. Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dedrick John. M. and Eugene H. Casad. 1999. *Sonora Yaqui language structure*. The University of Arizona Press.
- Escalante, Fernando. 1990. *Voice and Argument Structure in Yaqui*. Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Arizona.
- Fox, Barbara, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1990. 'A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation.' *Language* 66: 297-316.

- Guasti, Ma. Teresa. 1989. 'Romance infinitive complements of perception verbs.' *MIT Working papers in Linguistics* 11: 31-45.
- Guerrero, Lilián. 2004. *The syntax-semantic interface in Yaqui complex sentences, a Role and Reference Grammar analysis*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University at Buffalo.
- Guerrero, Lilián and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 2004. 'Yaqui and the analysis of primary object languages.' *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70: 290-319.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1985. 'Relative clauses.' *Language typology and syntactic description: Complex constructions* 2, ed. by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. 1977. 'Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 8 : 63-99.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1981. *Topic, antitopic, and verb agreement in non-standard French*. (Series Pragmatics and Beyond 2: 6). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Roland. 1977. *An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar*. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 1. SIL and UTA presses.
- Lindenfeld, J. 1973. *Yaqui Syntax*. University of California Press.
- Martínez, Constantino and Terence Langendoen. 1996. 'Sobre las llamadas cláusulas relativas en yaqui.' *Memorias del III Encuentro de Lingüística en el Noroeste*, ed. by Z. Estrada, M. Figueroa, and G. López. Hermosillo: Universidad de Sonora.
- Van der Auwera, J. 1985. 'The predicative relatives of French perception verbs.' *Predicates and Terms in Functional Grammar*, ed. by A.M. Bolkestein, C. de Groot, J.L. Mackenzie. Foris publications, 219-234.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 2005. 'Some issues in the linking between syntax and semantics in relative clauses.' Paper presented at On the Typology, Acquisition & Processing of Relative Clauses. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.