On so-called relative clauses in Yaqui
Constantino Martinez Fabian, University of Sonora and University of Arizona
D. Terence Langendoen, University of Arizona

0   Summary

This paper argues against the widely-held view maintained for example by Lindenfeld 1973 that Yaqui has separate constructions, distinguished by their final suffixes *me* and *'u,* for expressing subject and nonsubject relative clauses.[1] We propose instead that the *'u*-construction is the only relative-clause construction in Yaqui, noting that Johnson 1962 had previously cited a number of cases in which the construction must be understood as a subject relative clause. We also propose that the *me*-construction is a nominalization of a verb phrase.

1   Lindenfeld's analysis of *me*- and *'u*-constructions in Yaqui as relative clauses

Lindenfeld 1973:65-75 analyzes the relative clause in Yaqui within the 'standard theory' of Chomsky 1965 as a sentence which modifies a noun phrase, and whose deep structure contains a noun phrase which is identical to the modified noun (called the 'shared' noun phrase). The shared noun phrase is transformationally deleted, and the morpheme *me* or *'u* is suffixed to the main predicate of the relative clause, which invariably occurs finally.[2] The *me*-construction is used for subject relative clauses (that is, if the shared noun phrase is the subject of the relative clause), and the *'u*-construction is used for object or oblique relative clauses (that is, if the shared noun phrase bears any other grammatical relation in the relative clause).[3] In 1.1-3, we repeat examples 24, 27 and 30 from Lindenfeld 1973:70, which illustrate the use of these two constructions.[4]

---

[1] We thank our consultants Francisca Gómez Tadeo and Onésimo Buitimea Valenzuela for their invaluable assistance; Fernando Escalante, who graciously checked our examples and led us to explore aspects of Yaqui syntax that we might not otherwise have considered; Mirna Castro Llamas, who generously provided us with examples from her fieldnotes; Eloise Jelinek, who assisted us in numerous ways throughout the development of this paper and who suggested many substantive improvements; and Ana Lidia Munguía Duarte, who helped us on a number of points of Yaqui morphology and syntax. The Spanish version of this paper was published in 1996 as Sobre las llamadas cláusulas relativas en yaqui, *Tercer Encuentro de Lingüística en el Noroeste*, ed. by Zarina Estrada Fernández, Max Figueroa Esteva, and Gerardo López Cruz, 443-464. Hermosillo, MX: Editorial Unison.

[2] We adopt Lindenfeld's conventions for transcribing Yaqui examples without marking pitch accent, except that we represent the labiovelar stop as b^w rather than as *bw*. However, we follow Escalante 1990 in representing the suffixes that Lindenfeld analyzes as *ame* and *a'u* as *me* and *'u* respectively, and the perfective suffix as *ka*, rather than as *k*, which is Lindenfeld's representation. We also adopt one- or two-character versions of Escalante's codes for interlinear glossing of morphemes of grammatical interest except that we gloss the suffixes *me* and *'u* as *ME* and *'U* respectively.

[3] The pattern of having distinct constructions for what are considered subject and object relative clauses is characteristic of a wide range of Uto-Aztecan languages. For example Ute uses the suffix *tch* for subject relative clauses and *na* for object relative clauses (Givón 1994:284-5, 292-5); and Luiseño uses the suffix *mokwish* for subject past-tense relative clauses and *vo* for past-tense object relative clauses (Hyde 1971: 178).

[4] We suggest that *ama* in 1.3 may be a resumptive proform. Although Lindenfeld translates it 'That house over there in which they live is old', *ama* 'there' is clearly part of the relative clause, not the main clause; a more literal translation would be 'That house that they live there is old'. In oblique relative clauses generally, Yaqui uses resumptive pronouns, as in i-iii; iii is from Langacker 1977:183.

i	inii	hu	kuta	hoan-ta	tooro-ta	ae	a=beba-ka-'u		
	this	D	stick	Juan-Ps	bull-Ac	3:Sg:Cm	3:Sg:Ac-beat-Pf-'U		
	'This is the stick with which Juan beat the bull.'								
ii	hu	boo'o-t	em=aet=yepsa-ka-'u		teta-m ayu-k				
	D	road-Lc	2:Sg:Ps=3:Sg:Lc=travel-Pf-'U		stone-Pl	have-Pf			
	'There were stones on the road on which you traveled.'								
iii	hu-me	haamuch-im	in	amet	noka-ka-'u				
	D-Pl	woman-Pl	1:Sg:Ps	3:Pl:Lc	talk-Pf-'U				

1.1 hu-me woi sakoba'i-m mesa-po hoka-me nee maka
    D-Pl two watermelon-Pl table-on be-ME 1:Sg:Ac give
    'Give me the two watermelons which are on the table.'

1.2 hu chuu'u itom usi-m nu'u-ka-'u ko'okwe
    D dog 1:Pl:Ps child-Pl bring-Pf-'U be-sick
    'The dog which our children brought is sick.'

1.3 gwa'a kari bem ama ho'a-ka-'u mweela
    D house 3Pl:Ps there live-Pf-'u be-old
    'That house where they live is old'

Examples 1a-b in Escalante 1990:11, repeated here as 1.4-5, show the same pattern.[5]

1.4 hu enchi bicha-ka-me siika
    D 2:Sg:Ac see-Pf-ME leave:Sg:Pf
    'The one who saw you left.'

1.5 hu-me em bicha-ka-'u-m sahak
    D-Pl 2:Sg:Ps see-Pr-'U-Pl leave:Pl:Pf
    'The ones who you saw left.'

As 1.5 shows, the subject of the relative clause appears with possessive case marking, as is characteristic of the subject of a subordinate clause in Uto-Aztecan languages generally. In Yaqui, possessive and accusative case marking is distinguished only for first and second person singular pronouns, otherwise they are the same; see Escalante 1990:7-9.[6]

Comparing examples 1.1 and 1.5, we see that if the head of the relative clause is plural, then plural marking is added to the *'u*-construction, but not to the *me*-construction.[7] Lindenfeld 1973:71-2 reports that the opposite is true for accusative case marking (she calls it 'dependency marking'): if the head of the relative clause is marked for accusative case, then such case marking must be added to the *me*-construction, but not to the *u*-construction, as in her examples 34 and 37, repeated here as 1.6-7.[8]

'the women that I talked about'
In iv however, there is no resumptive pronoun and the locative suffix *po* is used instead of *'u*.

iv empo si'ime-ta ta'aru-k em yeesu-ka-po
   2:Sg:Nm all-Ac lose-Pf 2:Sg:Ps be-Pf-Lc
   'You lost everything where you were.'

[5]Escalante refers to the subjects in 1.4-5 as 'headless' relative clauses. However, he glosses *me* and *'u* as nominalizing suffixes, which partially accords with our analysis developed in sections 3-5. Escalante uses the orthographic conventions officially adopted by the Arizona Pascua Yaqui Tribe in 1985, in which *v* corresponds to our *b* and *ch* to our *ch*. Also, the determiner *hu* lacks the initial *h* in Arizona Yaqui. He therefore transcribes 1.4-5 as *u enchi vichakame siika* and *ume em vichaka'um sahak* respectively.

[6]In 1.2, the head of the subject of the relative clause is a plural noun, and such nouns are not further inflected for case in Yaqui. Moreover, if the head noun is possessed, it is also not further inflected for case, as i and ii show.

i. em miisi=ne tu'ure
   2:Sg:Ps cat=1:Sg:Nm like
   'I like your cat.'

ii. *em miisi-ta=ne tu'ure
        cat-Ac

[7]Plural marking is optional for object relative clauses; for example, 1.5 is grammatical, although less acceptable, with *bicha-ka-'u* replacing *bicha-ka-'u-m*. As Lindenfeld observes, and as we see in example iii in n. 3, there is no plural marking in oblique relative clauses.

[8]In 1.6, the relative clause is adjoined to the main clause as a whole (Hale 1973, Jelinek 1987); such adjunction is quite common in Yaqui. Note that the *e* of *me* drops when another suffix follows.

1.6. itepo chu'u-ta   hipwe   kaa   hi-hii-b^{w}a-m-ta
     1:Pl:Nm   dog-Ac   have   not   Fq-3:Inan:Ob-eat-ME-Ac
     'We have a dog which does not eat.'
1.7. ini-kabachi-ta   em   hinu-ka-'u   nee   maka
     D-Ac   corn-Ac   2:Sg:Ps   buy-Pf-'U   1:Sg:Ac   give
     'Give me the corn which you bought'

However, we have found that accusative case marking may also be added to the *'u*-construction, so that 1.7 remains grammatical with *hinu-ka-'u-ta* replacing *hinu-ka-'u*. Such case marking, in fact, disambiguates the extraposed relative clause in 1.8 that otherwise could be associated with either of two antecedents, as in 1.9.

1.8 hu   'o'ou   hu-ka   hamut-ta   em   bicha-ka-'u-ta
     D   man   D-Ac   woman-Ac   love   2:Sg:Ps   see-Pf-'U-Ac
     'The man loves the woman who you saw.'
1.9 hu   'o'ou   hu-ka   hamut-ta   waata   em   bicha-ka-'u
     D   man   D-Ac   woman-Ac   love   2:Sg:Ps   see-Pf-'U
     'The man who you saw loves the woman' or 'The man loves the woman who you saw.'

2.   Updating Lindenfeld's analysis of relative clauses

The relative clause is now analyzed within generative grammar not by deletion of a shared noun phrase, but rather by movement of an underlying relative proform into the specifier position of a functional category, generally identified as a complementizer (C); see for example Chomsky 1986. The maximal projection of C, namely CP, consists of a specifier — a relative proform which we categorize as a determiner phrase (DP) — and an intermediate projection C'. The C' consists of a sentence S (the relative clause proper),[9] which contains a trace or a resumptive proform bound by the specifier, and the complementizer.[10] Assuming that the relative clause is consistently either left headed or right headed, we can schematize its structure as in 2.1 (left headed) or 2.2 (right headed).

2.1 $[_{CP}$ $[_{C'}$ $[_{C}$ ...] $[_{S}$ ... $[_{DP_i}$ $t]$ ...]] $[_{DP_i}$ ...]]
2.2 $[_{CP}$ $[_{DP_i}$ ...] $[_{C'}$ $[_{S}$ ... $[_{DP_i}$ $t]$ ...] $[_{C}$ ...]]]

If 2.1 is the structure of the relative clause in Yaqui, then *me* and *'u* are relative proforms and the complementizer is null. If 2.2 is the structure of the relative clause in Yaqui, then *me* and *'u* are complementizers and the relative proform is null. We favor 2.2 for the following reasons. First, Yaqui constituent structure is generally right headed; for example, the noun and the verb typically appear at the right edge of their respective maximal projections.[11] Second, in the comparable constructions in Luiseño, in which both a relative proform and a complementizer appear overtly, the relative pronoun appears leftmost in the construction and the complementizer appears rightmost.[12] Third, given that *me* and *'u* are morphological suffixes and not clitics, they are more naturally analyzed as heads rather than as maximal projections. Accordingly, in 2.3 we recast Lindenfeld's analysis of *enchi bichakame* 'who saw you'occurring in 1.4 as a subject relative clause, and in 2.4 we recast her analysis of *em*

---

[9]Since we are not concerned here with the details of subsentential structure in Yaqui, we continue to use the categories familiar from Chomsky 1965 for that structure, except that we analyze referring expressions as determiner phrases (DP) rather than as noun phrases (NP).

[10]We indicate the binding relation in the usual manner by coindexing the binder and the bindee; however, we place the indices on the category labels rather than on their content.

[11]The determiner is an exception; it appears at the left edge of the determiner phrase.

[12]For example, in the Luiseño relative clauses *po 'oy tiiwi-mokwish* 'who saw you' and *pomom 'o-tiiwi-vo* 'who (pl) you saw', *po* and *pomom* are relative proforms, and *mokwish* and *vo* are past-tense complementizers; see n. 3.

bichaka'um 'who (pl) you saw' occurring in 1.5 as an object relative clause.[13]

2.3 [CP [DP*i* *e*] [C' [S [DP*i* *t*] enchi bichaka] [C me]]]

2.4 [CP [DP*i* *e*] [C' [S em [DP*i* *t*] bichaka] [C 'um]]]]

A relative clause occurs as an adjunct to a noun phrase (NP), which in turn occurs as the complement of a determiner (D).[14] If the NP is empty, the result is a 'headless' relative clause construction, as in *hume em bichaka'um* 'the ones who you saw' in 1.5; its structure is shown in 2.5.

2.5 [DP*i* [D hume] [NP [NP *e*] [CP [DP*i* *e*] [C' [S em [DP*i* *t*] bichaka] [C 'um]]]]]

If the NP is nonempty, the result is a 'headed' relative clause construction, such as *hu chuu'u itom usim nu'uka'u* 'the dog which our children brought' in 1.2; its structure is shown in 2.6.

2.6 [DP*i* [D hu] [NP [NP chuu'u] [CP [DP*i* *e*] [C' [S itom usim [DP*i* *t*] nu'uka] [C 'u]]]]]

3   Two problems with Lindenfeld's analysis of the *me-* and *'u-*constructions

Lindenfeld's contention that *me* and *'u* are in complementary distribution, the former suffixed to subject relative clauses and the latter to nonsubject relative clauses, is supported by the observation that these suffixes cannot be interchanged in examples 1.4 and 1.5: both resulting sentences are ungrammatical.

3.1 *hu enchi bichaka'u siika
     'The one who saw you left.'

3.2 *hume em bichakame sahak
     'The ones who you saw left.'

Indeed, *me* can never appear as the complementizer of a nonsubject relative clause. However, it can be inferred from examples given in Johnson 1962:43-4, repeated here as 3.3-5, that *'u* can appear in a subject relative clause if the dependent verb is intransitive.

3.3 yaha-ka-'u
     arrive-Pf-'U
     'who (pl) arrived'

3.4 ya'a-wa-ka-'u
     make-Pv-Pf-'U
     'which is made'

3.5 nenki-wa-'u
     sell-Pv-'U
     'which is sold'

An example from a Yaqui text in Johnson 1962 (231, line 365) is repeated here as 3.6.[15]

3.6 'ume'e   'ili-uusi-m-tu-ka-'u   kokok
     those:Pl   little-child-Pl-be-Pf-'U die:Pl:Pf
     'Those who were little children died.'

In such examples, *'u* can be replaced by *me* without loss of grammaticality or apparent change in meaning, as in 3.7.

3.7 'ume'e 'ili-uusi-m-tu-ka-me kokok
     'Those who were little children died.'

---

[13]We account for the number agreement of the complementizer *'u* with the relative pronoun as an instance of specifier-head agreement. For an explanation of the failure of *me* to agree in number with the relative pronoun, see n. 20.

[14]We analyze the internal structure of referring expresesions in Yaqui as determiner phrases following Abney 1987.

[15]We thank Eloise Jelinek for pointing this example out to us. Fernando Escalante reports that the grammaticality of this example is improved if the plural marker *m* is added to *'u*; see also n. 7.

There is considerable disagreement among Yaqui speakers about the grammaticality of some of these examples of intransitive *'u*-constructions serving as subject relative clauses. For example, Escalante 1990:22-3 considers all cases like 3.4-5, in which the relative verb is passive, to be ungrammatical.[16] We return to this problem in section 4.

Another, and more serious, problem with Lindenfeld's analysis is that the *me*-construction can also be used as a direct complement of a verb, as in 3.8-9, in which case it cannot possibly be analyzed as a relative clause.

3.8 yuke-m-ta   bena
    rain-ME-Ac   seem
    'It seems to be raining.'

3.9 yuke-m-ta=ne   hikkaha-k
    rain-ME-Ac=1:Sg:Nm hear-PRF
    'I heard it raining.'

On the other hand, if we analyze the *me*-construction as a nominalization of a verb phrase to handle cases like 3.8-9,[17] we can easily account for cases like 1.1, 4, 6, in which it appears to function as a subject relative clause. Consider the English *ing*-nominalization *wanting help* in a determiner phrase like *people wanting help*. This nominalization is understood like the subject relative clause *who want help*, yet is presumably not derived from it. In the same way, the *me*-constructions in 1.1, 4, 6, for example *enchi bichakame* in the determiner phrase *hu enchi bichakame* in 1.4, can be understood like a subject relative clause without being derived from one. We contend that there are no grammatical subject relative clause in Yaqui from which the *me*-constructions in 1.4, 6 can be derived.

In summary, examples 3.3-6, together with 1.2, 3, 5, 7-9, indicate that the *'u*-construction can be used to express at least some intransitive subject relative clauses, as well as any nonsubject relative clause. Examples 3.8-9, together with 1.1, 4, 6, indicate that the *me*-construction is a nominalization of a verb phrase, which can occur either as an adjunct which modifies a noun phrase or as a complement to a verb. In the next section, we provide an analysis of the *'u*-construction in Yaqui, which we consider to be coextensive with the relative-clause construction in that language. In the final section, we provide an analysis of the *me*-construction as a nominalization.

4   Analysis of the *'u*-construction as a relative clause

If the *'u*-construction is the sole mechanism for expressing true relative clauses in Yaqui, the problem is not so much to explain the grammaticality of 3.3-6 as it is to explain the ungrammaticality of 3.1. The structure of its subject phrase, **hu enchi bichaka'u* 'the one who saw you', is given in 4.1.

4.1 $*[_{DPi}$ $[_D$ hu$]$ $[_{NP}$ $[_{NP}$ $e]$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{DPi}$ $e]$ $[_{C'}$ $[_S$ $[_{DPi}$ $t]$ $[_{VP}$ enchi bicha-ka$]]$ $[_C$ 'u$]]]]]$

We propose a solution which is based on the observation that the subject trace in 4.1 is marked for possessive case, and that empty categories so marked cannot be bound. First observe that empty 'true' possessive phrases cannot be bound; for example 4.2 is also ungrammatical. On the other hand, a resumptive 'true' possessive pronoun may be bound, as in 4.3.[18]

---

[16]Escalante states of the particular pair *hu bepsuwakame* and *hu bepsuwaka'u* 'the one who was beaten' that only the former is grammatical.

[17]Since the nominalizations in 3.8-9 function as object complements, they receive accusative case from the matrix verb.

[18]For explanation of the lack of accusative case marking on *chuu'u* in 4.3, see n. 6.

4.2 *hu-ka   hamut-ta   in   chuu'u(-ta) bʷi-bʷisu-ka-'u=ne   tu'ure
   D-Ac   woman-Ac 1:Sg:Ps   dog(-Ps)   Fq-grasp-Pf-'U=1:Sg:Nm   like
   'I like the woman whose dog I stroked.' (lit: 'I like the woman who I stroked dog.')

4.3 hu-ka hamut-ta in apo'ik   chuu'u bʷi-bʷisuka-'u=ne tu'ure
                       3:Sg:Ps

   'I like the woman whose dog I stroked.' (lit: 'I like the woman who I stroked her dog.')

Thus, if 4.1 is subject to the same restriction, its ungrammaticality is accounted for. On the other hand, replacing the trace in 4.1 with a resumptive pronoun does not make the phrase grammatical: *hu apo'ik enchi bichaka'u 'the one who (s)he saw you' is also ungrammatical. Yaqui does not permit resumptive subject pronouns.[19]

    However, the restriction that disallows possessive traces also rules out 3.3-6. To account for their grammaticality, we must further assume that the subject traces of certain intransitive verb phrases may be reanalyzed as having nominative case, hence making them bindable. As noted in section 3, the extent to which this reanalysis takes place appears to vary among speakers. Without it, Yaqui would be like other Uto-Aztecan languages which do not permit the formation of subject relative clauses at all.[20]

5   Analysis of the *me*-construction as a nominalization

    The internal structure of the *me*-construction *enchi bichakame* 'who saw you' (lit. 'having seen you') in 1.4 is given in 5.1.

5.1   [NP [VP enchi bichaka] [N me]]]

Since the *me*-construction is itself an NP, it can occur directly as the complement of a D as in the DP *hu enchi bichakame* 'the one who saw you' (lit. 'the having seen you') in 1.4; its structure is given in 5.2. It can also occur as an adjunct to an NP as in the DP *hume woi sakoba'im mesapo hokame* 'the two watermelons which are on the table' (lit. 'the two watermelons being on the table') in 1.1; its structure is given in 5.3.[21]

5.2   [DP [D hu] [NP [VP enchi bichaka] [N me]]]

5.3   [DP [D hume] [DP [D woi] [NP [NP sakoba'im] [NP [VP mesapo hoka] [N me]]]]]

The *me*-construction can also occur as the complement of a possibly empty copula in independent clauses such as 5.4-6.

5.4   inepo   ye'e-me
      1:Sg:Nm   dance-ME
      'I am a dancer / one who dances.'

5.5   inepo enchi bicha-ka-me
      'I am one who saw you.'

5.6   inepo enchi bicha-ka-me   tu-ka
                           be-Pf
      'I was one who saw you.'

---

    [19]The same restriction is found in many other languages including English and Hebrew; see for example Shlonsky 1992.

    [20]We conjecture, for example, that the *tch*-construction in Ute (see n. 3) is a nominalized verb phrase, like the *me*-construction in Yaqui, and not a relative clause; and that the *na*-construction functions as a nonsubject relative clause only. On the other hand, the *mokwish*-construction in Luiseño presumably is a subject relative clause, as it includes an element which appears to be best analyzed as a relative proform; see n. 12.

    [21]We assume that *me* is invariant in number, so that it may be selected by a plural determiner, as in 5.3. Since it does not bear a grammatical relation with a plural specifier in 5.3, it is not in a position to undergo agreement with such a specifier, unlike *'u*.

In this construction, nominative case is assigned to the subject by the projection of the matrix tense.

Next, as 3.8-9 illustrate, the *me*-construction can occur as the noun-phrase complement to the verb *bena* 'seem, resemble' and verbs of direct perception, such as *hikkaha* 'hear' and *bicha* 'see'. In those examples, the verb of the *me*-construction does not take its own subject. If it does, then that subject occurs as in the nominative case if the construction is the complement of *bena*, and in the accusative case if the construction is the complement of a verb of direct perception, as 5.7-8 illustrate.

5.7   empo   ye'e-m-ta   bena
      2:Sg:Nm   dance-ME-Ac   seem
      'You seem to dance.'

5.8   inepo   enchi   ye'e-m-ta   bicha-k
      1:Sg:Nm 2:Sg:Ac   dance-ME-Ac   see-Pf
      'I saw you dancing.'

We assume that these case assignments are consequences of raising; the nominative form *empo* in 5.7 and the accusative form *enchi* in 5.8 originate as subjects of *ye'emta*, but cannot receive case from it, since the *me*-construction, being a noun phrase, is not a case assigner. In other words, we construe the underlying determiner phrase plus *me*-construction as a 'small clause' object complement of the matrix verb (Stowell 1981). The *me*-construction itself receives accusative case from the matrix verb as in 5.9-10.

5.9   [$_S$ [$_{DPi}$ empo] [$_{VP}$ [$_{SC}$ [$_{DPi}$ t] [$_{NP}$ ye'emta]] [$_V$ bena]]]

5.10 [$_S$ [$_{DP}$ inepo] [$_{VP}$ [$_{DPi}$ enchi] [$_{SC}$ [$_{DPi}$ t] [$_{NP}$ ye'emta]] [$_V$ bichak]]]

This small-clause-plus-raising analysis accords with the fact that *empo* is not the logical subject of *bena* in 5.9 and that *enchi* is not the logical object of *bichak* in 5.10. For example, 5.11 does not entail 5.12.

5.11 kaabeta=ne   ye'e-m-ta   bicha-k
       nobody=1:Sg:Nm   dance-ME-Ac   see-Pf
       'I saw nobody dancing.'

5.12 kaabeta=ne bicha-k
       'I saw nobody.'

Moreover, since small clauses cannot occur as subject complements in Yaqui, neither 5.7 nor 5.8 have passive counterparts; both 5.13 and 5.14 are ungrammatical.[22]

5.13 *ye'e-me   bena-wa
       dance-ME   seem-Pv
       'Dancing is seemed.'

5.14 *empo   ye'e-m-ta   bit-wa-k
       2:Sg:Nm   dance-ME-Ac   see-Pv-Pf
       'You were seen to dance.'

To express the idea conveyed by the translation of 5.14, a different nominalization of the verb is required, using the suffix *-ka*, which Johnson 1962:46-7 classifies as gerundive, as in 5.15.

5.15 empo   ye'e-ka   bitwak
                     dance-KA
      'You were seen dancing.'

Our analysis also accounts for the ability of the determiner phrase to bind a reflexive or reciprocal

---

[22]Yaqui also uses the passive to create impersonal constructions, such as *yi'iwa* 'There is dancing'. But this is only possible for the class of unergative verbs, of which *bena* is not one. Hence its passive with no arguments, as in *benawa* 'There is seeming', is also ungrammatical.

anaphor inside the *me*-construction, as in 5.16-17.[23]

5.16 peo   au   waata-m-ta bena
     Pete 3:Sg:Rf   love-ME-Ac   seem
     'Pete seems to love himself.'

5.17 peo   nee   ino   bekta-ka-m-ta   bichak
     Pete 1:Sg:Ac   1:Sg:Rf   shave-Pf-ME-Ac see-Pf
     'Pete saw me shave myself.'

It also accounts for the fact that the matrix subject can bind an anaphor occurring as the subject of the small clause, as in 5.18, but not an anaphor occurring as the object of the *me*-construction, as in 5.19-20.

5.18 ino=ne   ye'e-m-ta   bicha-k
     1:Sg:Rf=1:Sg:Nm dance-ME-Ac   see-Pf
     'I saw myself dance.

5.19 *peo nee   au   bekta-ka-m-ta   bichak
     Pete 1:Sg:Ac   3:Sg:Rf   shave-Pf-ME-Ac see-Pf
     'Pete saw me shave himself.'

5.20 *peo-ta=ne   ino   bekta-ka-m-ta bichak
     Pete-Ac=1:Sg:Nm   1:Sg:Rf
     'I saw Pete shave myself.'

Finally, Fernando Escalante (p.c.) has pointed out to us that when the *me*-construction functions as an object complement, *me* agrees in number with the subject of the small clause if the dependent verb is intransitive, and with the object of the dependent verb if it is transitive, as 5.8, 21-25 illustrate.[24]

5.21 enchi-m   ye'e-me(*-ta)=ne   bicha-k
     2:Ac-Pl   dance-ME(*-Ac)=1:Sg:Nm   see-Pf
     'I saw you (pl) dancing.'

5.22 peo itom   enchi-m   beba-me(*-ta)   bicha-k
     Pete 1:Pl:Ac   2:Ac-Pl   hit-ME(*-Ac)
     'Pete saw us hit you (pl).'

5.23 peo itom   enchi   beba-m-ta   bicha-k
              2:Ac   hit-ME-Ac
     'Pete saw us hit you (sg).'

5.24 peo nee   enchi-m   beba-me(*-ta)   bicha-k
              1:Sg:Ac   2:Ac-Pl   hit-ME(*-Ac)
     'Pete saw me hit you (pl).'

5.25 peo nee   enchi   beba-m-ta   bicha-k
              2:Ac   hit-ME-Ac
     'Pete saw me hit you (sg).'

This pattern could be explained if the arguments of a predicate appear as specifiers of functional projections dominating the verb, as Jelinek MS has proposed on independent grounds, and *me* agrees in number with the nearest such specifier. We plan to investigate this possibility in future work.

---

[23]For discussion of anaphoric binding in Yaqui, see Escalante 1990:12-4.

[24]See n. 6, where it is pointed out that accusative case marking is not added to plural heads; thus the test for plurality of *me* in this construction is whether the accusative case marker *ta* is attached to it.

References

Abney, Steven. 1987. *The noun phrase in its sentential aspect.* PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Escalante, Fernando. 1990. *Voice and argument structure in Yaqui*. PhD dissertation, University of Arizona.

Givón, Talmy. 1994. Nominalized clauses in Ute: The diachronic seesaw of finite structure. *II Encuentro de lingüística en el noroeste: Memorias 1*, ed. by Zarina Estrada Fernández, 269-310. Hermosillo: Universidad de Sonora.

Hale, Kenneth. 1973. The adjoined relative clause in Australia. *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, ed. by R. M. W. Dixon. ???, NJ: Humanities Press.

Hyde, Villiana. 1971. *An introduction to the Luiseño language*. Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1987. Headless relatives and pronominal arguments: A typological perspective. *Native American languages and grammatical typology*, ed. by Paul Kroeber and R. E. Moore. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Jelinek, Eloise. MS. Transitivity and voice in Yaqui.

Johnson, Jean B. 1962. *El idioma yaqui*. México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. *An overview of Uto-Aztecan grammar* (*Studies in Uto-Aztecan grammar 1*). Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Lindenfeld, Jacqueline. 1973. *Yaqui syntax* (University of California Publications in Linguistics 76). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1992. Resumptive pronouns as a last resort. *Linguistic inquiry* 23.443-68.

Stowell, Timothy. 1981. *Origins of phrase structure*. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.