Double locatives:
the case of external possession in Yaqui

Role and Reference Grammar International Conference
University at Buffalo, 2019

Lilián Guerrero (UNAM)
lilianguerrero@yahoo.com

Valeria A. Belloro (UAQ)
vbelloro@yahoo.com
1. PRESENTATION

It is well known that languages have more than one structure for encoding the relation between a possessor and a possessee and that their distribution usually correlates with different semantic relationships, e.g., kinship terms, body parts, part-whole, garments, domestic animals, and the ownership of personal objects (Seiler 1983; Heine 1997; Payne & Barshi 1999; Haspelmath 1999, 2006; Stolz et al. 2008; Stassen 2009; McGregor 2009; Nichols & Bickel 2013; Aikhenvald 2013).

The Yaqui language (Southern Uto-Aztecan; Mexico) is no exception.

Previous studies on Yaqui have focused on internal and verbal possession (Jelinek & Escalante 1988; Dedrick & Casad 1999; Gurrola 2005; Muchembled 2010; Álvarez 2012); external possession has gone unnoticed until now.
In this paper, we focus on external possessive constructions (EPCs).

There are two major types of EPCs, applicative and splitting. In these EPCs,

(i) the possessee can be coded as accusative or locative
(ii) the possessor may be coded as accusative, dative-like, or locative
(iii) regardless of the coding, the possessor has limited syntactic privileges

Accusative & locative possesses, and accusative & dative possessors are well-known cross-linguistically (Payne & Barshi 1999). In the case of locative possessors, Haspelmath (1999) claimed they are deviations of dative EPs, but ‘locative markers resemble the dative case in that they are dependent-marking elements signaling a non-nuclear grammatical relation [...] this pattern is peculiar to European language.’
Our goal in this paper is to show that:

(i) unlike typical dative EPCs with ‘raising/ascension/promotion’ of the possessor (e.g. yo le corté el cabello ‘I cut his hair’), Yaqui EPCs prefer the ‘no-promotion’ of the external possessor and the ‘demotion’ of the possessee;

(ii) the pattern of locative possessors is peculiar not because it is geographically limited, but because the external possessor cannot act as a passive-PSA.
Outline

§2 Simple clauses in Yaqui
§3 Typical possessive constructions in Yaqui
§4 External possessive constructions (EPCs)
§5 An (ongoing) analysis of Yaqui EPCs
§6 Final comments
Yaqui is an agglutinative, accusative, dependent-marking, head-final language. Direct and oblique core arguments are formally distinguished. Singular nouns serving as direct core arguments are unmarked -Ø for nominative and marked by -ta for accusative; plural nouns are marked by -(i)m.

1) a. Joan-Ø u-ka kari-ta bicha-k
   John-NOM DET-ACC house-ACC see-PFV
   ‘John saw the house.’

   b. Joan-Ø u-me kari-m bicha-k
   John-NOM DET-PL house-PL see-PFV
   ‘John saw the houses.’
Only direct core arguments can be assigned macroroles and can serve as PSA. Based on the transitive clause in (1a), the highest-ranked argument (effector) in the LS (1c) is the actor, and the lowest-ranked argument (theme) the undergoer. In (1b-b’), the suffix -wa is added to the verb, so the agent is omitted. In (1b), the theme takes nominative case, i.e. passive-PSA. In (1b’) the theme continues to be an accusative NP, i.e. non-PSA impersonal clause.

1) a. Joan-∅  u-ka  kari-ta  bicha-k  
   John-NOM  DET-ACC  house-ACC  see-PFV  
   ‘John saw the house.’

   b. U-∅  kari-∅  bicha-wa-k  b’. U-ka  kari-ta  bicha-wa-k  
      DET-NOM  house-NOM  see-PASS-PFV  DET-ACC  house-ACC  see-PASS-PFV  
      ‘The house was seen.’  ‘(Someone) saw the house.’

   c. see’ (JohnA, houseU)
Oblique core arguments are marked by locative postpositions. Verbs that translate as *miss, talk to, remember, forgive, or be angry* take the directional -\(u\) ‘to’ (when inanimate) or -\(ta-u\) (when animate) (2a); verbs like *know, envy, whistle, shout,* or *believe* take the contact locative -\(t\) or -\(ta-t\) ‘at, over’ (2b). Oblique NPs cannot serve as passive-PSA; thus, (2b’) is an impersonal clause.

2) a. Lupe-Ø Joan-ta-u waate-Ø  
Lupe-NOM John-ACC-DIR miss-PRE  
‘Lupe misses John.’ (Sp. *le extraña*)

b. Inepo Peo-ta-t e’a-Ø  
1SG.NOM Peter-ACC-LOCC believe-PRE  
‘I believe in Peter.’ (Sp. *le creo*)  

b’. Peo-ta-t e’a-wa-Ø  
Peter-ACC-LOCC believe-PASS-PRE  
‘(Someone) believe in Peter.’ (Sp. *se le cree*)

c. *believe’* (1sg\(A\), Peo)
There are two major classes of three-place predicates (Guerrero & Van Valin 2004). Verbs like bittua ‘send’ mark the third argument with the directional -u or -ta-u. In (3a), there is only one accusative NP (theme), so the undergoer is the lowest-ranked argument in the LS, and it serves as the passive-PSA (3a’).

3) a. Bempo u-ka seewa-ta u-e jamut-ta-u bittua-k
   3PL.NOM DET-ACC flower-ACC DET-OBL woman-ACC-DIR send-PFV
   ‘They sent a flower to the woman.’

   a’. U-Ø seewa-Ø u-e jamut-ta-u bittua-wa-k
   DET-NOM flower-NOM DET-OBL woman-ACC-DIR send-PASS-PFV
   ‘The flower was sent to the woman.’

   b. [do’ (3plA, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have’ (woman, flowerU)]       U= lowest-ranked argument
Verbs like maka ‘give’ mark the theme and the recipient as accusative (3c). When there is more than one accusative NP, the undergoer is the second highest-ranked argument (beneficiary), and it acts as passive PSA (3c’), i.e. primary object.

(3) c. Bempo u-ka toto’i-ta u-ka jamut-ta maka-k  
3PL.NOM DET-ACC hen-ACC DET-ACC woman-ACC give-PFV  
‘They gave the woman the hen.’

c’. U-Ø jamut-Ø u-ka toto’i-ta mak-wa-k  
DET-NOM woman-NOM DET-ACC hen-ACC give-PASS-PFV  
‘The woman was given the hen.’

d. [do’ (3plA, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have’ (womanU, hen)]  
U= 2nd highest-ranked argument
In sum,

- Direct core arguments are marked by -Ø for nominative and -ta for accusative; oblique core arguments are marked by postpositions.

- Since the locative/goal postposition -u ‘to’ introduces several semantic roles typically associated with dative case in many languages (interlocutor, experiencer, stimulus, source, recipient, beneficiary), it is usually glossed as a dative-like marker in Yaqui grammar.

- When translated into Spanish, oblique pronouns marked by -u and -t use dative clitics, e.g. ‘le’.

- Applicative, causative, desiderative and other complex constructions involve multiple accusative NPs. In these cases, the undergoer is the second highest-ranked argument.
3. TYPICAL POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN YAQUI

Although EPCs are few in number in corpus, they are a valid strategy in Yaqui grammar (Guerrero 2018, in press). Note that some constructions can express virtually any possessive relation, but others are more restrictive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive Constructions</th>
<th>Possessive relationships</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kinship</td>
<td>body part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive phrases</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive phrase</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive verb -(e)k</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive verb jippue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive verb atte’ak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicative possessives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting possessives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative possessives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero marking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          |       |           |           |           |           |           |       |
|                          | 410   | 352       | 68        | 67        | 84        | 252       | 1233  |

**TABLE 1. Yaqui possessive constructions (corpus)**
In internal possessive constructions (IPCs), the possessor and the possessee form a single constituent. There are three types: juxtaposition (4a), possessive phrases (4b), and genitive phrases (4c). A typical example of possessive phrase in object position is in (4d); in (4b’), the possessive phrase acts as the passive-PSA. Notice that the regular order within IPCs is **possessor-possessee**.

(4) a. juya bujam ‘tree’s branch’  
    b. in a’e ‘my mother’  
    c. Maria-ta luutu ‘Mary’s grief’  
    d. Joan-Ø [em karo-ta] taya-k  
        John-NOM 2SG.POSS car-ACC burn-PFV  
        ‘John burned your car.’
    d’. [em karo-Ø] taya-wa-k  
        2SG.POSS car-NOM burn-PASS-PFV  
        ‘Your car was burned.’
In **verbal possessive constructions** (VPCs) there is a possessive verb. Yaqui has three possessor-oriented verbs: -k, jippue and atte’ak. A typical example is in (5a); jippue ‘have’ takes the possessor as the nominative subject and the possessee as the accusative object; in (5b’), the possessee acts as the passive-PSA.

(5) a. **Bempo** suwa-ta jippue a’. **Suwa-Ø** jippue-wa

3PL.NOM wisdom-ACC have wisdom-NOM have-PASS

‘They have wisdom.’ ‘Wisdom was possessed, was had.’
Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 190) and Van Valin (2005: 52) distinguish alienable possession (6a) from inalienable possession (6b). For IPCs, the possessee (head) is underlined. Accordingly, for Yaqui verbal possession in (5), the LS would be (6c). For internal possession in (4d), we can adopt the LS suggested in Van Valin & LaPolla (1997: 192).

6)  

a. have’ (x, y)  
   have’ (woman, book)  
   have’ (woman, book)  
   ‘the woman has a book’  
   ‘the woman’s book’  

b. have.as.part’ (x,y)  
   have.as.part’ (woman, arm)  
   ‘the woman’s arm’  

have.as.kin’ (x,y)  
   have.as.kin’ (woman, mother)  
   ‘the woman has a mother’  

c. ‘They have wisdom’  
   have’ (3plA, wisdomu)  

d. ‘John burned your car’  
   do’ (JohnA, Ø) CAUSE [BECOME burned’ ([have’ (2sg, car)])u]
4. EXTERNAL POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS (EPCS)

In EPCs, the possessor and the possessee belong to two independent constituents, and there is no possessive verb. In order to code the possessor as an independent argument, languages can use noun incorporation, applicative morphemes, ‘raising’, or possessum demotion (Payne & Barshi 1999; Haspelmath 1999).

Based on the coding of the possessor, there are two major EPCs in Yaqui: applicative and splitting.

An applicative EPC would follow the expected pattern, not only because it is a well-known strategy cross-linguistically, but also because applicative clauses are highly productive in Yaqui grammar (Guerrero 2007).
Applicative EPCs: there is a valency-change suffix and the possessor is coded as a direct core argument (7a-b). In the EPC version, the possessee and the possessor are marked as accusative NPs. Note that the word order within EPC is different from the one attested in the IPC: **possessee-possessor**.

(7) a. *Inepo* [jamut-ta *soto’i*] jamta-*k*  
   1SG.NOM  woman-ACC  pot  break-PFV  
   ‘I broke the woman’s pot.’

b. *[Soto’i-ta]=ne* [jamut-ta] jamta-ria-*k*  
   pot-ACC=1SG.NOM  woman-ACC  break-APPL-PFV  
   ‘I broke the woman’s pot.’ (lit. broke the pot the woman)
Main features: (i) if the possessor or possessee is omitted, the construction is ungrammatical (8a-b); (ii) it allows inanimate possessors when coding part-whole relations (8c); (iii) the possessee may be a kinship term (8d), body part (8e) or garment, or another unique object such as water, money, a domestic animal or kitchen artefact; (iv) the EP can be nominal and pronominal; and (v) the actor and the possessor must be different.
8) a. * Aapo  [mam-pusiam]  pitta-ria-k  
    3SG.NOM  hand-finger.PL  squash-APPL-PFV  
    ‘He/She squashed fingers.’

b. * Aapo  [nee]  pitta-ria-k  
    3SG.NOM  1SG.ACC  squash-APPL-PFV  
    ‘He/She squashed me.’

c.  [Kandaom]=te  [pueta-ta]  jinu-ria-bae  
    padlock.PL=1PL.NOM  door-ACC  buy-APPL-DESID  
    ‘We will buy a door padlock.’ (lit. buy the door the padlock)

d. Yookooni-Ø  [huubi]  [nee]  etbwa-ria-k  
    Yookoni-NOM  wife  1SG.ACC  steal-APPL-PFV  
    ‘The Yookoni stole my wife from me.’ (lit. stole me my wife)

e. Em  maala  [tem-ta]  [enchi]  baksia-ria-k  
    2SG.POSS  mother-NOM  mouth-ACC  2SG.ACC  wash-APPL-PFV  
    ‘Your mother washed your mouth.’ (lit. washed you the mouth)
Since there is more than one accusative NP, the expected pattern would be for the accusative possessor to act as the passive-PSA. However, impersonal clauses are preferred over passive clauses (9a). The clause in (9b) is odd because the theme serves as the passive-PSA. As such, the syntactic status of these accusative NPs appear uncertain. The LS (9c) tries to capture the EPC (7b).

9) a. \([Soto’i-ta] [jamut-ta] jamta-ria-wa-k\)
   \(\text{pot-ACC woman-ACC break-APPL-PASS-PFV}\)
   ‘(Someone) broke the woman’s pot.’

   b. \(#*[Soto’i-Ø] [jamut-ta] jamta-ria-wa-k\)
   \(\text{pot-NOM woman-ACC break-APPL-PASS-PFV}\)
   ‘The pot was broken the woman.’

c. ‘I broke the woman’s pot’ (lit. broke the pot the woman)
   \(\text{do’ (1sgA, } Ù\text{) CAUSE [BECOME broken’ ([have’ (woman, pot)])]}\)
   \(U = ?\)
‘Splitting’ EPCs: there is no valency morpheme, and yet the possessor and the possessee belong to different constituents. Crucially, the possessee is marked by the locative -po ‘on’ and the possessor can be coded as accusative (10a), dative-like -u ‘to’ (10b) or locative -t ‘at, over’ (10c), i.e. splitting coding.

(10) a. $U$-Ø $yi$-jitebi-Ø $[toma$-po] $[a]$ bichu-k
    DET-NOM yori_doctor-NOM stomach-LOC 3SG.ACC examine-PFV
    ‘The white doctor examined his stomach.’ (lit. examined him on the stomach)

    b. $Ili$ $uusi$-Ø $[gok$ pusiam-po] jaiti $[a$-u]$i$ yaa-k
    little child-NOM foot_finger.PL-LOC dirty 3SG.OBL-DIR made-PFV
    ‘The child got his toes dirty.’ (lit. made dirty to him on the toes)

    c. $U$-Ø $yoeme$-Ø $[mam$-po] $[ne$-t] tajte-Ø
    DET-NOM man-NOM hand.PL-LOC 1SG.OBL-LOCC touch-PRE
    ‘The man is touching my hand.’ (lit. touches on the hand on me)
Main features: (i) if the possessor or the possessee is omitted, the clause is ungrammatical (11a) or pragmatically odd (11b-c); (ii) the EP must be pronominal; (iii) the possessee must be a body part, and (iv) an IPCs is not an option in this context (11d).

   DET-NOM yori_doctor-NOM stomach-LOC examine-PFV
   ‘The white doctor examined on the stomach.’

b. # U-Ø yoi_jitebi-Ø [a] bichu-k
   DET-NOM yori_doctor-NOM 3SG.ACC examine-PFV
   ‘The white doctor examined him.’ (but, where?)

c. # U-Ø yoeme-Ø [ne-t] tajte-Ø
   DET-NOM man-NOM 1SG.OBL-LOC touch-PRE
   ‘The man touches me.’ (= in a bad way)

d.* U-Ø yoeme-Ø [in man(-po)] tajte-Ø
   DET-NOM man-NOM 1SG.POSS hand.PL(-LOC) touch-PRE
   ‘The man touches my hand.’
The passive counterpart of splitting EPCs is also odd, and impersonal clauses are strongly preferred (12a-c).

12) a. \([\text{toma-po}] \ [a] \ bichu-wa-k\)
   stomach-LOC 3SG.ACC examine-PASS-PFV
   ‘(Someone) examined his stomach.’

   b. \([\text{gok pusiam-po}] \ jaiti \ [a-u] \ ya’a-wa-k\)
   foot_finger.PL-LOC dirty 3SG.OBL-DIR made-PASS-PFV
   ‘(Someone) got his toes dirty.’

   c. \([\text{Man-po}] \ [\text{ne-t}] \ tajte-wa-k\)
   hand-LOC 1SG.OBL-LOCC touch-PASS-PFV
   ‘(Someone) touch my hand.’
An accusative NP can serve as the PSA only if this is different from the possessor or possessee (12d-d’).

d. U-Ø jumut-Øi kooka-ta [kutanaa-po] [a-u]i u’ura-k
DET-NOM woman-NOM necklace-ACC neck-LOC 3SG.OBL-DIR take-PFV
‘The woman took off the necklace on her neck.’ (lit. took the necklace on the neck to her)

d’. U-Ø kooka-Ø [kutanaa-po] [a-u]i u’ura-wa-k
DET-NOM necklace-NOM neck-LOC 3SG.OBL-DIR take-PASS-PFV
‘The necklace was taken off her neck.’
Therefore, dative-like and locative EPs do not behave any differently from oblique core arguments for the selection of the PSA, but accusative EPs do: they do not serve as passive-PSA. The LSs in (13) attempts to capture the nature of splitting EPCs.

(13) a. ‘The white doctor examined his stomach’ (10a)
   \[\text{do’ (doctor}_{A}, \text{ see’ (doctor, [have.as.part’ (3sg, stomach)])]}\] \hspace{1cm} \text{MR1}

   b. ‘The child got his toes dirty’ (10b)
   \[\text{do’ (child}_{A}, \emptyset) \text{ CAUSE [become dirty’ ([have.as.part’ (child, toes)])]}\] \hspace{1cm} \text{MR1}

   c. ‘The man is touching my hand’ (10c)
   \[\text{do’ (man}_{A}, \text{ touch’ (man, [have.as.part’ (1sg, hand)])]}\] \hspace{1cm} \text{MR1}

   d. ‘The woman took off the necklace on her neck’ (12d)
   \text{do’ (woman}_{A}, \emptyset) \text{ CAUSE [become-not have’ ([have.as.part’ (3sg, neck), necklace}_{U})]}\]
5. AN (ONGOING) ANALYSIS OF YAQUI EPCS

5.1. Semantic properties

Yaqui EPCs satisfy the semantic features associated with external possession: (i) there is a human possessor as the primary experiencer (Seiler 1983; Schaefer 1999; Stolz et al. 2008), and (ii) they are prominent within the ‘personal’ domain (Haspelmath 1999; Velázquez-Castillo 1999; Lødrup 2009).
Applicative EPCs allows inalienable and alienable possession (close ownership), while splitting EPCs must be inalienable (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>kinship</th>
<th>body part</th>
<th>part-whole</th>
<th>ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicative possessives (53)</td>
<td>ACC-ta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting possessives (56)</td>
<td>ACC-ta</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAT-u</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOC-t</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative possessives (29)</td>
<td>NOM -Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2. External possessors and possessive relationships**

Previous studies have argued that EPCs occur very frequently with body parts because the possessor is too strongly affected to be left in situ; this is known as the ‘affectedness condition’ (Haspelmath 1999).
5.2. *Morphosyntactic properties*

The typical dative EPC in European languages (Payne & Barshi 1999; Conti 2011) takes an accusative possessee and an indirect object or dative possessor; compare (14a-b). A second type of EPC takes a dative possessor and a locative possessee (14c), i.e. possessum demotion.

(14)a. *Corté* [el pelo de la niña]_{ACC}  ‘I cut the girl’s hair’  IPC  
   b. *[Le]*{i} corté [el pelo]_{ACC} (a la niña)_{DAT}  ‘I cut her hair (to the girl)’  EPC  
   c. *[Le]_{DAT} golpee* [en la pierna]_{LOC}  ‘I hit him on the leg’  EPC
In Yaqui, the possessed entity is marked as accusative within applicative EPCs, and locative within splitting EPCs (Table 3). This distribution looks like a grammatical condition. However, a semantic motivation may also play a role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>ACC possessee</th>
<th>LOC possessee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicative possessives (53)</td>
<td>ACC-ta</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting possessives (56)</td>
<td>ACC-ta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAT-u</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOC-t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3.** Morphological coding of external possessors and possessee

When body parts serve as an object, they resist internal possession (15a-b). There are three options: the body part is unpossessed (15c), an applicative or splitting EPC occurs (15d), or the body part takes locative marking (15e). In previous works, we have considered (15e) to be an EPC, specifically one which takes a nominative possessor and a locative possessee.
(15) a.  Joan-Ø  [em  soto’i-ta]  beba-k  
    John-NOM  2SG.POSS  pot-ACC  hit-PFV  
    ‘John hit your pot.’ 

b.#? Joan-Ø  [em  koba-(ta)]  beba-k  
    John-NOM  2SG.ACC  head-ACC  hit-PFV  
    ‘John hit your head.’ 

c.  Joan-Ø  [koba-ta]  beba-k  
    John-NOM  head-ACC  hit-PFV  
    ‘John hit the head.’ (=his head or someone’s else) 

d.  Joan-Ø  [koba-t]  [enchi]  beba-k  
    John-NOM  head-LOCC  2SG.ACC  hit-PFV  
    ‘John hit your head.’ (lit. hit you on the head) 

e.  Joan-Ø  [koba-po]  beba-k  
    John-NOM  head-LOC  hit-PFV  
    ‘John hit his head.’ (lit. hit on head)
The morphological marking of the EP may be due to the meaning of the verb/construction:

- Dative-like EPs are uncommon (5 cases in our corpus) and they occur when the actor and the possessor are co-referential (see (9b) and (12a)).
- Accusative EPs are usually associated with causative or impact verbs that imply physical alteration, such as cut, burn, break, bite, peck, twist, scratch, hit, but also examine, open, wash, take care, raise.
- Locative EPs are mostly related to position or change-of-position verbs including sit, stand, fall, get out/appear, jump, hang up, put, take but also tie up, touch, keep, rub, and splash.

Accordingly, it seems that accusative EPs highlight a more affected possessor as a whole, while locative EPs emphasize an affected sub-region of the possessor.
6. FINAL COMMENTS

Yaqui has different EPCs,

- Dative-like and locative EPs do not behave any differently from oblique core arguments, but accusative EPs do: they do not serve as passive-PSA. Hence, the possessor is an external and independent core argument with limited syntactic privileges (‘no-promotion’).

- The accusative possessees is not selected as the passive-PSA either. The possessees undergoes some sort of ‘demotion’, either because it remains an accusative non-PSA argument (applicative EPCs) or because it is marked by a locative postposition (splitting EPCs).

- The locative marking on both the possessor and the possessees is a completely novel coding pattern heretofore undocumented in Yaqui grammar.
Within RRG, Yaqui EPCs are all MR1: neither the possessee nor the possessor serve as undergoer nor can be selected as PSA. Lasting question: how the locative coding (assignation rules) of the possessor and possessee can be predicted from the LSs proposed here (there is no a \textbf{be-LOC}' (x, y)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION: Yaqui external ‘splitting’ possessive constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNTAX:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template(s): syntactic (in)transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA: the highest macrorole argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking: The macrorole core argument (Actor) receives nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-macrorole core argument introducing the possessee and possessor receives oblique coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORPHOLOGY:</strong> The possessee takes a locative oblique marking (-po)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possessor can take accusative, dative or locative marking (lexically marked?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEMANTICS:</strong> Possessive relationships involving body-parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possessor is less agentive and beneficially/adversely affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PSA is neither the possessor or the possessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAGMATICS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illocutionary force: Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus structure: Unspecified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{TABLE 4. Constructional schema for Yaqui ‘splitting’ EPCs}
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