

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)
vbello@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 possessives, 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

2. SIMPLE CLAUSES IN YAQUI

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 $-\emptyset$ for nominative and marked by *-ta* for accusative; plural nouns are marked by *-(i)m*.

1) a. *Joan- \emptyset u-ka kari-ta bicha-k*
John-NOM DET-ACC house-ACC see-PFV
'John saw the house.'

b. *Joan- \emptyset 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-Ø u-ka kari-ta bicha-k*
 John-NOM DET-ACC house-ACC see-PFV
 'John saw the house.'

b. *U-Ø kari-Ø bicha-wa-k*
 DET-NOM house-NOM see-PASS-PFV
 'The house was seen.'

b'. *U-ka kari-ta bicha-wa-k*
 DET-ACC house-ACC see-PASS-PFV
 '(Someone) saw the house.'

c. **see'** (John_A, house_U)

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

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

b’. *Peo-ta-t* *e’a-wa-∅*
 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-∅ seewa-∅ 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**’ (3pl_A, ∅)] CAUSE [BECOME **have**’ (woman, flower_U)] 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**’ (3pl_A, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **have**’ (woman_U, hen)] U= 2nd highest-ranked argument

In sum,

- Direct core arguments are marked by $-\emptyset$ 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.

Possessive Constructions		Possessive relationships					Total	
		kinship	body part	part-whole	locative	associative		ownership
internal	Juxtaposition	6	30	51	17	4	8	116
	Possessive phrases	325	65	-	23	38	110	561
	Genitive phrase	28	34	3	2	9	28	104
verbal	Possessive verb <i>-(e)k</i>	33	45	10	20	17	20	145
	Possessive verb <i>jippue</i>	11	46	-	5	16	46	124
	Possessive verb <i>atte'ak</i>	4	1	-	-	-	19	24
external	Applicative possessives	2	28	2	-	-	21	53
	Splitting possessives	-	54	2	-	-	-	58
	Nominative possessives	-	29	-	-	-	-	29
	Zero marking	1	20	-	-	-	-	21
		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* d'. *[em karo-Ø] taya-wa-k*
John-NOM 2SG.POSS car-ACC burn-PFV 2SG.POSS car-NOM burn-PASS-PFV
'John burned your car.' '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*
3PL.NOM wisdom-ACC have
'They have wisdom.'

a'. *Suwa-Ø* *jippue-wa*
wisdom-NOM have-PASS
'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, <u>book</u>) | 'the woman has a book' |
| | have' (woman, <u>book</u>) | 'the woman's book' |
| b. have.as.part' (x,y) | have.as.part' (woman, <u>arm</u>) | 'the woman's arm' |
| have.as.kin' (x,y) | have.as.kin' (woman, <u>mother</u>) | 'the woman has a mother' |
| c. 'They have wisdom' | have' (3pl _A , <u>wisdom</u> _U) | |
| d. 'John burned your car' | do' (John _A , Ø) CAUSE [BECOME burned' ([have' (2sg, <u>car</u>)] _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).

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* (=7b)
 pot-ACC woman-ACC break-APPL-PASS-PFV
 ‘(Someone) broke the woman’s pot.’

b. #* [*Soto'i-Ø*] [*jamut-ta*] *jamta-ria-wa-k*
 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)
do’ (1sg_A, Ø) 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-∅* *yoi_jitebi-∅* [*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-∅_i* [*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-∅* *yoeme-∅* [*mam-po*] [*ne-t*] *tajte-∅*
 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).

11)a. * *U-∅* *yoi_jitebi-∅* [*toma-po*] *bichu-k*
DET-NOM yori_doctor-NOM stomach-LOC examine-PFV
‘The white doctor examined on the stomach.’

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

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

d.* *U-∅* *yoeme-∅* [*in* *man(-po)*] *tajte-∅*
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. [*toma-po*] [*a*] *bichu-wa-k*
stomach-LOC 3SG.ACC examine-PASS-PFV
'(Someone) examined his stomach.'

b. [*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. [*Man-po*] [*ne-t*] *tajte-wa-k*
hand-LOC 1SG.OBL-LOCC touch-PASS-PFV
'(Someone) touch my hand.'

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)
[**do**’ (doctor_A, **see**’ (doctor, [**have.as.part**’ (3sg, stomach)))] MR1
- b. ‘The child got his toes dirty’ (10b)
[**do**’ (child_A, Ø) CAUSE [BECOME **dirty**’ ([**have.as.part**’ (child, toes)))] MR1
- c. ‘The man is touching my hand’ (10c)
[**do**’ (man_A, **touch**’ (man, [**have.as.part**’ (1sg, hand)))] MR1
- d. ‘The woman took off the necklace on her neck’ (12d)
do’ (woman_A, Ø)] 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).

	EP	kinship	body part	part-whole	ownership
Applicative possessives (53)	ACC- <i>ta</i>	2	28	2	21
Splitting possessives (56)	ACC- <i>ta</i>		18	2	
	DAT- <i>u</i>		5		
	LOC- <i>t</i>		31		
Nominative possessives (29)	NOM- \emptyset		29		

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. | <i>Corté [el pelo de la niña]</i> _{ACC} | ‘I cut the girl’s hair’ | IPC |
| b. | [<i>Le</i> _i] <i>corté [el pelo]</i> _{ACC} (<i>a la niña</i> _i) _{DAT} | ‘I cut her hair (to the girl)’ | EPC |
| c. | [<i>Le</i>] _{DAT} <i>golpee [en la pierna]</i> _{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.

	EP	ACC possessee	LOC possessee
Applicative possessives (53)	ACC- <i>ta</i>	52	2
Splitting possessives (56)	ACC- <i>ta</i>	2	18
	DAT- <i>u</i>	1	4
	LOC- <i>t</i>	1	30
Nominative possessives (29)			29

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-∅* [*em* *soto'i-ta*] *beba-k*
John-NOM 2SG.POSS pot-ACC hit-PFV
'John hit your pot.'

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

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

d. *Joan-∅* [*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-∅* [*koba-po*] *beba-k* nominative EPC
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 possessee is not selected as the passive-PSA either. The possessee 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 possessee 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 **be-LOC'** (x, y)).

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

TABLE 4. Constructional schema for Yaqui ‘splitting’ EPCs

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A. 2013. Possession and ownership: a cross-linguistic perspective. *Possession and ownership*, A. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon, 1-64. Oxford: OUP.
- Álvarez, A. 2012. Estructuras posesivas en yaqui. *UniverSOS* 9: 115-131.
- Conti, C. 2011. Possessive dative revisited: another view of external possession in Spanish. *Studia Linguistica* 65 (1): 170-197.
- Guerrero, L. 2019a. Grammatical relations in Yaqui. In *Argument selectors: A new perspective on grammatical relations*. A. Witzlack-Makarevich & B. Bickel. Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 433-467.
- _____. 2019b. Propiedades formales y funcionales de las posposiciones en yaqui. In *Adposiciones y elementos de su tipo en lenguas de América*. L. Guerrero (ed.). México: UNAM, 513-560.
- _____. 2007. Estructuras argumentales alternativas: las cláusulas aplicativas en yaqui. *Mecanismos de voz y formación de palabra*. Z. Estrada et al. (eds). México/Hermosillo: Editorial Plaza y Valdez/Universidad de Sonora, 177-204.
- Guerrero, L. & R. Van Valin. 2004. Yaqui and the analysis of primary object languages, *IJAL* 70: 290-319.
- Gurrola, A. 2005. *Posesión e individuación en yaqui*. MA thesis, Universidad de Sonora.
- Haspelmath, M. 1999. External possession in a European areal perspective. *External possession*, D. Payne & I. Barshi (eds.), 109-135. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- _____. 2006. Explaining alienability contrasts in adnominal possession: economy vs. iconicity. In *Syntax of the world's languages 2*, University of Lancaster. <http://email.eva.mpg.de/~haspelmt/2006swl.pdf>.
- Heine, B. 1997. *Possession. Cognitive sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jelinek, E. & F. Escalante. 1988. Verbless possessive sentence in Yaqui. In *In honor of Mary Hass: From the Hass Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics*. W. Shipley (ed.), 411-431. Berlin: Mouton.
- König, E. 2001. Internal and external possessors. *Language Typology and Language Universals, Vol. 2*. M Haspelmath et al. (eds.), 970-978. Berlin: Mouton.
- Lødrup, H. 2009. External and internal possessors with body part nouns: the case of Norwegian. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 22: 221-250.
- McGregor, W. 2009. *The expression of possession*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Muchembled, F. 2010. *La posesión predicativa en lenguas taracahitas*. MA thesis, Universidad de Sonora.
- Payne, D. & I. Barshi. 1999. *External Possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schaefer, R. 1999. On the properties of Emai possessors. *External possession*, D. Payne y I. Barshi (eds.), 449-472. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Seiler, H. 1983. *Possession as an operational dimension of language*. Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Stassen, L. 2009. *Predicative Possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stolz, T. et al. 2008. *Split possession. An areal linguistic study of the alienability correlation and related phenomena in the languages of Europe*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van Valin, R. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantic interface*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Van Valin, R. & R. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Velázquez-Castillo, M. 1999. Body-part EP Constructions. A Cognitive/Functional Analysis. In *External Possession*, D. Payne & I. Barshi (eds.), 77-108. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.