CHAPTER SIX

THE UTILITY OF THE CLASSIFICATION

0. INTRODUCTION

Because the Constituent, the Argument Structure, and the Proposition each result from the application of functors of the same type (i.e. obligatory, listable, and non-localizable), by the classification developed in Chapter One they must be assigned the same category type (i.e. syntactically inaccessible, but phonologically accessible). We expect, then, the sort of parallel we have witnessed: All three categories — and none of a different type — are potential arguments in the rule schema in (1).

(1) \[ \langle \text{ASP: } - | \text{RIGHTAN: Number} \rangle: [. . . \text{Person} . . . ] \rightarrow [. . . \langle \text{ASP: } - | \text{RIGHTAN: Number} \rangle . . . ] \]

In this chapter we develop another, and more elaborate, parallel. Each of these three categories — and no other — defines a domain for embedding. Not only, then, is the range of similarities among these three extended, the utility of each in Luiseno syntax is more firmly established, and the theoretical framework within which the existence of the categories Constituent, Argument Structure, and Proposition have been developed receives significant support.

The analysis of clauses presented in this chapter also deserves attention in its own right. Any Clause type in Luiseno contains minimally a single Word; unlike a Luiseno (non-imperative) Sentence it may not contain an aux form and an independent Argument-Categorizing Element. Further, the obligatory Word is morphologically different — and, thus, on the account here, formally different — from the Argument-Categorizing Element in a Sentence. At issue, then, is whether a structural parallel between Clause and Sentence is anything more than a theoretician’s desire for generalization. The analysis will argue that it is, that the single obligatory Word in a Clause contains both the Argument-Categorizing Element and the clausal equivalent of a Sentence-Defining Element, yielding the desired generalization. But the analysis has this result while respecting the morphology of this Word. The contrast between this analysis and other analyses of parallel phenomena in other languages that do violence on this score is noted at the relevant points below.

1. DATA

Luiseno has three different Clause types, types which can be given
relatively familiar labels: relative clauses, complement clauses, and adjunct clauses. An analysis of each type and its identification as a Clause follows.

1.1 Types

Four different examples of relative clauses are shown bracketed in (2). In (2a) and (2b) the ‘head’ is the same as the ‘subject’; in (2c) and (2d) the ‘head’ is different from the ‘subject’. In (2a) and (2c) the ‘head’ is the word instantiating the function from Proposition to Proposition in the embedding Sentence according to the rule schema in (1); in (2b) and (2d), the ‘head’ is an element in the Argument Structure of the embedding Sentence.

(2) a. po hengeemal [tooyaqalmokwish] up nokaamay
   *that boy [laughed] aux my:son*
   The boy that laughed is my son.

   b. noo n ‘o’naq hengeemali [tooyaqalmokwichi]
      *I aux know boy:object [laughed:object]*
      I know the boy that laughed.

   c. po hengeemal [’ochaqalaqivo] up nokaamay
      *that boy [2sg:tickled] aux my:son*
      The boy that you tickled is my son.

   d. noo n ‘o’naq hengeemali [’ochaqalaqivoy]
      *I aux know boy:object [2sg:tickled:object]*
      I know the boy that you tickled.

These are the simplest possible examples of relative clauses, each containing a single Word.

Second, there are complement clauses, four different examples of which are bracketed in (3) and (4). These are the simplest possible complement clauses, each containing a single Word.¹

(3) a. noo n ‘ayaliq [poheelaxpiy]
   *I aux know [3sg:will:sing:object]*
   I know that he will sing.

   b. noo nil tiiwax hunwuti [huluqaqal]
      *I aux saw bear:object [falling]*
      I saw the bear fall.

(4) a. wunaal up [pongeepi] miyq
    *he aux [3sg:will:leave] is*
    He has to leave.