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There are several ways to modify a noun in Maricopa. Certain intransitive verbs can be used as attributive adjectives.

(1) kwes'ul'ul havshuu chqaw-m
    apple  green-blue eat-asp 'He ate a green apple'

(2) '-ime lyesh-v-sh rav-k
    1-leg  break-dem-sj hurt-asp 'My broken leg hurts'

These intransitive verbs follow the nouns they modify and when they are the last element of the NP, they bear the appropriate demonstrative and case suffixes for the NP (cf. (1)). The verbs which can be used in this way are commonly verbs which refer to such qualities as number, color or size.

The specification of an NP can also be accomplished with an intransitive verb of which the NP specified is the logical subject using switch reference. The modifying clause can be embedded to the main clause and marked with switch reference. (Often just the same kind of verbs which can be used as attributive adjectives can be used as modifiers with switch reference.)

(3) Pam-sh mash lanes paly-m nyi-chash-k
    Pam-sj food table many-DS pl=cj-put+dist-asp
    'Pam put the food on lots of tables'

(4) mhay-ny-sh vii-sh paly-m taav-k
    boy-dem-sj rock-sj many-DS throw-asp
    'The boy threw lots of rocks'

In (3) and (4) the clause whose verb is paly 'be many' is fully embedded in the main clause. In both cases paly 'be many' is marked with the different subject suffix -m, since in both cases the subject of that verb is different from that of the main clauses. Note that the subject of the subordinate does not have to be marked with the subject suffix -sh (as in (1)), although it can be (as in (2)). If we consider some more examples, it becomes clear that the subject of the subordinate verb can be marked for its role in either the subordinate or the main clause.

(5) Pam-sh hat 'ii-sh anoq-m nym-saham-m
    Pam-sj dog stick-sj small-DS with-hit-asp
    'Pam hit the dog with a small stick'

(6) Pam-sh hat 'ii-m anoq-m aaham-m
    Pam-sj dog stick-with small-DS hit-asp
    'Pam hit the dog with a small stick'
In (5) 'ii 'stick' is marked as the subject of the subordinate clause, while in (6) (a close paraphrase of (5)) 'ii 'stick' is marked as the instrumental argument of the main clause. Thus, the NP being specified can always appear as part of the subordinate clause or as part of the main clause in the appropriate case role.

(7) 'iipash-sh paly-k ashuuham-k men-s] many-DS hit+pl-asp
'Many men hit him'

If the subject of the subordinate clause is also the subject of the main clause, then it is always marked with the subject suffix -sh (as in (7) above). In this case, it is impossible to determine which clause the NP is playing a syntactic role in. (Note that the subordinate verb paly 'be many' is marked with the same subject -k as is appropriate since the subjects of the two clauses are the same.)

There is another way to specify an NP using a clause without nominalizing that clause. As in the switch reference case described above, these clauses are marked with verbal rather than nominal morphology and their subjects (when they occur within the clause) are subject marked. This kind of referring clause employs the verbal suffix -sha and its alternate -ksha. These clauses can only have past reference (like switch reference marked clause, but unlike nominalized clauses). Unlike switch reference marked clauses, -sha clauses cannot be embedded and their subjects if they are overt are always marked with the subject marker.

-sha and -ksha are found as final main verb suffixes to signify past realis actions. -ksha is found on verbs which would take -k as their final realis aspect marker and which have first person subjects. -sha is found in all other cases. (Thus, in this case the presence or absence of -k is sensitive only to the kind of verb to which it is suffixed and to its own subject, not to the subject of any other clause.)

(8) vakpaly yem-sha (-k-taking verb)
city go-pst 'He went to the city'

(9) vakpaly '-yem-ksha
city l-go-lpst 'I went to the city'

(10) mii-sha
cry-pst '-m-sha ('m-taking verb)
1-cry-pst 'I cried'

The same distribution of -sha and -ksha occurs when the clauses are being used to specify some NP. The -sha marked clause comes first, followed by the main clause containing a resumptive pronoun.
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(12) va '-chew-ksha humar-sh as-ly uuvak-k ar'oy-k house l-make-lpst child-sj dem-in be=loc-SS play-asp
'The boy played in the house I built'

(13) 'iipea-ny-sh m-wik-sha anya '-yuu-k man-dem-sj 3/2-help-pst dem l-see-asp
'I saw the man who helped you'.

(14) hat '-saham-sha any-sh skiny-k
dog l-hit-pst dem-sj flee-asp
'The dog I hit ran away'

Aside from the fact that these strings are given as translations for English sentences containing relative clauses, there is other evidence that these sentences are single sentences (and not two simple sentences juxtaposed). First, the intonation pattern with which these sentences are uttered does not mark the -sha marked verb as sentence final. Second, the anaphoric pronoun used in the second clause is quite odd if these are merely adjacent sentences. Overt demonstrative pronouns are not very common in Maricopa sentences (particularly in the non-oblique roles). These pronouns always show up in these utterances, though they only very rarely show up in sentences linked only by juxtaposition. Moreover, in an example like (14), if it were merely two adjacent sentences, the anaphoric pronoun any would not be used since coreference with the only available third person noun (the dog) would be obligatory anyway. Consider also the following example.

(15) va-s-ly '-ashvar-ksha anya m-yuu-k
house-dem-in l-sing-lpst dem 2-see-asp
'Do you see the house I sang in?'

Again, there is no other possible referent for the object of the main verb, so the use of the demonstrative is strange. The presence of the demonstrative in the second clause is invariant and obligatory.

Switch-reference marked clauses and -sha marked clauses have in common that they maintain verbal properties (the verb cannot take nominal suffixes to mark the role of the role of the clause in the matrix clause). They differ in that switch-reference marked clauses can be center-embedded while -sha marked clauses cannot be, and in that switch-reference marked clauses are marked with respect to the main clause, while -sha clauses are not (in fact, one might claim the main clause in such a sentence is marked with respect to the -sha marked clause since the pronoun overtly signals back to the -sha clause).

Another major way of specifying some noun is to employ the two major nominalizing constructions which are referred to when discussing relative clauses in Yuman. These constructions are cognate to relative constructions found all over the Yuman family. In both of these constructions, the verb is nominalized and takes final nominal morphology (demonstrative and case suffixes) and the subject of the relative clause is unmarked (is not marked with -sh). They differ as to whether the head of the relative clause is the subject of the relative clause (kw- marked clauses) or plays some other role in the relative clause (nom-clauses).
The kw- marked clause is characterized by the relative marker kw- in the position of the subject pronominal prefix on the relative verb. The subject of the clause is the head of the clause. The final verb of the relative clause is marked for the syntactic role born by the NP in the matrix clause.

(16) 'iipaa ny-kw-tshqam-sh shmaa-m
    man l-rel-slap-dist-sj sleep-asp
    'The man who beat me is sleeping'

(17) hat-sh kr'ak kw-nyoy-nya chkyew-k
dog-sj old-man rel-bad-dem bite-asp
    'The dog bit the bad old man'

Note that the noun which is the logical subject of the relative clause is not marked with -sh (the subject marker). It is difficult to determine whether these unmarked nouns are part of the relative clause or part of the matrix clause, since they always appear at the beginning of the relative clause. This position would be appropriate if the nouns were part of the matrix or part of the relative clause syntactically. The relative clause (including the head) can readily be found in the position appropriate to its role in the matrix clause, even when as in example (2), that placement results in center-embedding. On the other hand, the clause can be preposed, in which case a resumptive pronoun will usually mark its place in the matrix clause.

(18) va kw-havshuu nyaa as-ly '-uuwa-k '-sshvar-k
    house rel-green=blue I dem-in 1-be=loc-SS 1-sing-asp
    'I sang in the house which is blue'

These clauses can occur without any head of the relative clause appearing at all.

(19) avne 'ny-k-chew-ny-sh nyip '-ntay shuupaw-m
    dress l-rel-make-dem-sj me l-mother know-asp
    'The one who made that dress for me knows my mother'

If there is more than one relative clause within the same NP, or more than one predicate of which the head is the subject within a single NP, several constructions are possible. If the two relative clauses are explicitly conjoined, then they can each be marked with kw- and with appropriate case marking.

(20) 'iipaa nhvewt kw-tpuy-sh humar kw-daw-sh iipaa-k nyikwov-k
    man bear rel-kill-sj child rel-take-sj brave-SS very-asp
    'The man who killed the bear and saved the child is very brave'

If the relationship between the two predicates is less explicit or is clearly not conjunction (if, in fact, one of the predicates is subordinate to the other), other constructions are employed. Both verbs can be marked with kw- with only the second verb marked for the case of the NP in the matrix clause.
(21) mıhay t'ar k-uuva kw-ar'oy-sh m-kshuanav-ly aly'i-m
boy outside rel-be=loc rel-play-sj 3/2-talk-des think-asp
'The boy playing outside wants to talk to you'

In (21) uuva 'be located' is not marked with a case marker (even
though it modifies the subject of the sentence), nor with a
switch reference marker (even though it would be if it were not in
a relative clause (cf. 12)). It is, however, marked with kw-, just
as the following form of 'play' is.

An alternate way of structuring these complex relative clauses
is to mark the first verb for its role in its own matrix clause.

(22) 'iipaa ny-k-vik-uum k-uu'ish-sh5 'ny-va-v-ii vaa-k
man l-rel-help-inc rel-say+nom-sj l-poss-house-dem-at come-aspect
'The man who said he was going to help me came to my house'

In (22) both verbs in the relative clause are marked with kw-, although
the first verb (which is the lowest verb in the relative clause) is
otherwise marked for its role in the predication controlled by 'say'.

Finally, it may be that only the final verb of the relative
clause is marked with kw- and the other verbs are simply marked
as they would be if they were in construction with a main clause
verb.

(23) 'iipaa nyip ny-mhan-k k-uu'ish-sh skiiny-k
man me 3/1-like-k rel-say+nom-sj flee-aspect
'The man who said he liked me ran away'

(24) sny'ak avhay k-hvet-nya humara ar'oy-k mat-ly k-uvash-nya
woman dress rel-red-dem child play-35 land-in rel-be=loc+nom-dem

xtay-sh (duu-m)
mother-sj be-aspect
'The woman wearing the red dress is the mother of the boy
playing in the field'

(24) is quite complicated and has several interesting features.
If one examines just the NP 'the boy playing in the field', one can
see the construction just described--only the second verb marked
in any way as relative.

Another interesting thing in this example is the use of a
relative clause as a possessor--instead of on some argument of
the main predication.

The final interesting point about this example concerns the first
relative clause in the sentence 'the woman wearing the red dress',
sny'ak avhay k-hvet-nya. It is clear from this clause that the assignment
of the relative morphology depends on the syntactic subject rather
than the logical subject of the clause. The logical subject of hvet
'be red' is avhay 'dress', not sny'ak 'woman'. The referent of the
clause, however, is the 'woman', not the 'dress'. The verb of the
relative clause hvet is marked as having its subject as its head.
Colors belong to a class of predicates which permit the possessor
of their logical subject to appear either as a possessor or as their
syntactic subject.
(25) sny'ak e'e ku-hmaaly-sh ny-wik-k
    woman hair rel-white-sj 3/1-help-asp
    'The woman with the white hair helped me'

Example (26) further exemplifies the fact that syntactic, rather
than logical, relations control the structure of the relative clause.
In relative clauses which contain auxiliary constructions either
only the auxiliary or both the main verb and the auxiliary can be marked
with kw-.

(26) 'iipaa mii-m v-k-uuvash-sh 'ayu rav-k
    man cry-m dem-rel-be=loc+nom-sj s.t. hurt-asp
    'The man who is crying is sick'

(27) mhay kw-ashvar-k v-kv-v'aw-sh m-wik-uum
    boy rel-sing-SS dem-rel-stand-sj 3/2-help-inc
    'The boy who is singing will help you'

Realized relative clauses, as we have seen up to now, are Ø-marked.
Irrealis relative clauses are marked with the irrealis suffix -h
between the stem and the nominal suffixes.

(28) 'iipaa 'ny-k-wik-h-ny-sh dii aly-vaa-ma-k
    man 1-rel-help-ir-dem-sh here neg-come-neg-asp

    Negation in relative clauses is exactly like main clause verbal
    negation. The verb of the clause being negated is prefixed with (w)aly-
    and suffixed with -ma (for a main clause example see (28) above).

(29) mhay waly-kw-ashvar-ma-nya 'nchen-sh
    boy neg-rel-sing-neg-dem 1-older=sib-sj
    'The boy who didn't sing is my brother'

When the head of the relative clause is not its syntactic subject,
the clause is never marked with kw-. The verb is marked with nominal-
izing morphology (uu- prefix, -sh suffix and/or vocalic ablaut), the
subject of the relative clause is unmarked (i.e., not marked with
the case suffix -sh), and the clause is marked with case and demonstrative
suffixes appropriate to its syntactic role in the matrix clause and
the semantic/pragmatic features of the deictic system.

(30) Bonnie va-s-ii uuyem-sh havshuu-k
    Bonnie house-dem-at go+nom-sj green=blue-asp
    'The house Bonnie went to is blue'

Note that the head of the relative clause is fully within the relative
clause and marked for its role in the relative clause. The head noun
can appear at the beginning of the relative clause, as in

(31) kwno Bonnie Pam uuaaya '-yuu-k 'I see the basket Bonnie
    basket Bonnie Pam give+nom 1-see-asp gave to Pam'
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If the referent of the relative clause is restricted by the semantics of the predication which determines that only one of the non-subject nouns in the relative clause can be the referent, then any order of the non-subject nouns is possible.

(32a) mvar kwaho ily-m-uuchash-sh m'iily-k
     flour basket in-2-put+nom-sj be=infested-asp
     'The flour you keep in that basket is infested'

b) kwaho mvar ily-m-uuchash-sh m'iily-k
     basket flour in-2-put+nom-sj be=infested-asp

The main verb in (32) is limited to having a certain class of subjects; mvar 'flour' belongs to this class, but kwaho 'basket' does not.

If there is more than one non-subject noun in the relative clause which could be the head (i.e. if the referent is not uniquely determined by its role in the main predication), then the head usually (or perhaps necessarily) occurs as the first non-subject NP in the relative clause.

(33) mvar kwaho-ly m-uuchash-sh nyikor-k
     flour basket-in 2-put+nom-sj old-asp
     'The flour you keep in the basket is old'

(34) kwaho mvar ily-m-uuchash-sh nyikor-k
     basket flour in-2-put+nom-sj old-asp
     'The basket you keep the flour in is old'

As with kw- marked clauses, it is perfectly possible to have a nominalized relative without any overt head at all, e.g.

(35) hanmo ts'osh ily-'uuchash-ly 'cha-m
     chicken eggs in-1-put+nom-in 1-put-asp
     'I put it in what I keep eggs in'

If the relative clause is future or otherwise irrealis, it is marked with the irrealis suffix -h. (The irrealis suffix -h and the nominalizing suffix -sh never cooccur.)

(36) sny'ak many m-uwikh-nya shuupaw-m
     woman you 3/2-help+nom-ir-dem know-asp
     'He knows the woman who will help you'

If the relative clause is negative, it is marked with (w)aly- and -ma.

(37) maa waly-'-uuse-ma-nya Bonnie nyuuwit-sh
     milk neg-1-drink+nom-neg-dem Bonnie have+nom-sj

If an NP contains two relative clauses each is marked appropriately for the kind of relative clause it is, but only the final relative clause is marked with the final nominal markings.
If the relative clause is complex and the head is not the subject of the higher relative verb, but is the subject of the lower relative verb, two constructions are possible. In both constructions the higher verb is nominalized. The lower relative verb can be marked can be marked with the kv- relative prefix.

The alternate construction consists of the lower verb appearing as it would if it were not in a relative clause.

Notice that the lower verbs in the relative clauses in (42) and (43) are not marked with kw-, but that the head of the clause (which is the subject of the subordinate relative clause) is not marked with -sh. In all the cases (40-43), the lower relative clause verb is marked for its role in its matrix clause whether or not it is marked with kw-.

Relative clauses which are constructed with nominalized verbs (without kw-) are ambiguous with action nominalizations (where the matrix verb does not disambiguate it with its own constraints).

This is not generally much of a problem since most Maricopa verbs are limited as to what kind of arguments they can take. The number of matrix verbs which can take either referential or clausal arguments is not particularly large. Moreover, there are other ways of expressing clausal arguments which are not ambiguous in those cases where nominalization would be ambiguous (where the discourse would not clear up the problem). Thus, the (44b) reading can also be conveyed with a switch reference marked complement clause.
(45) harav m-sii-m waly-hot-ma-k
   liquor w-drink-m neg-good-neg-asp
   'Drinking liquor is bad for you!'

There are a number of ways to modify a noun in Maricopa. Two
major types of modification can be seen: nominal, in which the
verb which is specifying the NP takes nominal morphology (demo-
strative and case suffixes) and in which the subject of the verb cannot
be marked with -sh, and verbal, in which the verb has verbal mor-
phology only (it cannot be marked with demonstrative or case suffixes)
and in which the subject of the verb is obligatorily marked with
the subject marker -sh. The nominal constructions consist of the
adjectives, kw-marked clauses and nominalized clauses. The verbal
constructions consist of the switch reference marked clauses and
the -sha marked clauses.

Footnotes

1. I owe a large debt of gratitude to Pollyanna Heath for sharing
   her time and knowledge with me. Ms. Heath is a native speaker of
   Maricopa and a kind and patient teacher. I would also like to thank
   Jasper Donahue for his careful teaching. Many thanks go to Pamela
   Munro and Sandra Thompson for comments on earlier descriptions,
   and to Margaret Langdon for her always valuable comments and Pan-
   Yuman perspective.

   The data in this paper is presented in practical orthography.
   h=[x], ch=[ç], sh=[¿], '=[^], VW=[V:] and no epenthetic vowels are
   represented.

   The abbreviations used in this paper are: sj=subject; pl=oj=
   plural object prefix; SS=same subject; DS=different subject; asp=
   realis aspect; pl=plural; pst=past; lpst=first person subject past;
   dem=demonstrative; be=loc=be located; inc=incompletive; ir=irrealis;
   rel=relative prefix; nom=nominalized; neg=negative affix; pos=possessed.
   - shows morpheme boundaries; = joins parts of multi-word glosses;
   + signals forms containing more than one morpheme, but which
   are inseparable (e.g. verb root + ablaut of root vowel).

   Numbers refer to the person of the possessor or subject or object
   of the verb. Number/Number represents the person of the subject/
   the person of the object.

2. Maricopa, like the other languages of the River branch of Yuman,
   marks realis verbs with either -k or -m. In Maricopa, about 30-40%
   of the verb roots I have seen take -m as their realis suffix. (This
   situation is quite different from Yuma and Mojave.) These roots can
   not be marked with -k unless some other suffix intervenes between the
   root and the final suffix. They cannot be marked with -k for realis
   marking. Further, they cannot be marked with -k marking same subject.
   In all environments where same subject -k would be predicted, they
   are marked with -m. (This accounts for the -m's in the data which
are glossed -m.) This is not a phonological constraint, since some -m-taking verbs have homophones which are -k-taking verbs and since -m verbs can be marked with a -k-suffix (which does not mark same subject). Complements of the verbs 'ii 'say' and aly'ii 'think' regularly have verbs marked with -k regardless of whether the verbs have the same or different subjects as the higher verbs. -m-taking verbs can be marked with either -m or -k when they are subordinated to 'say' or 'think'. (The -k's which are glossed -k in this paper are the -k's which mark complements of 'say' and 'think'.

3. This distribution may seem somewhat less odd if one compares this affix with another main clause suffix, ̄yu and k'yu which shows the same pattern of the -k form occurring only on verbs which have first person subjects and which are -k taking verbs. Unlike -sha, ̄yu is semantically and morphologically transparent. ̄yu is used on a verb to signal that the action it expresses occurred in the past in the sight of the speaker.

(i) puy-̄yu  
    die-pst+see  
    'He died (I know, I saw him)'

̄yu is transparently related to the verb yu 'to see' with a first person -prefix. 'See' is a verb whose complements are marked with switch reference.

(ii) puy-m ̄yu-k  
    die-DS 1-see-asp  
    'I saw him die'

If this relationship is correct, then when ̄yu is after a first person verb, a same subject -k is expected (except in those cases where the the verb cannot be marked with SS -k (-m-taking verbs)). Everywhere -m would be predicted one gets ̄yu, everywhere switch reference would lead you to expect -k, one gets k'yu. The distribution is the same for -sha and -ksha (although no independent verb can be postulated as the source for these suffixes).

4. These constructions are discussed for Diegueño in Gorbet (1974), for Mojave in Munro (1976), for Yavapai in Kendall (1974) etc.

5. kw- marked relative verbs can also be nominalized with uu- and -sh at the same time. I have never seen 'say' for example, in a kw-relative clause without this other nominalizing morphology.

6. Maricopa has a quite productive process which enables possessors of subjects to be the syntactic subjects of a clause.

(iiiia) many m-e'e-ny-sh nyiily-k  
    you 2-hair-DEM-sj black-asp  
    'Your hair is black'

b) man-sh m-e'e m-nyiiyli-k  
    you-sj 2-hair 2-black-asp  
    'Your hair is black, you have black hair'
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