Alternative expressions of "want" complements*

Lilián Guerrero

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

The complements of "want" predicate may vary depending on the identity of the main and the dependent subjects. When identical, five main tendencies are found cross-linguistically: (i) the dependent subject is omitted, (ii) the dependent subject is overtly expressed, (iii) "want" is a desiderative affix or (iv) an uninflected particle, and (v) there are alternative choices (Haspelmath 2005). Using data from the Uto-Aztecan family, this article focuses on one of the less common means, the co-existence of alternative expressions. The analysis provides an account for this phenomenon in light of the Interclausal Relations Hierarchy (Van Valin 2005): whenever there are available structures in a language, the tightest linkage encodes intention, and the less tight expresses different mental states.

1. Introduction

In the study of complementation, it is well known that there is a correlation between the semantic structure of complement-taking predicates and the morpho-syntactic properties of their complements (cf. Givón 1980, 2001; Noonan 1985; Cristofaro 2003; Dixon & Aikhenvald 2006). Predicates like "can", "make", and "start" usually take a noun-like complement with less finite verbal morphology, i.e., limited availability of tense, aspect, modality, and agreement. Predicates like "know", "see" and "tell" generally take a sentence-like complement with finite verbal morphology, and full argument realization. Certain predicates may select more than one complement type.

Take the predicate "want" as an example. The complements of "want" may vary with respect to two major factors, the coding of the participants and the verb form. On the one hand, when the main and the dependent subjects are different, the two must be overtly expressed, e.g., *I want you to leave* in (1a). It should be born in mind that the notional subject of the complement may be realized in different ways, including as a pronoun or affix, a nominative or non-nominative element, or a raised or absent form. When the subjects are identical, languages vary. Some omit the dependent subject, e.g., English in (1b) and Spanish (2b). Others express it overtly, such as Otomí (3b). Even others allow more than one choice. In Obolo, subject omission is optional; the dependent subject is left implicit in (4a), but not in (4b). In Tzeltal, the dependent subject must be expressed but there are two distinguished complement: only in (5b) the aspectual marker *ya*, the verbal enclitic *-e* and the clause linkage marker *te* are present. On the other hand, because of the semantics of "want", the complement refers to an unrealized, future-oriented event, which usually appears in a special verb from, e.g., infinitival or bare form (1), (2b), and (4); potential or future (3), or subjunctive (2a). For clarity, in the example sentences, the dependent unit is enclosed in square brackets and the dependent subject is underlined.[1]

(1)   a.   *I want [you to leave]*.
      b.   *I do not want [to go]*

(2)   a.   *Yo quiero [que tú vayas]*.
      b.   *Yo no quiero [ir]*.

(3)   Otomí (Oto-Manguean; Lastra 1989: 97, 98)

      a.   *di-né*   [*gi-kóh   kwá*].
           1SG.PRES-want   2SG.FUT-stay here
           'I want you to stay here.'

      b.   *di-né*   [*go-kóh   kwá*].
           1SG.PRES-want   1SG.FUT-stay here
           'I want (me) to stay here.'

---

1.   Abbreviations: A = ergative, ACC = accusative, AG = agent, AL = alative, APL = applicative, ART = article, ATR = attributive, B = absolutive, BEN = benefactive, CIT = citative, CL = enclitic, CLM = clause linkage marker, COND = conditional, COMPL = completive, DESID = desiderative, DET = determiner, DIR = directional, DS = different subject, EST = stative, EVID = evidential, EXHRT = exhortative, EXT = extension, FUT = future, GNR = gerund, IMPF = imperfect, INC = incompletive aspect, INDF = indefinite, INF = infinitive, INT = intention, IRR = irrealis, LOC = locative, M = masculine, NEG = negative, NOM = nominative, NOML = nominalizer, NSUBJ = non-subject, NREAL = non-real, O = object, PASTC = past continuous, PL = plural, PRES = present, PL = plural, PRV = perfect, perfective, POT = potential, PTC = participial, RDP = reduplication, REM = remote, REFL = reflexive, SUBOR = subordinated, SG = singular, S = subject, SS = same subject, VBLZ = verbalizer.

(4)   Obolo (Niger-Congo; cited in Haspelmath 2005)

    a.   *m'-wèèk*   [*igêgê*   *íkpá*].
        1sɢ-want   ɪɴꜰ.write   letter
        'I want to write a letter.'

    b.   *m'-wèèk*   [<u>*n*</u>-*gê*   *íkpá*].
        1sɢ-want   1sɢ-write   letter
        'I want (me) to write a letter.'

(5)   Tzeltal (Mayan; Sántiz Gómez 2006)

    a.   *ya*   *j-k'an*   [*x-tal-<u>on</u>*].
        ɪᴄᴘ   ᴀ1-want   ɪᴄᴘ-come-ʙ1
        'I want (me) to come.'

    b.   *ya*   *j-k'an* [*te*   *ya*   *x-tal-<u>on</u>-e*].
        ɪᴄᴘ   ᴀ1-want   ᴄʟᴍ ɪᴄᴘ   ɪᴄᴘ-come-ʙ1-ᴄʟ
        'I want (me) to come.'

Whereas subject omission in same-subject clauses has been widely discussed (i.e., dubbed as "equi-deletion" or "control" in the literature), the possibility of choosing among alternative structures in a language has been barely noticed. The present study explores the syntax and semantics of "want" clauses in the Uto-Aztecan family. Special attention is paid to those cases where there are alternative structures for same-subject "want" clauses. The goals are twofold. To provide data on the form and meaning of alternative "want" expressions, and to propose an analysis in light of the Interclausal Relation Hierarchy as proposed by Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997; Van Valin 2005). It is argued that, whenever there are available structures in a language, the tightest morpho-syntactic linkage encodes pure intention, whereas the less tight expresses different mental states and attitudes.

2.   The morpho-syntax of "want" complements

In a "want" construction, there are two clearly distinct events, the mental disposition encoded by the main predicate, and the desire expressed in the dependent unit. Based on two structural properties, that is, the coding of the dependent subject and the verb form employed for "want", Haspelmath (2005: 4) has proposed five different types of languages when expressing same-subject "want" constructions. The preference for each language's type is indicated in Table 1.

    The most common strategy is to leave the dependent subject implicit when it is identical to the main subject. When the dependent subject is overtly expressed, it generally appears as a person-number affix or a pronoun. The third most common method is when "want" shows up as a desiderative verbal affix. Significantly less common are the co-existence of two patterns in a language and the use of uninflected particles. When the subjects are different, languages usually select different complements,

Table 1. "Want" complements (Haspelmath et al. 2005)

1.	The complement subject is left implicit	144
2.	The complement subject is expressed overtly	72
3.	Both construction types exist	14
4.	"want" is expressed as a desiderative verbal affix	45
5.	"want" is expressed as an uninflected desiderative particle	8
		283

i.e., in Spanish, same-subject clauses takes an infinitival verb (2b), but different-subject clauses take a subjunctive and a clause linkage marker *que* "that" (2a).

The omission of the dependent subject when identical to the main subject has been explained by the universal functional factor of *economy* and frequency. Subject omission in same-subject constructions is "economically motivated because subject identity is significantly more likely than different subjects" (Haspelmath 1999: 3), and therefore more likely to be omitted. But subject omission is not universal. Languages such as Modern Greek, Standard Arabic, Otomí and Tzeltal show explicit coding of the subject in the complement of "want" constructions, even if identical to the subject of the main clause, motivated by the functional preference for *explicitness* (Haspelmath 1999: 2). Although plausible, it is hard to determine why this motivation works for some languages but not for others. As a unique motivation, explicitness also does not explain the co-occurrence of more than one "same-subject" construction in a language.

Based on a preliminary analysis of oral texts in four structurally different languages -Spanish, English, Nahuatl and Yaqui-, I found that 70% of the occurrences of "want" and "would like" predicates refer to same-subject clauses. The data in Table 2 then support the frequency effect proposed by Haspelmath (1999: 3): the expression of the speaker's own intentions and desires it is more common than situations involving different participants.[2]

Indeed, the predicate "want" is particularly interesting not only because languages vary the coding devices depending on the reference of the subjects, but also because the verb encodes two basic meanings. It behaves as a *psych-action* (actor control) verb when expressing the participant's mental disposition regarding a possible event involving herself, e.g., *I want to go*. It functions as a non-implicative *jussive* (undergoer control) verb when encoding the expression of a request, the speaker's strong emotion with respect to another's participant involvement in the event in question, e.g., *I want you to go*. Different-subject "want" can also be analyzed as having a propositional attitude meaning in certain

---

2. Oral text corpora: Spanish: Historia de Vida del Lonko Wenceslao Paillal (online), 12,935-words; English: Spoken English Corpus (http: //www.athel.com/cspa.html), 42,720-words; Yaqui: Pascola's texts (Buitimea, 2007), 8,586-words; Nahuatl: Nahuatl oral texts (as appeared in Peregrina, 2005).

Table 2. Oral text frequency of predicates encoding "wanting"

		Text frequency	SS	DS
Spanish	*querer, gustar*	28	21	7
(life story)	jussive verbs	8	–	8
English	*want, would like*	143	115	28
(business conversation)	jussive verbs	17	–	17
Nahuatl	*Neki*	47	36	11
(folk stories)	jussive verbs	13	–	13
Yaqui	*-bae, -pea*	95	95	–
(life story)	jussive verbs	24	–	24
		375	267	108
			(71.2%)	(28.8%)

contexts, e.g., *I want John to wash the car* is an expression of the speaker attitude, in this case a desire, toward the proposition "John was the car" (Van Valin 2005: 206). Although less frequent, the expression of wishes concerning other participants do occur in oral texts, as shown in the last column in Table 2. The low text frequency of jussive meanings may be due to pragmatic factors, i.e., it is fine to talk about our own wishes but it may be impolite to express our emotions involving others' actions.

Another factor that may be taken into consideration is the preference for statements containing first person (e.g., *I want to leave*) over non-first person (e.g., *he wants to leave*) (cf. Mithun 1999). The oral text frequency in Table 3 suggests that talking about other person's mental states is generally less frequent compared to the expression about the speaker's own wishes. The Nahuatl data were excluded since, as most folktale narratives, they are basically reported in third person. Thus, it is not only the case that the expression of our own wishes is significantly more likely, but also first person, egocentric wishes are in general more frequent.

Table 3. Verbs of volition and person marking

		Text frequency	1st	2nd	3rd
Spanish	*querer, gustar*	28	19	1	8
English	*want, (would) like*	143	94	23	26
Yaqui	*-bae, -pea*	95	55	9	31
			168	33	65

In what follows, I present the formal devices and semantic effects of "want" clauses in the Uto-Aztecan family. I first describe these languages following the universal tendencies, i.e., the expression or omission of the dependent subject, and the use of "want" as a desiderative verbal affix. The degree of syntactic tightness among the main and dependent unit is based on the overt expression of the dependent subject, the use of clause linkage markers, the operator dependency, as well as the position of the complement with respect to the main clause. The analysis contrasts same-subject and different-subject clauses.

The Uto-Aztecan linguistic family is one of the largest and most widely distributed in North America, including at least 61 languages spoken through western United States and México, divided in two mayor branches, the Northern and the Southern.[3] As family, most Uto-Aztecan languages tend to show verb-final properties, e.g., predominant use of postpositions and suffixes, and embedded complements, although word-order variations are found. When available in the language, it is common that the dependent subject in complex constructions is marked as a non-nominative argument, i.e., accusative or genitive/possessive. Besides few stems (specially, motion and posture verbs), most verbs do not show grammatical agreement, although the personal pronouns may be bound forms or clitics. The data presented here come from traditional grammars, grammatical sketches, published archives and vocabularies, and my own fieldwork.

3.   The expression of "want" clauses in the Uto-Aztecan family

3.1   The dependent subject is overtly expressed

Tohono O'odham seems to be the only Uto-Aztecan language that overtly expresses the dependent subject within same-subject "want" constructions. The predicate *tačču* "want" equally expresses volition (6a) and demand regarding another participant (6b). In both meanings, the complements are very similar. There is a clause linkage marker *m-*, the dependent subject is explicit, and the verbs are marked by the future particle *wo*. But the two complements differ in the distribution of other grammatical particles such as the presence of the citative (quote) marker *š* in the jussive function (b) but never when expressing volition.

(6)   Tohono O'odham (Langacker 1977: 167–8)

    a.   *tačču*   *a = ñ*   [*m = a = n = t*   *wo* *ñ = hii*].
          want   B = 1SG   CLM = B-1SG = PRF FUT REFL-shave:PRF
          'I want to cut my hair.'

    b.   *higi o tačču* [*m = a = n = t*   *š*   *wo* *chipk*].
          this B want CLM = B-1SG = PRF CIT FUT work:PRF
          'He wants me to work.'

3.2   The dependent subject is left implicit

The omission of the dependent subject when identical to the main participant is well attested in Hopi and Ute. The Hopi verb *naawakna* in (7) and the Ute predicate *ʾasti* in (8)

---

express both the participant's mental disposition (a), and a non-implicative, weak manipulation (b). Notice that in the (a) versions, the dependent subjects are left implicit. Besides the participant coding, the complements of "want" in the two languages are embedded in the main clause, and the verbs are equally marked by a special verb form. Notice that in Ute, the dependent subject in (8b) is marked as non-nominative. However, there is a specific clause linkage marker when indicating volition, and a different one when expressing manipulation. Usually, the clause linkage marker used with different-subjects is the general subordination marker and its occurrence it is not restricted by the structure type or the semantics of the main verb. The distribution of the same-subject clause linkage markers is more limited.

(7) Hopi (Kalectaca 1978: 170–1)

   a. *pam   as   [nos-ni-qe]   naawakna.*
       3SG   PTCL   eat-FUT-CLM.SS   want
       'He wants to eat.'

   b. *pam   as   [nu-y   nos-ni-qat]   naawakna.*
       3SG   PTCL   1SG-ACC   eat-FUT-CLM.DS   want
       'He wants me to eat.'

(8) Ute (Givón 2001: 61–2)

   a. *mamach   [tɨka-vaa-chi]   ʼasti-pɨga.*
       woman.S   eat-IRR-CLM.SS   want-REM
       'The woman wants to eat.'

   b. *mamach   [taʼwach-i   tɨka-vaa-ku]   ʼasti-pɨga.*
       woman.S   man.O   eat-IRR-CLM.DS   want-REM
       'The woman wants the man to eat.'

3.3   The expression of "want" as a verbal affix

The preferred tendency among the Uto-Aztecan languages is the use of desiderative verbal affixes. When the expression of volition turns up in a co-lexicalized structure, i.e., the main and the dependent verb are morphologically adjacent, two properties are relevant: whether there is one or two lexical forms expressing wanting, and whether the two verbal units share the notional subject, i.e., subject omission. Generally, the two meanings of "want" are expressed by the same lexical predicate, e.g., *querer* in Spanish, *kʼan* in Tzeltal, *ʼasti* in Ute. But this is not always the case. In the Southern Uto-Aztecan languages, the lexical verb may also depend on the identity of the subjects. The expression of volition usually comes up as a verbal affix, whereas the jussive function occurs as a main predicate taking a complement. In Cora, the verbal suffix *-iku* (historically related to "die.PL") is the only way to express the speaker's volition and desire (9a), while the full verb *šeʼeveʼe* acts as jussive predicate (9b).

(9)   Cora (Casad 1984: 348, 398)

　　a.   *ṭ-á'-u-kiiny-iku.*
　　　　1PL-far-COMPL-walk-DESID.PL
　　　　'We want to go.'

　　b.   *ka-nú　yéewi　čée　ra-še'eve'e　[peh　yá*
　　　　NEG-1SG　quote　cont　dist:SG-want　2SG:SUB　there

　　　　wa-tá-ka-tʸi　　　　　nʸi-céh].
　　　　COMPL-PRF-be-NREAL　my-house

　　　　'I don't want you to stay in my house.'

The question whether the dependent subject is implicit or not does not arise within a co-lexicalized structure, because there is no complement clause (Haspelmath 2005: 3). In other words, since the two notional verbs build a complex but single predicate, it is likely that the dependent subject is omitted. This maximum expression of economy is attested in Cora and Guarijio in (10) below, as well as Southern Tepehuan, Mayo and Yaqui.

(10)   Guarijío (Miller 1993: 97)

　　a.   *pa'á=ni　　　simi-náre　ihtiénda-ci　pi'arí.*
　　　　already=1SG　go-DESID　store-LOC　early
　　　　'I want to go to the store early.'

　　b.   *nahki-ná=niga　[amó　tehíba-mi-o　i'wá].*
　　　　want-PRES=1SG　2SG.NS　stay-FUT-CLM　there
　　　　'I want you to stay there.'

Nevertheless, the omission of the dependent subject in this structure type is not universal. In Huichol, the verbal suffix *-keyu* may or not omit its dependent subject; contrast the clauses in (11a) and (11b) below; in both instances, the pronominal subject is nominative. The expression of the dependent subject is also optional in Northern Tepehuan (11c), but obligatory in Cupeño (11d); notice that the bound pronoun in the verbal predicate is marked accusative.

(11)   Huichol (Gómez 1999: 130)

　　a.   *ke-pe-ti-yurie-ni-keyu.*
　　　　int-2SG.S-INT-do-FUT-DESID
　　　　'What do you want to do?'

　　b.   *'ena　ne-pɨ-ne-hayewa-keyu.*
　　　　here　1SG: S-ASI-1SG.S-stay-DESID
　　　　'I want to stay here.'

Northern Tepehuan (Bascom 1982: 282)

　　c.   *[imí=á=iñ]　ágai-tadai　(áánɨ).*
　　　　go=B=1SG　desid-pastc　1SG
　　　　'I wanted/intended to go.'

Cupeño (Langacker 1977: 149)

d. <u>ne'e</u>=<u>n</u>   pi-čak-<u>ne</u>-n-viču-qal.
    1SG.NOM=1SG this-take-1SG-ACC-want-PASDUR
    'I wanted to take it.'

It may be also the case that both meanings make use of verbal affixes, one bound form encoding volition, and another bound form expressing the speaker's request on another participant. For Nevome in (12), there are *-mut'* and *-orida* for same and different subjects, respectively. In Yaqui, there is *-pea/-bae* and *-'ii'aa*, the latter related the speech act predicate "to say".

(12) Nevome (Shaul 1982: 81, 133)

  a. *a-si-mu-gugba-mut'-<u>an</u>'-igui*
      2PL-EST-2PL-hit-want-1SG-IRR
      'I want to hit you (PL).'

  b. <u>*mumu*</u>   *an'-igui cauari s'-haquiard'-orida.*
      2SG   1SG-IRR eggs   EST-count-want
      'I want you to count the eggs'

(13) Yaqui (Guerrero 2006: 113)

  a. <u>*Ne*</u>   *kaa polisia-ta   tomi-ta   mak-bae-k.*
      1SG:NOM   NEG policeman-ACC money-ACC give-DESID-PRF
      'I didn't want to give money to the policeman.'

  b. <u>*Ne*</u>   *kaa <u>enchi</u>   polisia-ta tomi-ta   mak-'ii'aa-k.*
      1SG:NOM   NEG 2SG.ACC police-ACC money-ACC give-want-PRF
      'I didn't want you to give money to the policeman.'

The morpho-syntactic properties described so far, follow the main tendencies found cross-linguistically, i.e., several Uto-Aztecan languages omit the dependent subject when identical to the main subject; many express the notion of wanting by means of verbal affixes. The next section presents cases where there is more than one same-subject "want" expression, one clause morphologically more complex than the other, and each structure highlighting specific semantic notions.

4. Alternative expressions of "want" clauses

We have seen examples where the notion of wanting is encoded by a verbal affix, especially when involving identical participants. Languages may vary even when using the same structure type. In Yaqui, the verbal affix *-bae* expresses volition (13a), but the reduplicated form *-babae* systematically encodes a stronger emotion on the part of the speaker (14). The point here is that there are two formal expressions involving the notion of wanting and identical subjects, the short form *-bae* expresses the basic

meaning of volition, while the long form *-babae* encodes a related but slightly more complex semantic situation, i.e., decision, planning, and strong emotion.

(14)   Yaqui (Buitimea 2007)

    a.   *bweta jiba juni nee   ania-babae-k.*
        but   now then 1SG.ACC help-RED.DESID-PRF
        'But at the end, they decided to help me.'

    b.   *Junak bea* <u>*ne*</u>   *aman-bichaa wee-babae-k.*
        then thus 1SG.NOM there-toward go-RED.DESID-PRF
        'And then, I decided to go there.'

In Nahuatl, there are two choices for same-subject "want" clauses: the co-lexicalized type expresses volition, and the reduced complement clause encodes inception/strong desire. When expressing volition, the predicate *neki* may be attached to the dependent verb (15a) or it can take a complement (15b). In the former, the dependent subject is omitted; in the later, it is overtly expressed. In both cases, the verb takes the future/irrealis suffix -s. The author refers to a meaning change between the tightest linkage in (a) and the less tight structure in (b): only the latter additionally encodes the participant's attitude (even motion) to realize the intended event, e.g., "*I really, I am going to sleep*". When expressing the participant's weak manipulation over another participant, the only possibility is the complement in (15c) introduced by the clause linkage marker *ma*.

(15)   Tetelcingo Nahuatl (Tuggy 1979: 108–9)

    a.   <u>*ni-koči-s-neki.*</u>
        1SG-sleep-FUT-DESID
        'I want to sleep.'

    b.   <u>*ni-k-neki*</u>   [<u>*ni-koči-s*</u>].
        1SG-3SG.O-want 1SG-sleep-FUT
        'I want, I am going to sleep.'

    c.   *k-neki*   [*ma*   <u>*ni-ya*</u>].
        3SG.O-want EXHRT 1SG-go
        'He wants me to leave.'

What is more, it seems there are some dialectal preferences on the expression of volition. In Amanalco Nahuatl, the most common way to encode the speaker's own desires is when the predicate *neki* is combined with the reduced complement in (16a). The co-lexicalized structure in (16b) is used to highlight a stronger, controlled, even awful desire, e.g., "*to pee on someone*".

(16)   Amanalco Nahuatl (Peralta 2006; p.c.)

    a.   *a'mo* <u>*ni-h-neki*</u>   [<u>*ni-tla'tlami: na-s*</u>].
        NEG 1SG-3O-want 1SG-urinate-IRR
        'I don't want to urinate.'

b. *ni-tla' tlami:na-s-neki.*
1SG-   urinate-IRR-want
'I want to urinate.' (e.g., bad intention)

The alternative expressions may also include the combination of two morphological means into the same clause. In Northern Paiute, the verbal affix *su-* indicates volition (17a) but so does the full verb *sunami* (17b). Notice, however, that the embedded verb in (b) also has the desiderative prefix *su-*, i.e., there is a double coding of "wanting". A change of meaning is again reported: whereas the former encodes an internal desire, the latter emphasizes the participant's decision, inception and willingness to realize the event coded in the complement.

(17)   Northern Paiute (Snapp & Anderson 1982: 77–78)

a. *umɨ ka   nobi-kwai-tu   su-kimmau.*
3PL ACC house-LOC-toward want-come
'They want to come to the house.'

b. *nɨ [mɨ tigapu odɨ   tu'i su-ĵagʷi]   sunami.*
1SG PL rope   long try want-make want
'I decided to make these ropes longer." (lit. want try-want-make).'

A more complex pattern is reported in Raramuri (Tarahumara) where three alternative expressions co-exist. There is one structure taking the verbal affix *-nare* (18a), another structure involving the full verb *naki* (18b), and a third structure combining the two, the verbal affix and the main verb in the same clause (18c). The double coding of wanting gives emphasis not only to the expression of a desire, but also the participant's commitment and attitude regarding a state of affairs in which he/she is involved, e.g., *I have the feeling, the strong intention of going.*

(18)   Raramuri (Brambila 1953: 168)

a. *we   ne   šimi-nare.*
a lot 1SG.NOM go.SG-want
'I want to go.'

b. *we   ne   naki [šimi-ga].*
a lot 1SG.NOM want go.SG-GER
'I want to go (I have the intention of going).'

c. *we   ne   naki [šimi-nare].*
a lot 1SG.NOM want go.SG-want
'I really want to go/I have the strong desire to go.'

What these languages (or speakers) are trying to encode when selecting alternative structures to express the notion of wanting, is to indicate that the participant is more or less strongly committed to the likelihood of the state of the affairs to being realized. This phenomenon is even clearer when the semantic notions covered by the predicate go from volition and emotions, to opinion, and to cognition. In the Tepiman

languages there is not a unique word meaning "want". Depending on the morpho-syntactic properties of the complement, the same lexical form acts as a psych-action, propositional attitude and cognitive predicate. In Northern Tepehuan, the full verb *ilíd^yi* serves double duty: it expresses the participant's desires (19a) as well as her/his attitude regarding the content of the complement (19b). Only in the cognitive reading (b), the dependent unit is formally introduced by the clause linkage marker *iš*, the verb expresses all its arguments, and it is independent in term of operator marking. The position of the linked unit also differs for each semantic reading.

(19)   Northern Tepehuan (Bascom 1982: 282, 350)

   a.   *ka = kilí-t^yu*   *ááni*   [*ka=óóñ-t^ya*]   *iñ-ilíd^yi.*
      already=man=become   1SG.S   already=wife-CAUSE   1SG.NS-want
      'Now that I am a man, I want to get married.'

   b.   [*kɪɪgádo*]   *ilídyi*   *ááni*   [*iš = gi-oohí-dya-gi*].
       good   want   1SG   CLM=2SG-write-APPL-IRR
      'I thought it would be good to write you.'

The Tepiman languages are also special in the sense that the dependent subject is raised, and hence marked as a non-nominative argument within the main clause. The clause in (19a) would literally mean "*now that I am a man, it is my pleasure to get married*". The last set of examples belongs to Pima Bajo, where the predicate *ilid* equally encodes volition (20a), remembering (20b–c) and thinking (20d). Again, whereas the most basic sense is expressed in the less finite complement, i.e., the dependent unit in (a) is embedded and the verb is limited to the potential suffix *-ia*, the meanings get complex as soon as the complement acquires more finite properties. From (b) to (d), the subjects can be different, the dependent unit is now extraposed to the right, and the verb may take the relevant operators, e.g., evidential, probability and even perfective markers. Only in the cognitive reading "to think" is the complement formally introduced by the clause linkage marker *ko*.

(20)   Pima Bajo (Estrada 1998: 87–90)

   a.   *aan*   [*i'a   vo'o-ia*]   *in*   *ilid.*
      1SG.S   here   stay-POT   1SG.NS   want
      'I want to stay here (lit. my staying here is my pleasure).'

   b.   *aan*   *im*   *in*   *ilid*   [*puertat   kuupa-it*].
      1SG.S   NEG   1SG.NS   think:IMPF   door   close-EVID
      'I didn't remember to close the door.' (LIT. I did not think myself)

   c.   *aan*   *im*   *in*   *ilid*   [*api   ab   duvia*].
      1SG.S   NEG   1SG.NS   think:IMPF   2SG.S   DIR   come:PROB
      'I didn't remember that you would arrive.'

   d.   *ani*   *in*   *ilid*   [*ko-va*   *higai*   *huaan-viin hiim*].
      1SG.S   1SG.NS   think:IMPF   CLM-COMPL   3SG.S   Juan-COM   go:PRF
      'I think that he went with Juan.'

In sum, individual languages may make use of universally-available coding devices in different ways. Although this paradoxical data may be too few to question the pertinence of economy, frequency and explicitness as the crucial motivations, they are too salient to be neglected and ask for a reasonable explanation.

5.   The analysis of "want" clauses in the light of the
   Interclausal Relations Hierarchy

Without denying the relevance of economy as an explanation for the three most common strategies found in the expression of same-subject "want" clauses, the occurrence of alternative expressions in the same language may be motivated by either one of the following two principles: extravagance and iconicity.

Extravagance, as proposed by Haspelmath (1999b: 1043) is the "speaker's use of unusually explicit formulations in order to attract attention." In the lines of frequency and economy, when a novel and extravagant form is adopted widely by the speech community, it usually becomes more frequent and, consequently, the novel form is reduced in its phonological or morphological shape. Without doubt, the Uto-Aztecan patterns described above are unusual and novel formulations originally chosen by speakers in certain contexts. But, still the question arises in how to establish the basis for such motivation, i.e., what part is extravagant? The structure? The resulting meaning? The context? All of these?

We have seen a variety of functional effects in all cases of alternative expression: the meanings encoded in the innovative structures are more or less constant. From the participant's willingness or intention in cases where the focus is upon a future event that is planned, threatened, to the predictability and attitude towards the realization of the event in question, in cases where the focus is upon the participant's mind. These functional effects make possible another explanation: iconicity.[4] Iconicity is understood not as a one-to-one relationship between the syntactic and semantic representations of a sentence (cf. Silverstein 1976; Givón 1980; Haiman 1985), but as a functional motivation organizing the form and meaning dimensions together in a scale of clause union, as does the Interclausal Relations Hierarchy (IRH) proposed by Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997; Van Valin 2005). Although there might be mismatches among the linkage of the two representations in particular languages, the IRH represents general constraints on the way natural language is structured: it narrows down the possible range of form-meaning correspondences and rejects unlikely ones (see Ohori 2005).

---

4.   Haspelmath (1999a, 2005) also argues against iconicity as a motivation, and provides a detailed argumentation in favor of frequency in explaining grammatical asymmetries.

When establishing the different degrees of tightness in clause linkages, the omission of the dependent subject is, perhaps, the first property in defining a higher syntactic integration. But we have seen that the degree of finiteness is also due by operator dependency, the use of clause linkage markers, and the position and status of the dependent unit. The establishment of the degree of the semantic cohesion among the units is slightly more complex, though. For this, I adopt Van Valin's proposal regarding the semantic integration as the result of the interaction of a set of sub-hierarchies, including but not limited those listed below:

(21)   Semantic sub-hierarchies (Van Valin 2005: 211)

    a.   *Temporal hierarchy*: phases of a single event > simultaneous events > sequential events > unspecified

    b.   *Causal hierarchy*: physical > verbal > underspecified $_{[non\text{-}defeasible]}$ > inferred $_{[defeasible]}$

    c.   *Necessarily shared participant [NSP]*: Yes > No

    d.   *Participant's mental disposition*: intention > perception > belief > knowledge

For "want" complements, the temporal hierarchy (a) is irrelevant since the meanings of "want" necessarily involve a sequential relationship among the two events, as it always includes an unrealized, future-intended event. The causal hierarchy (b) is relevant only in the jussive reading, e.g., the clause *I want you to stay* implies some sort of causality, but *I want to go* does not. The hierarchy in (c) simply says that two events which necessarily share a participant are more closely linked than two verbs which not. This is true for the two interpretations of "want": the actor is the shared argument when encoding volition, while the undergoer is the shared argument in a jussive interpretation. The mental disposition hierarchy concerns what kind of cognitive stance a participant is in. For "want" predicates, the participant is acting according to her/his own intentions. As is, the interaction of the semantic sub-hierarchies in (21) are able to establish the form-function correlation between same-subject and different-subject "want" clauses only, but not to distinguish among the different senses of the same-subject expressions.

Compared to the others, the participant's mental disposition hierarchy is the most complex and heterogeneous. It originally denotes the experiencer's intention to be involved in a state of affairs, perception, and different stages of cognition. Because it is closely correlated with the semantic features of the predicate expressing the main state of affairs, it furthermore reflects some sort of inherent epistemic scale in the language, in that the values refer to somebody's commitment towards the truth of some proposition being expressed. In view of that, we may re-formulate this hierarchy as a cognitive scale involving different aspects including but not limited to (i) intended event on the part of the speaker, (ii) experiences generated in the speaker's mind (e.g., internal/mental perceived phenomena vs. external/mental phenomena), and (iii) the speaker's measure of subjectivity (e.g., judgment, reasoning, report). The revised version is illustrated below:

(22) *Participant's mental disposition* (Guerrero 2006: 219)
      Intention > internal/direct experience > mental experience: judgment >
      mental experience: reasoning > non-mental experience: report

The first two values are relevant for "want" complements. Whereas "intention" conveys the participant's own conceptualization of volitional preferences, wishes and desires encoded in the complement, the second value seeks to account for different kinds of mental stances on the part of the participant. That is, "internal/direct experience" indicates the state of affairs was internally generated in the participant's mind, a mental concept formed by internal, physical, direct contact with another entity and/or event. The proposal is the following: whenever there are available structures in a language, the tightest linkage would encode pure intention, whereas the less tight may express a particular mental stance, i.e., decision in Yaqui, emotions values in Nahuatl, inception and strong desires in Raramuri. One more argument in favor of a mental disposition distinction is the fact that "want" can serve "double duty" expressing volition, propositional attitude and even cognition, as in the Tepiman languages.

6.   Concluding remarks

The notion of "wanting" not only has different morpho-syntactic expressions across languages, but also within a language. Using data from the Uto-Aztecan family, we saw cases following the universal tendencies regarding the omission or overt expression of the dependent subject, and the use of desiderative affixes. However, we also found several instances of alternative same-subject expressions in a language. The interesting results are that language-specific constructions moving away from the universal tendencies predictions, reflect a slightly more complex mental experience on the part of the participant: a conscious, internal desire reflecting attitude or emotions regarding the intended state of affairs on the part of the participant.

References

Bascom, B. 1982. Northern Tepehuan. In *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 3*, R.W. Langacker (Ed.), Dallas TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Brambila, D. 1953. *Gramática Raramuri*. México: Buena Prensa.

Buitimea, C. 2007. *Preesio betana nottiwame* (Talks from Hermosillo). Hermosillo: Universidad de Sonora.

Casad, E.H. 1984. Cora. In *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 4*, R.W. Langacker (Ed.), Dallas TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Cristofaro, S. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: OUP.

Dixon, R.M.W. & Aikhenvald, A.Y. 2006. *Complementation*. Oxford: OUP.

Estrada Fernández, Z. 1998. *Pima bajo de Yapechi, Chihuahua.* Archivo de lenguas indígenas de México 21. México: El Colegio de México.

Gómez, P. 1999. *Huichol de San Andres Cohamiata, Jalisco*. Archivo de lenguas indígenas de México 22. México: El Colegio de México.

Givón, T. 1980. The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4: 333–77.

Givón, T. 2001. *Syntax. An Introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Guerrero, L. 2006. *The Structure and Function on Yaqui Complementation* [Studies in Native American Linguistics 54]. Munich: Lincom.

Haiman, J. 1985. *Natural Syntax: Iconicity and Erosion.* Cambridge: CUP.

Haspelmath, M. 1999a. On the cross-linguistic distribution of same-subject and different-subject complement clauses: Economic vs. iconic motivations. (Available at the author's web page).

Haspelmath, M. 2005. Iconicity versus frequency in explaining gramatical asymmeries. (Available at the author's web page).

Haspelmath, M., Dryer, M.S., Gil, D. & Comrie, B. (Eds). 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures.* Oxford: OUP.

Kalectaca, M. 1978. *Lessons in Hopi.* Tucson AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Lastra, Y. 1989. *Otomí de San Andrés Cuexcontitlán, estado de México*. Archivo de lenguas indígenas de México 13. México: El Colegio de México.

Langacker, R. 1977. *An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar* [Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 1]. Arlington TZ: Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Miller, W.R. 1993. *Guarijio de Arechuyvo, Chihuahua* [Archivo de lenguas indígenas de México 16]. México: El Colegio de México.

Mithun, M. 1999. *The Languages of Native North America.* Cambridge: CUP.

Noonan, M. 2007. Complementation. *Language typology and syntactic description 2*, 52–150. Cambridge: CUP.

Ohori, T. 2005. More Thoughts on the semantic representation in RRG; event types and the semantics of clause linkage. Paper presented at the *2005 Role and Reference Grammar conference*.

Peralta, V. 2006. Completivas en Nahuatl. Paper presented at the *Seminario sobre Complementación en Lenguas Indígenas de México y Mesoamérica*.

Sántiz Gómez, R. 2006. Completivas en Tsetsal. Paper presented at the *Seminario sobre Complementación en Lenguas Indígenas de México y Mesoamérica*.

Silverstein, M. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, R.M.W. Dixon (Ed.), 112–71. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Snapp, A. & J. Anderson, 1982. Nortern Paiute. In *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 3*, R.W. Langacker (Ed.), Dallas TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Shaul, D.L. 1982. A grammar of Nevome. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Tuggy, D.H. 1979. Tetelcingo Nahuatl. In *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 2*, R.W. Langacker (Ed.), Dallas TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Van Valin, R. & LaPolla, R.J. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, Meaning and Function.* Cambridge: CUP.

Van Valin, R.D., Jr. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantic Interface.* Cambridge: CUP.