Chapter 15

Coordination and related constructions in Omaha-Ponca and in Siouan languages

Catherine Rudin

Syntactic constructions expressing semantic coordination vary widely across the Siouan language family. A case study of possible coordinating conjunctions in Omaha-Ponca demonstrates that distinguishing coordination from other means of expressing ‘and’ relations is a non-trivial problem. A survey of words translated as ‘and,’ ‘or,’ or ‘but’ in Siouan languages leads to the conclusion that neither coordinating conjunctions nor the syntactic structures containing them are reconstructable across the Siouan family. It is likely that Proto-Siouan lacked syntactic coordination.

1 Introduction

All languages have ways of expressing additive, disjunctive, and adversative relations among entities or propositions. In European languages these relations are expressed by two distinct syntactic means: coordination and subordination. In Siouan languages these two types of conjunction construction are also present, but the distinction between them is less robust and less clear; coordination may not have existed at all historically. Neither coordinating conjunctions (‘and,’ ‘or,’ ‘but’) nor the syntactic structures containing them are reconstructable across the Siouan family.

I begin this examination of coordination in Siouan by defining coordination and discussing some of the issues involved in distinguishing coordinate from subordinate conjunction (§2). This is followed in §3 by a case study of additive coordination and coordinate-like constructions in Omaha-Ponca, the Siouan language with which I am most familiar. §4 is a survey of available data on coordination across all branches and most of the languages in the Siouan language family, with a summary table. §5 concludes the chapter with a discussion of the

(non)universality of coordination constructions and some speculations on the history and origins of coordination in Siouan.

2 Issues in defining and identifying coordination

2.1 The syntax of coordination

Traditionally, coordination is a structure of the type shown in (1):

(1) 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
\_ \\
X \\
\_ \\
X \\
\_ \\
\end{array}
\]

In this structure two or more conjuncts of identical grammatical category together constitute a larger syntactic unit of the same category. These conjuncts might for instance be noun phrases, verbs, or clauses:

(2) 
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NP} & \text{V} & \text{CP} \\
\text{NP} & \text{V} & \text{CP} \\
\end{array}
\]

The conjuncts are sisters, of equal syntactic status, in a symmetrical constituent. Neither coordinate is subordinate to or included in the other. Equality of status is seen by coordinate NPs bearing the same case and triggering plural agreement in languages where those categories are overtly marked. In addition coordinate phrases resist extraction (Ross 1968 (1967), Coordinate Structure Constraint), and any movement out of them must be “across the board” movement out of all the conjuncts. Thus in standard English when two pronouns are coordinated, as in (3); they must both be nominative in subject position, they require a plural verb, and they cannot be separated.

(3)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item [She and I] were chosen.
\item * [She and me] were chosen.
\item * [She and I] was chosen.
\item * [She] was chosen [and I].
\end{enumerate}

This contrasts with a non-coordinate construction like that in (4), in which the two pronouns are different cases, the verb is singular, agreeing with only the first pronoun, and the subordinate portion of the construction can be moved.
a. [She] [along with me] was chosen.
b. [She] was chosen [along with me].

Coordinate constructions may or may not contain an overt coordinating conjunction, a word translating as ‘and,’ ‘or,’ ‘but,’ etc. If there is one, it may occur between the conjuncts, or after the last one, or may be repeated (before or after each conjunct):

In recent theories of syntax (i.e. Minimalism), coordinate structures are instead treated as asymmetric constructions headed by the coordinator: “CoordP” or “isi&P,” or the similar “Boolean Phrase” structure argued for by Munn (1993). This type of structure is adopted partly for theory-internal reasons such as Kayne’s Linear Correspondence Axiom (1994), but also for reasons having to do with intonation, ellipsis, and other phenomena which often suggest that the conjunction is more closely associated with one conjunct than with the other. See Citko (2011) for detailed discussion. Under this view coordinate structures look something like those in (6); presumably Siouan languages, being strongly head-final, would tend to have the left-branching variant shown on the right:

Issues of whether the conjunction forms a constituent with either the preceding or following X, and whether there is such a thing as a Coordination Phrase, are obviously important if one is concerned with distinguishing “true” coordination from other constructions such as comitatives which have similar meanings. Under the “isi&P” analysis coordination has a syntactic configuration much like comitative or subordination structures, with one conjunct higher than the other, making it less straightforward to explain the distinctive behavior of coordinate structures,
as well as less clear what criteria distinguish coordinate from subordinate structures. Numerous works have wrestled with these issues theoretically and across languages, e.g. Wesche (1995) and Fabricius-Hansen & Ramm (2008). I lack data to deal with such questions in most of the Siouan languages, so the exact structure of apparently coordinate phrases is left vague in what follows. Detailed research within each language will be needed to sort it out.

It is likely that many of the structures which translate ‘and/or/but’ in various Siouan languages are actually not coordinate. Several other types of syntactic constructions often express semantic coordination. These include at least the following: (1) comitatives (prepositional phrases or subordinate clauses expressing ‘accompaniment’ or a ‘with’ relation); (2) adverbial clauses with temporal or other subordinate relations to a matrix clause (‘when,’ ‘although,’ ‘having done X,’ etc.); (3) simple listing of nouns, verbs, or clauses (that is, concatenation of separate items which do not form a larger constituent of any kind, sometimes with elements meaning ‘too,’ ‘also,’ ‘furthermore,’ ‘however’ or a phrase which sums them up (‘both,’ ‘all’); (4) co-subordinate or clause-chaining constructions, (see e.g. Graczyk 2007; Boyle 2007).

There are a number of problematic coordination constructions in languages of the world, for instance a coordinator analyzed as a transitive verb in a Papua New Guinean language (Brown & Dryer 2009), partial/covert coordination of the *nie s Ivan ’we with Ivan’ = ‘Ivan and I ’ type in Slavic (e.g. McNally 1993; Larson 2014), special treatment of commonly linked items (Wälchli 2005), and overlaps with serial constructions (Carstens 2002). I do not deal with these specifically, but mention them just as a further reminder that the syntax of coordination is not necessarily a simple issue. For a useful typological overview of coordination, see Haspelmath (2007); other general treatments include Johannessen (1998) and van Oirsouw (1987).

2.2 The semantics of coordination

Coordinators join constituents with diverse semantic relations, though the semantic aspects of coordination have received less attention than its syntax. Different authors use widely varying terminology for the meanings coordination can express; see for instance Citko’s (2011) discussion of Andrej Malchukov’s system of classification of coordination constructions into semantic types. Among the terms used in the literature are *additive, adversative, comitative, consecutive, concessive, contrastive, correction, disjunctive, mirative* and others.

In the cursory survey of the Siouan data below I will for the most part ignore
issues of semantics beyond the gross level of meaning indicated by being trans-
lated in a grammar or dictionary as ‘and’ versus ‘but’ or ‘or’ — roughly additive,
adversative, and disjunctive. From the data available it is often not clear pre-
cisely what range of meanings are covered by a given conjunction. Semantic
classification of the conjunctions will require detailed investigation of usage in
each individual language, and will surely interact with numerous factors, includ-
ing modality, adverbial modifiers, same or different subject of conjoined clauses,
and so on. I leave this entire area for future research. For the present I simply list
all elements which seem to translate ‘and,’ ‘but,’ or ‘or’ in any of their meanings.

2.3 Identifying lexical coordinators

Another issue is that some of these lexical items, although they translate English
coodinators, may in fact not be coordinators. This is yet another area which pro-
vides fertile ground for future, deeper research into each individual Siouan lan-
guage. Coordinating conjunctions can be difficult to distinguish from sentence-
initial or sentence-final elements (complementizers, discourse particles, switch-
reference markers, and other clause-linking morphemes), and from comitative or
adverbial words. Coordinators often develop historically into sentence-initial or
-final elements, presumably by way of a stage involving elided conjuncts. Histor-
ical change can go the other way too: as Mithun (1988) and Stassen (2000) both
point out, many languages have coordinating conjunctions which are recently
and transparently derived from various sources, including comitative preposi-
tions, adverbial particles, aspect markers, and clausal (subordinating) conjunc-
tions. This leads to situations in which the same word is sometimes a coordinator,
sometimes not, and teasing apart the two usages is tricky; such is the case for
example with Bulgarian no, ama, ami (Fielder 2008) and Australian English but
(Mulder & Thompson 2008). Given the slipperiness of this issue in well-studied
European languages, it should be no surprise that identifying coordinators can
be problematic when dealing with spoken or inconsistently written data in a
language with no tradition of written prose or punctuation conventions.

3 Additive coordination in Omaha-Ponca

My interest in coordination in Siouan was sparked not by theoretical consider-
atations but by a practical problem of language teaching. In an Omaha language
class in 2002, a student’s question of how to say ‘and’ turned out to be unex-
pectedly hard to answer, with no one word corresponding to English *and*. There are several clause connectors which are at least plausible candidates for coordinators in Omaha-Ponca, but nothing which syntactically coordinates nominal or other non-clausal phrases. To say things like ‘I have a cat and two dogs’ or ‘That dress is black and white’ our Omaha-speaking consultants rephrased with non-coordinate constructions, to the sometimes frustrated bewilderment of the English-dominant students. In this section I examine various options for expressing additive coordination (‘and’) in Omaha-Ponca and consider whether they are true coordination or involve some other strategy such as adverbial modifiers or subordination. This case study illustrates both the richness and complexity of the data and the difficulty of conclusively distinguishing coordination from non-coordinate structures in a Siouan language.

3.1 Coordination of clauses: *shi* and similar words

The word most commonly offered by Omaha consultants as a translation for *and* is *shi*, which often occurs as an apparent sentence conjoiner, or at least a discourse link between sentences. Koontz (1984: 52) lists *shi* along with *ki*, *goⁿ*, *goⁿki*, *oⁿska*, and *egithe* in a table of “sentence introducers” culled from James Owen Dorsey’s 19th-century Omaha and Ponca materials; the same words are found in my field recordings from 100 years later. It is an open question whether these words start a new sentence or not; i.e. whether the structure is [S *shi* S] or [S][*shi* S], with [*shi* S] constituting a separate sentence.¹ Dorsey apparently considered them to be the start of a new sentence, but it is unclear why. Presumably he heard a preceding pause, or speakers when dictating to him tended to pronounce *shi* with the following sentence. But there is often a pause or break before a conjunction in English as well, sentences do begin with coordinating conjunctions (in spite of prescriptive prohibitions), and in the more recent view of coordination, the conjunction does form a tighter unit with one of the joined clauses. Even if we assume the entire string [S *shi* S] is a single sentence, it is unclear whether the two smaller sentences so joined are syntactically coordinated or one subordinate to the other. Omaha has no clear markers of subordination that I know of (e.g. no nonfinite verb forms).

The precise meaning of *shi* is another issue: Koontz states that *shi* differs from the other “introducers” in that it has a meaning of ‘again’ or ‘marks repetition’, but this meaning is not always apparent to me. *Shi* sometimes seems to indicate

¹ David Rood (pc) points out that [S *shi*] [S] might be a more expected split into two sentences in a verb final language, but *shi* is not sentence final, in written texts or spoken prosodic contours.
repetition, but not always. In the examples below,\(^2\) \textit{shi} (boldfaced) seems to mark not so much repetition as simple additive coordination semantics — ‘and also’ — or even contrast, as in (8) or (10). In some discourses \textit{shi} strings together several sentences or clauses in a row, as in (10) and (11). Example (11) in particular is a fairly extended discourse in which nearly every sentence after the first starts with \textit{shi}, and the discourse is a list of items, with no sense of repetition except the continued idea of praying for something. Note that \textit{shi} cooccurs with other “sentence introducers,” for example, go\(^n\)ki (in (10) and (11)), and with arguably subordinating adverbial \textit{ki} (in (11)).\(^3\)

(7) \textit{Thíshti xtāwithe.} \textit{Shi thíshti xtó\(^\circ\)thathe.} éshti xtó\(^\circ\)tha=i \textit{ge shi}

\begin{tabular}{l}
you 1sgA.like.2P and you 2A.like.1sgA s/he like.1P=PROX \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
wíshti xtáathe. \textit{I.too sga.like.3P} \\
'\textit{I like you. And you like me. S/he likes me and I like her/him too.}'
\end{tabular}

(8) \textit{Zhi\(^n\)gá ama águdishti údon wánö?o\(^n\)=no\(^n\), \textit{shi águdishti}}

\begin{tabular}{l}
children the some good listen.to.1plP=HAB and some \textit{wánö?o\(^n\)=bazhi=no\(^n\),} \\
listen.to.1plP=NEG=HAB \\
'Some of the children are good; they listen to us, but some of them don’t listen to us.'
\end{tabular}

(9) \textit{Shi gó\(^n\)ki shaó\(^n\) ama ... shaó\(^n\) xé=ta=i \textit{á=bi=ama}.}

\begin{tabular}{l}
and then Sioux the ... Sioux bury=FUT=PROX say=PROX=QUOT \\
'And the Sioux ... His wish was for the Sioux to bury him.'
\end{tabular}

(10) \textit{Gó\(^n\)ki \textit{shi gá=t\(^\circ\)e o\(^n\)gáhi \textit{ki shi wach\(^\circ\)igagha ama}}}

\begin{tabular}{l}
them and that=the.1plA.go.there when and dancers \textit{the} \textit{shó\(^n\)-gagha=i=t\(^\circ\)e ki shi shó\(^n\)sho\(^n\) shi zhuá wagthe} \\
end-do=PROX=EVID when and right.away and together
\end{tabular}

---

\(^2\) These examples are from my field tapes, recorded in the late 1980s and 1990s, in Macy Nebraska. I am grateful to the National Science Foundation and Wenner-Gren Foundation for support, and to the speakers quoted here, Clifford Wolfe Sr., Bertha Wolfe, Mary Clay, and Coolidge Stabler, for sharing their language with me. The orthography used in this paper is the “Macy Standard” spelling used at Umo’hó’ Nation School and the University of Nebraska.

\(^3\) '?' in examples marks words which were unclear when transcribing field tapes or whose meaning is unknown. Since the morphological breakdown of most words is immaterial for the purposes of the paper, glosses are not necessarily morpheme-by-morpheme. Clitics are separated with an equal sign.
agthé=tʰa=ama.
took.1PLP.home=EVID=AUX
‘We would go there but as soon as the dancers quit they took us right home.’

(11) a. *Wakó"da thiⁿkᵇe shti btháha=ta=miⁿkᵇe*
    god the too 1SGA.pray=FUT=1SG.AUX
    ‘I’m going to pray to God.’

b. *Shi gáge iⁿdádoⁿ thé amá nikashi"ga amá shti ewéwaha=tᵇe*
    and that this the person the too 1SGA.pray.for.it=EVID
    ‘I (will) pray for the people who had these things.’

c. *Shi umó"hoⁿ ti thoⁿ shti agíwahoⁿ.*
    and Omaha house the too 1SGA.pray.for.it.REFL
    ‘And I (will) pray for my Omaha camp/village.’ (i.e. for the present-day reservation)

d. *Shi tʰóⁿwoⁿgtha dúba édi moⁿthíⁿ umóⁿhoⁿ shti ewéwaha.*
    and town several there 3A.walk Omaha too 1SGA.pray.for.3P
    ‘And I (will) pray for the Omaha who are in various cities.’ (i.e. off reservation)

e. *Gáge shi gahí nikashi"ga.*
    this and chief person
    ‘And for the council.’

f. *Shi uzhóⁿge oⁿgáthe dshtoⁿ.*
    and road/path LA.go maybe
    ‘And for the path we will take.’ (i.e. for our lives)

g. *Awóⁿhoⁿ egóⁿ é=ta=miⁿkᵇe*
    1SGA.pray thus that=FUT=1SG.AUX
    ‘I will pray for those things.’

The other “sentence introducers” listed by Dorsey and Koontz include *ki, goⁿ, góⁿki, and kigóⁿki*, all meaning ‘and, and then’. Their distribution is similar to that of *shi*; both in Dorsey’s texts and in mine, they occur written at the beginning of sentences as well as joining two sentences or clauses, and they indicate a range of connections between those clauses, sometimes temporal and sometimes not.

3.2 Coordination of non-sentential categories: does it exist?

*Shi* and the other sentence conjoiner/introducers generally do not occur in con­joining contexts other than linking sentences. That is, they appear not to coordi­
nate nominals or other non-clausal categories (though see (35) below). In the case of nominals, several patterns occur, generally consisting of a string of NPs with a word meaning something like `also’ at the end, sometimes with some element between the individual NPs as well.

Koontz (1984: 201) gives the formula NP, NP éthoⁿba for conjoined nominals in Dorsey. This pattern is found in modern materials as well. Example (12) is a sentence from the story Jimmy and Blackie, translated into Omaha as a school booklet in the 1980s, and (13) is an example from a conversation I recorded in 1990. Ethoⁿba is etymologically related to the number two (noⁿba) and probably best treated as an element meaning ‘both’ or ‘the two of them’ instead of as a conjunction.

(12) Iⁿnoⁿha akʰá, iⁿdadi éthoⁿba théthudi gthíⁿ é=shti.
    my.mother the my.father also here live they=too
    ‘My mom and also my dad, they live here too.’

(13) Ivan akʰá Silas éthoⁿba ukíkizhi.
    Ivan the Silas also brothers
    ‘Ivan and Silas, those two were brothers.’

Ardis Eschenberg (pc) reports that the elders/language teachers at Umoⁿhoⁿ Nation school in the early 2000s generally used NP, NP shti for conjoined nominals. I have found some examples of this too, but actually very few with this exact pattern. Example (14) is one. Most sentences with shti in my data have variations on the pattern such as shti after a single NP (15), or repeated shti (16), (17). Note that shti cooccurs with shi in (16) to coordinate three NPs: NP shti, NP shti, shi NP. In (17) the second conjunct looks like a postverbal afterthought. The word shti ‘too, also’ could perhaps be analyzed as a coordinator, but seems more likely to be an adverbial element, perhaps related to xti ‘very’.

(14) Ithádi, ihóⁿ akʰá shti gíñita ezhé goⁿki ithádi ama,
    his.father his.mother the too living ? and his.father the
    ihóⁿ akʰá zhúgigtha=bazhi.
    his.mother the together=NEG
    ‘His father and his mother are both alive, but his father and mother do
    not live together.’

(15) Tim akʰá iwíkoⁿ=ta=akʰá Clifford shti utháha
    Tim the 3A.help.1sgP=FUT=3aux Clifford too ?
In my elicited data conjoined nominals most often take the form NP (ego⁰), NP sheno⁰, with degree elements literally meaning ‘so much’ or ‘that much’ as in examples (18) through (24). The awkward literal gloss with ‘as … that extent’ could perhaps be better rendered ‘as well as … all of those’. In any case, this seems unlikely to be a coordinate construction.

(18) Téska tanúka égo⁰ wazhi⁰ga égo⁰ nú shéno⁰ that⁶ xtáathe. cow meat as chicken as potato that.extent eat 1sgA.like ‘I like to eat beef and chicken and potatoes.’

(19) Wat⁶é zhíde égo⁰ hiⁿbé ská shéno⁰ bthíwi⁰. dress red as shoe white that.extent 1sgA.buy I bought a red dress and white shoes.’

(20) Wat⁶é zhíde, hiⁿbé ská, watháde pézhitu shéno⁰ abthi⁰. dress red shoe white hat green that.extent 1sgA.have I have a red dress, white shoes, and a green hat.’

(21) Sézi t⁶e shé shéno⁰ áhige o⁰gáthi⁰. orange the apple that.extent much 1plaA.have ‘We have plenty of (both) oranges and apples.’

(22) Mary ak⁶á égo⁰ wi shéno⁰ Macy ata o⁰gátha. Mary the as I that.extent Macy to 1plaA.go.there ‘Mary and I went to Macy.’

(23) John ak⁶á égo⁰ Mary ak⁶á shéno⁰ Macy ata ahí=t⁶e. John the as Mary the that.extent Macy to 3plaA.arrive.there=evid ‘John and Mary went to Macy.’
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(24)  *Tim akʰá Clifford égoⁿ wi shénoⁿ iwíkoⁿ=ta=akʰa.*

Tim the Clifford as I that.extent help.1SGP=FUT=3AUX
‘Tim will help Clifford and me.’

This NP égoⁿ, NP shénoⁿ pattern also occurs in bilingual booklets produced by the Umoⁿhoⁿ Nation school; the translations are from the booklets as well:

(25)  *Jimmy akʰá égoⁿ Sabe akʰá shénoⁿ*

Jimmy the as black the that.extent
‘Jimmy and Blackie’ (title of booklet)

(26)  *Núzhiⁿga ga tʰoⁿ é=egoⁿ mízhiⁿga ga tʰoⁿ e=shti shénoⁿ uwáwakizhi. my.younger.siblings*

‘This is my little brother and sister.’

A more literal translation of (26) would be ‘Like this boy, this girl also, as a group they are my little siblings.’ Another pattern combines the previous two: NP égoⁿ, NP shti; (27) is an elicited example from my field tapes, (28) a spontaneously produced sentence.

(27)  *Mary akʰá égoⁿ wi=shti Macy atə oⁿgátha.*

Mary the as I=too Macy to 1PLA.go.there
‘Mary and I went to Macy.’

(28)  *Ihóⁿ wiáxchi égoⁿ ithádi shti wiáxchi.*

their.mother just.one so their.father too just.one
‘They have the same mother and the same father too.’

Simply juxtaposing a string of nominals is another coordination strategy, and quite a common one, though I will not give any examples. In fact, all of the nominal coordination patterns we have seen so far could be interpreted as simple listing of noun phrases, with some kind of focus element following one or more of the nominals and/or a summing-up element at the end of the nominal string. Given the lack of case marking and near-absence of number agreement in Omaha-Ponca, as well as the likely status of most if not all lexical noun phrases as adjuncts in this language, the usual tests for coordinate as opposed to other structures tend not to apply, and it is difficult to distinguish for example coordinate from comitative constructions.

---

4 Third person plural is not audibly marked in many verbs, and in those where it is, it is homophonous with proximate singular marking.
A final, very common way of expressing English ‘and’ in situations involving two participants acting together is with the verb *zhugthe* ‘be with, accompany, be together’. This verb sometimes occurs following two nouns which could be seen as coordinated but are probably just listed; (29) is more literally ‘Mary, John, being together they went to Macy’:

(29)  
Mary akʰá John Macy ata *zhúgthe* aʰi.
Mary the John Macy to together arrive there
‘Mary went to Macy with John. /Mary and John went to Macy.’

In non-elicited examples, there is almost never more than one lexical noun phrase with *zhugthe*; instead one nominal is given and the other is understood as accompanying it. In (30) only the woman is mentioned; the other participant is already present in the discourse. In (31) the unmentioned participant is the speaker, and interestingly the verb is first person singular, not plural, indicating that the construction is definitely comitative and not coordination of an overt with a null NP.\(^5\)

(30)  
Agthí *(i)tʰediki shi* wa’ú shtewiⁿ *zhúgthe*
3A.came home when and woman whatsoever together
*agthi=i*tʰe.*
came.home=EVID
‘When he came home, he came home with a woman.’ (He and some woman came home.)

(31)  
Wa’ú wiwitá Tésóⁿwiⁿ *zhúágithe* atʰi, she=kʰe
woman my White.Buffalo together.1SUS 1SGA.arrive this=the
*1PLA.arrive*
‘My wife White Buffalo and I are both here; we came here.’ (more literally, ‘My wife White Buffalo, together with my own, I came here...’)

There are thus several ways of expressing semantic coordination of nominals in Omaha-Ponca, but none for which a strong case can be made that it is a syntactic coordinate construction or any clear candidate for a coordinating construction. The nominal “coordination” patterns above are all basically lists of NPs with the option of adding a word or words stressing repetition or accompaniment. The picture is even more dubious for adverbs, nominal modifiers, and

---

\(^5\) In playback speakers commented that the second verb, *atʰi*, could have been *oʰgátʰi* (first person plural), like the verb of the next clause; *zhúágithe* however would still be first person singular.
other non-clausal constituent types. Koontz (1984) does not mention conjunction of categories other than nominals. I did not think to elicit them in field work, and have not found naturally produced examples. The kind of sentences my Omaha-language-class students wanted to say, like ‘I’m wearing a red and yellow shirt,’ seem impossible to express without resorting to multiple clauses (‘My shirt is red and it is also yellow.’)

3.3 Discussion: Once more on shi

Having concluded that Omaha-Ponca has no clear coordinating conjunction or coordination construction for non-clausal coordination, I return briefly to my best candidate for clausal coordinating conjunction, shi. In §2.1 I presented a number of examples of shi apparently linking clauses together; however, it may actually be an adverbial of some sort, not a conjunction, in which case Omaha-Ponca would not have any true coordination, even of clauses. It often appears in positions other than clause-initial, most often preverbal, as in the following examples. Here it is clearly not conjoining anything, but does have an ‘again’ sense:

(32) óⁿba wéthabthiⁿ ki shi wat’exe=ta=ama.
    day third at and funeral=FUT=AUX
    ‘There’ll be another funeral Wednesday.’ (Wednesday again will be a funeral.)

(33) Oⁿwóⁿthatʰoⁿ thishtʰoⁿ=i tʰedi tápuska ta shi háthe oⁿgákʰi.
    1PLA.eat finish=PROX when school to and 1PLA.arrive.back
    ‘After dinner we went back (again) to the school.’

(34) óⁿba wiⁿ Ishtíⁿthiⁿkhe akʰá shi edí=bi=ama.
    day one Monkey the and there=PL=QUOT
    ‘One day Monkey was there (again), they say.’ (traditional story opening)

However, it is possible that this is a different shi from the sentence-coordinating one. Further research is obviously needed. My data contain a few examples in which shi might be interpreted as conjoining nominal phrases, following the last in a string of NPs: NP, NP shi. None are very convincing, however, and shi in them can plausibly be taken as an adverbial expressing repetition. In (35), for instance, fighting was a regular occurrence.

(35) Umóⁿhoⁿ kʰe shaóⁿ kʰe shi wóⁿdoⁿ kikína=noⁿ=i
    Omaha the Sioux the and both 3A.REFL.fight=HAB=PROX
    ‘The Omaha and the Sioux tribes used to fight each other.’
This section thus concludes rather inconclusively: Omaha-Ponca apparently has no coordination of non-clausal constituents, and may or may not have true coordination of clauses.

4 Siouan languages: An overview

At this point we leave the details of Omaha-Ponca and turn to a shallow but broad survey of the Siouan family. In spite of limited data on many members of the family and the challenges of interpretation and analysis, there is quite a lot we can say about coordination in Siouan languages. In several of the languages coordination has been described in some detail. Nearly all of the languages have recorded equivalents of ‘and,’ and many have equivalents for ‘or’ or ‘but,’ though their morpho-syntactic status is often unclear. In many of the languages coordination of clauses is different than coordination of noun phrases or other categories, as we saw in Omaha-Ponca. Perhaps the most interesting result of a survey of Siouan coordination is the lack of unity within the family. No coordinators are reconstructable, there are no widespread cognates, and strategies for expressing coordination differ from language to language. It appears likely that Proto-Siouan had no true coordination. In this section I briefly describe the data from each sub-branch of Siouan (starting with Dhegiha because it is most familiar to me; information on Omaha-Ponca is repeated in brief form for completeness). No examples are given in this section and no attempt is made to justify the lexical items given as (possible) coordinators; instead, anything mentioned in sources is listed.

4.1 Dhegiha

Omaha-Ponca (data from Dorsey n.d.(a) Dorsey n.d.(b), Koontz 1984, Rudin 2003 and my own fieldwork)\(^6\) has several ways of expressing ‘and’. As discussed above, different conjunctions are used to coordinate clauses and NPs. Clauses may be conjoined with \(ki\), \(go^{n}\), \(shi\) ‘again, and then,’ \(go^{n}ki\), \(kigo^{n}ki\) ‘and then’. Dorsey considers \(ki\) to be Ponca and \(go^{n}\) to be Omaha; both of these are said to join “substantive clauses”. \(Go^{n}\) is likely the same as subordinating \((e)go^{n}\) ‘having (done),’ related to postposition \(ego^{n}\) ‘like, as’. \(Go^{n}ki\) and \(kigo^{n}ki\) are pretty clearly combinations of these two conjunctions. \(Shi\) is perhaps the best candidate for a

---

\(^6\) These sources use several different orthographies. In the interest of consistency I have spelled all Omaha-Ponca words in the modern “Macy Standard” spelling.
true coordinator, although it, like the others listed here, occurs most often sentence initially (conjoining the sentence to the preceding discourse semantically if not syntactically). NPs are occasionally joined by goⁿ; this may actually be the postposition mentioned above. More commonly two NPs are followed by 
edoⁿba/éthoⁿba ‘also, both;’ literally ‘the two of them’. A string of three or more NPs may be followed by edabe ‘also’. Two or more NPs can be followed by shti ‘too’. Although Dorsey does not list it, one of the most common strategies for coordinating NPs in my data is 
egoⁿ … shenoⁿ ‘both … and;’ literally ‘as … that-extent’, Ardis Eschenberg (p.c.) finds egoⁿ … thóⁿzhoⁿ used in the same way. The most common translation of ‘and’ with NPs is clearly not syntactic coordination: a comitative construction with the verb zhugthe ‘be with’. Simple juxtaposition (listing) of conjuncts with no conjunction is common for both S and NP coordination. ‘Or’ and ‘but’ in Omaha-Ponca are formed with the ‘and’ conjunctions for joining clauses, and to the best of my knowledge do not exist at all for NPs. Dorsey lists 
goⁿ … ite ki ‘either … or’, shoⁿ doⁿste ‘either-or, perhaps’, and doⁿste at end of clause ‘or’ (the latter two in Dorsey’s slip file). ‘But’ is commonly expressed by shi ‘and’ connecting two clauses, the second of which is negative or contrasts in some way.

**Osage** (data from Quintero 2004) coordinates NPs using ééðǫǫpa ‘the two of them’ following two or more NPs. (Compare Omaha-Ponca ethoⁿba.) Verb agreement suggests that this is a true coordination structure; however, it is possible that the two NPs are appositive and the plural verb actually agrees with pronominal ée-. Another possible NP coordinator isški ‘also’. Clauses are coordinated by juxtaposition without a conjunction: “There is no Osage equivalent to the English use of and to conjoin sentences; rather, the elements are strung together with no intervening forms of any kind” (455). Quintero gives no information on ‘or’ or ‘but’.

**Kaw (Kansa)** (data from Cumberland & Rankin 2012; Justin McBride p.c.; Robert Rankin p.c.) has an ‘and’ coordinator, ši, which is used in a variety of syntactic environments (postverbal, preverbal, postnominal, clause-initial) and apparently can conjoin both clauses and nominals. McBride states that it usually seems to be used adverbially (‘again’) or adjectivally (‘another’), but can also symmetrically coordinate clauses. Numerous conjunctions with meanings like ‘and, then, so’ exist, but all seem to be subordinating rather than coordinating. The conjunction dq ‘and, then, so’ occurs between clauses and in other coordinating situations; Rankin, in a 2012 email, states that “Kaw ... seems to allow the conjunction dq (often reduced to d-schwa ...) in exactly the same places English would allow ‘and’”; he suggests this is a result of adopting Spanish coordination
structures. Further evidence of Spanish influence is the clearly borrowed coordinator *pero* ‘but’. I have no information on ‘or’ in Kaw.

**Quapaw** (data from Rankin 2002; 2005) probably has conjunctions similar to those in the other Dhegihal languages, but I have very little information. Rankin’s grammar and dictionary list *şi* ‘and’ (cf. Omaha-Ponca *shi*, Kaw *ši*), but give no indication of how it is used.

### 4.2 Winnebago-Chiwere

**Ho-Chunk** (data from Helmbrecht 2004; confirmed by Iren Hartmann p.c.) has three apparently straightforward coordinating conjunctions, which Helmbrecht labels as follows: *ánąga* ‘and’ (coordinate); *nįįgéšge* (*nįgeešge*) ‘or’ (disjunction); *nųnįge* ‘but’ (adversative). The ‘and’ and ‘or’ words are used to conjoin all types of syntactic constituents: NP, VP, S, “obliques” (adjunct phrases), and AdvP. The conjunctions are placed between the coordinated phrases, or in the case of three coordinated NPs, preceding the last NP (*X Y *ánąga* Z ‘X, Y and Z’). Helmbrecht argues that *ánąga* conjunction is true coordination: the resulting constituent requires plural agreement, and an overt pronoun is needed to conjoin a 1st or 2nd person. Ho-Chunk also has a comitative construction with the verb *hakižu* ‘to be together,’ as well as some other, presumably subordinating conjunctions: *näga*, *hireanąga* ‘along with’ conjoins animate subjects or objects, and clauses can be conjoined with ‘eegi ‘and then’ or *šge*/*hišge* ‘also, even’ (placed after 2nd conjunct). Helmbrecht also discusses negation of one or both conjuncts; a special conjunction *hąkέ*, used at the beginning of S or NP, expresses ‘and not/but not’.

**Chiwere** (data from Goodtracks 1992 – present; Greer 2016 (this volume); Bryan Gordon, p.c.) has several ways of expressing ‘and’. These include words meaning ‘with’ (*tógre, insú*, *inú"ki*), ‘also’ (*hedá*, -*da*, *na, -ku*), ‘again’ (*šige*), and a set of discourse connectives in the form of clefts, with copula *aré: aréda, edá, arédare, édare, hédare*. In addition, a string of nominals can be followed by *inu"ki* or *broge*. Gordon also lists ‘bracketing’ conjunctions: *šu*, *gasú*, *nahéšu*, and a number of subordinating connectives. ‘But’ is *núna*.

### 4.3 Dakotan

There is information available on several of the Dakotan languages and dialects; some sources include data from more than one dialect. I have found no information on Stoney.

**Assiniboine** (data from West 2003; Cumberland 2005; Levin 1964) has two main ‘and’ coordinators, *hìk* and *hìknà*, but sources differ somewhat in their
descriptions of how these are used. West argues explicitly that *hĩkná* conjoins VP or V, not clauses; i.e. it occurs in the context VP *hĩkná* VP or V *hĩkná* V. She analyzes it as head of a CoordP with the first conjunct VP/V as complement and the second one as specifier (pp. 32-38). Clauses are joined by *hĩk* repeated after each clause: S *hĩk* S *hĩk*. Cumberland, on the other hand, shows all categories joined by non-repeating *hĩk*: NP *hĩk* NP, V *hĩk* V, VP *hĩk* VP. Levin (1964), cited in Stassen (2000: 36) discusses a third coordinator, *ka*, which conjoins NP. There is also a comitative construction with *kici* ‘with’ at the end of a string of NPs. I have no information on ‘but’ or ‘or’ in Assiniboine.

**Lakota**

(data from Rood & Taylor 1996; Ingham 2003; Ullrich 2016; Boas & Deloria 1941) has several ‘and’ conjunctions: *na*, *nahán* ‘and also’; *čha*, *čhaŋkhé* ‘and so’; *yuŋkhán* ‘and then’; *na* can coordinate nouns or clauses, while the others appear to coordinate only clauses. Lakota also has a word meaning ‘or’: *naiņš*, and several expressing contrastive coordination ‘but’: *éyaš*, *k’éyaš*, *tkȟá*, *khéš*, *škȟá*. *Éyaš* is also listed as an interjection meaning ‘well, but’. Numerous other conjunctions are listed, including *ho*, *honá* ‘furthermore’, *nakúŋ* ‘also’, *hé uy* ‘therefore’, *tkȟáš* ‘but indeed’, and others. Ulrich gives examples of an apparent comitative, *kičhi*, as well. It is not entirely clear to me whether the ‘and/or/but’ conjunctions are all coordinators or whether some (or all) are subordinating conjunctions. Rood and Taylor define “conjunction” as connecting two sentences, but at least the ‘and’ and ‘or’ words can also conjoin “parts of a sentence, such as nominal or verbs”. The position of all the conjunctions is between conjuncts in their examples, but they state there are “two possible positions: in the second slot from the beginning or in the last slot in the sentence.” David Rood (p.c.) points out that obligatory ablaut before *na* and *naiņš* suggests a strong bond between the conjunction and the preceding verb.

**Dakota**

(data from Riggs 1851; Boas & Deloria 1941) has unsurprisingly some similar conjunctions to Lakota, though some also differ. Several words translate ‘and’: *k’a*, *čha*, *uŋkhán*, *nakúŋ*. *Uŋkhán* conjoins clauses with different subjects, while *k’a* conjoins nouns and clauses with same subject; no details are given of the usage of the other ‘and’ words. ‘But’ is *tukhá*, and ‘or’ is *k’a iš*. Boas & Deloria give forms from several dialects; alongside the Lakota forms in the previous paragraph they also list Dakota forms, usually labelled as “Yankton” and/or “Santee” dialect, including *k’a* ‘and, *uŋkhán* ‘and then’.

---

7 In general I have used the orthography of the source in this paper. However, in the case of Lakota, I have standardized all the disparate orthographies of the various sources to the modern standard spelling system used by the Lakota Language Consortium.
4.4 Missouri Valley

Crow has very different strategies for conjoining clauses and nominals (data from Graczyk 2007). For coordinate nominals, the conjunctions are -dak ‘and’ and -xxo ‘or’. Both are suffixes (or enclitics), but at different levels: -dak suffixes to NP, while -xxo suffixes to N’. Both conjunctions are repeated after each conjunct; -dak may and -xxo must be omitted after the final conjunct. There is also a comitative construction involving the transitive verb áxpa ‘be with’ (also ‘marry’) with same-subject marking or an incorporation structure. Clauses in Crow are linked by switch-reference marking rather than conjunction. Graczyk analyzes apparently coordinate clauses as ‘co-subordination’ or clause-chaining: a string of clauses with switch-reference markers but no sentence final clitic, except for the last clause, which determines the speech-act type of the entire string (eg. declarative). The adversative ‘but’ relation between clauses is marked with -htaa (suffix on clause) or hehtaa (sentence connector).

Hidatsa (data from Boyle 2005; 2007; 2011) has significantly changed its coordination constructions in quite recent times. Boyle points out that Crow and Hidatsa share some cognate morphology in the area of conjunctions (eg. Hidatsa -k is cognate with Crow -dak), but Hidatsa has innovated a semantic distinction involving specificity and inclusiveness of NPs. In the area of clausal/verbal coordination, Hidatsa’s former switch-reference markers have evolved into English-like coordinators (Boyle 2011). At present, the following morphemes express ‘and’: hii coordinates S’s; -k coordinates NP (with a nonspecific reading when suffixed to both NPs and a specific reading when suffixed only to the first NP); -šek coordinates NPs with a non-specific reading; -a coordinates V in serial verb construction; -ak (the old Same Subject marker) coordinates V or VP. There is apparently no ‘but’ coordinator; adversative meaning “is shown with juxtaposition with one element being negated” (John Boyle p.c.).

Mandan (data from Clarkson 2012; Randolph Graczyk p.c.) links clauses via a switch reference system similar to that of Crow. The morpheme ni is used both as a same-subject marker for clauses and as a NP coordinator. NP coordination is accomplished with a coordinator following each NP; coordinating conjunctions used in this way include eheni, -kini, -hini, -kiri, all meaning ‘and’. In modern usage two new coordinators appear, not found in older texts: hi(i) with NPs and ush with clauses. Both occur between conjuncts rather than after each conjunct. Clarkson claims that coordination is much more common in recent texts than in those from the early 20th century, suggesting that Mandan syntax, like that of Hidatsa, has been restructured under pressure from English. I have no information about alternative or adversative coordination in Mandan.
4.5 Southeastern Siouan

Biloxi (data from Zenes 2009; based on Dorsey & Swanton 1912) has an NP coordinator yą ‘and’ which suffixes either to each NP or just the last one; it is also possible for NPs simply to be listed. Clauses are coordinated by simple juxtaposition. Zenes treats the latter two constructions (concatenated NPs and S’s) as CoordP with a zero coordinator. Coordination of a series of object NPs is expressed by coordinating clauses with the same verb repeated (‘I planted onions, I planted potatoes, I planted turnips’). Disjunction of NPs is expressed by ha ‘or’ following the second NP. Zenes gives no information about ‘or’ with sentences or clauses. Biloxi also has a comitative construction with nöpa following the second NP.

Ofo (Dorsey & Swanton 1912; Robert Rankin, p.c.) apparently coordinates clauses only by juxtaposition with no conjunction. I have no further information about Ofo coordination, and none at all about Tutelo.

4.6 Summary

The known possibly-coordinating conjunctions of the Siouan languages are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. To give some sense of their syntax, the conjunctions are shown with the type of constituents they conjoin when this is known; for instance S ki S means ki can occur between two clauses; NP NP shti means shti occurs at the end of a string of NPs.

A partial list of comitative (‘with’) subordinators is given in Table 3. Presumably the other Siouan languages also have comitative constructions; I list here only those which were mentioned in one of my sources as a common way to express ‘and’ coordination.

5 Conclusion

What can we learn from the array of facts above? The most striking conclusion that emerges from the data is the lack of unity among the Siouan languages. Even within subfamilies, the Siouan languages are quite diverse in their treatment of coordination. We can identify several areas of disagreement: (1) The languages differ in the types of constituents that can be coordinated, some having only clausal coordination, while others can coordinate NPs and other types of constituents as well, and some may have no true coordination at all, but use various types of subordination, co-subordination, or simple concatenation to express the relations English expresses with ‘and’/‘or’/‘but’. (2) They differ in the constituent
Table 1: Coordinating(?) conjunctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Additive <strong>and</strong></th>
<th>Disjunctive <strong>or</strong></th>
<th>Adversative <strong>but</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omaha-Ponca</td>
<td>S <em>ki</em> S; NP <em>ki</em> NP</td>
<td><em>go</em> S <em>ite</em> <em>ki</em></td>
<td>S <em>shi</em> S-NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>go</em> S; NP <em>go</em> NP</td>
<td><em>dshto</em> S <em>shi</em> S <em>dshto</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>shi</em> S</td>
<td><em>edo</em>ba/ <em>étho</em>ba</td>
<td><em>dshto</em> S <em>sho</em> S <em>do</em>ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP NP <em>ego</em> NP <em>sheno</em></td>
<td><em>do</em>ste</td>
<td>S <em>do</em>ste *‘or’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td><em>edo</em>ba/ <em>étho</em>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponca</td>
<td><em>edo</em>ba/ <em>étho</em>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omaha- Ponca</td>
<td><em>edo</em>ba/ <em>étho</em>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponca</td>
<td><em>edo</em>ba/ <em>étho</em>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponca</td>
<td><em>edo</em>ba/ <em>étho</em>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage</td>
<td>NP NP <em>éédóopa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaw</td>
<td>S <em>ši</em> S</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>përo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>da</em> S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quapaw</td>
<td><em>ci</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-Chunk</td>
<td>S <em>ánaga</em> S</td>
<td><em>nijgéšge</em> S</td>
<td><em>nùŋige</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also conjoins NP, VP, AdvP, oblique</td>
<td>also conjoins NP, VP, AdvP, oblique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiwere</td>
<td><em>šige</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>núna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>heda</em>, <em>-da</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP NP <em>inu</em>ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP NP <em>brogé</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
<td>V <em>hikná</em> V, VP <em>hikná</em> VP</td>
<td><em>nùŋige</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>hik</em> S; also with NP, V, VP, etc.</td>
<td><em>nùŋige</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>hik</em> S <em>hik</em>; also with NP, V, VP, etc.</td>
<td><em>nùŋige</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP <em>ka</em> NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakota</td>
<td>S <em>na</em> S, NP <em>na</em> NP, V <em>na</em> V</td>
<td>S <em>naíŋš</em> S</td>
<td>S <em>éyaš</em> S, NP <em>éyaš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP, V <em>éyaš</em> V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>yuŋkháŋ</em> S</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>k’éyaš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>čha</em> S</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>tkhá</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>čhaŋkhé</em> S</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>khéš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>škhá</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>S <em>k’a</em> S, NP <em>k’a</em> NP</td>
<td><em>naíŋš</em> NP</td>
<td><em>tukhá</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S <em>uŋkháŋ</em> S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>nakúŋ</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>čha</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Coordinating(?) conjunctions continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Disjunctive</th>
<th>Adversative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crow</td>
<td>NP <em>dak</em> NP <em>dak</em></td>
<td>N’ <em>xxo</em> N’ <em>xxo</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidatsa</td>
<td><em>S hii S</em></td>
<td><em>S</em> juxtaposition with negation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP-<em>k</em>; NP-<em>k</em> NP-<em>k</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP-<em>šek</em> NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-<em>a</em> V (serial verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-<em>ak</em> V; VP-<em>ak</em> VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandan</td>
<td><em>S-ni S</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ush Sush S</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP <em>eheni</em> NP (<em>eheni)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP-<em>kini</em> NP-<em>hini</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP-<em>kiri</em> NP(-<em>kiri</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP <em>hii</em> NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biloxi</td>
<td>NP NP <em>ya</em>; NP <em>ya</em> NP <em>ya</em></td>
<td>NP NP <em>ha</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutelo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Comitative words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omaha-Ponca</td>
<td><em>zhughe</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiwere</td>
<td><em>tògre, inúⁿ, inúⁿki</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
<td><em>kici</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakota</td>
<td><em>kičhi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow</td>
<td><em>áxpa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biloxi</td>
<td><em>nopä</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
order within coordination constructions, with the conjunction following the first conjunct (XP & XP), the second conjunct (XP XP &) or each of the conjuncts (XP & XP &), and may also differ in whether the conjunction forms a constituent with a following or preceding conjunct ((XP &) XP); (XP (&XP)). The hierarchical structure of each of these configurations has not been studied in most of the languages. Given the generally head-final nature of phrase structure in Siouan languages, if the conjunction heads a coordination phrase it is expected that the complement of the “&” head would be to its left; an XP occurring to the right could be a specifier, which we would expect to be less closely associated with the conjunction than the complement. (3) They differ in the lexical items expressing additive, disjunctive, and adversative coordination. Some of the words or suffixes for ‘and’/’or’/’but’ are cognate among subfamilies — for instance, most of the Dhegiha branch have [ši] or something similar, and the Dakotan branch share something like [na]. But no coordinators appear to be cognate across the family. (4) Finally, the languages differ also in the expression of comitative and other “semantically coordinated” phrases.

In short, there does not seem to be a “typical Siouan” coordination pattern, nor does it look like we can reconstruct proto-Siouan coordinators. Clearly there has been innovation in at least some of the languages – perhaps all – and at least in one or two cases there has been borrowing of coordinators and/or coordination patterns from European languages, suggesting quite recent change in this semantic field. In at least some languages the most common way to conjoin NPs is with a comitative, not a coordinate construction. (This is my impression in Omaha-Ponca, and Cumberland (p.c.) has the same impression in Assiniboine, for example.) Is it possible there was no morphosyntactic coordination in proto-Siouan?

In fact, this is not as unlikely as it might first appear. Mithun (1988) suggests overt coordination tends to come with literacy: in spoken language simple concatenation tends to be common, while in writing, where intonational cues are lacking and one cannot assume the same degree of common knowledge with one’s audience, explicit morphosyntactic coordination is more useful. It is certainly not the case that unwritten languages never have true coordination, but as a statistical tendency it makes some sense. Many languages, Mithun says, seem to have developed coordinating conjunctions after exposure to written languages or after developing an indigenous tradition of writing. Since Siouan languages were, until recently, not written, perhaps lack of an inherited coordination construction and associated morphology is not surprising. The borrowing or innovation of coordinators as speakers became literate in English or other European
languages (as well as perhaps in the Native languages) seems logical under this view.

In spite of the lack of overt morphological or lexical coordinators in some languages, Mithun considers coordination as a syntactic and semantic structure to be universal. Stassen (2000), on the other hand, claims coordination, or at least nominal coordination, is not universal. He divides languages into two types: “WITH-languages,” which have only a comitative (NP with NP) or subordinating strategy for conjoining NPs, and “AND-Languages,” which also have a coordinate strategy. Stassen acknowledges that Native American languages tend to be problematic and difficult to classify into his two categories. This preliminary study of the Siouan family certainly bears out the elusiveness of coordination constructions in these languages.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>first, second, third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVID</td>
<td>evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUUS</td>
<td>suus (reflexive possessive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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