

NP Coordination Questionnaire for Australian languages

Louisa Sadler

Rachel Nordlinger

(louisa@essex.ac.uk)

(racheln@unimelb.edu.au)

University of Essex

University of Melbourne

May 15, 2007

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Marking Coordination	3
2.1	No Marker	4
2.2	Morphological (word-internal) Markers	4
2.3	Single Lexical Marker	5
2.4	Multiple Markers	7
2.5	Pronouns as Markers of Coordination	7
2.6	Progressive Pronominal Inclusion	9
3	Coordination and Agreement	9
3.1	Syntactic Agreement Patterns	9
4	Semantic Features and Coordination	13
4.1	Restrictions on Coordination: Animacy	13
4.2	Semantic and Syntactic resolution	14
4.3	Natural vs. accidental coordination	15
4.4	Boolean Coordination	17
5	Distinguishing coordination from other constructions	17
5.1	Coordinate and Comitative Constructions	17
5.2	Inclusory Constructions	19
5.3	Appositive constructions	20
6	The Morphosyntax of Coordination	20

6.1	Interactions with other nominal morphology	20
6.2	Symmetry and Parallelism	22
6.3	Discontinuous coordination	24
6.4	Wordhood and Coordination	25
7	Relating NP Coordination to other constructions	26

1 Introduction

This work forms part of the project *Coordination Strategies in Australian Aboriginal languages* funded by the British Academy (Sadler and Nordlinger SG-39545). The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify issues that may arise in NP coordination in Australian languages, in the hope that it will stimulate researchers to collect further data on coordination in these languages. Thus, this document reviews some basic dimensions along which coordinate structures might be classified, and poses some questions (identified by italics) which might be useful in gathering data on these constructions. We would welcome any feedback or discussion, and suggestions as to further dimensions to NP coordination which we have overlooked.

We use the term coordination to refer to a syntactic construction in which two or more units of the same (or similar) type form a syntactic unit which enters into construction with elements external to the coordination structure. A fundamental idea about coordination is that within the syntactic coordination the elements are equal and parallel. In the formulation of this idea known as Wasow's generalization, an element in construction with a coordinate constituent must be syntactically construable with each conjunct. Other definitions focus more on semantic properties - for example in Haspelmath's definition the term *coordination* refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements (Haspelmath 2004:34). For general overviews on coordination strategies cross-linguistically the reader is referred to Haspelmath (2004, to appear) and Stassen (2000).

2 Marking Coordination

There are three basic patterns for marking coordination cross-linguistically: asyndetic coordination or simple juxtaposition; monosyndetic coordination, with a single coordination marker and bisyndetic coordination with more than one marker of coordination.

The majority pattern in Australian languages would seem to be the use of juxtaposition or asyndetic coordination, as observed by Dixon (1980:458): "Only a minority of languages have a class of words that specifically mark coordination (like English *and*, *but*, *because*, and the like); coordination can be shown by intonation patterns, by the deletion of a repeated NP – often under rather strict syntactic conditions..... – and sometimes by special verbal inflections."

Within languages using explicit markers of coordination, a distinction may be

made between so-called **and** and **with** languages (Stassen 2000) - the latter are those which use the same marker for conjunctive and comitative relations. Stassen formulates the following implicational statements:

- if a language has cases, it will tend to have AND-status
- if a language has WITH-status, it will tend to be non-cased

How is coordination marked?

Is the marker of coordination used on other construction types also, for example, in comitative constructions or inclusory constructions? If so, how does the behaviour of the marker differ from construction to construction?

2.1 No Marker

Stassen (2000: 7) reports that cross-linguistically, obligatory use of juxtaposition for NP coordination is very rare. However it does appear to be the most common strategy amongst Australian languages (Blake 1987:91), and many languages (such as Wambaya) have this as the only possible (and therefore obligatory) strategy for NP coordination.

- (1) *Gaj-ba ngurru manganyma yangaji.*
eat-FUT 1PL.INC(NP) tucker.III(ACC) meat.I(ACC)
'Let's eat the bread and meat.' (Wambaya, Nordlinger 1998: 257)

If juxtaposition is possible, is it the only possibility in the language for NP coordination?

2.2 Morphological (word-internal) Markers

Coordinators can be distinct lexical items or coordination can be marked morphologically as in the Latin example below.

- (2) *Senatus Populusque Romanus*
senate people.AND Roman
the Senate and people of Rome (Latin)

Languages in which each conjunct is marked exhibit multiple morphological marking, as in the following Nyangumarta example:

- (3) *Kuwarri kurrngal ngalyun-pa pirirri-pa partany-karrangu-pa.*
 now many woman-CONJ man-CONJ child-PL-CONJ
 ‘Now there is a big mob of women, men and children.’ (Nyangumarta,
 Sharp 2004: 156)

Morphological (or word-internal) marking of coordination may include the use of morphophonological means. Drellishak and Bender (2005), for example, report that Telugu marks coordination by vowel lengthening, citing data from Krishnamurti and Gwynn (1985). In the example below the two names being coordinated are marked by the lengthening of their final vowels.

- (4) *kamalaa wimalaa poDugu*
 Kamala Vimala tall
 Kamala and Vimala are tall (Telugu, Krishnamurti and Gwynn 1985: 325)

If the marker of coordination is morphological, is it multiply marked or does it occur on a single conjunct? If the latter, which one?

2.3 Single Lexical Marker

In other languages, coordinate structures are marked lexically, by the occurrence of conjunction words.

- (5) *Kanku ya mankada-li wima wangka-yi.*
 boy and girl-ERG song-ABS sing-PRES
 ‘The boys and girls are singing a song.’ (Diyari, Austin 1981: 231)

There are four logically possible types of monosyndetic coordination, which Haspelmath (2004) finds in the following descending order of frequency, with type 3 being very rare and type 4 unattested in his sample.

- (6) [A] [co B]
 [A co] [B]
 [A] [B co]
 [co A] [B]

Despite its apparent rarity, there are a number of examples of type 3 among Australian languages:

- (7) *Henry-ku mama ngunytju puru*
 Henry-GEN mother father and
 ‘Henry’s father and mother’ (Pitjantjatjara, Glass and Hackett 1970: 66)

One example from Tiwi is suggestive of a type 4 construction, but without further information it's hard to tell whether it is to be analysed as a true coordinated structure or not:¹

- (8) *wuta Thapara Waijai*
 3PL Tapara Waijai
 'Tapara and Waijai' (Osborne 1974: 72)

Classification into one of the four types of asyndetic coordination outlined by Haspelmath is equally relevant for languages with morphological (single) markers. The following are examples of Type 3:

- (9) *nalija miyha-ngana*
 tea meat-LINK
 'tea and meat' (Bunuba, Rumsey 2000: 115)
- (10) *ngunha marlpa ngatharntu-ku karnku-lku kurrjarta-ku*
 that man 1sgGEN-ACC keep-PRES spear-ACC
warrkunti-muntu-ku.
 boomerang-CONJ-ACC
 'That man is keeping my spear, and boomerang.' (Panyjima, Dench 1991: 153)
- (11) ... *gu-yapan? gu-wangginy?, barrgu-yo-ngana, rni-ki-?, rna-ki-?*
 ... GU-two GU-one 3PL/GU-put.on-PR here there
gu-rawarra, rni-ki-? rlurrungga?, rna-ki-? ngarni, gu-wolo-pula-yung
 GU-EAST here middle there west GU-that-and-ABS
 '... Three of them– one they put here, there on the east side; another here in the middle; another there on the west side, that also' (Ngandi, Heath 1978a: 207)

Both Panyjima and Ngandi have an alternative bisyndetic option whereby the coordinator appears on each conjunct, as predicted by Stassen (2000:14) who says that these constructions are usually best seen as a variant of the bisyndetic type with one coordinator optionally deleted. Heath (1978:128) however, claims that [X Y *pula*] is the usual structure for NP coordination in Ngandi. Moreover, there is no bisyndetic alternative reported for Bunuba.

¹The Tiwi example (8) is given by Stassen (2000:16) as an example of a pronoun grammaticalising into a coordinator. Yet elsewhere (p.15) he states that there are no languages that conform to the AND-NP NP schema. It's not clear why this wouldn't constitute a possible example of this schema.

It seems to be generally assumed that if marking involves the single strategy, then it will be a fixed coordinand which is marked (see the Haspelmath comment above). But mobility might be an issue in languages with generally freer word order.

If the language shows monosyndetic coordination, which of Haspelmath's patterns does it exemplify?

2.4 Multiple Markers

This is the bisyndetic type of coordination. It likewise can be found with lexical and morphological markers. The following exemplifies morphological bisyndetic marking in Nyangumarta.

- (12) *Kuwarri kurrngal ngalyun-pa pirirri-pa partany-karrangu-pa.*
now many woman-CONJ man-CONJ child-PL-CONJ
'Now there is a big mob of women, men and children.' (Nyangumarta, Sharp 2004: 156)

If multiple markers are possible in the language, are they obligatory?

2.5 Pronouns as Markers of Coordination

Australian languages are well-known for the use of 3rd non-singular pronouns as coordinators. Blake (1987:91) lists "the use of a word or clitic meaning 'they' or 'they two' or simply 'two'" as one of the three basic coordination strategies in Australian languages. And Stassen (2000:16) finds that a concentration of cases in his sample that involve the grammaticalisation of coordinators from pronouns or other words meaning 'two' are found in the Australian-Papuan region.

Languages with this strategy include Ngandi (13), Tiwi (14), Kuuk Thaayorre (Gaby 2006) and Kugu Nganhcara (*pula*, glossed 'and' in the Ngandi example, is a 3DU pronoun).²

- (13) *rni-goyow-pula a-jinma-pula ba-bu-ydhi-ni*
Ni-croc-and A-shark-and they-fought
'The crocodile and the shark fought.' (Ngandi: Heath 1978: 128)

²Although Smith and Johnson (2000: 434) provide the basic schema for NP coordination in Kugu Nganhcara as *X pula Y pula* (with the pronoun "optionally" added before each conjunct) they provide no actual examples.

- (14) *wuta Thapara Waijai*
 3PL Tapara Waijai
 ‘Tapara and Waijai’ (Tiwi: Osborne 1974: 72)

Arrernte (15), is an example of a language in which a numeral meaning ‘two’ is used as a coordinator:

- (15) *Augustine therre Duncan therre*
 Augustine two Duncan two
 ‘Augustine and Duncan’ (Arrente: Wilkins 1989:371)

One issue is whether such grammaticalised coordinators retain their dual number specification – i.e. can they be used when there are more than two conjuncts? This seems to be possible in Ngandi, showing that *pula* has truly grammaticalised beyond its dual pronominal meaning:³

- (16) ... *gu-yapan? gu-wangginy?, barrgu-yo-ngana, rni-ki-?, rna-ki-?*
 ... GU-two GU-one 3PL/GU-put.on-PR here there
gu-rawarra, rni-ki-? rlurrungga?, rna-ki-? ngarni, gu-wolo-pula-yung
 GU-EAST here middle there west GU-that-and-ABS
 ‘... Three of them– one they put here, there on the east side; another here in the middle; another there on the west side, that also’ (Ngandi, Heath 1978: 207)

Questions arising:

- If a pronominal form is used as a coordinator, does it still have its original number specification or has it been grammaticalised into a true coordinator?
- Does the language permit only binary coordination or are multiple coordinand permitted?
- Are there any examples of the use of numerals as coordinators other than the numeral ‘two’?
- If a numeral is used as a coordinator does the numeral used always have to match the number of conjuncts?

³See also discussion of this issue in Kuuk Thaayorre in Gaby (2006:317-8).

2.6 Progressive Pronominal Inclusion

Heath (2004) reports the phenomenon of progressive pronominal inclusion for Nunggubuyu, providing only the following example:

- (17) *nu:-ya-nggi, wara-mij-bura:yung, F ni-ni mari G*
1EXCL-go-INFL PL-PL-children F we(EX.MA.DU) and G
nu-ru, nuru-gu-gubadha-ngi
we(EX.PL), 1EX.PL-RDP-walkabout-INFL
'We (=men) went, along with (our) children, F and G and me, we went
walkabout.' (Heath 2004: 81)

He describes this constructions as follows: “the gloss ‘F and G and me’, denoting the adult men (F and G are personal names), corresponds to a Nunggubuyu sequence ‘F 1Ex.Ma.Du (= the two of us), *mari G* 1Ex.PL (= the 3+ plurality of us)’. Instead of a running list of the type ‘F&G&me’, the Nungguubuyu sequence is built up piece by piece, the pronominal sum being recomputed at each point (‘F we-Du, moreover G we-Pl’)” (Heath 2004:82)

Is this phenomenon is attested more widely? We have so far not found it mentioned for any other language.

3 Coordination and Agreement

3.1 Syntactic Agreement Patterns

A lot of recent theoretical work on coordination has focussed on patterns of agreement in coordination structures (Dalrymple and Kaplan, 2000; Wechsler and Zlatić, 2000; Camacho, 2003; Sadler, 2003). Cross-linguistically languages differ in how they resolve conflicting person, number, and/or gender features in conjuncts. Moreover, a single language may use one strategy for noun-modifier agreement, and another for e.g subject-verb agreement. For example, in English, verbal agreement is with the combined number of the coordinated subject NP (resolution):

- (18) A boy and girl *are*/**is* waiting for a bus.

but plural determiner agreement in this context is ungrammatical:

- (19) This/*these boy and girl are waiting for a bus.

Here the determiner shows distributive agreement, agreeing with each conjunct. Distributive agreement requires the features of each conjunct to match. Resolved agreement involves the agreement target reflecting the resolution class of the combined conjuncts.

- (20) *As meninas e eu saímos.*
 the girls and I left.1PL
 ‘The girls and I left.’ (Brazilian Portuguese, Munn 1999: 655)

Another strategy for agreement with coordinate structures is single conjunct agreement (SCA), where one conjunct (normally that closest to the agreement target, but not always) controls agreement. Examples below from Swahili.

- (21) *Mguu wa meza na kiti ki-mevunjika.*
 3.leg of table and 7.chair 7-be broken
 ‘The leg of the table and the chair are broken.’ (Swahili, Marten 2000 from Bokamba 1985)

Crosslinguistically, single conjunct agreement is most often found when the agreement target precedes the coordinate structure and most often takes the form of agreement with the closest (rather than the most distant, or any other) conjunct, however there are cases which do not conform to these tendencies.

- (22) *et ego et Cicero meus flagitabit.*
 and I and Cicero my will-demand(3SG)
 ‘Both my Cicero and I will demand it.’ (Latin, Corbett 1983:179 from Gildersleeve and Lodge 1948)

A language may also exhibit both resolved agreement and SCA. In some languages, the strategy is dependent on word order - note that in the following Brazilian Portuguese examples, verbal agreement is determined by resolution in post-subject position (23), and by nearest conjunct agreement in pre-subject position (24).

- (23) *As meninas e eu saímos/*saíram.*
 the girls and I left.1PL/*left.3PL
 ‘The girls and I left.’ (Brazilian Portuguese, Munn 1999: 655)
- (24) *Foram as meninas e eu que compramos as flores*
 were.3PL the girls and I who bought.1PL the flowers
 ‘It was the girls and I who bought the flowers.’ (ibid: 655)

If a language shows single conjunct agreement, this raises the issue of whether the structure in question is truly coordinate (with an agreement asymmetry) or whether the agreement controller is the head. If the resolved features control other agreement processes (pronominal and reflexive anaphora, for example) this provides evidence that the agreement phenomenon is not indicative of a deeper asymmetry.

Resolved, distributive and single conjunct agreement differ in terms of whether the coordinate structure as a whole, each conjunct or a single (distinguished) conjunct determines or controls the agreeing forms. Broadly there are two sorts of agreement contexts, predicate-argument agreement and head-modifier agreement, in which the agreement determining patterns of coordinate structures can be investigated. The canonical case of predicate argument agreement is subject verb agreement. Crosslinguistically, predicate argument agreement is not limited to subject-verb agreement, with verb object agreement, agreement between preposition and its object and possessor-noun agreement also occurring.

Modifier agreement is concerned primarily with the agreement of determiners, adjectives, etc with coordinated nouns. Resolved, distributive and single conjunct agreement are all also found in head-modifier agreement contexts. The resolution gender in Portuguese is masculine but in the following example the postnominal modifier shows gender agreement with the closest conjunct (while the determiner is in the resolution gender, and matching its closest conjunct):

- (25) *Os mitos e lendas brasileiras*
 the.MPL myth.MPL and legend.FPL brazilian.FPL
 ‘the brazilian myths and legends’ (Portuguese)

It is particularly interesting if agreement features may be differently controlled. In Portuguese NPs it appears that number agreement is always conditioned by resolution, although closest conjunct agreement in gender is attested (Villavicencio et al., 2005), as in (26).

- (26) *o sofrimento e a experiência*
 the.MS suffering.MS and the.FS experience.FS
humanas/vividas/passadas
 human.FPL/felt.FPL/past.FPL
 the human (/...) suffering and experience

These examples show the potential complexity in the interaction between agreement and coordination. However, unfortunately, we have virtually no information of this type for Australian languages. Very few grammars give information about

number and/or gender agreement patterns of a modifier with conjoined nominals (e.g. ‘my meat and tucker’, ‘your spear and boomerang’, ‘those men and women’). Notable exceptions include Nunggubuyu for which Heath (1984: 543) lists detailed resolution patterns, and Diyari, for which Austin (1981: 230) reports that definite conjoined NPs are preceded by a pronoun (functioning as determiner) showing resolved number agreement:

- (27) *pula mathari ya wilha ngurra-nhi ngama-yi.*
 3DU.S man(ABS) and woman(ABS) camp-LOC sit-PRES
 ‘The man and the woman are sitting in the camp.’ (Diyari, Austin 1981: 230)

Diyari is thus different to English in this respect, which would have a singular determiner in this context (see above).

As noted above, data on the agreement question is sparse in accessible sources. The following (single) example from Wambaya is suggestive of (closest) SCA. Note the masculine singular agreement on the demonstrative where resolution might have produced dual number.

- (28) *Ini ilirri gagama gurl gaj-ba,*
 this.I.SG.ACC blood.I.ACC guts.III.ACC DU.IMP eat-FUT
 ‘You two eat this blood and guts.’ (Wambaya, Nordlinger 1998: 229)

Without further examples, however, it’s impossible to tell whether the gender agreement here is with the nearest conjunct, or simply the resolved value for masculine plus another gender. It’s also possible that *ilirri gagama* is an example of natural coordination, which may not trigger dual number agreement (see §4.3).

Verbal agreement is conditioned by resolution in Wambaya:

- (29) *Ngarringga wurlu-ngga alaji gambarda wardangarri.*
 take.from 3DU-RR-NF boyI.(ACC) sun.II.(NOM) moon.II(NOM)
 ‘They took each other’s child, the son and the moon.’ (Wambaya, Nordlinger 1998: 239)

Questions concerning Predicate-argument agreement

- What is the pattern of agreement between a coordinated argument and the predicate; is it syntactically resolved or not?
- Does the same pattern arise irrespective of whether or not the coordinated nouns are animate/inanimate, and irrespective of their ordering?

- Are there examples of resolved agreement on the predicate controlling other processes like reflexive/reciprocals, pronominal anaphora, etc.?
- If the language has single-conjunct agreement, does it allow coordinated subjects with collective predicates (e.g. *John and Mary met-SG*)?

Questions concerning Modifier agreement

- What are the patterns of agreement between determiners and coordinated nominals, and between adjectives and coordinated nominals? Do the modifiers agree with (i) resolved features; (ii) just one of the conjuncts (as in the Wambaya example above); (iii) have a default agreement?
- In languages with both gender and number, do the same patterns of agreement hold with both gender and number features? If not, how do they differ?
- Does ordering of conjuncts have any effect on the agreement of determiners and modifiers?
- How do the patterns of modifier agreement relate to patterns of predicate-argument agreement? Does the language use the same set of patterns for both, or are there differences between the two types?

Questions concerning the Interaction with number marking

- Can you have a numeral that has scope over a coordinated NP? E.g. can you say things like *three men and women* and, if so, what does it mean? Does it refer to a set of 3 people or a set of 6 people?
- How does nominal number morphology interact with coordination? For example, how many people would *man-DUAL woman-DUAL* be referring to – 4 or 2? What about *man woman-DUAL*? Can it refer to 2 people?
- Is there any difference between something like *man-DUAL woman-DUAL* and something like *two man woman* in terms of the number of people that are being referred to?

4 Semantic Features and Coordination

4.1 Restrictions on Coordination: Animacy

In some languages there are restrictions related to animacy determining what you can combine in a coordinate structure. For example, in some languages it is not

possible to coordinate animate nouns with inanimate nouns – a different strategy, such as a comitative constructions, must be used instead.

Factors such as animacy might determine the applicability of a particular coordination strategy. For example, Takia (Oceanic, PNG) has different coordination strategies determined by the animacy (or, to be more precise, the ‘humanness’) of the conjuncts: human nouns are conjoined with the postposition *da* while non-human nouns are conjoined with simple juxtaposition (Haspelmath 2004). Animacy is also a factor in differentiating coordination strategies in other Oceanic languages, such as Nêlêmwa (Bril 2004) and Nemi (Moyses-Faurie and Lynch 2004).

We have as yet found no reports of animacy or related semantic factors governing the choice between alternative coordination strategies in Australian languages. It would be interesting to know if there are in fact Australian languages in which factors such as animacy do play a role in coordination strategies.

Is coordination possible with conjuncts which differ with respect to their position on the animacy hierarchy?

Does position on the animacy hierarchy determine selection of the coordinator or of the coordination strategy used?

4.2 Semantic and Syntactic resolution

The previous section discussed syntactic resolution of agreement features. In many languages, animacy plays a role in determining whether a coordinate structure governs agreement syntactically or semantically, a distinction which becomes relevant when grammatical gender and natural gender diverge. For example in French *sentinelle* is syntactically feminine and determines FEM agreement. However the contrast for coordinate NPs shows that semantic gender determines resolution in coordinate structures.

- (30) *Les sentinelles ont été prises en otage.*
the sentries were taken.FPL hostage.
the sentries were taken hostage (Wechsler and Zlatić, 2003, 177)
- (31) *La sentinelle et sa femme ont été pris en otage.*
the sentry and his wife were taken.M hostage.

The sentry and his wife were taken hostage. (ibid.)

Is there evidence of grammatical and semantic gender diverging and if so, can anything be determined about agreement under coordination?

4.3 Natural vs. accidental coordination

Many languages exhibit a syntactic distinction between *natural* and *accidental* coordination (Haspelmath 2004, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2006, Wälchli 2005). In natural coordination the conjuncts of a coordinate phrase form a conceptual unit or are closely related in meaning (e.g. husband and wife, knife and fork, brother and sister, etc.), whereas accidental coordination involves items which are not expected to co-occur.

In some languages a particular coordination strategy is reserved just for natural coordination. For example, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2006: 831) show that in Udihe (Altaic, Siberia) there are distinct coordination markers for natural and accidental coordination; in Eastern Armenian there are different inflectional agreement patterns for each type of coordination; and in German, some cases of natural coordination lack determiners, while this is never possible with accidental coordination (32)-(33):

- (32) *der Mond und ein Sechser*
the moon and a sixpence
'the moon and a sixpence' (German: accidental coordination)
- (33) *Sonne und Mond*
sun and moon
'the sun and the moon' (German: natural coordination)

Natural coordination is limited to two conjuncts (binomial pairs) and often controls plural concord and agreement. In Finnish, natural coordination, but not accidental coordination, permits a plural adjective with singular nouns):

- (34) *iloiset mies ja poika*
happy.PL man and boy
the happy man and boy (Finnish, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2006: 825)

One observed cross-linguistic generalisation is that strategies for marking natural coordination tend to be less marked formally than those for accidental coordination (Haspelmath 2004). Stassen observes (2000:8) that where a language has

available both juxtaposition and overt coordinators as coordinating strategies, the juxtaposition option is often used in more restricted functions, such as for natural coordination.

Although many Australian languages report both juxtaposition and overtly marked coordination as alternative possibilities, few report any difference in function. However, Austin (1981:231) reports that, while Diyari NPs are usually coordinated with the conjunctive particle *ya*, juxtaposition is possible when kin terms or human nouns are coordinated that refer to people of the same generation/age and (usually) different sex. For example *ngandi-yali ngapira-li* (mother-ERG father-ERG) ‘mother and father’; *pinadu wilhapina-li* (old.man old.woman-ERG) ‘old men and old women’.

Interestingly, Evans (2003) reports the opposite for Bininj Gun-wok. The usual way to encode NP coordination in Bininj Gun-wok is through juxtaposition as in (35), in which the coordinands are discontinuous:

- (35) ... *kun-kerri* *ma-ngi* *kun-yerrng*
 ... IV-cooking.stone 3/3P.get-PI IV-wood
 ‘... he got cooking stones, and firewood.’ (Evans 2003: 248, ex. 6.64)

However, it is also possible to use a conjunction, such as *dja* ‘and, or’, the use of which is more common with natural coordination involving “elements that in some way form a linked pair rather than simply an accidental grouping.” (Evans 2003:249)

- (36) *Man-bardbard la man-dadjek kabene-djarrk-nguybu-n.*
 III-heliosperma CONJ III-pteridifolia 3ua-together-flower-NP
 ‘The *Grevillea heliosperma* and the *Grevillea pteridifolia* flower together
 (at the same time).’ (Evans 2003:249, ex. 6.65)
- (37) *Wurdwurd dja teacher kabirri-kuk-djarrangbu-n kabirri-kurrme*
 children CONJ teacher 3a/3-body-sort-NP 3a/3-putNP
na-yahwurd dja na-kimuk.
 MA-small CONJ MA-big
 ‘The children and teacher sort out the fish into big and little (groups).’
 (ibid, ex. 6.66)

Thus, Bininj Gun-wok is of particular interest in the light of the observation in Haspelmath (2004:13) that there is a functional explanation for reduced or absent marking in the case of natural coordination, and the observation that “we have found no language that uses reduced morphological or syntactic marking

for accidental coordination as opposed to natural coordination” (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva, 2006, 832).

Are both natural and accidental coordinations possible? If so, are there any syntactic differences between them?

4.4 Boolean Coordination

In many languages, if the meanings encoded by the nominals in a coordinate structure are compatible, two readings may potentially emerge, a so-called split reading, and a joint (or boolean) reading (under which both properties hold of the same individual), which arises despite the occurrence of an overt coordinator.

(38) The President and Chief Executive of Air France will both arrive this evening.

(39) The President and Chief Executive of Air France is standing over there.

If the language has an overt coordinator, are joint (or boolean) readings possible?

5 Distinguishing coordination from other constructions

5.1 Coordinate and Comitative Constructions

Coordinate structures are sometimes quite similar in form to comitative constructions. The latter typically involve a preposition or marker corresponding to ‘with’ and are headed, modificational structures. It is pointed out in the literature that there is in fact a notional three-way distinction, as comitative-marked constructions frequently fall into two types – those that are truly comitative (and therefore modificational structures) and those that are coordinate structures. Sometimes careful analysis is required to distinguish these. For example, Russian has the following 3 possibilities:

(40) *Anna pridët s Petej*
A.NOM come-3SG with Peter-INSTR
Anna is coming with Peter (Russian, McNally 1993: 350)

(41) *Anna s Petej napisali pis'mo*
A.NOM with Peter-INSTR wrote-PL letter

Anna and Peter wrote a letter (ibid: 347)

- (42) *Anna i Petja pridut*
A.NOM and Peter-NOM come-3PL
Anna and Peter are coming (ibid:349)

On the basis of syntactic behaviour McNally (1993) shows that the first and second are distinct in various ways: the first is a VP adjunct (modifying subject or direct object) while the second is a comitative coordination. Evidence that the latter form a constituent in Russian is strong (syntactic distribution, obligatory continuity, failure of extraction, ability to antecede reflexives and control participial and infinitival clauses). The semantic difference is that ordinary coordination denotes a sum or set of individuals while comitative coordination denotes a group (or singleton set consisting of a set of individuals). Thus, the ordinary coordination in (43) may refer to more than one piano lifting event but the comitative coordination in (44) cannot.

- (43) *Boris i Petya podjali rojal'*
Boris-NOM and Peter-NOM lifted-PL piano
Boris and Peter lifted the piano (Russian, McNally 1993: 373)
- (44) *Boris s Petej podjali rojal'*
Boris-NOM with Peter-INSTR lifted-PL piano
Boris and Peter lifted the piano (ibid)

To take another example, Ndebele has a single form for 'and/with' *la*, but it can be shown on syntactic grounds that this marks both truly coordinate constructions and comitative (non-coordination, modificational) structures (Moosally, 1998). The comitative structure (45 b) only permits an interpretation where they are working together, while the coordinate structure permits an interpretation in which they can be working independently (45 a).

- (45) a. *U-mama lo-dade wethu ba-yasebenza*
1/2 SG-mother CONJ.1/2SG-sister my 1/2PL-working
My mother and my sister are working (Ndebele: Moosally 1998: 66)
- b. *U-mama u-yasebenza lo-dade wethu*
1/2SG-mother 1/2SG-working CONJ.1/2SG-sister my
My mother is working with my sister (ibid)

Questions arising:

- Are there Australian languages that use the comitative case in coordination?

- If so, how (if at all) are coordinate constructions to be distinguished syntactically from true comitative (modification) constructions in these languages?
- Are there Australian languages that use another type of case marker to encode coordinate structures?
- If so, how (if at all) are the coordination constructions distinguished from modification structures in these cases?

5.2 Inclusory Constructions

Australian languages are well known for having inclusory constructions in which a non-singular pronoun occurs with a nominal referring to one member of the set of individuals referred to by the pronoun (see examples below), see Singer (2001, 2005) for discussion.⁴ Inclusory constructions are therefore notionally like conjunction but crucially different in that one of the constituents has the same reference as the entire construction:

- (46) *kake ilerne*
 elder.brother 1DU
 elder brother and I (Mparntwe Arrernte, from David Wilkins; Haspelmath 2004:25)

A *split inclusory construction* is when the pronominal is incorporated, as in the following example from Polish:

- (47) *Posz-li-śmy z matką do kina*
 go-PAST-1PL with mother to movies
 Mother and I went to the movies (Polish, Schwartz 1988:52)

Questions arising:

- In languages with inclusory constructions that are “fully nominally encoded”, are there any SYNTACTIC grounds on which to distinguish these from coordinate constructions? Possibilities include: case marking differences, possibility of discontinuous constructions, etc.
- Can you get inclusory constructions with nominal supersets, as in *the men john*, to mean *the men, including john*?

⁴Strikingly similar constructions in other languages are often referred to as plural pronoun constructions, see Schwartz (1988); McNally (1993); Aissen (1989)

- Can you get discontinuous inclusory constructions? If so, can you get these under the same conditions as discontinuous coordinate constructions?

5.3 Appositive constructions

Many languages in which coordination is asyndetic also use juxtaposition for other construction types, expressing for example specific-generic, part-whole constructions and nominal apposition by means of juxtaposition (Nordlinger and Sadler, 2006). This raises some interesting questions concerning how such construction types might be distinguished.

Questions arising:

- If the language uses juxtaposition to encode NP coordination, what other constructions are also encoded in this way?
- Can you find any SYNTACTIC grounds to distinguish instances of NP coordination from other types of juxtaposed constructions? Possibilities include: case marking, ordering constraints, possibility of discontinuity, agreement mismatches, etc.

6 The Morphosyntax of Coordination

6.1 Interactions with other nominal morphology

For languages with coordinating affixes, an interesting question arises as to how these affixes interact with other nominal morphology, such as case marking. In some languages, coordinating affixes occur outside number and relational case morphology:

- (48) *Kuwarri kurrngal ngalyun-pa pirirri-pa partany-karrangu-pa.*
 now many woman-CONJ manCONJ child-PL-CONJ
 ‘Now there is a big mob of women, men and children.’ (Nyangumarta, Sharp 2004: 156 ex. 4.163)
- (49) *Wanikinyi pulu ngurra-nga, yarrkal ya-nikinyi pulu*
 stay-IMPF 3DU.SUB camp-LOC hunting go-IMPF 3DU.SUB
yukurru-pa pala partany kuyi-karti-pa mayi-karti.
 dog-CONJ that child meat-ALL-CONJ vegetable.food-ALL
 ‘Those two stayed at the camp and went hunting; the dog and the child for meat and grain.’ (ibid. ex. 4.165)

Whereas, in other languages, coordinating affixes appear inside relational case morphology:

- (50) ... *gu-yapan?* *gu-wangginy?*, *barrgu-yo-ngana*, *rni-ki-?*, *rna-ki-?*
 ... GU-two GU-one 3PL/GU-put.on-PR here there
gu-rawarra, *rni-ki-?* *rlurrungga?*, *rna-ki-?* *ngarni*, *gu-wolo-pula-yung*
 GU-EAST here middle there west GU-that-and-ABS
 ‘... Three of them– one they put here, there on the east side; another here in the middle; another there on the west side, that also.’ (Ngandi, Heath 1978a: 207)
- (51) *yaba-nggu nyumbu-djada-nggu*
 brother-ERG father-and-ERG
 ‘my brother and father’ (Djabugay, Patz 1991)
- (52) *ngunha marlpa ngatharntu-ku karnku-lku kurrjarta-ku*
 that man 1sgGEN-ACC keep-PRES spear-ACC
warrkunti-muntu-ku.
 boomerang-CONJ-ACC
 ‘That man is keeping my spear, and boomerang.’ (Panyjima, Dench 1991: 153)

In Martuthunira, the coordinating suffix usually occurs inside relational case morphology (53), but can sometimes follow the case marker (54). There is apparently no semantic or syntactic difference associated with these two possibilities.

- (53) *Ngayu ngawurri-ma-rninyji puwara-thurti-i*
 1SG.NOM mixed-CAUS-FUT charcoal-CONJ-ACC
martarr-thurti-i
 red.ochre-CONJ-ACC
 ‘I’ll mix up charcoal and red ochre.’ (Martuthunira, Dench 1995:199, ex. 8.32)
- (54) *Ngayu kampa-lalha thanuwa-ngara-a wuruma-l.yarra*
 1SG.NOM cook.PAST vegetable.food-PL-ACC do.for-CTEMP
pawulu-ngara-a-thurti kanyara-nagara-a-thurti
 child-PL-ACC-CONJ adult-PL-ACC-CONJ
 I cooked food for the children and the adults. (ibid, ex. 8.33)

These various possibilities have potentially interesting implications for syntactic models of case morphology and its interaction with morphosyntactic structure.

According to Blake (1987:92), word-marking languages mark all co-ordinands for case, as do some phrase marking languages (e.g. Warlpiri, Nash (1980, 176). In

the phrase marking language Diyari case can occur either on both coordinands, or on the second coordinand.⁵

- (55) *Kanku ya mankada-li wima wangka-yi.*
boy and girl-ERG song-ABS sing-PRES
'The boys and girls are singing a song.' (Diyari, Austin 1981: 231)
- (56) *wata kanku-yali ya wilha-li nhayi-rnda pudi-ya*
not boy-ERG and woman-ERG see-PART AUX-PAST
'The boys and women didn't see (the corroboree)' (ibid)

Questions arising:

- What are the case marking patterns in non-coordinated NPs and how are they different or the same in coordinated NPs?
- If the language has morphological marking of coordination, how does this interact with other nominal morphology? For example, do the coordinating affixes come inside or outside case morphology? If they can come in either order, does this correlate with any semantic or syntactic differences?
- In a language in which each coordinand in a coordinate structure is inflected for case, do the coordinands always have to have the same case? If not, when does a case mismatch arise, and what are the semantic effects of the case mismatch? See, for example Gaby's (2006) discussion of the dative inclusory construction in Kuuk Thaayorre (57).

- (57) *Jimmy-nthurr Johnny-n pul ngerngkan thanp-rr-r pul.*
Jimmy-ERG Johnny-DAT 3DU.ERG yesterday kick-RCP-PST 3DU.ERG
'Jimmy and Johnny kicked each other yesterday' (Kuuk Thaayorre, Hall 1972:244, cited in Gaby 2006: 322)

6.2 Symmetry and Parallelism

Definitions of coordination generally refer to some form of syntactic parallelism, but in fact languages often have coordinate structures which shown parallelism failures of various degrees and types (for example, cases of unlike constituent coordination in English).

⁵In these examples we have altered Austin's orthography to represent laminals with h and retroflex consonants with r.

An area in which an asymmetry may show up is when only one conjunct satisfies a morphosyntactic requirement (such as a CASE requirement) placed by an external element (governor). Such cases have sometimes lead to proposals that the coordinations are **structurally** asymmetric, but have not attracted analyses which deny that these are cases of coordination.

Examples of asymmetries in Australian languages include a nominal suffix in Wardaman that marks the focal member of a pair (58), generally found with proper names.

- (58) *wunggunburr-wo-ndi julay-warrma juni*
 3NSG/3NSG-give-PAST July-FC Junie
 They gave it to July and Junie (Wardaman, Merlan: 89 (124))

Case mismatches are found in Kuuk Thaayorre, which has a ‘dative inclusory construction’ that contains two subset nominals, one which is marked with the grammatical case for the whole NP, and the other that is marked with the dative case (Gaby 2006), see (57) above.

Definitions usually assume that coordination entails that the conjuncts fulfill the same function. However, a particularly striking example of asymmetry in coordination comes from Tiwi, in which “It is quite common for nominals which function as subject and object respectively to be coordinated” (Osborne 1974: 72).⁶

- (59) *ji-pungipa ngarr uwani kayi pithara, purrukuparli*
 3SGMASC.SUBJ.PST-hit 3SGMASC? brother in eye Purrukuparli
thaparra
 Thapara
 He hit his brother in the eye, Purrukuparli and Thapara (Tiwi, Osborne 1974: 72)

Questions arising:

- Are there examples of these or other types of asymmetric coordinate constructions in other Australian languages? If so, what are their properties?
- In particular, is it possible to find other examples of the type exemplified for Tiwi in (59)? If so, is there any independent evidence that the juxtaposed nominals are truly coordinated in this construction?

⁶Example provided unglossed in the source.

6.3 Discontinuous coordination

A number of languages allow discontinuous coordinated NP structures. Haspelmath (2004) reports it to be relatively common cross-linguistically to split a coordinate structure by placing one coordinand at the end of the clause. While many of the Australian examples in the literature involve one coordinand appearing at the end of the clause, other orderings are possible (see (64) for example).

- (60) ... *kun-kerri ma-ngi kun-yerrng*
... IV-cooking.stone 3/3P.get-PI IV-wood
'... he got cooking stones, and firewood.' (Bininj Gun-Wok, Evans 2003: 248, ex. 6.64)
- (61) *Ma-wurndan? balaka nyarrma-ga-ma-ngi, ma-berge?-bula*
VEG-black.plum first we.got.it VEG-green.plum-AND
'We got black plums and green plums.' (Ngandi, Heath 1978: 128)
- (62) *Kintja-(ng)ku=yana intji-mi-ngi-yu ntiya-(ng)ku tjipa-yi*
female-ERG=and pelt-FUT-me-they.DU stone-ERG this-ERG
kurlayingu-thu.
male-ERG
'The girl and boy will both pelt me with stones.' (Kalkatungu, Blake 2001: 423, ex. 17)
- (63) *Nungka bene-dangwe-rr-inj dird.*
he 3UAP-argue-RR-PP moon
He had an argument with the moon (Bininj Gun-wok, Evans 2003: 442 (10.207))
- (64) *ngaya nga'a-wu pama kunhji nhingurum ngana uwa*
1SG.NOM fish-DAT man brother 3SG.ABL 1DUEXC.NOM go
His brother and I are going for fish/ I'm going fishing with his brother
(Kugu Nganhcara, Smith and Johnson: 434 (ex. 169))

In these cases, there is reason to believe these are not afterthoughts (e.g. dual number on the verb in (62) and control of a reciprocal in (63), and in other examples (not cited here) the discourse setting seems to exclude this possibility (Blake 2001:95)

Questions arising:

- Can you get discontinuous coordinations? If so, what are the ordering constraints, if any?
- Do discontinuous coordinate constructions have the same constraints as discontinuous inclusory constructions?

- Is it easier to get discontinuous coordinations when you also use a summative pronoun referring to the whole set?

6.4 Wordhood and Coordination

There are some structures which resemble word-internal coordination. In Nyangumarta two nominals may form a complex filler of the entity (head) slot within a NP. While Nyangumarta has NP-internal case concord, these “complex fillers” exhibit only case marking on the final part of the head.

- (65) *Pipi-japartu-lu partany kalku-rnikinyi pulu.*
 mother-father-ERG child keep-IMP 3DU.SUB
 The mother and the father (the parents) looked after the child (Nyangumarta, Sharp 2004: 312 (ex. 9.50))

Note that the complex nominal in (65) controls dual agreement on the verb. This might suggest that although word-internal it is right to view this as coordination.

Compare the general-specific example in (66) with the compound in (65).

- (66) *Mima-nikinyi-a yi-nganya-ku kuyi-ku kartantarri-ku*
 wait.for-IMP-PURP give-NM-DAT meat-DAT duck-DAT
 He (the father) waited for (them) to give him duck meat. (Nyangumarta, Sharp 2004: 311 (ex. 9.46))

One question is whether this is restricted to ‘natural’ coordinations, that is, those in which there is a salient relation between the entities denoted by the conjuncts, which form a conceptual unit or are closely related in meaning.

Further challenging cases involve the interaction of coordination with noun incorporation. It appears possible for incorporated nominals to be conjoined with V-external nominal arguments, as noted in Evans (2003).

- (67) *Oo gunak gare yi-yerrng-ma-ng, gun-boi.*
 oh fire perhaps 2-wood-get-NP IV-cooking.stone
 Well maybe you should get some firewood and cooking stones (Bininj Gun-wok, Evans 2003: 453 (ex. 10.253))

The interaction of incorporation with coordination provides another type of challenge to parallelism in coordination. In the following example the incorporated generic nominal *dalk* ‘grass’ appears to be relevant to only one conjunct in the coordinated object NP.

- (68) *Bene-dalk-mey man-dalk-buk dja kun-dulk, bene-worrhme-ng*
 3UAP-grass-getPP VE-grass-dry and IV-stick 3UAP-make.fire-PP
bene-kinje-ng na-wu wirlarrk.
 3UAP-cook-PP MA-DEM goose.egg
 ‘Gathering dry grasses and sticks, they made a fire to roast the eggs’ (Bininj Gun-wok, Evans 2003: 453 (ex. 10.257))

If the language is an incorporating language, how does incorporation interact with coordination?

7 Relating NP Coordination to other constructions

Stassen (2000) claims about half the world’s languages use different conjunctive coordination for nominal and clausal coordination - however VPs sometimes pattern with NP and sometimes with S and sometimes independent of both. It seems that you never get NP and S patterning together with VP differing. Nyangumarta doesn’t have a coordinator for clausal coordination, despite having one for NP coordination. The following example shows both clausal and NP coordination:

- (69) *Ngalyun-pa pirirri munja-rna pula-rninyi ngampal karri-nyi*
 woman-CONJ man kiss-NFUT 3DU.SUB-RECIP embrace STAT-NFUT
pulu-rnangu.
 3DU.SUB-RECIP
 ‘The woman and man are kissing each other and embracing each other.’
 (Nyangumarta, Sharp 2004: 385, ex. 11.48)

Languages with coordinators for clausal coordination include (Blake 1987: 137): Diyari, Kalkatungu, Mangarrayi (means *also, furthermore* as well), Garrwa (*also, then*), Warluwara (*and, more, another*), Alawa (*after that*), Lardil (means *and, also*). In some Western Desert dialects there are separate co-ordinating conjunctions for same-subject and different-subject clauses.

Questions arising:

- What types of things can be coordinated? e.g. NPs, clauses, adjectives, VPs. Can you get unlike constituent coordination? What about non-constituent coordination?
- Do you get the same coordinator used for different phrasal types?

- How do NP-coordination patterns differ from clausal coordination?
- Are there any examples of pre-coordinators in Australian languages, like ‘both’, ‘either’, ‘neither’?
- What about disjunction or disjunctive coordination, which is reported for only a handful of Australian languages? Is it possible at all? If so, how is it distinguished from coordination?

Not many Australian languages have words for *but* or *or*. Blake (1987) lists only Alawa with *dya* ‘but’ and Diyari with *kara* ‘or’ (p. 137). The Bininj Gun-wok coordinator *dja* can also mean ‘or’. An example is:

- (70) *Galuk danjbik dja bogen bani-lobm-i gunak-dorreng*
 then three CONJ two 3uaP-run-PI fire-with
bani-wurlh-wurlhge-yi.
 3uaP-ITER-light-PI
 ‘Then the two or three would run around with a firestick and set fire (to the shelter).’ (Bininj Gun-wok, Evans 2003: 249, ex. 6.68)

References

- Aissen, Judith. 1989. Agreement Controller and Tzotzil Comitatives. *Language* 65:518–36.
- Austin, Peter. 1981. *A Grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blake, Barry. 1987. *Australian Aboriginal Grammar*. London: Croom Helm.
- Blake, Barry J. 2001. The Noun Phrase in Australian Languages. In Jane Simpson et. al., ed., *Forty years on: Ken Hale and Australian languages*, pages 415–425. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Bokamba, E. G. 1985. Verbal Agreement as a non-cyclic rule in Bantu. In D. L. Goyvaerts, ed., *African Linguistics: Essays in memory of M.W.K. Semikenke*, pages 9–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2004. Coordination Strategies and Inclusory Constructions in New Caledonian and other Oceanic Languages. In M. Haspelmath, ed., *Coordinating Constructions*, pages 499–533. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Camacho, José. 2003. *The Structure of Coordination: Conjunction and Agreement Phenomena in Spanish and Other Languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Corbett, Greville. 1983. *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement Patterns in Slavic*. London: Croom Helm.
- Dalrymple, Mary and Ronald M. Kaplan. 2000. Feature indeterminacy and feature resolution. *Language* 76(4):759–798.
- Dalrymple, Mary and Irina Nikolaeva. 2006. Syntax of natural and accidental coordination. *Language* 82-4:824–849.
- Dench, Alan. 1991. Panyjima. In R. M. Dixon and B. Blake, eds., *The Handbook of Australian Languages, Vol 4*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Dench, Alan. 1995. *Martuthunira: a language of the Pilbara Region of Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Drellishak, Scott and Emily Bender. 2005. A coordination module for a crosslinguistic grammar resource. In S. Müller, ed., *Proceedings of 12th HPSG Conference*, pages 108–128. CSLI Publications: <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/publications>, Stanford, CA.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2003. *A Pan-dialectal Grammar of Bininj Gun-Wok (Arnhem Land): Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Gaby, Alice. 2006. *A Grammar of Kuuk Thaayorre*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.
- Glass, A and D. Hackett. 1979. *Ngaanyatjarra texts*. Canberra: AIAS.
- Hall, A. 1972. *A study of the Thaayorr Language of the Edward River tribe, Cape York Peninsula, Queensland: being a description of the grammar*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Queensland.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordinating constructions: An overview. In M. Haspelmath, ed., *Coordinating Constructions*, pages 3–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. to appear. Coordination. In T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and linguistic description*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1978. *Ngandi grammar, texts and dictionary*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

- Heath, Jeffrey. 1984. *Functional Grammar of Nunggubuyu*. Canberra: AIAS.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 2004. Coordination: an adaptationist view. In M. Haspelmath, ed., *Coordinating Constructions*, pages 67–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- King, Tracy Holloway and Mary Dalrymple. 2004. Determiner agreement and noun conjunction. *Journal of Linguistics* 40(1):69–104.
- Krishnamurti, B. H. and J. P. L. Gwyn. 1985. *A grammar of Modern Telugu*. Delhi: OUP.
- Marten, Lutz. 2000. Agreement with Conjoined Noun Phrases in Swahili. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 64, Swahili Forum VII:75–96.
- McNally, Louise. 1993. Comitative Coordination: A Case Study in Group Formation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:347–79.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1994. *A Grammar of Wardaman: a language of the Northern Territory*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moosally, Michelle. 1998. *Noun Phrase Coordination: Ndebele Agreement Patterns and Cross-Linguistic Variation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Tx.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire and John Lynch. 2004. Coordination in Oceanic languages and Proto Oceanic. In M. Haspelmath, ed., *Coordinating Constructions*, pages 445–497. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Munn, Alan. 1999. First Conjunct Agreement: Against a Clausal Analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 75(3):552–562.
- Nash, David. 1980. *Topics in Warlpiri grammar*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 1998. *A Grammar of Wambaya, Northern Territory (Australia)*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Nordlinger, Rachel and Louisa Sadler. 2006. Apposition as Coordination: evidence from Australian Languages. In M. Butt and T. H. King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications: <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/publications>.
- Osborne, C. R. 1974. *The Tiwi Language*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Patz, Elisabeth. 1991. Djabugay. In R. M. Dixon and B. Blake, eds., *The Handbook of Australian Languages, Vol 4*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

- Rumsey, Alan. 2000. Bunuba. In R. M. Dixon and B. Blake, eds., *The Handbook of Australian Languages, Vol 5*, pages 35 – 39. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Sadler, Louisa. 2003. Coordination and Asymmetric Agreement in Welsh. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King, ed., *Nominals: Inside and Out*, pages 85–118. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Schwartz, Linda. 1988. Asymmetric Feature Distribution in Pronominal ‘Coordinations’. In M. Barlow and C. A. Ferguson, eds., *Agreement in Natural Language*, pages 237–50. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Sharp, Janet. 2004. *Nyangumarta: A Language of the Pilbara Region of Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Singer, Ruth. 2001. The Inclusory Construction in Australian Languages. *Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics* 1(2):81–96.
- Singer, Ruth. 2005. Comparing constructions across languages: a case study of the relationship between the inclusory construction and some related nominal constructions. Unpublished talk, ALT 2005.
- Smith and Johnson. 2000. Kugu Nganhcara. In B. Blake and R. R. Dixon, eds., *Handbook of Australian Languages, Volume 5*, pages 357–507. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stassen, Leon. 2000. And-languages and with-languages. *Linguistic Typology* 4(1):1–54.
- Villavicencio, Aline, Louisa Sadler, and Doug Arnold. 2005. An HPSG Account of Closest Conjunct Agreement in NP Coordination in Portuguese. In S. Mueller, ed., *Proceedings of the HPSG05 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications: <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/publications>.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2005. *Co-compounds and natural compounds*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wechsler, Stephen and Larisa Zlatić. 2000. A theory of agreement and its application to Serbo-Croatian. *Language* 76(4):759–798.
- Wechsler, Stephen and Larisa Zlatić. 2003. *The Many Faces of Agreement*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Wilkins, David. 1989. *Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda): Studies in the structure and semantics of grammar*. Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University.