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(Author’s note 2009: The following is the handout for my contribution to the session on “the NP: structure, case, nominalization, incorporation, and relative clauses” at the Siouan Syntax Fest. It consists of a brief sketch of the facts of NP structure in Omaha-Ponca, followed by a selection of data. Although it is really more “notes toward a paper” than an actual article, I am making it available in hopes that others will find the data and preliminary analysis useful.)

OVERVIEW:
1. Structure
All modifiers follow the noun. A rough template for a maximal nominal phrase is:
   [ N Clause Poss Quant Dem D]

This can be analyzed as a right-headed DP; in fact as nested right-headed phrases, though I wouldn’t bet anything on the details of this:

All components, including N, are optional.

A quantifier can also occur outside DP, making a larger QP:  [QP [ DP ] Quant ]

A demonstrative can also occur before N:  [[Dem] [(DP?) N ... ]]

Nominal phrases can also consist of:
  pronoun
  relative clause
  nominalized clause
  appositive (or multiply articulated) construction
  conjoined nominals?
  N can be a compound or a nominalization

2. Case
I don’t have anything to say here. There is no morphological/overt case marking, and I don’t know anything interesting about abstract Case either.

3. Nominalization
Many nouns are morphologically verbs (clauses); “zero nominalization” or simply using a verb as a noun, is very common. The verb form is 3rd person; it may include an indefinite object (detransitivizing) prefix.
Larger clauses (i.e. a verb plus nominal argument or other stuff) can undergo the same process and be used as derived nouns.

4. Incorporation
(No doubt there IS something to say here, but I’m not going to say it.)

5. Relative Clauses
Relative clauses are internal-headed. The clause is marked with a final article, which correlates with the role of the relativized nominal in the matrix clause, not its role within the RC. The head nominal has no article.

\[ DP \left[ s \ldots \left[ \text{head} \right] \ldots \right] \text{article} \]

EXAMPLES AND DISCUSSION:

1. structure
A nominal core can combine with an article to make a determiner phrase (DP). The nominal core (shown in [] in the following examples) consists of an N and/or one or more modifiers.

\begin{align*}
nú ak^b\text{a} & \quad \text{‘the man’} \\
\text{man art} & \quad \left[ N \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{wo"githe} & \quad \text{‘all (of us/them)’} \\
\text{all} & \quad \left[ \text{quantifier} \right] \\
\text{zhi"gá amá} & \quad \text{‘the children’} \\
\text{be-small art} & \quad \left[ \text{clause} \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{gá ak^b\text{á}} & \quad \text{‘that one’} \\
\text{that art} & \quad \left[ \text{dem} \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{Mary ak^b\text{a}} & \quad \text{‘Mary’} \\
\text{M. art} & \quad \left[ N \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{i"utha gá the} & \quad \text{‘that story’} \\
\text{tell that art} & \quad \left[ \text{clause + dem} \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{nikashí"ga dú ak^b\text{a}} & \quad \text{‘this person’} \\
\text{person this art} & \quad \left[ N + \text{dem} \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{wa"ù no"bá amá ‘the two women’} \\
\text{woman two art} & \quad \left[ N + \text{Q} \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{wa"ù zhi"gá wi" ‘an old woman’} \\
\text{woman be-small art} & \quad \left[ N + \text{clause} \right] + \text{art} \\
\text{i"shṭá thithíta} & \quad \text{‘your eye’} \\
\text{eye your} & \quad \left[ N + \text{poss} \right]
\end{align*}
Sometimes a quantifier (including numerals) follows DP, making a quantifier phrase.

```
shó^ge akʰ a wó^n githe ~ 'all the horses'
          horse art all                          [[N + art] + Q

shó^ge shé akʰ a nó^ba ~ 'those two horses' / “two of those horses”
          horse that art two                     [[N + dem] + art] + Q

shó^ge duá=thi^n wi^n ~ ‘this one horse’ / “one of these horses”
          horse this art one                    [[N + dem] + art] + Q

wahábe gáʰ e júba ~ ‘this little bit of corn’
          corn that art some                    [[N + dem] + art] + Q

éthi wiwíta ama wó^n githe ~ ‘all my relatives’
          relatives my art all                  [[N + poss] + art] + Q
```

Sometimes a possessive follows DP but here it is predicative, not part of nominal phrase:

```
[shi^nuda tô^gá thi^n kʰçe] o^guta ~ 'the big dog is ours'
          [DP] poss

[mazho^n=khe] wiwíta ~ 'the land is mine' (Dorsey 1890:435.12)
```

Sometimes a demonstrative precedes N, with or without other modifiers (Dorsey examples from recent Siouan list posting by John Koontz). This pattern is “the more common alternative with a single demonstrative and a noun” in Dorsey, but very rare in my data. (shé mizhi^ga/shé nuzhi^ga excepted)

Dem N (and similarly  Dem [N V] and Dem [N Quant])
90:28.12  thé nikashi^ga 'this person'
Patterns with dem following noun (examples below still from John Koontz’s post) are far more common in my data than any pattern with dem preceding the noun.

Patterns with dem following noun (examples below still from John Koontz’s post) are far more common in my data than any pattern with dem preceding the noun.
It's not at all clear how to analyze demonstrative constructions. It's been suggested that N Dem constructions are "possibly copular constructions" -- perhaps so, but many (actually I think all or at least most) do not seem copular in sentences. eg:

[Shinuda é] nôpâ ‘He is scared of that dog.’

Frequency of demonstrative constructions of various types may have changed since Dorsey’s time? Or perhaps just more limited range of styles in my data? In any case, more investigation is needed here, especially into difference in meaning between N-dem and dem-N.

Possibly related to demonstratives: A common construction consists of two (occasionally 3 or even 4) coreferential nominals with identical articles. Usually one has a demonstrative as its nominal core; in fact, this is perhaps the most common use of demonstratives in my data, especially in narratives. But some instances don’t involve a demonstrative. Probable structure: \([\text{DP} \ [\text{DP} \ \text{NP art},] \ [\text{DP} \ \text{NP art}],]\); i.e. appositive. But it could be a type of definiteness agreement?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{zhīgā ama shé ama} & \quad \text{‘those children’ (the children, those ones)} \\
\text{small art those art} & \\
\text{duā=thíkBwái thiKx} & \quad \text{‘this woman’ (this one, the woman)} \\
\text{this art woman art} & \\
\text{she ak'a níkashīga akx a winégi akx a Charlie akx a} & \quad \text{‘that guy, my uncle Charlie’} \\
\text{that art person art my-uncle art Charlie art} & \\
\text{gā ama níkashīga noBama} & \quad \text{‘those two people’ (those ones, the two people)} \\
\text{that art person two art} & \\
\text{[wāthě=thošawinBtho] newi a} & \quad \text{‘which dress did you buy?’} \\
\text{dress art which art buy Q} & \quad \text{(the dress, which one)} \\
\text{VFW Post [shé ge haská ge] uwáwa’i.} & \quad \text{‘The VFW post loaned them those flags.’} \\
\text{this art flag art loaned} & \\
\text{Shi [gā kx táapuska kx] di shti wabthihOx.} & \quad \text{‘And I worked here at this school too.’} \\
\text{and this art school art at too 1 work} & \\
\text{Conjoined nominals also occur, but I’m not sure how to analyze them. In my elicited data they are usually linked with ‘ego’...sheno’ :} \\
\text{I like to eat beef and chicken and potatoes: Téska tanúka égo wazhīxga égo nú shéno thatxéxtaathé.} \\
\text{I like running and swimming. ThóB=x go xithóx shéno xtáathe.} \\
\text{I bought a red dress and white shoes. Watxé zhíde égo hībé ská shéno bthiwi.} \\
\text{... a red dress, white shoes, and a green hat. Watxé zhíde, hībé ská, watháde pězhítu shéno ...} \\
\text{In texts conjoined NPs are generally juxtaposed, often with a word meaning “also/too”} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Dorsey 1890:18.5 nūga wìx miBwìx edábe ‘a male (and) a female also’
Dorsey 1890:72.11-12 áⁿpʰᵃⁿ núga zhiⁿga wiⁿ áⁿpʰᵃⁿ míⁿga zhiⁿga=shti wiⁿ ‘a small male elk (and) a small female elk, too’
Shi nikashiⁿga húton⁴⁴ga wa’u shti shaoⁿ⁴⁴ shti shti wáxe dúba édí atⁿi=ama.
and person winnebago woman too sioux too and white some there³ arrive=aux
‘And a Winnebago woman, some Sioux, and some whites were also there.’

Compounding is very common, with various combinations of stems:

N+N (modifier+head)
- póⁿka=wáu ‘Ponka woman’ (Ponca + woman)
- xáde=möⁿkʰᵒⁿ ‘tea’ (grass + medicine)
- moⁿshhtiⁿge=wathatʰe ‘salad’ (rabbit+food)

N+N (classifier+head)
- te=hé ‘buffalo horn’ (buffalo + horn)
- ti=zhébe ‘door’ (house + ???)

N+N (head +modifier)
- iⁿshtá=möⁿze ‘Iron Eye (flashing eyes?)’ (eye + metal)

N(Subj arg)+V
- moⁿkʰᵒⁿ=sabe ‘coffee’ (medicine + be black)
- nitá=toⁿga ‘mule’ (ear + be big)
- möⁿze=i-utha ‘telephone’ (metal + talk)

N(non-Subj arg)+V
- moⁿka=gaghe ‘earth lodge builder clan’ (earth + to make)
- wathóⁿ=bashpi ‘sliced squash’ (squash+one slices it)

N+particle
- tá=xti ‘deer’ (ungulate + very)
- wazhiⁿ=shte ‘be in a bad mood’ (be in a mood + so-ever)

more complex compounds:
- té=ska=möⁿze=ni ‘milk’ ((buffalo + be white = cow) + udder + water)
- móⁿze=ska=úzhí ‘purse’ ((metal + be white = money) + bag)
- tá=xti=zhiⁿga ‘fawn’ ((ungulate + very = deer) + small)
- zhábë=ta=zhoⁿ ‘box elder’ (beaver + its + wood)

truncated:
- shoⁿtoⁿga ‘wolf’ (shoⁿge ‘dog’/historically ‘horse’ + toⁿga ‘be big’)
- wazhiⁿtu ‘bluebird’ ((wa ‘indef’ + zhiⁿga ‘be small’ = bird) + tu ‘be blue’)
- iⁿgthoⁿsiⁿsnede ‘mountain lion’ (iⁿgthoⁿge ‘cat’ + siⁿde ‘tail’ + snede ‘be long’)
- moⁿshhtiⁿska ‘jack rabbit’ (moⁿshhtiⁿga ‘rabbit’ + ska ‘be white’)

3. nominalization
It is extremely common for a verb (or clause) to be used as a noun, with no overt nominalizing morphology. Noun/verb status is distinguished only by context (e.g. by occurring with article or auxiliary). Examples with a nominal argument (like ‘elephant’) might be analysed as compounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ti</td>
<td>‘house’ ~ ‘one dwells’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hithái</td>
<td>‘Saturday’ ~ ‘one bathes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>úhe</td>
<td>‘path’ ~ ‘one travels, proceeds’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watháṭe</td>
<td>‘food’ ~ ‘one eats something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wathízhá</td>
<td>‘laundry’ ~ ‘one washes something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ághthí</td>
<td>‘chair’ ~ ‘one sits’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wébase ‘saw’ ~ ‘one cuts something by pressing’
ti baxiatha ‘elephant’ ~ ‘it pushes over a house’

Complement clauses are sometimes nominalized by a clause-final article (usually the “default” article tể).

**presumably these are articles, not evidentials...?**

E.g.,

\[
\text{[Nôzhí=ta} \text{kʰε eðhégòn} \text{rains=fut} \text{art}\text{think ‘I think it’s going to rain.’}}
\]

\[\text{[Ebâ mô=zeka} \text{tʰε ishpåhòn? ‘Do you know who gave money?’}}
\]

\[\text{[Agûdi gthi} \text{tʰε iðåpåhòn=m=azhí. ‘I don’t know where she lives.’}}
\]

Often, there is no clause-final article. I think these are subordinate clauses with no overt subordinator, but perhaps it’s a complex predicate/serial verb kind of construction?

Often, there is no clause-final article. I think these are subordinate clauses with no overt subordinator, but perhaps it’s a complex predicate/serial verb kind of construction?

\[
\text{[s [ S] verb] (??or [s ...verb verb])}
\]

\[\text{[wahí thagthì] xátìha ‘he likes to chew bones’}
\]

\[\text{[awåk=eta nê] shko’nà... ‘wherever you want to go’}
\]

\[\text{[hô kʰa snède] athá ‘it’s getting late/the night is getting long’}
\]

\[\text{[sidådi bthë] eðhégò ‘I intended to go yesterday.’}
\]

\[\text{[hô sko’skà tʰε dì [azhò̂] agthì ‘I went to bed at midnight.’}
\]

\[\text{[s [ S] [NP head] ... ] article}
\]

\[\text{[John akʰa mizhì̂ga xátìha=i] akʰa] zhô. ‘The girl John likes is asleep.}
\]

\[\text{[Warthízhà gahítha] tʰε nó̂pe=nó̂=i=tʰε washing ‘They were afraid of the flapping laundry.’}
\]

\[\text{[Wàdìchò̂a ubthà̄] tʰε égô=i=tʰε this now I-tell-it art thus=P=evid ‘It was just like I’m telling it now.’ (Or is tʰε part of the clause?)}
\]

\[\text{[Shò̂ge ágthì=i] tʰε] gá tʰε a? ‘Is this the horse I was riding?’}
\]
... [(\text{wathá}^b\text{e} \text{that}^b\text{a}=\text{i} \text{that})) \text{ hébe} \text{that}^b\text{é}=\text{ak}^b\text{a}] \text{ ‘... the food that they ate...’}

food \text{ \text{3}eat} art \text{ that piece} \text{ \text{3}eat=}aux \text{ JOD 1890:356.}

\text{Shi} [(\text{nikagahi} \text{ahí=}bi \text{ehé} \text{ ak}^b\text{a})...] \text{ ‘Again the chief who I said had arrived...’}
again chief \text{ \text{3}arrive=}P \text{\text{1}said} art \text{ JOD 1890:421.1}

\text{Égithe} \text{ ti=}i=\text{t}^b\text{e} ha, [(\text{thé wahó}^n \text{athé} \text{ak}^b\text{a})] \text{ ‘Finally this camp-mover camped.’}
Finally \text{ \text{3}camp=}P=\text{evid dec} \text{ this set-off} \text{ \text{3}go} art \text{ JOD 1890:362.5}

[(\text{shi}^n\text{nuda no}^n\text{ba uxpáwathe}) \text{ ak}^b\text{a}] \text{ ‘the two dogs that I lost’}
dog two \text{ \text{1}lose} art

Relative clauses can be subject and object of the higher clause. Offhand I don’t know of examples of RC as postpositional object or in other roles....