SECTION INTROS: -- Mention the high points of each paper and how they fit together with each other and with earlier work, including Bob's.

I’m confused ... this looks like you’ve put a bunch of what was in the main intro into the section ones... I’ll have to think ........ might rather leave a lot of it in the main intro (especially parts with citations / bibliography ) or at least have a summary in the main intro ???

Part I Historical linguistics and philology (Kaufman Larson Danker Grant)

The relative degree of “genetic” relatedness of the major branches of the Siouan language family is quite well established: the Catawban languages split off first, followed by the Missouri Valley Siouan languages, followed by the Southeastern Siouan and Mississippi Valley Siouan languages. Among the latter branch, the Dakotan languages split off first, followed by the Dhegiha and Jiwere-Hocąk subbranches. Rankin (1988, 1998, Rankin et al 1998, among many other papers) contributed much to advances in these understandings alongside advances in rigorous application of the comparative method. Open questions include the possibility of relationships with Yuchi, Iroquoian languages and Caddoan languages (see CITES), as well as areal influences. Papers in Part 1 of this volume address some of these issues, as well as considering what we can learn from early attempts to write Siouan languages.

Part II Applied and descriptive linguistics (Cumberland GoodTracks et al McBride Greer)

Several Siouan languages are extinct, or “sleeping”, and the rest are endangered, so documentation, language retention, and language revival are crucial issues, both for the Native communities and for linguists seeking to record usage patterns, establish the details of historical change or investigate the limits of Human Language grammatical structure. The chapters in part 2 of this volume illustrate a variety of approaches to language documentation, language pedagogy, and enhancing communities’ language resources.

Many traditionally observable grammatical features have undergone rapid shift under “intense contact” conditions (i.e. violent colonization and historical trauma transmission), and as the numbers of fluent speakers decline Siouan languages are increasingly “housed” in the descriptions of linguists and non-fluent tribal and descendant communities. Yet while this shift in “housing” surely represents a great loss, it is also the site from which the future of Siouan languages is reborn in each moment of language reclamation and in every community program and activist agenda. Linguists and community members alike must be mindful to read linguistic descriptions – even those from trusted sources – with a grain of skepticism. How can we be sure that “the” meaning or pronunciation of a word is exactly as described or as unitary as the inherited documentation makes it out to be? How can we be sure that one linguistic practice is “traditional” and another is influenced by English? How can we be sure that a grammatical paradigm documented by a linguist consists of fully productive and obligatory oppositions, or that its descendant among contemporary speakers really is “reduced” in any way? Non-Native linguists, community members and descendants have tended to approach and answer these questions in different ways, with different interests. The gulf between these approaches and interests can be perceived in the lack of attendee overlap between meetings like the Dhegiha Preservation Society and the Siouan and Caddoan Languages Conference. It can be observed in the mismatch between linguists’ stated intentions of developing material useful to community-based programs, and these same community-based programs’ lack of access to and use for these materials. We feel that it is only by bringing these interests and approaches into conversation that these roads will cross, gulfs be breached, academic linguists’ work decolonizing rather than colonizing, decayed and broken trust rebuilt, and language-reclamation programs strengthened.

Part III Analyses of individual Siouan languages (Rood Boyle Johnson Rosen Johnson et al)

Part III comprises three chapters applying formal linguistic theory to problems in the phonological or syntactic structure of a Siouan language. David Rood reexamines a longstanding problem, the phonological status of voiced stops in Lakhota, and proposes a new analysis drawing on autosegments and feature geometry.....

John Boyle analyzes the internally headed relative clause construction in Hidatsa, from both formal syntactic and semantic perspectives....

This section of the volume concludes with three interrelated chapters, all dealing with Hoca̧k syntax.

Part IV Comparative studies (Rudin Gordon Helmbrecht)

Part IV consists of three chapters which compare some area of grammar across the Siouan family. The specific phenomena studied are quite different -- coordination constructions, information structure as reflected in intonation and word order, and the expression of possession -- but the approach of all three authors is similar in that they compare the facts of a number of different Siouan languages, from different branches of the Siouan family, within the framework of a broader crosslinguistic typology.

Introduction (I think it will be called the PREFACE in LSP template)

This volume presents a group of papers representing a range of current work on Siouan languages, in memory of our colleague Robert L. Rankin, a towering figure in Siouan linguistics throughout his long career, who passed away in February of 2014. The volume is divided into four broad areas (Historical, Applied, Formal/Analytical, and Typological) introduced in more detail below, in separate introductions to each part of the volume. Bob Rankin contributed to all of these areas.

Bob was a major figure in Siouan linguistics, a mentor to nearly all living Siouanists, and a mainstay of the annual Siouan and Caddoan Linguistics Conference meetings for decades. Trained in Romance and Indo-European linguistics, with a specialty in Romanian(Ph.D. University of Chicago 1972), he shifted gears soon after leaving graduate school, and became an expert in Siouan languages, especially the Dhegiha branch, with special focus on Kaw. From the mid 1970s through the end of his life, he devoted himself to Siouan studies, both practical and scholarly. His long association with the Kaw Tribe led to a grammar and dictionary of that language (see Cumberland, this volume), and he also produced a grammar of Quapaw, briefly conducted field work on Omaha-Ponca and Osage. At the University of Kansas he directed dissertations on Lakhota \footnote Sara Trechter The Pragmatic Functions of Genered Clitics in Lakhota (1995) and Tutelo \footnote Giulia Oliverio Grammar and Dictionary of Tutelo (1996) as well as several M.A. theses on Siouan languages, and taught a wide variety of courses including field methods and structure of Lakhota and Kansa as well as more theoretical courses in phonology, syntax, and historical linguistics. His scholarly publications centered primarily around Siouan historical phonology, but included works ranging from toponym studies to grammaticalization pathways, and often included insights from his broad interests in archeology, linguistic typology, Iroquoian and Muskogean languages, and the history of linguistics. Perhaps Bob’s greatest gift to the field was his encouragement of others. At conferences and on the Siouan List email forum, he was unfailingly patient and encouraging, answering all questions seriously, explaining linguistic terms to non-linguist participants and basic facts of Siouan languages to general linguists with equal enthusiasm and lack of condescension.

Following his untimely death, a special session was organized at the 2014 Siouan and Caddoan Linguistics Conference to organize several projects in Bob’s honor: The first of these was publication of the Comparative Siouan Dictionary, an immense project comparing cognates across all the Siouan languages, undertaken by Rankin and a group of colleagues in the 1980s. It had been circulated in various manuscript forms but never published. Thanks to David Rood (another founding member of the CSD project), with help from Iren Hartmann, the CSD is now available online (Carter et al 2015). The second project was a volume of Bob’s conference papers and other previously unpublished or semi-published work, to be collected and edited by a group also headed by David Rood; that volume is expected to appear in the next year or so. The third project was a volume of Siouan linguistic work in Bob’s memory -- the present volume.

Beyond honoring a beloved colleague, our aim in this volume is to bring a variety of issues in Siouan linguistics to the attention of the linguistic community. The Siouan language family is a large and important one, with branches geographically distributed over a broad swath of the North American plains and parts of the Southeastern United States. Siouan languages are, or were historically, spoken by the members of at least 25 ethnic/political groups. One Siouan language, Lakota, is among the handful of indigenous North American languages with younger speakers today. Siouan languages have occasionally risen to prominence in general linguistics, for instance in the study of reduplication (Shaw) ... others ? Nonetheless, the SIouan family has been underrepresented in the descriptive and typological literature, and most of the languages in the family are severely understudied. The majority of work on Siouan languages is unpublished, existing only in the form of conference papers or manuscripts. \footnote{Many of these unpublished works are collected in the electronic Siouan Archive, maintained by John Boyle at the University of California at Riverside.} This volume is a step toward making information on Siouan languages more broadly available and encouraging deeper investigation of the myriad issues they raise.

TYPOLOGICAL POSITION – what kinds of languages do Siouan languages tend to be?

Some Siouan languages reflect longtime cultural presence on the Plains, while others are located as far east as the Atlantic Coast, and many more show cultural aspects of both regions. Dhegiha-speaking peoples (Quapaw, Osage, Kaw, Omaha and Ponca, and likely Michigamea as well (KASAK AND KOONTZ-- CITES?) likely inhabited the metropolis at Cahokia, perhaps at a time before any of the descendant groups had broken off, and have many Eastern Woodlands-style features of traditional governance and religion, in sharp contrast with the more Plains-typical cultural features of close Lakhota and Dakota neighbors and relatives.

The Siouan languages pose a challenge to a number of generalizations in linguistic typology and theoretical syntax, several of which are the subject of chapters in parts 3 and 4 of this volume; those in part 3 use the tools of formal linguistics to address issues in the phonology or syntax of individual Siouan languages, while those in part 4 take a broader typological view and consider data from across the Siouan family.

From the perspective of linguistic typology, Siouan languages have many notable features. Many of these features stand to challenge strong theoretical claims and complicate typological generalizations, but few of them have figured prominently in relevant literature. The chapters in parts III and IV of this volume deal in detail with specific issues in this area. Here we briefly sketch a few of the most characteristic features of the Siouan family.

All Siouan languages possess a rich variety of applicative affixes, confirming Polinsky’s (2013) observation that applicatives are common in North America and adding another language family to her list of applicative-rich families in the area. Most of the applicatives in Siouan languages are located in two “instrumental” templatic slots in the verb ...

All Siouan languages have head-internal relative clauses. A series of strong claims motivated by Antisymmetry\footnote{Syntacticians who work with Siouan languages have by consensus rejected antisymmetric representations (KAYNE CITE) and insisted that all but the supraclausal projections (and even some of these) are head-final in all Siouan languages.} theory regarding the typological implications of head-internal relative clauses (cf. Cole, 1987; Murasugi, 2000), including purported distinctions between “Japanese-type” and “Lakhota-type” constructions (cf. Watanabe, 2004; Williamson, 1987; Bonneau, 1992), propelled at least one Siouan language into the debates of theoretical syntax. It has been pointed out that head-internal relative clauses of the kind found in Lakota (most if not all Siouan languages fall into this category) lack the island restrictions found in other languages. On the other hand, it has been argued that such languages also must have head-external relative clauses, which is not true in Siouan languages.

All Siouan languages have verbal affixes which index subject possession of or relationship with the object. They vary with respect to contexts of obligatoriness of these affixes.

Many Siouan languages have a modal CCV morpheme shape. This does not necessarily imply a preference for CCV phonetic realizations, but may indicate such a preference in the distant past. Another unusual prosodic feature is the preference for second-syllable stress in most Siouan languages. Hocąk may be the only attested language with default third-syllable stress in the world.

Most Siouan languages have ejective stops. The Dhegiha branch is notable for a four-way glottal-state distinction in its stop series (voiced/lenis, tense/pre-aspirated, ejective and aspirated). Outside of the Dhegiha branch are many Siouan languages which have the unusual feature of a phonemic voicing distinction in fricatives but not in stops.

Verbs play many typologically unusual, prominent roles in Siouan languages. Diachronically, many grammatical items which rarely grammaticalize from verbs in other languages tend to grammaticalize from verbs in Siouan languages. In some Siouan languages, the source verbs and target grammatical items continue to exist in parallel with substantial semantic overlap. The Omaha positional article *tʰoⁿ “obviative animate specific standing”*, for instance, is homophonous with the root of *átʰoⁿ “stand on”*.

[could refer here to Bob’s papers on the verb>aux>article cycle]

This diachronic tendency is mirrored by a synchronic flexibility. Siouan languages tend to verb freely – to use nearly any open-class stem as a verb. Thus Omaha and Ponca *níkshiⁿga* means either *“a person”* or *“s/he is a person”*.

Dhegiha languages, of which Omaha is one, are also notable in having as many as eleven articles indexing features such as animacy, proximacy/obviation (or case), posture/position, number, visibility, motion and dispersion. (Meanwhile other Siouan languages have no fully grammaticalized articles at all.) These same articles (which have many features in common with positional classifiers; see Gordon, CITE) are homophonous with postverbal and postclausal functional items like subordinating conjunctions and aspect and evidentiality markers, and have considerable semantic overlap with them too, a fact which comprises yet another area of blurriness between nominal and verbal syntax: In Ponca, *Níkshiⁿga-ama* may mean *“the [proximate animate plural specific] people”*, but also may mean either *“they are people”* or *“I am told s/he was a person”*. Plurality is a part of the semantics of *-ama* in both the nominal and the first clausal interpretation. To make matters more interesting, these kinds of ambiguity are sometimes not easily resolved by context alone, and may in fact be an ordinary part of the language for fluent speakers, or at very least a possible language game.

These “verb-heavy” flexibilities have resulted in some discussion on the status and quality of the noun/verb distinction in Siouan languages (CITES).

Nominal arguments in general are not required in Siouan languages, thematic relations being signaled by pronominal or agreement markers within the verb. ... . relevant to debates about the existence of “pronominal argument” languages (Jelinek) and to the related issues of whether there are languages with truly nonconfigurational or flat structure. The preponderance of evidence in Siouan is for the existence of hierarchical structure, specifically including a VP (for instance, West dissertation, WI papers this volume).

Although Siouan languages have many remarkable features in common, they vary on many others. All Siouan languages allow zero reference (referring to nominal arguments and other referents without using a nominal form), but only some Siouan languages have noun incorporation. Some Siouan languages have stress-accent systems, and others have pitch-accent systems.

*Although the broad outlines are clear, ....?, the descent of Siouan languages, and their degree of genetic and areal relationship with one another, are subjects of common misrepresentation. One commonly advanced claim is that the Dakotan languages can be divided into “Lakhota”, “Dakota” and “Nakota” based on their respective reflexes of a single proto-phoneme -- and that “Nakota” includes both Nakʰon’i’a (Assiniboine) and Nakʰoda (Stoney) on the one hand, and Ihaƞktȟuƞwaƞ (Yankton) and Ihaƞktȟuƞwaƞna (Yanktonai) on the other hand. Yet Ihaƞktȟuƞwaƞ and Ihaƞktȟuƞwaƞna people both use the word “Dakȟota”, not “Nakʰota” or “Nakʰoda”, to refer to themselves. Their language varieties are of the branch of Dakotan that includes largely mutually intelligible Lakȟol’iapi / Lakȟotiapi (Lakota) -- a separate branch from the one that includes Nakʰon’i’a and Nakʰoda.*

*\footnote “Siouan”is not to be confused with “Sioux”, a deprecated term referring to Lakota and Dakota people, rarely to Nakota people too, but never correctly to people of other traditionally Siouan-language-speaking communities.*
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