

# The Ordering Of Lakota Verbal Affixes\*

Avelino Corral Esteban\*\*  
*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*

**Resumen:** Mucho ha sido escrito sobre el orden de los afijos pronominales en Lakota (Siouan, 6,000 hablantes: EEUU y Canadá) en los últimos 150 años. Las propuestas tienden a seguir dos enfoques opuestos. Uno de estos enfoques defiende que el orden relativo entre los marcadores de los argumentos del predicado está relacionado con la asignación de caso o del papel semántico, de tal forma que las formas pronominales estáticas, las cuales marcan caso acusativo y representan al paciente, preceden a las formas activas, las cuales marcan caso nominativo y representan al agente. El otro enfoque sostiene que el posicionamiento de los afijos pronominales en esta lengua depende del concepto de persona, de modo que estos afijos siguen el orden tercera persona + primera persona + segunda persona. Este artículo tiene como objetivo arrojar alguna luz sobre la cuestión del orden de los afijos pronominales en Lakota a través del análisis de ejemplos de verbos estáticos transitivos

---

\* Financial support for this research has been provided by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO), FFI2011-29798-C02-01/FILO. I wish to express my gratitude to seven anonymous language consultants, native speakers of Lakota, Nakoda and Dakota with whom I have conducted fieldwork since 2010, for kindly sharing their knowledge of this language with me. I am also very grateful to John E. Koontz for their valuable comments, which have helped to improve the quality of this paper considerably. All errors, however, remain my sole responsibility.

\*\* Avelino Corral Esteban works as a Professor at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. He holds a PhD from UNED, a BA in English Philology from Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and a BA in German Philology from Universidad Complutense de Madrid. His main areas of research interest cover the study of the grammar of Native American languages (e.g. Lakota, Cheyenne, Blackfoot, Crow, and Arapaho), the interaction between syntax, semantics and pragmatics across languages, and the comparative analysis of the syntax of Romance, Germanic and Celtic languages. Correo electrónico: avelino.corral@uam.es.

aportados por dos lenguas estrechamente relacionadas con el Lakota, es decir el Nakota y el Dakota.

**Palabras clave:** Lengua Lakota, lengua de marcación en el núcleo, alineamiento intransitivo escindido, afijo pronominal, orden lineal.

**Abstract:** *Much literature has been written on the ordering of pronominal affixes in Lakota (Siouan, 6,000 speakers: USA and Canada) in the last 150 years. Proposals tend to take one of two opposing approaches. One is to argue that the relative ordering among the argument markers is linked to case or semantic role assignment, with stative forms, marking accusative case and representing patient participants, preceding active forms, marking nominative case and representing agent participants. The other approach is to argue that the positioning of pronominal affixes in this language depends on the concept of person, so these affixes follow the rule third person + first person + second person. This paper aims to shed some light on the issue of the ordering of pronominal affixes in Lakota by analyzing examples<sup>1</sup> of transitive stative verbs provided by two closely related languages to Lakota, namely Nakota and Dakota<sup>2</sup>*

**Keywords:** *Lakota language, head-marking language, split-intransitive alignment, pronominal affix, linear ordering.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations used in this paper: 1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person; SG – singular, PL – plural; STA – stative series of pronominal affixes, ACT – active series of pronominal affixes; AGIPS – agent impersonalizer, APD – animate patient dereferentializer, NP – noun phrase; LOC – locative, INSTR – instrumental; CAUS – causative verb; STEM – part of verbal stem; IF - Illocutionary Force.

<sup>2</sup> The data in this paper come from my native consultants, supplemented with language materials such as the Dakota Grammar (Boas and Deloria, 1941), the New Lakota Dictionary (LLC, 2011), a Ph.D. Thesis on Assiniboine Nakota language (West, 2003), or a number of papers on Lakota (De Reuse, 1983; Pustet and Rood, 2008, among others). Throughout this paper I will use the Lakota Language Consortium orthography system (LLC, 2011: 747-748). Likewise, I have glossed and translated all of the examples that occur in the paper, even those taken from the supplementary sources. Needless to say, all errors remain my sole responsibility.

## Introduction

The past three decades have witnessed a continuous debate about the split-intransitive agreement<sup>3</sup> pattern in Lakota<sup>4</sup>, which has attempted to find a concluding answer to questions about what these two series mark and what is the linear order of these pronominal forms preceding the verb root. This paper offers a study of Lakota morphosyntax, placing special emphasis on the ordering of pronominal affixes in transitive constructions. Firstly, this study provides a summary of previous work concerning the ordering of Lakota pronominal affixes. Once all the different views on this issue have been presented, I then present a hypothesis, based on diachronic claims rather than on synchronic claims, which states that this ordering appears to be influenced by a person hierarchy, rather than case or semantic role assignment.

### 1. Lakota verbs and their affixes

Lakota verbs fall into two main groups, namely stative verbs and active verbs, which are distinguished mainly by the set of the personal pronouns they take. Most stative verbs are one-place predicates and are marked with an Object personal affix (e.g. the stative series), which is realized as a bound morpheme within the verb:

---

<sup>3</sup> Lakota follows a stative-active or split-intransitive alignment system, because its intransitive verbs cross-reference subjects differently. That is, depending on language-specific semantic or lexical criteria, the subject of an intransitive verb in this language is sometimes marked as the subject of a transitive verb (it is coreferenced with the 'active' series) and sometimes as the direct object (it is crossreferenced with the 'stative' series).

<sup>4</sup> Lakota is a Siouan language with a mildly synthetic / partially agglutinant morphology. Likewise, it is considered a head-marking language, since the marking of syntactic relations is realised on the head of the clause.

1 <sup>st</sup> . person singular	...- <i>ma</i> -...
2 <sup>nd</sup> . person singular	...- <i>ni</i> -...
3 <sup>rd</sup> . person singular	...- $\emptyset$ -...
1 <sup>st</sup> . person dual inclusive	...- <i>uŋ(k)</i> <sup>5</sup> -...
1 <sup>st</sup> . person exclusive /plural	...- <i>uŋ(k)</i> -...- <i>pi</i>
2 <sup>nd</sup> . person plural	...- <i>ni</i> -...- <i>pi</i>
3 <sup>rd</sup> . person plural animate <sup>6</sup> collective	...- <i>wičha</i> -...
Distributive	...- $\emptyset$ -...- <i>pi</i>

Table 1: The stative series

The other most important group of Lakota verbs is called active verbs<sup>7</sup>. They are formally recognized by the fact that they take a Subject personal affix (i.e. the active series), which is also realized as a bound morpheme within the verb:

---

<sup>5</sup> In the first person dual and first person plural, a consonant *-k-* is added when the next word begins with a vowel.

<sup>6</sup> The plural of inanimate arguments is marked by the reduplication of the last syllable of the verb.

<sup>7</sup> This second group of verbs is more heterogeneous than the first one and can be classified into three different classes: Class 1 (e.g. *slohyA* 'know'), Class 2 (e.g. *yubá* 'have') and Class 3 (e.g. *yaykÁ* 'sit'). Furthermore, a great number of verbs present irregular paradigms, such as *eyÁ* 'say', *yútA* 'eat' or *yÁ* 'go', etc.

1 <sup>st</sup> . person singular	...- <i>wa</i> / <i>bl</i> / <i>m</i> -...
2 <sup>nd</sup> . person singular	...- <i>ya</i> / <i>l</i> / <i>n</i> -...
3 <sup>rd</sup> . person singular	...- <i>Ø</i> -...
1 <sup>st</sup> . person dual	...- <i>wŋ</i> ( <i>k</i> )-...
1 <sup>st</sup> . person plural	...- <i>wŋ</i> ( <i>k</i> )-...- <i>pi</i>
2 <sup>nd</sup> . person plural	...- <i>ya</i> / <i>l</i> / <i>n</i> -...- <i>pi</i>
3 <sup>rd</sup> . person plural animate <sup>8</sup>	...- <i>a</i> / <i>wičha</i> <sup>9</sup> -...
- collective	...- <i>Ø</i> -...- <i>pi</i>
- distributive	

Table 2 : The active series

As for their transitivity, most stative verbs are intransitive, while active verbs can be intransitive, monotransitive or ditransitive. When the verb is monotransitive, it codes two arguments through the presence of pronominal affixes, and with the exception of transitive stative verbs, which are exceptionally rare, these verbs normally present forms of both the stative and active series simultaneously.

## 2. Review of the previous literature on the ordering and number of affixes in Lakota

Here is a summary of the different proposals that have been offered regarding the relative order of the two types of cross-referencing forms in this language<sup>10</sup>. Furthermore, wherever it is

<sup>8</sup> The third person plural inanimate form is never marked overtly in active verbs.

<sup>9</sup> The marker *wičha* can also crossreference third person plural animate collective subjects in intransitive stative verbs and in some intransitive active verbs: *Wičhawášte* ‘They (as a group) are good.’ (De Reuse, 1983: 154); *Wičhani* ‘They (as a group) live.’ (LLC, 2011: 649). The bound form *a* is used to form a collective plural of verbs of movement: *Aya* = ‘They all go there.’ (LLC, 2011: 21).

<sup>10</sup> Although word order in Lakota may vary for pragmatic reasons, this language is believed to have a canonical order subject + object + verb, especially in sentences involving transitive verbs with two third person singular argument noun phrases, in order to avoid ambiguity:

possible, I will make reference to the way that each scholar analyzes third person singular, which is crucial to examine the relative order among pronominal affixes.

According to Riggs (1852: 30), when a verb contains forms of both series, the stative series precedes the active series<sup>11</sup>. Apart from this general rule, he adds an exception formed by the first person plural affix *ni*, which is always placed before the second person affix *ni* or *ya*, whether the form is active or stative. Later, Riggs (1893: 57) posits another rule: when one personal pronoun represents the subject and another represents the object of the same verb, the first person, regardless of its grammatical function, is placed before the second. Moreover, *wičha* always precedes the rest of pronouns. As regards the third person singular form, although this author does not explicitly say whether the third person singular affix exists or not, he mentions, since it is the most common form of expression, the third person of active verbs is never marked through an ‘incorporated pronoun’ (Riggs, 1852: 10).

Buechel (1939: 39) argues that if two person markers occur on one and the same verb, these markers follow the order Third-First-Second person. Regarding the third person pronoun, he states that, although these «inseparable» pronominal forms, except for the third person plural form *wičha*, are not overtly expressed, they are contained in the verb (1939: 37-40).

Following Riggs, Boas and Deloria (1941: 76) claim that the order of affixes within the verbal complex in Lakota responds to a double general rule: the object form always precede the subject form and the first person always precedes the second. According to

- 
- (i) Wičháša kiŋ wíŋyaŋ kiŋ ó-Ø-Ø-kiye  
man the woman the STEM-3SG:ACT-3SG:STA-help  
‘The man helped the woman.’
- (ii) Wíŋyaŋ kiŋ wičháša kiŋ ó-Ø-Ø-kiye  
Man the woman the STEM-3SG:ACT-3SG:STA-help  
‘The woman helped the man.’

<sup>11</sup>Riggs (1852: 30) uses the terms ‘objective’ and ‘subjective’ for ‘stative’ and ‘active’ respectively.

these authors' analysis (Boas and Deloria, 1941: 76), there is no third person pronoun<sup>12</sup>, but they do not mention whether it is specified covertly or whether it simply does not exist. Furthermore, they admit (Boas and Deloria, 1941: 77) the existence of some exceptions to this generalization, such as the special case of 'neutral verbs with two objects' or stative transitive verbs including two stative cross-referencing forms.

About thirty years later, Van Valin retakes the task of analysing the order of elements in the Lakota verb and describes this order as templatic, with object forms preceding subject forms<sup>13</sup> (1977: 6). As exception he mentions the case of the 'we-you (singular)' and 'we-you (plural)' forms, which are represented by the affix combination *uŋ-ni-...* and *uŋ-ni-...(pi)* respectively. He analyses Lakota affixal person markers as pronominal arguments, relying on their complementary distribution as evidence. He states (1977: 12) that verbs mark third person covertly and represents it through a zero form, except for the third person plural animate object, *wičha*.

Schwartz (1979: 8) suggests that the third person verbal affix always precedes the first person affix, both of which precede the second person affix. Therefore, a Third-First-Second person hierarchy determines the order of cross-referencing forms. Although she does not explicitly indicate whether the third person singular marker exists or not, she does point out that the third person is not represented by an affix (Schwartz, 1979: 7).

Miner (1979: 37) claims that subject affixes are preceded by object affixes, except in the sequence first person- second person singular or plural. Regarding the marking of the third person, this author points out that the third person singular form has a zero affix (Miner, 1979: 36).

According to Williamson (1979: 30) the order of the verbal prefixes in this language depends on person rather than grammatical

---

<sup>12</sup> It must be assumed that they are referring to pronominal affixes, rather than pronouns.

<sup>13</sup> Van Valin regards the notions of subject and object as irrelevant, choosing instead to rely on semantic macro-roles of Actor and Undergoer.

relation and the ordering hierarchy is Third-First-Second person. She arranges all the verbal prefixes (including a wide range of different markers such as locative, instrument, benefactive, dative, reflexive, reciprocal, agreement, etc.) in fixed slots and differentiate between those prefixes that alter the argument structure (e.g. *wa*, locative, instrument, *wičha*, etc.) and those that satisfy it (e.g. dative, benefactive, person agreement markers). She recognizes a verb class of ‘double-object’ predicates, which have two arguments, both of them in the stative form (Williamson, 1979: 85-86). Regarding this type of verbs, she agrees with Boas and Deloria that there is a fixed order for the two stative cross-referencing forms in transitive stative verbs and therefore an ambiguity regarding their meaning (Williamson, 1979: 86). With respect to the marking of the third person, Williamson mentions that the third person singular pronominal affix is null and that inanimates are never marked (Williamson, 1979: 73).

Shaw (1980: 12) assumes a basic subject + object + verb NP order for Dakota, which, owing to the possible cases of ambiguity, is the primary indicator of grammatical relations. She argues that the pronominal order in Dakota languages is determined by the surface template third-first-second, regardless of the subject - object functions of the pronouns. Likewise, she also recognizes the exceptional situation illustrated in ‘double-object’ verbs. In order to adequately account for such exceptional order, she posits that the ordering principle that determines the surface structure order of the pronominal prefixes in these languages is as follows: *wičha – uŋ(k) – ni/čhi – ma/wa – ya*. This scholar notes that the third person is always unmarked, with the only exception being the verbal prefix *wičha*, which codes animate plural objects (Shaw, 1980: 10-11).

De Reuse (1983: 88) states the order of the NP arguments in Lakota is as follows: subject + object + V, when two NPs are present and, regarding the order of affixes, he mentions that the affix order in this language is usually object + subject + verb. Likewise, this linguist analyzes third person singular forms as zero pronominal affixes.



Rood and Taylor (1996: 468) posit the object + subject affix order, although they list a number of exceptions to this rule, such as: *uŋ* precedes all affixes except *wičha*; the portmanteau form *či* for the combination first person agent-second person singular or plural patient; some forms in *y*-stem and nasal stem intransitive verbs (e.g. *yal* and *yan*); the position of the enclitic pluralizer *pi*; the ambiguity caused by the fixed order shown by affixes in stative verbs with two objects. Regarding the latter exception, they attribute a rigidly fixed order second person + first person to the verbal affixes in these sentences, that is *ni* always precedes *ma* regardless of the grammatical function, hence this ordering always leads to semantic ambiguity. Although they affirm that a Third + Second + First person order would account for these exceptions, they restrict the number of affix ordering principles operating in a language to one. Accordingly, and despite the aforementioned exceptions, they favour the object-subject order. Rood and Taylor posit that, except for the third person plural animate (i.e. *wičha*), there is no affix for third person (Rood and Taylor, 1996: 465) and represent the third person singular participants through a null marker in their chart containing combinations between the two affixes (Rood and Taylor, 1996: 466), which appears to imply that the remaining third person markers are covertly specified.

Ingham (2003: 19) argues that the patient marker usually precedes the agent when participants playing these two semantic roles co-occur in a sentence, with the exception that the first person plural marker *uŋ(ε)* always precedes second person, irrespective of its semantic role. As regards the marking of the third person singular, he simply mentions that it lies unmarked (Ingham, 2003: 18).

Rankin (2006: 542) claims that patient precedes agent regardless of person. This author mentions that third person singular is never marked, although he represents it through a zero marker in the chart including a hypothetical ordering of the Dakotan prefixes (Rankin, 2006: 541).

Woolford (2008: 3), observing a distinction between the behaviour exhibited by stative and active forms, which he classifies

as clitics and agreement markers respectively, argues that, when more than one syntactic clitic is present within the verbal complex, the order of these forms is determined by two types of alignment, that is a plural + dual + singular number hierarchy and a Third + Second + First person hierarchy, with number having precedence over person.

The grammar section of the Lakŋota Language Consortium dictionary (2011: 771) provides a chart including all the possible combinations of verbal affixes in transitive constructions but does not make reference to any specific ordering principle. In this chart, the cross-referencing of third person singular participants is indicated by null marker  $\emptyset$ .

### 3. Discussion on the ordering of affixes in monotransitive constructions

There are two main accounts of the relative order of the relative order of pronominal affixes: one makes reference to the person and the other to the grammatical function and/or semantic role<sup>14</sup> of the argument with which the pronominal affix corefers. The only exception to the first principle is found in the situation involving the transitive stative verbs or also called ‘double-patient’ verbs<sup>15</sup>, while the combination of a first person plural subject marker *uŋ* and a second person singular or plural object marker *ni* forms the only

---

<sup>14</sup> The only semantic roles that are taken into account are agent and patient in a monotransitive construction and agent and recipient or beneficiary in a ditransitive or benefactive construction, since Lakota shows secundative alignment and, therefore, the recipient or beneficiary is considered the primary object and is coded in the same way as the monotransitive patient, but differently from the ditransitive theme, which is never overtly cross-referenced. The dative and benefactive markers *ki* ‘to’ and *kii* ‘for’ are therefore not taken into consideration in the ordering since they behave as applicative markers, that is, they indicate that a new participant has been added to the argument structure of the predicate (i.e. the recipient or beneficiary) and that the overt reference to another participant (i.e. the theme) has been suppressed, and their form remains invariable regardless of the person of the participant functioning as primary object.

<sup>15</sup> This term is rather misleading since it implies that the two arguments of these verbs have the semantic role of patient, when this is not correct.

exception to the second principle. Thus, basically, both principles appear to be equally simple and general.

As regards transitive stative verbs, it has generally been believed (Boas and Deloria, 1941; Williamson, 1979; Rood and Taylor, 1996; among others) that this class of verbs presents two stative forms as affixes, and that the order of these cross-referencing pronominal affixes follow a rigidly fixed order second person + first person. Consequently, these sentences are believed to be ambiguous with regard to which prefix is interpreted as subject and which as object agreement, thereby having two diametrically different translations:

- (1) Iye-ni-ma-čheča  
INSTR<sup>16</sup>-2SG:STA-1SG:STA-resemble  
'I resemble you.' or 'You resemble me.' (Boas and Deloria, 1941: 77)
- (2) I-ni-ma-ta  
INSTR- 2SG:STA-1SG:STA-proud of  
'I am proud of you.' or 'You are proud of me.' (Boas and Deloria, 1941: 77)

The main problem concerning the analysis of these forms lies in the fact that they are extremely rare even in older written sources and that there is hardly any evidence of early stages of development in this language, insofar as it was first put into written form by missionaries around 1840. It is therefore very difficult to reconstruct the pre-history of this construction in this language and, consequently, the only way to access to the language historical development is an indirect one: the comparison with other, related languages within the same family. Thus, after consulting native informants speaking three different but closely related Sioux languages, that is, Sičhángu (Brulé) Lakota, Íyârhe (Stoney) Nakoda,

---

<sup>16</sup> Cumberland (2005: 224) classifies prefixes such as *a*, *i*, or *o* as locatives with the meanings of 'at/on', 'by means of / with / against / in reference to', and 'in/within' respectively. She also adds that sometimes two different locative prefixes may co-occur, being then separated by an epenthetic *-j-* or a glottal stop.

and Sisíthuŋwaŋ-Waǰpéthuŋwaŋ (Sisseton-Wahpeton) Dakota, I have found out that some speakers consider it archaic but also grammatically correct to alter the order of these pronominal affixes *ni-ma* on the basis of the grammatical function of the arguments corefering with them. Thus, the following examples in Lakota (3a and 3b), Nakoda<sup>17</sup> (4a and 4b) and Dakota (5a and 5b) illustrate how it is possible to find occurrences of pronominal affixes that follow the order *ma-ni*:

- |        |                                                                               |               |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| (3) a. | I-ni-ma-štušte<br>INSTR-2SG: STA-1SG: STA-tired of<br>'I am tired of you.'    | ye/yelo<br>IF |
| b.     | I-ma-ni-štušte<br>INSTR-1SG: STA-2SG: STA- tired of<br>'You are tired of me.' | ye/yelo<br>IF |
| (4) a. |                                                                               |               |
|        | I-ni-ma-stusta<br>INSTR-2SG: STA-1SG: STA-tired of<br>'I am tired of you.'    |               |
| b.     | I-ma-ni-stusta<br>INSTR-1SG: STA-2SG: STA-tired of<br>'You are tired of me.'  |               |

---

<sup>17</sup> West (2003: 107) provides the following examples in Assiniboine Nakota that confirm this hypothesis:

- |      |                                                                              |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (i)  | I-ni-ma-stusta<br>INSTR-2SG: STA-1SG: STA-tired of<br>'You are tired of me.' |
| (ii) | I-ma-ni-stusta<br>INSTR-1SG: STA-2SG: STA- tired of<br>'I am tired of you.'  |

However, as will be argued below, unlike her, I argue that the order of the two stative forms is object + subject, rather than subject + object.



examine', *inóglakA* 'tell sth about', *anánvizji* 'be jealous of' or *ihát'A* 'laugh at'. These transitive uses of both stative and active verbs are either not recognized or regarded as archaic by most speakers today. They could therefore be considered a reflection of a more synthetic period in the evolution of this language. Accordingly, these prefixes, such as *i-* or *a-*, may have lost their original locative or instrumental meaning and have now acquired a new meaning. In the case of the prefix *i-*, although it is believed to have originally meant 'at / against', its modern meanings appear to be those of 'with / on account of / with reference to / with respect to' (Buechel, 1936: 116; Cumberland, 2005: 224). Thus, formerly, when the language had a more synthetic nature, these locatives and instrumental markers were originally prefixed to the verbal complex bearing their object. Over time, in its development towards a more analytic language, Lakota started to make use of postpositions, which attracted their objects by taking them out of the verbal complex. Subsequently, these postpositions have inserted the object / object marker / object pronoun in front of the adposition, as can be observed in the following pair of sentences:

- (8) a. Ikhiyéla uŋ-ya-thi-pi  
       LOC       1: STA-2SG: ACT-live-PL  
       'You live near us.'
- b. Uŋk-ikhiyéla-pi ya-thi  
       1: STA-LOC-PL     2SG: ACT-live  
       'You live near us.'

Example (8a) is believed to contain an older form than that in (8b) and therefore this could reflect the evolution of this language from a polysynthetic nature to a more analytic one. An even more ancient feature of this language could have consisted in having the adposition attached to the verbal complex as a prefix, as the verb *thi* in (8a) shows.

Thus, forms like *inimatay* 'I am proud of you' were originally formed by a prepositional affix along with its object plus the obligatory argument of the non-verbal predicate *atáy* 'proud of'. In

summary, instead of being transitive stative verbs, they would be considered intransitive stative verbs with obliques. The problem is that, as both the oblique argument and the argument which is obligatorily subcategorized for by the verb occur in stative form, there is no morphosyntactic distinction today between these two arguments in terms of case.

Taking this assumption into consideration, we can assume that it was formerly also possible to build similar constructions, where the two stative cross-referencing forms involve the forms *wičha* and *uŋ(k)*, as illustrated by the following (hypothetical) constructions:

(9) ??? I-ma-wičha-štušta  
INSTR-1SG: STA-3PL: STA-tired.of  
‘They are tired of me.’

(10) ??? I-ni-uŋ-štušta-pi  
INSTR-1SG: STA-1: STA-tired of-PL  
‘We are tired of you.’

Nevertheless, although the examples (3-7) appear to confirm this hypothesis, far more work is required before it can be substantiated.

Finally, as third person singular arguments are never overtly cross-referenced on the Lakota verb, the remainder of the section attempts to provide, from a diachronic perspective, an explanation of the status of the third person plural form *wičha*, which serves to define more precisely the principle determining the ordering of pronominal affixes in Lakota.

Although it is not easy to determine the behaviour of the form *wičha*, the fact that there exists an homonymous term meaning ‘human or man’ could reflect a case of grammaticalization<sup>20</sup> by

---

<sup>20</sup> Rankin (2006: 542) claims that Proto-Siouan \**wu•k-* ‘man, person’ was incorporated and grammaticalized early, becoming the third person plural marker. According to Koontz (p.c.), *wičha* could come from *wičhaša* (Santee Dakota > *wičhastá*) ‘man’. Heine and Kuteva (2002: 208) also cite a similar example of grammaticalization from Lendu, a language where the lexical word ‘people’ is grammaticalized to a third person plural pronoun.

which the noun *wičha*, through different stages of development<sup>21</sup>, evolved into a syntactic clitic, which attached to the left edge of many verbs cross-referencing an argument expressing a non-specific collective noun (e.g. *wičháčheya* ‘wail’, *wičhabAŋ* ‘stand’, *wičhíyokíphi* ‘be happy’, *wičhóthi* ‘camp’, etc.), and finally became a pronominal affix standing for a third person plural animate subject and object marker of the stative series.

Williamson (1984: 78) appears to consider *wičha* a clitic, that is a suppletive form for *pi*, which in broad terms mark objects and subjects respectively since, while *wičha* is mostly restricted to third person plural animate objects<sup>22</sup>, *pi* occurs mostly with all plural animate subjects<sup>23</sup>.

Pustet and Rood (2008: 344-345) also provide evidence that this marker *wičha* can be used non-referentially:

- (11) Aŋpétu iyóhila owáchekiye kiŋ lená wa<sup>24</sup>-Ø-káħla-pi  
 na hená  
 day each church the these STEM-3: STA-ring-  
 PL and those  
 wichá-Ø-ħa-pi<sup>25</sup>  
 people-3:ACT-bury-APD

‘Every day the church bells rang and people were buried/there were funerales.’

---

<sup>21</sup> Hopper and Traugott (2003: 7)‘s ‘cline of grammaticalization’ illustrates the various stages of the form: content word → grammatical word → clitic → inflectional affix.

<sup>22</sup> *Wičha* also crossreferences third person plural animate collective subjects in intransitive stative verbs and in some intransitive active verbs.

<sup>23</sup> This is a broad generalization since, although *pi* does not occur with third person plural collective objects, it does crossreference first and second person plural objects in transitive verbs.

<sup>24</sup> *Wa-* is considered an inanimate patient dereferentializer in Pustet and Rood (2008: 342) or an indefinite object marker in LLC (2011: 578).

<sup>25</sup> Pustet and Rood (2008: 336) regards *pi* as an ‘agent impersonalizer’ or AGIPS when it does not refer to a specific animate plural referent. It seems to have an agent-suppressing function and therefore it does not convey the idea of plurality.



In this example, *wičha* does not refer to any specific plural referent and consequently it functions as an ‘animate patient dereferentializer’ or APD (Pustet and Rood, 2008: 344). In this use, it would not be possible to insert a third person plural animate patient corefering with *wičha* because it has suppressed reference to this patient.

Thus, the hypothetical course of events would reflect the following progression: a content word<sup>26</sup> develops firstly into dereferentializing clitic (or affix), with no overtly specified referent<sup>27</sup>, and finally into a grammatical morpheme indicating third person plural, which cross-references a plural argument NP functioning as patient that can be both overtly or covertly specified. In this last step, it does not only corefer with patients in transitive constructions, but also with collective agents of most stative verbs and some active verbs<sup>28</sup>.

To summarize, this grammatical morpheme developed out of a lexical item or content word with a generalized meaning – an important condition for grammaticalization – and prefixed to the left side of the verb, further away from the verb root than the inflectional morphemes (e.g. person agreement markers). What seems evident is that, regardless of whether *wičha* is either a syntactic clitic or an agreement marker, this pronominal argument occurs at the left edge of the verbal complex. Therefore, it precedes all the true agreement markers forms. Hence it can now be considered a mirror image of the plural number clitic *pi*, which always follows the verb. This supports Mithun (2000)‘s assumption that the order of

---

<sup>26</sup> Boas and Deloria (1941: 76) considers *wičha* not a pronoun but a noun meaning ‘person’ which has grammaticalized.

<sup>27</sup> E.g.:

(i)	Wič(a)-íyo-Ø-kiphi	i-bl-uŋhe
	people-INSTR-1SG:STA-be.pleased	STEM-1SG:ACT-try
	‘I try to please people.’	

<sup>28</sup> E.g.: *Wičhášiče* ‘They (as a group) are bad.’ or *Wičhawákhija* ‘They (as a group) confer in council.’

morphemes in a language appears to reflect their historical order of grammaticalization, in such a way that those affixes closest to the root are indeed the oldest, and those on the periphery of words can be seen to be more recent additions.

Accordingly, bearing in mind that *wičha* did not originally behave as a true agreement marker and that the third person is not overtly marked in this language, and consequently, it is impossible to discern its position within the verbal complex, it seems plausible to conclude that the ordering of the pronominal affixes marking person can be reduced to the analysis of the combination between first person and second person forms. Except for the combination first person singular agent and second person singular or plural patient, both of which are represented by the portmanteau form *ičhi*, the remaining combinations render the order first person + second person, which appears to have been the original ordering principle<sup>29</sup>.

#### 4. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to tackle the problem of the linear ordering of pronominal affixes in Lakota. After revising all the existent literature on this issue, and taking into account that, firstly, the plural clitic *-pi* can not be included in the analysis since it has no bearing on the relative order of affixes, secondly, the form *wičha* must not be included either, since it was not an affix in its origin and therefore its position reflects its order of attachment, and finally, third person singular is never marked overtly on the Lakota verb, I conclude that we can only analyze affix order in this language diachronically and that the search for an ordering principle of affixes in this language must be reduced to the one exhibited by the combination between first and second persons, which leads to the

---

<sup>29</sup> Following Buechel (1939: 39), I argue that the portmanteau form *ičhi* is indeed a more modern form, the original form being the expected combination first person + second person *wa-ni*.

order first person + second person. Consequently, this conclusion aims to bring the long-standing debate regarding the ordering of pronominal affixes to an end.

## 5. Bibliographic references

- Boas, Franz and Deloria, Ella Cara (1941): *Dakota Grammar*, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Dakota Press.
- Buechel, Eugene (1924): *Bible history in the language of the Teton Sioux Indians*, New York, Benziger Brothers.
- (1939): *A Grammar of Lakota: the language of the Teton Sioux Indians*, Saint Francis Mission, South Dakota, Rosebud Educational Society.
- (1978): *Lakota tales and texts*, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, Red Cloud Indian School.
- Buechel, Eugene and Manhart, Paul (2002<sup>2</sup>): *Lakota Dictionary: Lakota-English/English-Lakota. New Comprehensive Edition*, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press.
- Deloria, Ella Cara (2006<sup>2</sup>): *Dakota texts*, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press.
- De Reuse, Willem J. (1983): *A grammar of the Lakota Noun Phrase, Master's Thesis*, University of Kansas.
- (1994): «Noun incorporation in Lakota (Siouan)», *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Chicago, University of Chicago, 60, pp. 199–260.
- Hale, Ken (1972): «A new perspective on American Indian Linguistics», in Ortiz, Alfonso, ed., *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, Albuquerque, New Mexico, University of New Mexico Press, pp. 87-103.
- Heine, Bernd and Kuteva, Tania (2002): *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Traugott, Elizabeth C. (2003): *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ingham, Bruce (2003): *Lakota*, Lincom Europa: München.
- Lakota Language Consortium (2011<sup>2</sup>): *New Lakŕota Dictionary*, Bloomington: Lakota Language Consortium.

- Legendre, Geraldine and Rood, David S. (1992): «On the interaction of grammar components in Lakhota: Evidence from Split Intransitivity», *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, California: University of California Berkeley, 18, pp. 380-394.
- Miner, Kenneth L. (1979): «Discussion: the order of Dakota person affixes: the rest of the data», in *Glossa*, Gurabo, Puerto Rico, Universidad del Turabo, 13, pp. 35-42.
- Mithun, Marianne (2000): «The reordering of morphemes», in Gildea, Spike, ed., *Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 231–255.
- Pustet, Regina and Rood, David S. (2008): «Argument dereferentialization in Lakota», in Donohue, Mark and Søren Wichmann, eds., *The Typology of semantic alignment*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 334-356.
- Rankin, Robert L. (2006): «The interplay of synchronic and diachronic discovery in Siouan grammar-writing», in Ameika, Felix K., Alan Dench and Nicholas Evans, eds., *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*, Berlin / New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 527-547.
- Riggs, Stephen R. (1852): *Grammar and dictionary of the Dakota language*, Washington, Smithsonian Institution.
- (1893): *Dakota grammar, texts and ethnography*, Washington, Government Printing Office.
- Rood, David S. and Taylor, Allan R. (1996): «Sketch of Lakhota, a Siouan language», in Goddard, Ives, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians: Languages*, Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 17, pp. 440-482.
- Schudel, Emily (1997): «Elicitation and analysis of Nakoda texts from Southern Saskatchewan», M.A. Thesis, Regina, Saskatchewan, University of Regina.
- Schwartz, Linda (1979): «The order of Dakota Person Affixes: an evaluation of alternatives», *Glossa*, Gurabo, Puerto Rico, Universidad del Turabo, 13, pp. 3-11.
- Shaw, Patricia A. (1980): *Theoretical issues in Dakota phonology and morphology*, New York, Garland.

- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. (1977): «Aspects of Lakhota syntax. A study of Lakhota syntax and its implications for universal grammar», Ph.D., University of California at Berkeley.
- (1985): «Case marking and the structure of the Lakhota clause», in Nichols, Johanna and Anthony Woodbury, eds., *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 363-413.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. and Foley, William (1980): «Role and Reference Grammar», in Moravcsik, Edith A. and Jessica R. Wirth, eds., *Current Approaches to Syntax. Syntax and Semantics*, New York, Academic Press, 13, pp. 329-352.
- West, Shannon L. (2003): «Subjects and objects in Assiniboine Nakoda». Ph.D. Thesis. University of Regina.
- Williamson, Janis (1979): «*Patient marking in Lakhota and the Unaccusative Hypothesis*», *Papers from the Fifteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, University of Chicago.
- (1984): «*Studies in Lakhota Grammar*», Ph.D. Thesis, University of California.
- Woolford, Ellen (2008): *Active-Stativ Agreement in Lakota: person and number alignment and portmanteau formation*, Amherst, Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts.