Switch-Reference

Andrew McKenzie
Assistant Professor
Department of Linguistics
University of Kansas

Introduction

Switch-reference (SR) describes morphemes associated with clause junctures that typically indicate whether the subjects of those clauses co-refer. If the subjects co-refer, the juncture expresses SS (same-subject) marking. If the subjects are disjoint, they are marked with DS (different-subject) marking. In clauses without overt nominal expressions, SR is often the only indication in a discourse of who is doing what While SR typically involves subject reference, in many languages, SR can ignore subjects altogether. In these 'non-canonical' cases, SR is usually sensitive to continuity or discontinuity of the events in the discourse. SS and DS are still used as abbreviations even if subjects are not involved. While linguists had noticed SR early in the 20th century (e.g., Edward Sapir 1930's grammar of Southern Paiute) that conjunctions in a few languages were sensitive to subject co-reference, William Jacobsen was the first to notice SR cross-linguistically and propose it as an actual morpheme, in his 1967 "Switch-reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan." Since then, it has been found in countless languages all over the world outside of Europe. The literature on switch-reference can be difficult to classify because much of it

has a toe in three distinct streams. First is descriptive work on SR, which can be split based on language and language area. SR languages virtually all require fieldwork, and the literature on SR reflects the areal focus of field linguists. Second, SR highlights the interface between modules of the grammar by directly involving the syntax, semantics, and the discourse. Third, SR study offers a space where descriptive, formal, and functional traditions converse with each other.

Areal and Typological Surveys

Switch-reference systems are found in hundreds of languages. A primary step toward understanding it as a universally available structure involves finding patterns in its form and usage. No survey or study of SR worldwide has been published, but several surveys have been published about certain areas, starting with Austin 1981. The areal nature of these surveys reflects the understanding that the systems vary typologically from one region to another. SR systems tend to be found in areal clusters, and each survey focuses on one cluster. Roberts 1997 extensively covers Papua New Guinea. Jacobsen 1983 and McKenzie 2015 offer surveys of North America. SR is virtually completely absent from Mesoamerica, so no survey can be made. No one to date has surveyed the South American cluster in as much detail, but Ciccone & Nercesian 2015 provides a nice overview. Around the world, some tendencies have been noted in SR systems. One salient tendency is areal diffusion, first noted by Austin 1981 for Australia (Dixon 2002 updates Austin's findings). Another observation is that SR appears with nearly every type of clause juncture. McKenzie 2015 explicitly points out that SR occurs with coordination, subordination, and clause-chaining.   Ciccone & Nercesian 2015 describes clause diversity in South American SR languages, also noting a variety of clause types.

Austin, Peter. 1981. Switch-reference in Australia. *Language* 57: 309-334.
> Influential survey of SR systems in Australian languages. Based on geographic proximity and genetic dissimilitude of SR languages there, he proposes that SR spread by areal diffusion.

Ciccone, Florencia and Nercesian, Verónica. 2015. Seguimiento referencial en lenguas sudamericanas: mecanismos sintácticos/pragmaticos y distribución geográfica. In *Language Contact and Documentation*, Edited by Bernard Comrie and Lucía Golluscio, 239-320. Berlin: De Gruyter.
> Uses geographic distribution of SR languages in South America to argue for areal diffusion, and classifies local languages based on the type of SR or other reference-tracking system.

Dixon, R.M.W. 2002. *Australian Languages*. London: Routledge.
> Sections on SR are mainly a recap of Austin 1981, but with a focus on ergativity and updated maps.

Jacobsen Jr., William H. 1983. Typological and Genetic Notes on Switch-Reference in North American Languages. In *Switch-Reference in Universal Grammar.* Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro, 151-183. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
> Arranges information about SR systems in over 30 languages with SR in the North American linguistic region. Makes interesting typological generalizations that permit asking the question of the origin of SR morphemes.

McKenzie, Andrew. 2015. A survey of switch-reference in North America. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81: 409-448. (supplemental material online) [doi: 10.1086/681580]
> Catalogues SR morphemes in nearly 70 languages with SR. Survey targets major empirical and theoretical questions that have emerged in the SR literature since Jacobsen's survey. Article

summarizes the survey, while the supplemental material contains the survey itself: Tables listing SR languages and their known properties pertaining to SR.

Roberts, John. 1997. Switch-reference in Papua New Guinea. In *Papers in Papuan Linguistics No. 3*. Edited by Andrew Pauley, 101-241. Canberra: Australian National University.
> Catalogues SR systems representing more than 50 *families* of languages in the eastern half of New Guinea. Emphasizes interactions of SR morphemes with agreement and TAM morphology on medial linking verbs.

Edited Collections

On several occasions, SR researchers have met in conference, and published a book based on the papers presented therein. By far the most influential of these is Haiman and Munro 1983, whose introduction laid out many of the questions that still orient SR research, especially in typological or functionalist domains. Munro 1980 focuses on American languages, while Austin 1988 provides new perspectives on Australian languages. Some of the collections are broader in scope, focusing on complex clauses in general. In these, switch-reference adds one perspective to the entire collection, for instance subordination (van Gijn et al 2012) or interaction with the discourse (van Gijn 2014).

Austin, Peter, ed. 1988 *Complex Sentence Constructions in Australian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> Volume with information about several Australian languages with SR.

Haiman, John and Pamela Munro, eds. 1983. *Switch-Reference in Universal Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> Classic volume representing culmination of early phase of descriptive work on SR, and setting stage for later research, especially in functionalist directions.

Munro, Pamela, ed. 1980. Studies of Switch-Reference. UCLA Papers in Syntax 8.
> Useful volume with several thorough descriptive and analytic accounts of SR systems.

Gijn, Rik van, Katharina Haude, and Pieter Muysken, eds. 2012. *Subordination in native South American languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> Collection containing a couple of accounts of subordination involving SR.

Gijn, Rijk van, ed. 2014. Information Structure and Reference Tracking in Complex Sentences. Typological Studies in Language 105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> This collection addresses SR as part of a larger functional system of reference-tracking devices.

Descriptive Accounts

After Jacobsen 1967 (cited under *Early Descriptive Accounts from North America*), which introduces switch-reference as a morpheme in the structural sense, descriptive linguists the world over began to find it. Much of the early work on SR emerged in Americanist papers in the 1970's, culminating in Haiman and Munro 1983 (cited under *Edited Collections*). Investigations of SR took off in other areal groups as well: Australia in the 1980's, Papua New Guinea in the 1990's, South America in the 2000's. In addition, SR has been found in Oceania, Africa, India, and Siberia. A lot of information about SR is strewn across countless reference grammars, because virtually all SR research has required fieldwork--- it is completely absent from Indo-European, Turkic, Semitic, Sinitic and other East Asian languages. SR research has increasingly focused on `non-canonical' SR, where SR is context-sensitive and ignores subjects. As a

result, the examination of texts and context-based elicitation have become crucial in SR fieldwork.

Early Descriptive Accounts from North America

Switch-reference was first investigated by Americanist anthropologists, who focused on accurate, atheoretic linguistic description. Jacobsen 1967's seminal article set the stage. Oswalt 1976 and Moser 1978 employ SR marking as evidence of genetic relation, while Winter 1975 relies on known relations to explore Yuman languages. McLendon 1975 and Oswalt 1976 reveal the complexity of Pomoan SR marker. Munro 1976 in particular stands out for its thoroughness and emphasis on distinguishing uses of SR.

Jacobsen Jr., William H. 1967. "Switch-reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan." In *Southwestern Linguistics*. Edited by Dell Hymes and William Bittle, 238-263. The Hague: Mouton.
>   Seminal paper introducing *switch-reference* as a morpheme. He only meant the term to describe
>   what we now call DS marking, but over the next decade it became to be used for the
>   phenomenon as a whole. This paper focuses on Washo and Tonkawa, but suggests a wide
>   distribution.

McLendon, Sally. 1975. *A Grammar of Eastern Pomo*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol. 74. Berkeley: University of California Press.
>   One of many works from the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages that describe SR
>   systems.

Moser, Mary. 1978. Switch-Reference in Seri. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44: 113-120.
>   Expands SR awareness in support of the Hokan grouping.

Munro, Pamela. 1976. *Mojave Syntax*. New York: Garland.
>   Contains thorough discussion of SR.

Oswalt, Robert L. 1976. Switch-reference in Maiduan: An Areal and Typological Contribution
>   Discusses synchronic and historic implications of SR in this California family.

Sapir, Edward. 1930. *Southern Paiute, a Shoshonean Language*. Volume 65 of the Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences 1. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
>   Describes how subordinating connectives are sensitive to subject co-reference, but does not
>   notice SR as representing a distinct morpheme.

Winter, Werner 1976. Switch-reference in Yuman languages. In M. Langdon and S. Silver (Eds.), Hokan Studies, Number 184 in Janua Linguarum, series practica, pp. 165–74. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
>   Adds information about SR in Southwestern languages.

Recent North American Reference Grammars

Some descriptive material can be found in a number of papers, but much of it is sprinkled throughout reference grammars. In some cases, SR barely warranted mention. More recently, reference grammars contain highly detailed discussions of SR and its interaction with the other parts of the grammar. These discussions tend to reflect the author's research strengths. Broadwell 2006 focuses on the syntax from a generative perspective. Miller 2001 explores problems with syncretism. Graczyk 2007, Martin 2011, and Marlett 2013 insightfully integrate SR into the discussion of the grammar as a whole. Walker 2013 discusses contextual effects in detail.

Broadwell, George Aaron. 2006. *A Choctaw Grammar*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Parade of clause types and interaction with the syntax of subjects.

Givón, T. 2011. *Ute Reference Grammar*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
An interesting balance of functionalist and structuralist perspectives.

Graczyk, Randolph. 2007. *A Grammar of Crow.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Simply lovely examples and careful consideration of semantic effects.

Martin, Jack. 2011. *A Grammar of Muskogee (Creek)*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Covers a wide variety of semantic issues with SR, and includes a statistical survey of the frequency of `non-canonical' SR.

Miller, Amy. 2001. *A Grammar of Jamul Tipaay*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
Detailed discussion of clause-chaining and difficulties caused by ambiguity and syncretism.

Marlett, Stephen A. 2013-ongoing. **A Not-so-short Grammar of Seri* [http://arts-sciences.und.edu/summer-institute-of-linguistics/faculty/marlett-steve/marlett-seri-grammar-latest-draft.pdf]*.
Exploration of SR, clause types, and interactions with the context. Contains numerous detailed and lengthy examples to show the contexts involved.

Walker, Neil Alexander 2013. *A Grammar of Southern Pomo*. Ph. D. thesis, University of California at Santa Barbara.
The most recently documented Pomoan language; grammar includes discussion of context effects.

Africa

Africa is associated with logophoricity, but clearly distinct switch-reference systems are attested. They are found in two clusters. One is in Ethiopia; Amha 2001 gives a detailed description of Maale, while Treis 2012 describes a number of systems there. The other is in West Central Africa. Wiesemann 1982 argues for SR in certain Bantu languages of Cameroon. Carlson 1994 examines Supyiré SR in detail. Comrie 1983 discusses an SR system in Nigeria, but not in great detail.

Amha, Azeb. 2001. *The Maale Language*. Leiden: CNWS.
Detailed study of SR in an Omotic language of Ethiopia.

Carlson, Robert. 1994. *A Grammar of Supyire*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Pioneering study of SR in a Niger-Congo language of Mali.

Comrie, Bernard. 1983. *Switch-reference in Huichol: A Typological Study*.
Compares North American language Huichol to Nigerian language Gokana and New Guinea language Kobon.

Treis, Yvonne. 2012. Switch-reference and Omotic-Cushitic language contact in Southwest Ethiopia. *Journal of Language Contact*, Brill Online Books and Journals edition 1: 80-116.
Reveals SR to be fairly widespread in parts of Ethiopia.

Wiesemann, Ursula. 1982. Switch-reference in Bantu languages. *Journal of West African Languages* 12: 43-57.
> Small study of SR in some Cameroon languages.

Asia
Switch-reference is found in a few places in Asia. Anderson 2008 describes several systems in the Munda languages of Eastern India. Maslova 2003a and Maslova 2003b detail SR in Yukaghir languages of Eastern Siberia.

Anderson, Gregory, ed. 2008. *Munda Languages*. London: Routledge.
> Collection of small reference grammars, many of which describe SR systems in this Indian language family.

Maslova, Elena. 2003a. *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. The Hague: Mouton Grammar Library.
> Extensive discussion of SR and its distinction from converbs.

Maslova, Elena. 2003b. *Tundra Yukaghir*. Munich: LINCOM GmbH.
> Small reference grammar with short but interesting discussion of SR.

Australia
A sizeable number of Australian languages have SR, all in the center of the continent. Much of the descriptive work on SR in these languages was done in the 1980's after Austin 1981's survey. Austin 1980 offers a detailed look at Diyari. Wilkins 1988 and Wilkins 1989 discuss Mparntwe Arrernte, while Goddard 1985 explores a Western Desert language. Bowe 1990's discussion of SR in part helps build a theoretical argument for phrase structure in Pitjantjatjara.

Austin, Peter K. 1980. *A Grammar of Diyari*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
> The first detailed grammar of an Australian SR system.

Bowe, Heather J. 1990. *Categories, Constituents and Constituent Order in Pitjantjatjara*. London: Routledge.
> Demonstrates syntactic constraints on word order in this Western Desert language, despite signs of nonconfigurationality. Contains extensive discussion of SR system both with sentential coordination, which is shown to be more discourse-based, and with subordination, which is shown to be subject-based.

Goddard, Cliff 1985. *A Grammar of Yankunytjatjara*. Alice Springs: Institute for Aboriginal Development Press.
> Includes numerous interesting examples of SR.

Wilkins, David P. 1988. Switch-reference in Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda): form, function, and problems of identity. In Austin, P. K. *Complex sentence constructions in Australian languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 141–176.
> Details homophony with case markers.

Wilkins, David P. 1989. *Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda): studies in the structure and semantics of grammar*. PhD dissertation, Australian National University

Larger version of Wilkins 1988.

New Guinea and Oceania

Switch-reference is seen all over New Guinea. Indeed, SR-marked clause chains are a typological hallmark of New Guinea languages. Longacre 1972 introduces clause chains, but does not focus on SR. The first detailed discussion of SR in a New Guinea language is Haiman 1980, and Roberts 1997 (cited under *Areal and Typological Surveys*) offers a survey of the various sorts of systems on the Papuan side. There is no survey of the Indonesian side, but van Enk & de Vries 1997 and Barclay 2008 document different SR languages in that region. MacDonald 1990, Roberts 1998, and Whitehead 2004 discuss particular New Guinea languages in great detail, with numerous excellent examples. Wade 1997's discussion of the New Guinea language Apali may demonstrate that there is more to reference-tracking in some of these languages than simple SR. Oceania is represented mainly by languages spoken on Melanesian islands. Lynch 1983 and Crowley 1998 in particular discuss the "echo subject" form of SR particular to these languages, which involves special agreement prefixes. Bril 2004 discusses what is essentially an SR system, without expressly calling it such.

Barclay, Peter. 2008. A Grammar of Western Dani. LINCOM Europa.
    A comprehensive grammar of one of the largest Papuan languages, with a healthy section devoted to clause chaining and SR. However, its idiosyncratic glossing conventions make it less useful than it could be.

Bril, Isabelle. 2004. Coordination strategies and inclusory constructions in New Caledonian and other Oceanic languages. In M. Haspelmath (Ed.), Coordinating Constructions, pp. 499–536. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.
        Introduces SR, including non-canoncial SR, in the Nêlêmwa language of New Caledonia.

Crowley, Terry. 1998. *An Erromangan (Sye) Grammar.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
        Well-received grammar with discussion on echo-subjects and switch-reference.

Van Enk, Gerrit J. and de Vries, Lourens. The Korowai of Irian Jaya: Their Language in Its Cultural Context. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
    Small but informative section on switch-reference discusses the different structures that lead to various types of non-canonical values.

Haiman, John. 1980. *Hua: A Language of the Eastern New Guinea Highlands*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
        First highly detailed study of SR in a New Guinea language. Also contains a thorough discussion of typological facts concerning SR in New Guinea.

Longacre, Robert E. 1972. *Hierarchy and Universality of Discourse Constitutents in New Guinea Languages.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown U. Press.
        This book is the starting point for reading about clause-chains. It is not particularly helpful for SR *per se*, but is very interesting for trying to situate the structure of clauses that SR-marked connectives are linking.

Lynch, John 1983. Switch-reference in Lenakel. In *Switch-Reference in Universal Grammar.* Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro: 209–221. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Links so-called "echo subject" construction to switch-reference in this language of Vanuatu. It's often cited as a rare case of SR in VO-language, but many others have been found, notably in Africa.

Wade, Martha. 1997. Switch-reference and control in Apalɨ. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 28: 1–16.
Splits SS and DS into distinct systems, based on the observation that in this language, they can appear together. Although that may mean that one of these is not SR.

Macdonald, Lorna. 1990. *A Grammar of Tauya*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
Detailed discussion of SR and effects of clause-chaining.

Roberts, John. 1988. *Amele*. London: Croom Helm.
Extensive reference grammar with important sections devoted to SR.

Whitehead, Carl R. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Menya*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Manitoba.
Follow up on several other projects detailing verb morphology in Menya, and includes discussion of switch-reference.

South America
South America has dozens of SR languages, but most of the systems were not investigated in full until quite recently. Cole 1983 provides information about Quechua dialects. Aikhenvald 2003 details an Arawak language.   A number of useful descriptions of SR systems are contained in surveys about language areas in the continent. Adelaar 2004 notes several systems in Andean languages, while Aikhenvald 2011 describes several systems in the Amazon. Dixon & Aikhenvald 1999's collection on Amazonian languages contains a number of mini-grammars with SR sections, and Campbell & Grondona 2012 does the same, but with a continent-wide scope.

Adelaar, Willem F. H. 2004. *The Languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Survey of Andean languages discusses several SR systems.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2003. *A Grammar of Tariana, from Northwest Amazonia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reference grammar of the only Arawak langauge with SR, highlighting the effects of areal diffusion.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2011. *Languages of the Amazon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Contains information about SR systems in a number of area languages.

Campbell, Lyle and Grondona, Verónica, eds. 2012. *The Indigenous Languages of South America: A Comprehensive Guide*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Contains SR information and sources for dozens of South American languages.

Cole, Peter. 1983. Switch-reference in two Quechua languages. In Switch-reference and universal grammar. Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro: 1-15. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
First work presenting SR in a South American language, focusing on two dialects of Quechua. Argues that a person hierarchy can interfere with the co-reference relations that SR encodes.

Dixon, R.M.W. and Aikhenvald, Alexandra, eds. 1999. The Amazonian Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

> Contains numerous micro-grammars with SR, notably of Tucanoan and Macro-Jê languages.

Dooley, Robert A.1989. Switch Reference in Mbya Guarani: A Fair-Weather Phenomenon. In Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session. Volume 33. Edited by Robert A Dooley and J. Albert Bickford. 93-119. Summer Institute of Linguistics.

> Paper detailing the SR system in this Guarani variety, with an interesting emphasis on subjects that overlap or are empty. Also hints at some context effects,

Non-Canonical Usage and the Discourse

Non-canonical switch-reference occurs when the value of SR does not match what is expected based on the subjects' identity. For instance: if DS appears despite identical subjects. Non-canonical SR forces us to question the morpheme's meaning and function. Two basic sorts of account address this question. One employs it to develop full-fledged theories of switch-reference, which try to incorporate canonical and non-canonical SR as two special cases of a single phenomenon. The theories vary about what that phenomenon is. The other type of account discusses instances of non-canonical SR (usually in a single language), and sketches out a sense of discourse-based coherence or continuity, the presence or lack of which SR is marking across clauses. SS marking would indicate continuity, DS discontinuity. Under these accounts, SR's primary function is to track this coherence, and subject-tracking is simply a common form of coherence.

Theories of Discourse Coherence

Givón 1983 is the first to lay out topic continuity in a broader framework, and is well-cited even beyond the SR literature. O'Connor 1993 adds an explicit role for pragmatics. Stirling 1993 is the key reference, deriving coherence effects from identity of event properties. Lungstrum 1995 employs situations as states of affairs to explain conjunction use in Lakota narratives. McKenzie 2012 argues against Stirling, and employs situations as parts of possible worlds to explain SR's meaning and configurational restrictions. McKenzie 2012 gives the first account of SR to rely on targeted elicitation rather than examples culled from texts.

Givón, Talmy 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: The functional domain of switch-reference. In *Switch-reference and universal grammar.* Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro: 51–82. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

> Argues for a broadening of the perspective on the of SR, to consider a larger function of topic continuity which it serves along with other phenomena like passivization, zero anaphora, and deixis. Influential paper in functionalist research on SR, but largely set aside in generativist research.

Lungstrum, Richard. 1995. *Switch-reference and the structure of Lakhota narrative discourse*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

> Situates SR in Lakota narratives within a Barwise and Perry framework of situations, focusing on its use at boundaries within the discourse.

McKenzie, Andrew. 2012. *Contextual Restriction and Reference-Tracking.* Ph.D. dissertation. University of Massachusetts Amherst.

> First account to emphasize the interaction of syntax and semantics in the distribution of SR.

Demonstrates a difference in configuration: SR with coordinating conjunctions tracks the co-reference of the Kratzerian topic situations of the joined clauses, and is sensitive to context. With intensional subordination, SR tracks subjects.

O'Connor, Mary Catherine. 1993. Disjoint reference and pragmatic inference: Anaphora and switch reference in Northern Pomo. In *The Role of Theory in Language Description.* Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 69. Edited by William A. Foley: 215-242. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Extends Reinhart's pragmatic derivation of binding effects to switch-reference, arguing that SS asserts subject identity. Meanwhile. DS marking is actually open between same or different subject, as it simply marks the lack of SS.

Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-Reference and Discourse Representation.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge U. Press.

First thorough account of the semantics of switch-reference and its interaction with information structure, with special focus on non-canonical DS marking. Proposes that SR indicates agreement between events, based on the parameters of subject co-reference, location co-reference, and actuality. Available in 2005 reprint.

Descriptive Accounts and Non-Formal Proposals

Most accounts of non-canonical SR are brief, and focus on offering the perspective of one language, rather than an explicit theory of SR. Dahlstrom 1982 was the first to link SR to the discourse, focusing on the Siouan language Lakota. Further studies of Siouan languages include Mixco 1997, Torres 2011, and Pustet 2013; Pustet's approach is novel in its use of statistical analysis of texts. Munro 1983 describes three different sources for non-canonical marking in the Muskogean language Chickasaw, some grammatical, some discourse-based. Roberts 1988's detailed discussion focuses on several New Guinea languages rather than just one. Mithun 1993 and Watkins 1993 each provide new perspective on the discourse effects of SR. Comrie 1998 explores the role of discourse in SR markers skipping clauses. Van Gijn 2012 asks a different set of questions: Why does SR serve the functions it does, and why does it spread so easily?

Comrie, Bernard. 1998. Switch reference in Haruai: Grammar and discourse. In *Productivity and Creativity : Studies in General and Descriptive Linguistics in Honor of E. M. Uhlenbeck.* Edited by Mark Janse. . 421-432. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
Discusses the way that discourse affects how subject-based SR skips clauses, and the difficulties of determining which type of clause juncture is being used.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 1982. A functional analysis of switch-reference in Lakhota discourse. In *Proceedings from the 18th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*: 72-81.

The first paper to explore `non-canonical' SR in detail, showing DS to involve discontinuity, and SS to involve continuity, of events across a discourse.

Gijn, Rik van. 2012. Switch attention (aka switch reference) in South American temporal clauses: facilitating oral transmission. *Linguistic Discovery* 10: 112-127.

Interesting discussion of SR as an aid to speech participants using primarily or exclusively oral languages, explaining its frequency despite its *prima facie* complicating linguistic signals.

Mixco, Mauricio. 1997. Mandan Switch Reference: A Preliminary View. *Anthropological Linguistics* 39:

220– 298.
> Argues that Mandan has SR. Discusses context effects on SR, especially genre effects from narratives.

Mithun, Marianne. 1993. Switch-reference: Clause combining in Central Pomo. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 59: 119-136.
> Emphasizes cases where speaker portrayal shapes the choice of SS or DS. Perhaps the only account to emphasize structural differences between SR morphemes themselves, rather than focusing on the clauses they combine.

Munro, Pamela. 1983. When "same" is not "not different".   In *Switch-Reference in Universal Grammar*. Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro: 223-244. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
> Detailed discussion of three cases from Chickasaw where SR marking does not match what we'd expect from subject-tracking. Each has its own cause, rooted in the context, or in grammaticization.

Pustet, Regina. 2013. Switch-Reference or Coordination? A Quantitative Approach to Clause Linkage in Lakota. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 79: 153–188.
> Innovative statistical study of corpora to discern context factors behind SR distribution: Subject identity, contrast, temporal cohesion, and probability. Suggests that stochastic accounts may be the path forward.

Roberts, John R. 1988a. Switch-reference in Papuan languages: A syntactic or extrasyntactic device? *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 8: 5–118.
> Extensive cross-linguistic study of SR, focusing on non-canonical SR and exploring its use based on discourse.

Torres, Silviana 2011. Switch-Reference in Biloxi: The architecture of a complex morpho-discourse phenomenon. Master's thesis, Northeastern Illinois University.
> Integrates SR markers with the Topic and Focus system.

Watkins, Laurel. 1993. The discourse function of Kiowa switch-reference. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 59: 137-164.
> Argues for distinguishing paragraph-level SR, oriented toward discourse and event-tracking, from sentence level-SR that tracks subjects.

Language Change
Little research has been conducted on the diachrony of SR, mainly due to the lack of historical materials for all SR languages, but also partially due to its areal diffusion. In a few cases, SR has been suggested for a proto-language: Oswalt 1976 (cited under *Early Descriptive Accounts from North America*) gives one for Pomoan languages, Winter 1976 reconstructs a Proto-Yuman system, and Booker 1980 reconstructs a Proto-Muskogean system. Haiman 1983 explores SR from the concept of grammaticalization, as does Munro 1984. De Vries 1997 notes that related languages can build SR markers in different ways. In another vein, the endangered status of many SR languages has led to forward-looking diachronic studies exploring how the phenomenon survives (or does not survive) the agonies of language death. Williams 1999 describes effects on Choctaw SR, while Boyle 2011 lays out the virtual disappearance of the SR system of Hidatsa.

Booker, Karen. 1980. *Comparative Muskogean: Aspects of Proto-Muskogean Verbal Morphology.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas.
    Historical linguistic account of these languages, including switch-reference.

Boyle, John. 2011. Switch-Reference in Hidatsa: The Evolution of a Grammatical System. *International Journal of American Linguistics.* 77: 413-428.
    Explores the remnants of the SR system in this Siouan language, as language attrition and obsolence have affected it.

De Vries, Lourens 1997. The rise of switch-reference in the Awyu languages of Irian Jaya. In Language Change and Functional Explanations. Edited by Jadranka Gvozdanovic. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Compares SR markers in several related languages, showing that they emerged along very distinct paths.

Haiman, John. 1983. On some origins of switch-reference. In *Switch-Reference in Universal Grammar.* John Haiman and Pamela Munro, Eds: 291–315. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
    Attempts to elucidate the source of SR morphology, focusing on New Guinea languages, so focused on links to verbal agreement. It is not clear how this would apply to cases in other areas, which do not rely so heavily on clause-chaining.

Munro, Pamela. 1984. Auxiliaries and auxiliariation in Western Muskogean. In *Historical Syntax.* Edited by Jacek Fisiak: 333-362. The Hague: Mouton.
    Argument about the origin of auxiliaries within a clause in these languages as relics of SR across clauses.

Williams, Robert S. 1999. Referential Tracking in Oklahoma Choctaw: Language Obsolescence and Attrition. *Anthropological Linguistics* 41: 54-74
    Despite the fact that most SR languages are endangered, this was for a long time the only account to explore the effects of obsolescence on switch-reference use.

Winter, Werner. 1976. Switch-Reference in Yuman languages. In *Hokan Studies.* Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, no. 181. Edited by Margaret Langdon and S. Silver: 165-174. The Hague: Mouton.
    Reviews Yuman SR facts, and proposes that SR was present in Proto-Yuman.

Syntactic Theory
Switch-reference has played a peripheral role in syntactic theory, especially since much of the SR literature is atheoretic. However, syntactic theory has had a large effect on SR research, in two distinct ways. First is the nature of switch-reference itself. Accounts focused on this develop theories of switch-reference. The second applies SR to contribute to other theories. The two threads sometimes feed each other.

Morphosyntax
The two major syntactic issues concerning SR involve the nature of the SR morpheme in the syntax, and the configurational types that SR can appear with. Gordon 1983 is the first to demonstrate SR sensitivity to hierarchical relations between clauses. Finer 1984 and Finer 1985 argue that SR is a pronoun at C, subject to a binding theory, whose requirements entail that SR only appears with coordination. Roberts 1988b and Stirling 1993 (cited under *Theories of Switch-Reference and Discourse Coherence*) argue

explicitly against binding, pointing out non-canonical SR and arguing for SR across coordinating clause chains. Broadwell 1997 takes up the binding+subordination mantle. Dickey 2000 argues for coordination and a link to tenselessness. Keine 2013 argues instead that SR always involves coordination. Meanwhile, Enç 1989 points out that due to the semantics, SR must be below C. McKenzie 2012 adds that SR occurs in all sorts of clause types, and in some languages, multiple types, and offers a pronominal account placing SR as its own head between T and C.   O'Connor 1982, as well as Mithun 1993 (cited under *Descriptive Accounts and Non-formal proposals*) and Graczyk 2007 (cited under *Recent North American Reference Grammars*) point out that SR morphemes are not always morphosyntactically paradigmatic within a language. Gordon 1983 and Miller 2001 (cited under *Recent North American Reference Grammars*) show that SR clauses that look the same have distinct structures.

Broadwell, George Aaron 1997. Binding Theory and Switch-Reference. In H. Bennis, P. Pica, and J. Rooryck (Eds.), Atomism and Binding, pp. 31–49. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
> Tries to preserve Finer's binding account against Roberts 1988b's claims. Argues for subordinating structures in Choctaw clause-chaining.

Dickey, Michael Walsh. 2000. Switch-reference and clause chaining in Miskitu. *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers, The UMOP Volume on Indigenous Languages*. Edited by Elena Benedicto. Amherst: GLSA.
> Attempts to link tenselessness to switch-reference, by claiming SR as marking anaphoric tense, in a line similar to Borer's anaphoric Agr. The link between subjects emerges when anaphoric T, like anaphoric Agr, raises to the dominant clause.

Finer, Daniel. 1984. The Formal Grammar of Switch-Reference. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
> Most widely cited SR dissertation. Introduces Binding Theoretic approach to SR, and tries to fit a wide variety of cross-linguistic data.

Finer, Daniel. 1985. The Syntax of Switch-Reference. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16(2), 35–55.
> Foundational SR paper in generative theory. Argues that SR is a pronoun at C subject to a generalized binding theory; consequently, SR only occurs in subordinating clauses. SS is simply co-reference, while DS is disjointness.

Gordon, Lynn. 1983. Switch reference, clause order, and interclausal relationships in Maricopa. In: *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar.* Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro: 83-104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
> Demonstrates that SR is sensitive to hierarchical relations between clauses, not simply linear adjacency.

Keine, Stefan. 2013. Decomposing Switch-Reference. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31: 767–826.
> Iconoclastic paper arguing that switch-reference merely reflects coordination at distinct levels of the syntactic structure.

O'Connor, Catherine. 1982. Asymmetries in the switch-reference system of Northern Pomo. In *Proceedings of the 1981 Hokan Languages Workshop and Penutian Languages Conference.* Edited by James E. Redden. Carbondale, Ill.: Dept. of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University.
> Northern Pomo SR markers are mixed with other morphemes, like simultaneous or sequential.

This paper examines asymmetries in the SR paradigm based on these other morphemes.

Roberts, John. 1988b. Amele switch-reference and the theory of grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 45-63.
Rejoinder to Finer 1985 that argues that a subject-based binding approach is impossible, because of non-canonical SR, and because standard syntactic tests show Amele clause chains to involve coordination.

Accounts Contributing to a Larger Syntactic Debate

Theories of switch-reference are often applied as a basis to provide evidence for a distinct issue. Papers along these lines tend to assume (incorrectly) that SR only tracks subjects and only occurs at C. If they're generative, they start with Finer 1984 and Finer 1985. SR served theories of pronouns from Enç 1989 and Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002. Watanabe 2000 lumps it into complementizer agreement, while Jeanne 1992 ties it to the case filter. Munro & Gordon 1982 uses SR to highlight the importance of syntactic facts in studying the phenomenon.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie and Martina Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquir*y 33: 409–442.
Small SR discussion supports a larger theory of pronouns, in a Minimalist framework.

Enç, Mürvet. 1989. Pronouns, Licensing, and Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 51-92.
Small SR discussion supports a larger theory of pronouns, but still points out several crucial advances required for Finer 1984/1985's approach to be successful.

Jeanne, LaVerne Masayesva. 1992. Case, switch reference, and the Hopi relative clause. *Anthropological Linguistics* 34: 316-323.
Derives restriction on relative clauses through the interaction of switch-reference and the Case Filter.

Munro, Pamela and Lynn Gordon. 1982. Syntactic Relations in Western Muskogean: A Typological Perspective. *Language* 58: 81-115.
Demonstrates that syntactic relations for arguments takes precedence over semantic ones, relying in part on SR data from Choctaw and Chickasaw. Also useful for highlighting the need for fieldwork to investigate semantic and pragmatic phenomena directly, rather than relying on translation.

Watanabe, Akira. 2000. Feature copying and binding: Evidence from complementizer agreement and switch-reference. *Syntax* 3: 159-181.
Situates SR in a Minimalist account of Agree, linking it to complementizer agreement.

Clause Chaining and Head-Tail Linking

A frequent use of switch-reference in clause-chaining languages involves the use of anaphoric pro-verbs marked with SR. This phenomenon goes by various names, but tail-head linking is the most common. Research on the Muskogean languages and on New Guinea languages feature the most discussion of these. Here we list a few works that directly focus on it. Longacre 1972 is the starting point for understanding clause chains, while Longacre 1983 compares clause chains in New Guinea to that in the Americas. Guillaume 2011 provides detailed discussion of this linking in some South American languages.

Longacre, Robert. 1972. *Hierarchy and Universality of Discourse Constituents in New Guinea Languages*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
Classic book first laying out the properties of SR-bearing clause chains, and exploring the ways they mark out units of discourse.

Longacre, Robert E. 1983. Switch-reference systems in two distinct linguistic areas: Wojokeso (Papua New Guinea) and Guanano (Northern South America). In: *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar.* Edited by John Haiman and Pamela Munro: 185-208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Discusses SR in a comparative context, with emphasis on morphosyntactic differences.

Guillaume, Antoine. 2011. Subordinate clauses, switch-reference, and tail-head linkage in Cavinenã narratives. In *Subordination in Native South American Languages*. Edited by Rik van Gijn, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken: 109-139. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Discusses SR as one of the methods by which this language's tail-head linkers indicate information about the discourse structure.

The Nature of Subjects

The use of switch-reference as a reference-tracking device between subjects has allowed a healthy investigation of what it means to be a subject. Langdon and Munro 1979 explores peculiarities in Yuman languages. Dooley 1989 explores similar peculiarities in a Quechua variety. Muskogean languages, between raising possessors to subject position or the intricate agreement system, have offered several pieces of insight, including Broadwell 1997, Broadwell 2006 (cited under *Recent North American Reference Grammars*), and Davies 1984. Farrell et al 1991 looks at the isolate Seri along similar lines. These questions have dimmed in importance a bit with the focus on non-canonical switch-reference, but remain promising.

Davies, William D. 1984. Choctaw Switch-reference and levels of syntactic representation. In *Syntax and Semantics 16: The Syntax of Native American Languages*. Edited by Eung-Do Cook and Donna Geurdts. New York: Academic Press.
Relational grammar account positing subject selection at distinct points. Notable descriptively for discussion of possessor raising in SR.

Dooley, Robert A.1989. Switch Reference in Mbya Guarani: A Fair-Weather Phenomenon. In Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session. Volume 33. Edited by Robert A Dooley and J. Albert Bickford. 93-119. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
Paper detailing the SR system in this Guarani variety, with an interesting emphasis on subjects that overlap or are empty. Also hints at some context effects,

Farrell, Patrick, Stephen A. Marlett, and David M. Perlmutter. 1991. Notions of Subjecthood and Reference: Evidence from Seri. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 431-456.
Relational grammar account using SR to explore the nature of subjecthood.

Langdon, Margaret and Pamela Munro 1979. Subject and Switch-reference in Yuman. *Folia Linguistica* 13: 321–344.
Employs SR to question the nature of subjecthood, though its impact on this question is dampened by later work on non-canonical SR. Offers the first look at SR with weather predicates, and overall, concludes that grammatical factors alone cannot explain SR distribution.

Notions of Sentential Anaphora and Discourse Reference

Several threads have tried to situate switch-reference in a larger family of anaphoric or discourse devices. As a result, these works have usually found themselves on the periphery in the SR literature. Jeanne 1988 and Hale 1992 look at Hopi, a language with SR and obviation, and try to link the two. Muehlbauer 2012 attempts the same with Plains Cree, though McKenzie 2015 shows that particular case not to involve SR. Wichmann 2007 tries to locate a middle ground between SR and obviation. Ariel 1990 derives SR from general accessibility relations. Woodbury 1983 discusses the use of special 3rd-person anaphors to have SR-like effects. From a functionalist perspective, Foley & Van Valin 1984 places in the set of `reference-tracking' devices, a characterization that is widely used even outside of functionalist circles. Stirling 2001 continues along the same line, linking SR to general discourse considerations. Kibrik 2011 discusses SR among a number of referential aids. Huang 2003 tries to link SR to logophoricity. Stirling 1993 (cited under *Theories of Switch-Reference and Discourse Coherence*) builds on Comrie 1983 (cited under *Africa*) to go the other way, incorporating logophoricity into SR.

Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.
> Situates SR within a novel approach to discourse anaphora based on ease of processing.

Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge Univ. Press.
> Functionalist approach situates SR in a family of reference-tracking devices.

Hale, Ken. 1992. Subect obviation, switch-reference, and control. In *Control and Grammar*. Edited by Richard Larson, Sabine Iatridou, Uptal Lahiri, and James Higginbotham, 61-77.
> Unifies SR in Hopi and Misumalpan under a broader umbrella of obviation marking, all subject to a generalized binding theory.

Huang, Yan. 2003. Switch-reference in Amele and logophoric verbal suffix in Gokana: a generalized neo-Gricean pragmatic analysis. In *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 53-76.
> Attempts to unite SR and logophoricity under a single pragmatic approach.

Kibrik, Andrei. 2011. *Reference in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
> Discusses switch-reference along with logophoricity and other `referential aids' that have a narrow domain (in or across clauses), rather than a broad one throughout a discourse.

Muehlbauer, Jeffrey. 2012. The Relation of switch-reference, animacy, and obviation in Plains Cree. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78: 203-238.
> Paper exploring various reference-tracking devices, but with a small bit about switch-reference. McKenzie 2012 explains why this is not actually switch-reference, but probably a morpheme situated firmly in the obviation system.

Stirling, Lesley. 2001. The multifunctionality of anaphoric expressions: a typological perspective. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21: 7-24.
> Builds on SR data to expand the set of functions of anaphoric expressions to contain roles that signal discourse boundaries.

Wichmann, Søren. 2007. The reference-tracking system of Tlapanec. Between obviation and switch-reference. *Studies in Language* 31: 801-827.
> Explores a reference-tracking system that has certain features of SR, and also certain features of

obviation.

Woodbury, Anthony C. 1983. Switch Reference, Syntactic Organization, and Rhetorical Structure in Central Yup'ik Eskimo. In *Switch-Reference in Universal Grammar.* John Haiman and Pamela Munro, Eds: 291–315. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
      Discusses "fourth-person" constructions in Yup'ik and its relation to switch-reference morphology.

Interactions with Case

One interesting area of research involves the link between switch-reference and case. In many languages, SR markers are identical to a pair of case markers. This homophony is notable in the Muskogean, Numic, and Yuman families of North America, the Shipibo group of South America, and in Australia. Austin 1981 (cited under *Areal and Typological Surveys*) shows several Australian examples. Studies that focus on these languages attempt to link the two phenomena, one verbal one nominal, like Camacho 2010 (cited under *Syntax*), which links case and SR in Shipibo. Researchers of these family groups tend to assume as a matter of course that they represent the same morpheme. On the other hand, McKenzie 2015 (cited under *Areal and Typological Surveys*), which lists languages with case homophony, proposes that the resemblance is a purely accidental by-product of other forces, like areal diffusion. Languages borrow SR structures but not the morphemes, and need to press into service a pair of opposing morphemes, like case markers.

Yuman Languages

The Yuman family of the American Southwest has many SR languages where –k marks SS and –m marks DS. Langdon 1970 notes that –k and –m match case markers as well as certain verbal suffixes. Kendall 1975, Slater 1977 and Ichihashi-Nakayama 2004, each describing one language, claim the markers as part of a single system, with implications for the entire family. However, Munro 1976 (cited under *Early Descriptive Accounts from North America*), suggests caution in that regard, while Miller 2001 (cited under *Recent North American Reference Grammars*) finds no fewer than 13 morphemes homophonous to –k or -m, implying they should be distinct.

Langdon, Margaret. 1970. *A Grammar of Diegueño: The Mesa Grande Dialect.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
      First detailed discussion of the Yuman homophony issue.

Kendall, Martha B. 1975. The /-k/, /-m/ problem in Yavapai Syntax. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 41: 1-9.
      Proposes a polysemous account but asks if an overriding notion of point of view can link the meanings.

Ichihashi-Nakayama, Kumiko 2004. Grammaticization of 'to' and 'away': A unified account of -k and -m in Hualapai. In E. Contini-Morava, R. Kirsner, and B. Rodríguez-Bachiller (Eds.), Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis, pp. 261–273. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
      Argues for a point-of-view unification for Hualapai SR markers, case markers, and verbal markers.

Slater, Susan. 1977. The Semantics of Switch-Reference in Kwtsaan. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.* Edited by Kenneth Whistler *et al.* : 24-36. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
      Brings together distinct uses of –m and –k for SR and other meanings under a sort of obviation

system, whereby –k indicates subject primacy, -m indicates otherwise.

Muskogean Family
The Muskogean family, indigenous to the American Southeast, has many SR languages where –t marks nominative case and SS, while –n (or a nasal feature) marks oblique case and DS. Some languages instead employ –k for nominative and SS. The striking homophony has made it generally accepted among Muskogeanists that case and SR form a single system. Lupardus 1982 and Martin 2011 (cited under *Recent North American Reference Grammars*) do not distinguish them in glosses, while Kimball 1991 does. Rising 1992 explains the homophony by making case and SR the nominal and verbal exponents of a single discourse-tracking system. Camacho 2010 derives it in a generative framework from the way features are transmitted across clause boundaries.

Camacho, José. 2010. On case concord: the syntax of switch-reference clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28: 239-274.
> Proposes that SR in certain language families emerges from agreement across C that is licensed by case. If the case is in concord, SS marking ensues; otherwise DS does.

Kimball, Geoffrey. 1991. *Koasati Grammar*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
> Quite extensive grammar, with countless examples. Does maintain a distinction between SR and case, but only for convenience.

Lupardus, Karen. 1982. *The Language of the Alabama Indians*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Kansas.
> Includes description of case and SR as a single unified system.

Rising, David P. 1992. *Koasati Switch-Reference in Discourse*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
> Builds off a homomorphism between case markers and SR markers to develop a theory whereby both case and SR are lumped together under a single morpheme set that expresses topic continuity or lack thereof.

Numic
The Numic languages of the American West and Plains have SR systems that in some cases matches the case-marking system. Zigmond et al. 1990 suggests that SR came first in these languages, and that case makers derived from it. Givón 2011 (cited under *Recent North American Reference Grammars*) discusses the links between SR markers and accusative case markers. However, Charney 1993 extensively covers SR independent of case marking.

Charney, Jean. 1993. *A Grammar of Comanche*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
> Solid discussion of SR that does not have to do with case. Notable also because Comanche has distinct topic marking that SR ignores.

Zigmond, Maurice L., Curtis G. Booth, and Pamela Munro. 1990. *Kawaiisu: A Grammar and Dictionary with Texts*. Edited by Pamela Munro. Berkeley: University of California Press.
> Discussion of SR proposes that case markers in this Numic language arose from SR markers.