Proposals of coordination have frequently debated whether conjunction can be analyzed as propositional (cf. Chomsky 1957, Goodall 1986, Munn 1993, Camacho 1997, Johannessen 1999 among others). In this paper, we will argue that languages with switch-reference provide striking evidence that conjunction is indeed propositional. SR morphemes encode the relationship between the events of two related (conjoined, we will argue) sentences as shown in (1), a sentence from Capanahua, taken from Loos (1999), the object of the first sentence is coreferential with the subjects of the second, as marked by -año (SR indicates same referent, DR disjoint referent), and the first event precedes the second one.

**Generalizations.** SR-languages have two important properties: 1) Switch-reference joins clauses (cf. (2), from Loos (1999)), furthermore, it is usually impossible to tell which of the joined clauses is the “main” clause and which is the “subordinate” clause (cf. Munro 1980), and (2) below. Normally it is argued that switch-reference marking goes on the “subordinate” verb, however, in (2), switch-reference is marked on tatañoʔ-aš ‘become soft’ because its subject is the same as that of mi-rakaʔ-ai-ton ‘lie on the earth’, which is also marked with switch-reference. 2) These languages do not have productive conjunctions (cf. Munro 1980 for Mojave). This suggests that switch-reference is a form of coordination. In Capanahua, NPs may be joined by a comitative which is very rare, otherwise nothing appears.

**Analysis.** Suppose that some conjunctions involved propositional conjuncts and some nominal elements. This analysis would leave it as a mystery why languages like Capanahua only has syntactically marked conjunctions (switch-reference markers) between propositional elements (verbs) but nothing between nominals. On the other hand, if coordination is always propositional, the data from switch-reference languages follows directly: the reason why nominals appear with nothing is that there is no overt nominal conjunction. In some sense, these languages become the default case. Conjunction always joins functional projections at the sentential level. What remains to be explained is the difference between Capanahua and English, where the same conjunction is used for both sentences and nominals. In this view, such a difference stems from the restrictions a language imposes on functional categories: in English, sentential functional projections can be null (as in (3)), whereas in Capanahua, functional projections must always be full (as in (4)).

Traditional objections to this view from collective predicates can be dealt with using an event-based semantics, as in Schein (1997).

(1) hatiʔibi hato yoʔi-wi honan-aʔbo
all them tell-IMPER know-SR
“Tell all of them, so that they, will know”

(2) hiwi ?ani baʔo kiyani bimi tataʔoʔ-aš naman mi- rakaʔ-ai-ton
tree big baso tall fruit soft-become-SR below earth.on-lie-PRES-SR
ska honon mira-son pi-kin
then peccary find-SR eat-PART
“The baso tree is huge, very tall. When the fruit becomes soft and pro, falls to the ground the peccary, finds it and pro, eats it.

(3) John e, and Mary arrived, (English)
(4) NP V and NP V (Capanahua)