Austronesian syntax[*]

Maria Polinsky and Eric Potsdam

1   Introduction

This chapter presents on overview of major syntactic issues in the analysis of Austronesian languages. Certain typologically unusual aspects of syntactic design are known to recur in the different groupings within the Austronesian family, and each raises interesting theoretical questions from both Austronesian-internal perspectives and general theoretical perspectives. The phenomena include widespread predicate-first (head-initial) word order, articulated voice systems, strict extraction restrictions, and articulated systems of possession marking. We hope to give a sense of the empirical picture and the theoretical issues that they raise, as well as address several other fundamental aspects of Austronesian syntactic structure. This survey is not intended to be comprehensive. We by no means want to claim full coverage of either languages or phenomena, nor will we be able to offer a definitive analysis of particular phenomena. Rather, we have tried to select the topics that are particularly relevant for Austronesian languages and at the same time present theoretical challenges that are of interest to linguists who work outside

Austronesian. In doing so, we often identify competing analyses which need to be refined or explored further.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 presents and analyzes the syntax of predicate-initial orders in Austronesian, with an emphasis on proposals for deriving such a word order. Section 3 discusses the structure of noun phrases and some syntactic issues that have emerged in their investigation. Section 4 presents the morphosyntax of several verbal categories. Section 5 addresses main types of case-marking patterns in Austronesian and surveys major proposals regarding the origins of the ergative vs. accusative alignment in these languages. Section 6 introduces the subject-only restriction prominent in Austronesian languages. Section 7 introduces several other phenomena that have stimulated research on Austronesian syntax: binding, questions, negation, and comparatives.

2   Verb-first word order

Austronesian languages are head-initial, and many Austronesian languages, including languages spoken at the geographical extremes of the family, are verb-initial or predicate-initial, i.e., VSO or VOS. In other Austronesian languages, the neutral word order is SVO or verb-medial; this order is represented in Micronesian languages and some Melanesian languages. With the exception of some Western Melanesian languages that have long been in contact with Papuan languages and have developed verb-final orders, including postpositions (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002: 41, 49-50, 87; Crowley 2002: 37; Lichtenberk 1983b), no other word order types are considered basic within the family.[1]

---

[1] Variation from canonical verb-first or verb-medial word orders is of course possible as a reflection of information structural variation. For example, Cheke Holo (Northwest Solomonic,

Verb-initial languages have long been of interest to typologists, in part because they are infrequent but not rare, representing roughly one fifth of the world's languages. Verb-initial languages seem to fall into roughly two classes: those in which verbs are distinguished among predicate heads in appearing initially, and those in which verb-initial word order is part of a larger predicate-initial trend in the languages. This distinction can best be seen by looking at concrete examples.

Tukang Besi is an example of language where verbs alone can appear initially. Compare the following sentences (1a, b) where the verb can appear either in the clause-initial position or following a preposed subject, whereas the non-verbal predicate cannot be fronted (2a, b):[2]

(1) a. *no-'ita-'e   na   kene-no   te   ana*   *Tukang Besi*

         3R-see-3OBJ   NOM   friend-3POSS   CORE   child

         'The child saw its friend.'

   b. *no-'ita-'e   te   ana   na   kene-no*

         3R-see-3OBJ   CORE   child   NOM   friend-3POSS

         'The child saw its friend.' (Donohue 1999: 51)

Solomon Islands) has neutral VSO order; however, a single preverbal topic position accounts for what appears to be SVO and OVS. Focused constituents appear in clause-final position; hence, VOS is also possible (Palmer 2009a).

[2] The glosses are taken from the original source.

(2) a. *te wunua-mamo   i   kampo   ito*

       EA house-1PA.POSS   OBL village   that:higher

       'Our house is in the village up there.' (Donohue 1999: 57)

    b. **i   kampo   ito   te   wunua-mamo*

        OBL   village   that:higher   CORE   house-1PA.POSS

       (Mark Donohue, pers.comm.)

In contrast, Malagasy is a predicate-initial language. The basic word order is VOS, which is
part of a more general pattern in which the predicate is initial. This is the case for all
categories of predicates (Paul and Potsdam 2012):

(3) a. *[mividy   ny   akoho]$_{VP}$ i Bao*   *Malagasy*

       buy   the   chicken   Bao

       'Bao is buying the chicken.'

    b. *[vorona ratsy feo]$_{NP}$ ny   goaika*

       bird   bad voice   the   crow

       'The crow is a bird with an ugly voice.'

    b. *[faly   amin' ny zanany]$_{AP}$ Rasoa*

       proud PREP   the child.3SG   Rasoa

       'Rasoa is proud of her children.'

    c. *[any   an-tsena]$_{PP}$ Rakoto*

       PREP   ACC-market   Rakoto

       'Rakoto is at the market.'

Niuean, despite its basic VSO word order, is another instance of a predicate-initial language
(Massam 2005). The initial position in a clause can be occupied by true predicates such as NPs,

headless relative clauses, and PPs, or it can be occupied by the verb alone, followed by the subject and object. In general, VOS is not possible, which seems to indicate that verbal clauses are not predicate-initial, assuming that the verbal predicate would be the verb plus its complements. Nevertheless, a special construction that Massam (2001) calls pseudo-incorporation suggests that the lone clause-initial verb, despite not being accompanied by its dependents, is in fact the predicate. Pseudo-incorporation involves the use of a bare noun in internal argument position. This noun shares semantic properties with syntactically incorporated nouns, such as obligatory narrow scope, inability to introduce discourse referents, or number neutrality. On the other hand, pseudo-incorporated nouns have more syntactic freedom than syntactically incorporated ones (cf. Mithun 1984, Baker 1988, van Geenhoven 1998, Chung and Ladusaw 2003); strict adjacency to the verb is not (always) required, the noun can be marked for case, and the verb can show agreement with that noun. Under pseudo-incorporation, the complex predicate consists of a verb and object which cannot be separated from the verb; the object is invisible to the syntax beyond the verbal complex. The East Futunan example in (2) illustrates this phenomenon. In (2a), we find the canonical VSO word order. In (2b), the object loses its determiner and case and appears immediately adjacent to the verb, yielding VOS order. In verbal clauses with pseudo-noun incorporation, the word order is clearly predicate-initial.

(4) a. *e   taki   e   le   fafine   le   motokā kula   East*
       IPFV drive ERG DET   woman   DET car   red   *Futunan*
       'The woman is driving a red car.'

   b. *e   taki motokā le   fafine*
       IPFV drive car   DET   woman
       'The woman drives.'   (Moyse-Faurie 1997a: 239)

The fact that the reduced object seems to constitute an initial verb phrase with the verb leads Massam and others to conclude that verbal clauses are really predicate-initial too. VSO word orders are then also predicate-initial, with the predicate consisting only of the verb. In such instances, the object has vacated the predicate in some way.

The head-initial/verb-initial nature of Austronesian languages has several visible structural properties, which have been noted for head-initial languages by a number of researchers starting with Greenberg (1963):

(5) a.   impossibility of postpositions (prepositions only)

     b.   the order noun before arguments (PPs) and modifiers (adjectives, relative clauses)

     c.   the order determiner-noun

     d.   preverbal particles or prefixes marking tense, aspect, mood, negation

     e.   inflected prepositions (Keenan 1976, Kayne 1994)

     f.   lack of the verb 'have' and the expression of possession existentially (Freeze 1992, Freeze and Georgopoulos 2000)

     g.   order host-incorporated noun under (pseudo-)noun incorporation (Massam 2001, Kissock 2003: 150-153, Chung and Ladusaw 2003, Ball 2008)

Most Austronesian languages that have verb-initial or predicate-initial orders are characterized by the properties listed in (3). Why these characteristics pattern together is a question of theoretical and typological interest.

2.1   Deriving verb-initial word order

The primary analytical question regarding verb-initial languages is how this word order is derived structurally. Although there are a range of answers (see Potsdam 2009), we focus on

two: V(erb) Raising and V(erb) P(hrase) Raising. In a V Raising analysis, the verb originates

inside the verb phrase but raises to a left peripheral head position in the functional layer of the

clause (see Carnie 1995, Chung and McCloskey 1987, Emonds 1980, Sproat 1985, and others).

The subject does not raise to the vicinity of the same head, but remains lower and to the right of

the verb, as shown in (6).

(6) V Raising derivation of verb-initial word order

   [$_{XP}$ V [Subject [$_{VP}$ ~~V~~ Object]]]

In some languages, crucial evidence for V Raising is supplied by ellipsis. Since everything

following the verb is a constituent, ellipsis can apply, stranding the verb (McCloskey 1991,

Goldberg 2005, and others).

In a VP Raising analysis, in contrast, the entire VP raises to a specifier in the functional layer

of the clause (see Davies and Dubinsky 2001, Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000, Massam and

Smallwood 1997, Rackowski and Travis 2000, Chung 2006, and others), as shown in (5a). In

cases where less than a VP appears initially, as in VSO word order, it is hypothesized that

elements move out of the VP before the VP raises, as in (5b).

(7) VP Raising derivations of verb-initial word order

   a.   [$_{TP}$ VP [Subject [$_{VP}$ ~~V Object~~]]]
   b.   [$_{TP}$ VP [Subject [Object ~~[$_{VP}$ V Object~~]]]]

Chung 2005, 2006 critically evaluates the VP Raising analysis for Austronesian and discusses in detail one potential argument in its favor from extraction patterns. Assuming that VP raises to a specifier position and specifiers are islands for extraction, the raised VP ought to be an island for further extraction (see e.g. Rackowski and Travis 2000 and Chung 2006). That is, in a VP Raising language, it ought to be impossible to extract complements and VP-internal adjuncts. This expectation reflects one of the typologically unusual extraction patterns, found mainly in Western Austronesian languages, that extraction of nominal arguments is restricted to subjects (Subject-Only Restriction). This pattern could be taken to show that VPs are islands in these languages, and hence clausal word order is indeed derived by VP Raising. At the same time, extraction patterns in individual languages are more complex and individual languages pose challenges (Sabbagh 2005, Chung 2006).

By now, there has been enough investigation of different Austronesian languages to form the basis for an in-depth comparison of these competing accounts of verb-initial order. Many of these investigations have adopted VP Raising, with or without partial evacuation of the VP (see e.g. Massam 2001 and Rackowski and Travis 2000). However, others have argued in favor of V Raising (e.g. Pearce 2002, Sabbagh 2005). We would like to emphasize here that the mechanisms for deriving verb-initial order are likely to be different for different languages (see, for example, the papers in Carnie, Harley, and Dooley 2005). For example, Otsuka 2005 argues in favor of employing V Raising and VP Raising for the very closely related languages Tongan and Niuean. It is therefore critical to establish the correct analysis for individual languages.

2.2   Postverbal position of the subject

The discussion up to this point might seem to suggest that nothing needs to be said about the position of the subject in verb-initial languages. Assuming that the subject remains in place, the V Raising analysis automatically accounts for the postverbal subject in VSOX clauses.

The VP Raising analysis likewise automatically describes the position of the subject in VOXS. The VP Raising analysis can also explain VSOX word order if everything but the verb vacates the VP before it fronts (Massam 2000, 2001, and others). For example, Bauer (1993: 245) proposes that VSO word order in Māori should be derived from a basic VOS word order.[3] Māori allows both VSO and VOS orders, and Bauer suggests that the underlying or basic word order is VOS, with VSO derived with extraposition of one or more complements as follows:

(8) *ka   whakareri   t_i   a   Rewi   [i   ngā   Māori*

    TNS   make.ready   DET   Rewi   OBJ   DET.PL

    rama   me   ngā   pīhuka]_i

    torch   with   DET.PL   hook

    'Rewi prepared the torches and the hooks.' (Chung 1998: 164)

Nonetheless, investigations of clause structure in Austronesian languages have also led to other accounts of the position of the subject. Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992) account for VOXS word order in Malagasy and other Austronesian languages by placing the subject in a

---

[3] Bauer does not assume VP Raising but needs some independent mechanism to get verb-initial word order.

right specifier of TP. A number of theoretical concerns arise with this analysis. One concern is that a mechanism is required that can specify which side of the head a specifier is on. On the one hand, this is necessary to distinguish languages from each other. For example, English specifiers are uniformly on the left but Malagasy specifiers—subject and possessors—are on the right. On the other hand, it is also necessary to distinguish specifiers of particular phrases within a single language. To take two examples, Aissen (1992, 1996) proposes that in the Mayan language Tzotzil,specifiers of high functional projections are on the left but specifiers for lower, lexical projections are on the right. Tzotzil would have a right-hand specifier for the projection housing the subject given its basic word order, but wh-phrases front to a clause-initial position, indicating that the specifier of CP is on the left. In fact, it has been proposed that the specifier of CP is universally on the left (Hawkins 1999, and others), even in right-hand-specifier languages. While such parameterization at the phrase level is possible, no specific mechanism has been widely adopted (see Ernst 2002 for a specific proposal). A second objection is that much work in syntax currently aims at a more restrictive phrase structure that eliminates the possibility of specifiers on the right entirely. Kayne 1994 and subsequent work proposes that specifiers are uniformly on the left. Such theories would preclude Guilfoyle et al.'s analysis.

Finally, Chung (1998) and Sabbagh (2005) handle the flexible verb-first word order of Chamorro and Tagalog by proposing that the subject can lower to right-adjoin to some projection of V. Lowering is posited to account for the fact that, in these languages, the subject can occur immediately to the right of any V head of a coordinate VP, including the V of a right VP conjunct, as is illustrated in Chamorro below.

(9) a.   [*mu-ma'a'ñao i   säkki*] *ya*   [*ha-yutu' i   salappi*]   *Chamorro*

AGR-afraid   DET thief   and.then   AGR-drop   DET money

'The thief got scared and dropped the money.' (Chung 1998: 134)

   b.   [*humanao]ya*   [*ha-po'lu i   balutan-ña   i   ma'estru*

AGR.go and.then   AGR-put   DET bundle-AGR   DET teacher

gi   istanti]

LOC shelf

'The teacher went and put his bundle on the shelf.' (Chung 1998: 138)

This extreme flexibility in the position of the subject receives an explanation if the following assumptions are made: (a) coordinate structures are fully projected from all of the conjuncts, and (b) the subject lowers and adjoins on the right in any of the conjuncts (Chung 1998: 138).

It is important to recognize the interaction between the accounts of verb-initial word order and the positioning of the subject. VSO and VOS word orders do not simultaneously require mechanisms that move the verb leftward (V and VP Raising) and the subject rightward (a right-hand specifier or subject lowering), although there may be empirical reasons for doing so. Hopefully, more systematic empirical investigation of Austronesian clause structure will help restrict the choices and availability of analytical options.

2.3   Do Austronesian languages have verbs and other lexical classes?

A related issue in the study of Austronesian languages is the existence or absence of lexical categories (Broschart 1997, Tchekhoff 1981, Gil 2004, 2005, 2009, Kaufman 2009). From a diachronic standpoint, it is hypothesized that a lack of lexical categories gives rise to

verb-initial word order in the following manner: thematic nominalizations, which occur as internal arguments of a silent verb 'BE', 'OCCUR' or 'EXIST', are reanalyzed as event predications (Clark 1976; Starosta, Pawley, and Reid 1982; Kaufman 2009, a.o.). The nominalizations themselves are head-initial, in accordance with the strong head-initial character of Austronesian, which explains why the verb appears first. Thus, schematically, the transition is from (a) to (b) (English lexical items are used for illustration):

(10) a. EXIST [$_{XP}$ address(ing) by the chief of the people]

    b. [$_{TP}$ address the   chief   the people]

An alternative view is that lexical categories are well-developed in Austronesian languages but that there are a fair number of silent inflectional elements, and lexical classes are thus related by zero conversion in morphology (Himmelmann 2005: 18-131). Not surprisingly, Austronesian linguists who study Polynesian languages, which are known for their impoverished morphology, lean toward the former view; Austronesian linguists who study Philippine languages or Malagasy, whose morphology is richer, lean toward the latter view. For example, Sabbagh (2005) explores a number of morphosyntactic diagnostics in Tagalog, which distinguish verbs from adjectives and unaccusative adjectives from unergative adjectives. Similarly, Richards (2009) and Aldridge (2009) raise objections to Kaufman's (2009) nominalism based on a careful investigation of lexical categories in Tagalog and Seediq. In a detailed investigation of Māori, Bauer (1997) shows that the categories noun, verb, and adjective may be less visible than in richer inflectional languages but that their existence is quite clear from the standpoint of their syntactic distribution. Likewise, Chung (2012) argues for a well-articulated set of lexical

categories in Chamorro. In Chamorro, as in many other Austronesian languages, "the same word" often "function[s] as a noun, a verb, and an adjective according to the traditional definitions of these grammatical terms" (Topping and Dungca 1973: 77). Furthermore, "reversals" of predicate and argument are possible, cf. (6a) where 'sleep' is the predicate, 'child' is the argument, and (6b) the functions are reversed:

(11) a. *mamaigu'   i   pätgun*   *Chamorro*

        sleep.PROG   DET   child

        'The child is sleeping.'

   b. *pätgun i   mamaigu'*

        child   DET   sleep.PROG

        'The one sleeping is a child.'

However, although a large set of lexical categories can occur in the predicate position, only predicates that are lexically specified as verbs and adjectives can show agreement with the subject; predicates that are lexically specified as nouns do not agree with the subject in person and number. Only nouns can combine with the prefix **gai-** to form a verb meaning 'have N'; e.g., *gai-patgun* 'have a child' but **gai-malati'* (intended 'have smarts'). Verbal predicates differ from nominal and adjectival predicates in their co-occurrence with bare subjects (Chung 2012). Finally, only nouns can combine with numerals, only verbs and prepositions can take a direct object, and only adjectives can combine with degree words (see also Pearson 2010 for Fijian)—distributional patterns well attested in more familiar languages. Crucially, the size of the adjectival class should not be of concern: it is quite possible that a language may have very few

adjectives (Chung 2012). To take an extreme case, Lichtenberk (2005a) suggests that Toqbaqita may have just one adjective, however, that is enough to claim that the category still exists.[4]

Within Oceanic, this issue arises in a limited domain: does the category adjective exist in these languages, or are all adjectives actually stative verbs (cf. Harrison and Albert 1976 on Mokilese; Willson 2002 on Marshallese; Hyslop 2001, 2004 on North-East Ambae)? The main argument against positing a class of adjectives comes from the ability of such "adjectives" to combine directly with tense and agreement morphology, which would qualify them as verbs on the assumption that tense and aspect morphology only combines with verbs.

3   Structure of the noun phrase

Compared to clausal syntax, the syntax of noun phrases has received relatively less attention. In this section we survey some of the issues particular to nominal syntax in Austronesian and suggest how they might inform syntactic theory.

3.1   Noun types

Nouns in Austronesian languages generally fall into three different types: common nouns, proper nouns, and locative nouns. Each type co-occurs with different determiners, and the difference may also be reflected in a difference in the prepositions and case markers that the noun takes. Locative nouns include conventional place names and expressions such as 'beach', inland/bush', 'home'.[5] The following illustrate the three classes in Fijian:

---

[4] See also Ross 1998 for a similar approach based on diachronic evidence.

(12) a.   proper nouns   *Fijian*

    'o/*na   Taina

    DET   Taina

  b.   common nouns

    na/*'o   yacana

    DET   book

  c.   local nouns

    Suva/*na Suva/*'o Suva

The class of proper nouns includes personal names, some kinship terms, and typically the interrogative pronoun 'who'. Like proper nouns, 'who' often co-occurs with proper name determiners (12), cannot serve as the pivot of an existential,[6] and cannot undergo pseudo-noun incorporation (13), (14). It stands in contrast to common nouns and 'what'.

---

[5] As noted in Blust (1989, 2005), locative nouns often occur in their citation forms with an attached locative marker, e.g., Mokilese *nehn loangge* 'Heaven' (= *nehn* 'in, on, inside' + *loang* 'sky')—so called "adhesive locative" in Blust's terminology. Although adhesive locatives are poorly understood synchronically or diachronically, they are widespread across Austronesian languages.

[6] See Sabbagh 2009, Nicolae and Scontras 2010 for a discussion of the same constraint in Tagalog.

(13) a.　*'o/*na　cei　e　a　savata na　i　sulu?*　　　*Fijian*

　　　　DET　　who 3SG　PAST　wash　DET　NMLZ　clothes

　　　　'Who washed the clothes?'

　　b.　*na/*'o　cava e　a　kania 'o Jone?*

　　　　DET　　what 3SG　PAST eat　　DET　John

　　　　'What did John eat?'

(14) a.　*na'e　inu　'a　e　koke　'e　Sione*　　　　　*Tongan*

　　　　PAST　drink ABS　DET soda　ERG　John

　　　　'John drank a/the coke.'

　　b.　*na'e　inu　koke　'a　Sione?*

　　　　PAST　drink　soda　ABS　J

　　　　'John drink coke.'

　　c.　*na'e inu hā　'a　Sione?*

　　　　PAST drink what　ABS　J

　　　　'What did John drink?' (Incorporated wh)

(15) a.   *na'e   fakamavahevahe'i   'e   he   tu'i   'a   e   Tongan*

        PAST   separate   ERG   DET   chief   ABS   DET

        ngaahi   fili

        CLF   enemy

      'The chief separated the enemies.'

    b.   *na'e   fakamavahevahe'i   fili   'a   e   tu'i*

        PAST   separate   enemy   ABS   DET   chief

      'The chief separated enemies.'

    c.   **na'e   fakamavahevahe'i   hai   'a   e   tu'i*

        PAST   separate   who   ABS   DET   chief

      ('Who did the chief separate?')

Generally nouns do not inflect for case and their relationship to the governing heads is expressed by particles, such as *'a* 'ABS' and *'e* 'ERG' above, which can be analyzed as either case-marking clitics or prepositions. A number of researchers specifically argue that they are prepositions (see Broschart 1994, which also includes a review of earlier research). Two arguments support the conception that these are indeed adpositions. First, they are often homophonous with the actual prepositions used in a given language. For example, the prepositions in Māori are *i* 'in, to', *ki* 'toward, at', *e* 'from, by', and *a* 'of'. Of these, *i* marks direct objects, *ki*, indirect (possibly dative) objects, and *e* marks passive by-phrases. The second argument in favor of treating these markers as prepositions and not pure case markers, comes from the fact that the "oblique" case forms do not combine with any prepositions, an unexpected distribution pattern if some forms with case markers are to be governed by prepositions. There is no consensus in the literature on what these elements are, and we would like to emphasize that their status is unlikely to be uniform across different languages.

3.2   Possessive and classifier constructions

Very few Austronesian languages have gender classes. In those languages that have gender distinctions, the agreement in gender is registered on the determiner. For example, Teop (Mosel 2007) has three noun classes: *e*-class (personal names, people with high social status, pets), *a*-class (all other humans, vertebrae, landmarks), and *o*-class (plants, amorphous masses). Since gender is infrequent and is limited to determiner agreement we won't be discussing it below.

A much more common division of nouns is into directly and indirectly possessed. Semantically, direct possession corresponds roughly to inalienable (other terms used include obligatory, inherent, subordinate, or realized) possession, and indirect possession includes everything that can be alienably possessed (also known as dominant or unrealized possession). Beyond the small core of truly inalienable entities such as body parts, the semantics of (in)alienability is not entirely predictable; it has been subject to rich discussion in the literature (Lynch 1973, 1997, Lichtenberk 1983a, 1985, 2005b, Wilson 1982, Bickel and Nichols 2008, Nichols and Bickel 2008 and references therein).

Morphologically, the distinction is marked in diverse ways. In Drehu (Moyse-Faurie 1983: 60-61), inalienable possession is marked by an affix on the head noun indicating that the possessor and alienably possessed nouns have only a freestanding possession marker:

(16) a. inalienable: *la   pengö-ng*   *keme-hun*   *Drehu*

DET   manner-INAL.1SG   father-INAL.1PL

'my manner'   'their father'

b. alienable: *la   ihnim   i   angeic*

DET   love   PRP   3SG

'his love'

Inalienable possession marking may be obligatory, with 3sg typically being the default, citation form. Alienable possession marking is never obligatory.[7]

In Polynesian languages, the distinction between inalienable and alienable possession is represented as the contrast between two series, the *o* series corresponds roughly to inalienable possession, and the *a* series corresponds roughly to alienable possession. Compare some examples from Māori (Bauer 1997: ch. 12) and Tongan:

(17) a. *te   Pukapuka **a** Heremaia*   *Māori*

       DET book   A Jeremiah

       'The Book of Jeremiah' (written by him)

   b. *te   Pukapuka **o** Hōhua*

       DET book   O Joshua

       'The Book of Joshua' (written about him)

(18) a. *he'ene   manatu'i*   *Tongan*

       3SG.POSS.A remembering

       'his/her remembering something'

   b. *hono   manatu'i*

       3SG.POSS.O remembering

       'the remembrance of him/her'

Within alienable possession, many Oceanic languages further distinguish several categories based on salient properties of objects (see Lichtenberk 1983a for an overview and

---

[7] The complete absence of possessive markers is unusual, and such languages are rare, e.g., Toqabaqita (Lichtenberk 2008).

Bender and Beller 2006 for an overview and historical reconstruction). The most common, and rather simple, system is the one that divides entities into food, drink, and everything else. Micronesian languages have a more articulated classification (cf. Dyen 1965, Benton 1968 for Chuukese; Rehg 1981 for Pohnpeian; Lee 1975 for Kosrae).[8] The classification into categories such as 'food', 'drink', 'general', etc., is encoded by freestanding expressions inside the DP which are indexed for the person and number of the possessor; in what follows we will gloss them as CLF. Compare in Iaai (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976: 189):[9]

(19) a.   *bele-n*   *kəiə*   'his/her water'   *Iaai*

        CLF.DRINK-3SG.POSS   water

     b.   *hanii-ɲ*   *wɔɔ*   'his/her fish'

        CLF.FOOD-3SG.POSS   fish

     c.   *aʃi-n*   *meie*   'his/her fire'

        CLF.GEN-3SG.POSS   fire

---

[8] It seems that the more articulated Micronesian classification is subject to attrition. For example, while Benton and Dyen recognize over two dozen classificatory expressions in traditional Chuukese, in our work with Chuukese consultants in the late 1990s, we found only the following: general, inanimate mobile, inanimate able to grow, small/intimate, drinkable, edible (raw), edible (cooked), animate female, and animate male.

[9] The form of the possessive morpheme is phonologically conditioned (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976: 149); the allomorph *-ɲ* appears after the long *e* and after the long/short *i, and* unless the consonant preceding *i* is palatalized, the allomorph *–n* appears elsewhere.

The actual category of these classificatory expressions has been subject to debate. Most researchers agree that they are heads; their order in the DP follows the general headedness principles of a language. In most Austronesian languages they precede the noun denoting the possessum, although in VSO Micronesian languages they follow the noun. Most researchers agree that these expressions are different from sortal and measure classifiers familiar from such languages as Chinese or Thai (see, however, den Dikken 2003: ch. 2 for a case for their being more similar to the familiar classifiers than one would assume). Unlike the better-known Southeast Asian classifiers, Austronesian classifiers are not obligatory in counting, their inventory is more limited than that of familiar classifier languages, and most importantly, they do not serve to individuate and atomize nouns (cf. also Palmer and Brown 2007: 203).

Some researchers suggest that these words are a special closed class of nouns which take pronominal possessive marking and nominal dependents (Palmer and Brown 2007; Palmer 2009b). This approach relies on the parallelism between the classifiers and inalienably possessed nouns, which are also indexed for the person and number of their possessor using the same marking. The alternative, proposed by Lichtenberk (1983, 2009), is that these expressions should be considered "relational classifiers", thus functional elements, whose main purpose is to individuate the relation between the possessor and possessum under indirect possession. Lichtenberk's main morphosyntactic argument against treating these words as nouns comes from the fact that they are typically monosyllabic/monomoraic, while all other lexical nouns in Oceanic are disyllabic and/or bimoraic. Thus, "classifiers" do not meet the minimal nominal word criterion (Lichtenberk 2009: 385).

3.3   The Genitive Relative Construction

Polynesian languages have a striking construction known as the genitive or possessive relative clause (GRC), which is used when relativizing a non-subject. In a GRC, the head noun is

apparently modified by a genitive possessor, which is interpreted as the subject of the attached relative clause. The relative clause itself appears to lack a subject:

(20) a. *'ua   hāpono   te   'orometua 'i   te   rata*   *Tahitian*

           PERF send   DET teacher   OBJ DET letter

          'The teacher sent a/the letter.'

    b. *te   rata$_i$ tā   te   'orometua$_k$ [i   hāpono   __$_k$ __$_i$]*

       DET letter POSS DET teacher   DEP_TNS   send

       'the letter that the teacher sent'

       not *'the teacher's letter that someone sent'

(21) *ka   wā$_i$ a   Pāka'a [i   ha'alele aku ai$_i$ Hawaiian*

     DET time   POSS Pakaa   DEP_TNS   leave   DIR   RP

    iā   Waipi'o]

    OBJ   Waipio

    'the moment when Pakaa left Waipio' (Hawkins 2000: 134)

The GRC raises several analytical challenges. The first concerns whether the genitive noun phrase is internal or external to the relative clause. For seemingly similar constructions in the unrelated Altaic languages (Miyagawa 2011), the assumption is that the genitive is the subject of the relative clause and is internal to it. Baker 2006 argues for this view in Hawaiian. Other researchers, however, are in agreement for Polynesian that the genitive is a genuine possessor and is hence external to the relative clause (Clark 1976: 118, Bauer 1997, 2007; Hawkins 2000; Otsuka 2010b; Herd et al. 2011). Evidence for this conclusion comes from the fact that in Polynesian languages that allow pre-nominal possessors, the genitive in a GRC can occur pre-nominally, (22), a position that cannot be inside the relative clause:

(22) *ka   Pua   puke   i   kākau   ai*   *Hawaiian*

    GEN Pua   book PFV write   RP

    'the book that Pua wrote'   (Baker 2006:9, citing Hopkins 1992:233)

Accepting that the genitive is external to the relative clause, two analytical issues arise for which there is no consensus. We state them here without adjudicating on the evidence. The first issue is how the missing subject in the relative clause is syntactically represented in the relative clause, if at all. In other words, what is the identity of the empty category *e* in the representation in (23):

(23) $[_{DP}$ N$_i$ Possessor$_k$ $[_{rel\ clause}$ V e_k …]]

The second question is how the obligatory coreference relation between the genitive and a syntactic representation of the subject, which we represent by coindexation above, is enforced. A variety of answers to these questions are proposed in the literature (Otsuka 2010b, Herd et al. 2011), but without clear answers yet. Assuming that there is no movement relationship between the genitive on the head noun and an empty category inside the relative clause, the way coreference is established via co-indexation is relevant to syntactic theory because of the importance it attaches to cross-clausal dependencies. A better understanding of the GRC may lead to a new understanding of anaphoric dependencies if the mechanism used in GRCs turns out to be a novel one.

4   Verbal categories

The verbal domains in Austronesian languages have been very widely described and analyzed. Here we survey some of the major areas of research.

4.1 Agreement

Austronesian languages with agreement generally mark agreement with the subject (regardless of their case-marking alignment), and that marking is achieved using two basic strategies: affixal verbal agreement, common, for example, in Melanesian languages (see the discussion in Yamada 2006 for representative languages and examples), and clitics (in Micronesian, some dialects of Fijian, Rotuman, Polynesian, as well as some Melanesian languages). Micronesian languages and some Melanesian languages also show agreement with the object (see Song 1994 for an overview of the Nuclear Micronesian data). Compare in Puluwat, which illustrates a common pattern of agreement:

(24) *Wuŕumwo   ya   yákékkél-ee-ŕ   átekkit   mákk   Puluwat*

   Wurumwo   3SG.SUBJ   teach-TRANS-3PL.OBJ children writing

   'Wurumwo taught the children writing.' (Elbert 1974: 86)

Two questions are of interest in relation to agreement morphosyntax in Austronesian. First, a number of Austronesian languages are pro-drop, but it is not yet clear if there is a correlation between the availability of pro-drop and the availability of agreement. For example, Micronesian languages, which have relatively rich agreement, also have pro-drop, but so do agreement-poor Melanesian languages such as Cheke Holo (Palmer 2009a; Neeleman and Szendrői 2007). Presumably, the conditions on subject drop or topic drop may differ depending on whether or not a given language has agreement, but these conditions still need to be studied. The potential relationship between pro-drop and rich agreement has been very widely investigated in unrelated languages, and Austronesian language have the potential to inform the debate.

   The second issue has to do with the categorical nature of agreement markers: are they affixes or clitics? For subject markers, it is generally assumed that they are clitics, often on the basis of separability from the verb. For Rotuman, which on the surface seems to employ subject suffixes,

den Dikken (2003: ch. 6), following Vamarasi (2002), argues that these are also clitics. His main argument is that the apparent "pronominal suffixes" attach to any element on their immediate left and do not select for a particular category of host. He also cites diachronic evidence that some pronominal suffixes develop from clitics. However, that does not necessarily mean that a clitic cannot change its category. Object markers are generally assumed to be suffixes (cf. Song 1994).

Aside from the general criteria used to distinguish clitics and affixes (Zwicky and Pullum 1983, Zwicky 1985, Preminger 2009), criteria for identifying certain agreement markers as clitics or affixes may depend on a given language. The distinctions between affixation and cliticization have lately generated a lively debate in theoretical linguistics (e.g., Preminger 2009). We would like to emphasize the rich empirical potential offered by Oceanic languages in this area.

4.2   Voice

Perhaps no morphosyntactic category has been as much investigated in Austronesian as voice. Austronesian languages have constructions that resemble passives of more familiar Romance languages, which we discuss in section 4.2.1. However, so-called symmetric voice systems are the primary focus of interest, and their analysis is still quite controversial, as describe in section 4.2.2.

4.2.1   Passives

English-like passives are found in numerous Austronesian languages, for example, Indonesian and Māori illustrated below.

(25) a. saya   di-jemput   oleh   dia   *Indonesian*

        1SG   PASS-meet   by   3SG

        'I was met by him.'   (Sneddon 1996:248)

    b. i   koohete-tia   a   Pani   e   Huia   *Māori*

        T/A   scold-PASS   PERS   Pani   by   Huia

        'Pani was scolded by Huia.'   (Bauer 1993:396)

Some languages allow such passivization freely and extend it to intransitive predicates as well, cf. in Hawaiian (see also (29) above):

(26) a. *ua   komo-hia ka   mana'o   i   loko   ona*   *Hawaiian*

        PERF   enter-PASS DET   thought   to   inside   3SG.POSS

        'A thought occurred to him.' (Elbert and Pukui 1979: 86)

    b. *ua   hae-hia   ka   ʻīlio*

        PERF   bark-PASS   DET   dog

        'The dog was angry.'   (Elbert and Pukui 1979: 86)

Austronesian languages are relevant to our understanding of passives because of various language-particular characteristics that appear. For instance, in Samoan (Cook 1996), Woleian (Sohn 1975), and possibly in Marshallese (Willson 2010), passivization is possible only for those transitive verbs that denote an intended and apparent result. Thus, verbs like 'untie' or 'burn' can passivize (untying or burning leads to a clear change of the object's state) but verbs like 'count' do not (Willson 2010: 255). One challenge that Austronesian languages often pose is that putative passive morphology is not overt. The discussion of Fijian is illustrative, with Schütz and Nawadra 1972 arguing against passive and Kikusawa 1998 arguing for a passive. Even in languages where there is overt morphology, several strategies may be used (as in Marshallese, cf. Willson 2010:238), or the marking may be ambiguous with other verbal categories, such as

transitive and perfective (See Willson 2010 for Marshallesee, Cook 1996, Mosel and Hovdhaugen 1992: 198-204, 729-743 for Samoan).

A consequence of null morphology is that it becomes difficult to distinguish passives from null argument constructions. For example, subjects and objects can be dropped in Marshallese for some verb classes, making the analysis of the "passive" in (25) unclear.

(27) *John   e=naaj   ṃwij~ṃwij rainin*   *Marshallese*

   John   3SG.AGR=FUT   operate-INTR today

   (a) 'John will operate today.'

   (b) 'John will be operated on today.' (Willson 2010: 233, citing Bender 1969)

This is also the case in Hoava. (26b) could either be passive or transitive with a null indefinite subject.

(28) a.   *tuke-a   sa   makariva   sa   leboto*   *Hoava*

       throw-3SG.OBJ   DET boy   DET bushknife

       'The boy threw away the bushknife.'

   b.   *tuke   sa   leboto*

       throw   DET bushknife

       'The bushknife was thrown away.'   (Davis 2003: 113)

These languages and phenomena, including passive imperatives to be discussed below, are relevant to the theoretical analysis of passive. Despite decades of syntactic theorizing (Baker, Johnson, Roberts 1989, Goodall 1993, Collins 2005, Bruening to appear), major pieces of the analysis are still not in place, including Case properties of passives and the analysis of the agent *by*-phrase.

4.2.2 Imperative

The syntax of imperatives in Austronesian has been little analyzed (but see Koopman 2005, Potsdam 2010, and also Xrakovsky 2001, Aikhenvald 2010 for some mention of imperatives in Austronesian, among other languages). A widely noted characteristic of Austronesian imperatives is that they commonly occur in the passive voice, in both European-like and symmetric systems. In Māori, (29), the passive is required with a transitive verb (Bauer 1993:32). In Malagasy, (30), the passive is preferred to the active as less direct, although not required.

(29) a. *patu-a   te   kurii   raa!*   *Māori*
          beat-PASS DET dog   DIST
          (lit. "The dog be beaten!')
          'Beat that dog!'

     b. *whio-nga   atu   too   kurii   kia   hoki   mai*
          whistle-PASS   away   your dog   SJV   return hither
          'Whistle out to your dog to return!'   (Bauer 1993:32)

(30) a.   *vakio*   *ilay*   *boky!*   *Malagasy*

        read.PASS.IMP   that   book

        (lit. "That book be read!")

        'Read that book!'

    b.   *ataovy*   *foana*   *ny*   *enti-mody!*

        do.PASS.IMP   always   DET   homework

        'Always do the homework!'

Such examples raise a number of cross-linguistic analytical issues. Is it a question of grammar and/or usage that determines the bias towards passive imperatives and what accounts for the contrast with English and similar languages where parallel passive imperatives are uniformly ungrammatical (cf. *The dog be beaten!*)? What is the structure of such imperatives and, in particular, what is the subject of the clause? That is, are the clauses genuinely passive with the theme in subject position, or do they represent some other alignment of grammatical functions? Passives are thus potentially very informative for the correct analysis of symmetric voice systems, as in Malagasy. In many languages, such as Māori, expression of the agent is restricted in various ways (Bauer 1993:33-34), which further complicates the picture.

4.3   Serial verbs

A serial verb construction (SVC) is typically understood as a monoclausal structure expressing a single event and consisting of more than one lexical verb. The relationship between the verbs in SVCs is not expressed by overt morphosyntactic means. The verbs in a SVC all share one or more of the core arguments, typically either the subject argument or the object (theme) argument (Foley and Olson 1985, Comrie 1995, Baker 1989, Collins 1997).

Since the notion of event and the criteria which allow us to identify the main verb vary from language to language, the notion of SVC is far from typologically or theoretically coherent; some researchers have specifically argued that SVCs do not form a coherent class (Sebba 1987; Baker 1991; Foley 2010). The range of SVCs across languages is highly varied, from what looks like light verb complexes to complex narrative strings. Verbal serialization is more common in, but not exclusive to, languages with impoverished morphology and languages with verb-medial order. Accordingly, in Oceanic SVCs are found primarily in Melanesian languages, many of which are SVO.

Despite some apparent differences, SVCs share a number of common properties that distinguish them from coordinated VPs. First, they have to appear in a fixed order, whereas the order of constituents under coordination can be changed. Second, an overt pronoun cannot appear with the second or third verb in SVCs. Third, serial verbs typically fall under the scope of single negation. And finally, object arguments can be A-bar moved under serialization, which would be unexpected in coordination.

Researchers recognize several subtypes of SVCs within Oceanic languages (Crowley 1987; Sperlich 1993; Crowley 2002: ch. 2; François 2007; Lichtenberk 2007, a.o.). Despite some differences, these constructions share several common properties: the verbs appear without any overt linkers or connectors, they cannot have different tense and aspect markings, they can have just one negation, and their mood marking is subject to a number of constraints which we will discuss below.

In the *same-subject* subtype of serialization, two or more verbs within the SVC share the subject:

(31) *ø-pa   ø-tapolou ø-teke   pulu-p̃alu*   *Lewo*

   3SG-go   3SG-hide   3SG-stay hole-creek

   'He went and hid in the creek bed.' (Early 1993: 68)

Although we do not have detailed analyses of such structures, we hypothesize that same-subject serialization involves V-V compounds, as has been proposed for similar structures outside Oceanic.

Same-subject SVCs typically include verbs of motion or posture, and it is possible that such SVCs could be reduced to paratactic coordination rather than subordination.

(32) *na-muali   nau-vaa   eni   leilai*   *Paamese*

    1SG:REAL-walk 1SG:REAL-go to   bush

    'I walked to the bush.' (Crowley 2002: 53)

In the type known as *switch-subject serialization*, the object of the one verb in SVC serves as the subject of the next verb ('the pig' is subject of 'hit' and object of 'die'):

(33) *ti-rap   nggaya   ø-mate*   *Gitua*

    3PL-hit   pig   3SG-die

    'They killed the pig.' (Bradshaw 1999: 278)

Next, serialization is common in cases when a non-first verb in the SVC *adds a new argument*, typically a goal (recipient, benefactive), a source, or an instrument. For example:

(34) *e-metlei   pihin   keléri   k-i-to   semel wak*   *Kele*

    2SG-kill   woman   that   IRR-3SG-stand iron long

    'Kill that woman with an axe.' (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002: 143)

Judging by examples, some cases of argument-adding serialization fall under the type of switch-subject serialization, or the case where all the verbs share the subject and theme object (cf. Margetts 2007: 90-96 for examples from different Oceanic languages).

Under *inclusory serialization*, the subject of the non-first verb is referentially identical to both the subject and object of the first (Crowley 2002: Ch. 2). For example, in (23), the subject of 'go' includes both the subject and object of 'take':

(35) *ma-kuri-ko*   *lo-va-haa*   *Paamese*

   1SG:IMM_FUT-take-2SG   1DUAL.INCL-IMM_FUT-go

   'I will take you away with me.' (Crowley 2002: 41)

Finally, research on Oceanic SVCs recognizes so-called *ambient serialization* (Crowley's term), where a serialized verb denotes a general characteristic of a given event. This type of SVC seems similar to secondary predication or adverbial modification of non-serializing languages.

(36) *inau na-muasi-ko*   *ø-gaiho*   *Paamese*

   1SG   1SG.REAL-hit-2SG   3SG.REAL-hard

   'I hit you hard.' (Crowley 2002: 61)

Typically, only one verb in SVCs is marked for tense, aspect, and agreement (Collins 1997; Hiraiwa and Bodomo 2008), and some take this to be a defining property of SVCs. However, in Paamese, Numbami, Kele, and possibly some other Oceanic languages, those markers appear on all serialized verbs (Crowley 2002; Bradshaw 2004: 265-6); in such cases, the markers have to be the same or congruent for tense and aspect. For example, in Paamese, the marking for tense and mood has to be identical on all the verbs inside the SVC (Crowley 2002: 59-62). In contrast, when one of the verbs takes a subordinate complement, the subordinate verb shows dependent mood marking (immediate mood rather than realis), and this difference in mood marking separates genuine SVCs from paratactic subordination (Crowley 2002: 55-57, 62-64). SVCs are different from asyndetic coordination in that they allow only one subject clitic per verbal complex, although the placement of that single clitic may vary (Crowley 2002: 56). Other

distinctions include the absence of a linker or conjunction in SVCs and the uniform scope of negation over all the verbs in the SVC.

We are aware of these differences in Paamese because of Crowley's careful work on this language (Crowley 1982; 2002: Ch. 3, 5). However, the nature of restrictions on SVCs may vary across Oceanic languages. In the absence of detailed data from individual languages, it is difficult to judge the relevant examples or assign a particular syntactic structure to them. Apparent SVCs may in fact stand in for at least four other structures: (a) paratactic coordination of verbs, (b) control structures, (c) compound verbs with one of the verbs possibly serving as a light verb, and (d) combinations of a verb and adverb. With respect to the last type, we have already commented on the difficulty of identifying the class of adjectives in Oceanic. The identification of adverbs is equally difficult, as it is sometimes hard to determine if a word following a verb is an adverb or a secondary verb. For example, in Big Nambas, it is not entirely clear if the word *maməln* is to be interpreted as an adverb or as a stative verb:

(37) *a-van*   *maməln*   *a*   *nəhau*   *Big Nambas*
      3REAL-PL-do   aimless   OBL   pudding

      'They made the pudding in a slovenly manner.' (Crowley 2002: 51, citing Fox 1979)

The discussion in Crowley seems to suggest this may be a SVC; however, it does not conform to the established types of SVCs, and most importantly, in the absence of detailed diagnostics like those for Paamese, it is hard to draw any conclusions about this construction. Since quite a number of descriptions of Oceanic SVCs do not go into the same level of detail as Crowley did for Paamese, the limits of Oceanic serialization remain to be explored.

5   *Alignment*

5.1   *Alignment types*

As mentioned above, Austronesian nouns typically do not bear case-marking affixes and are marked for case by free-standing case particles. The majority of Austroneisan languages show a nominative-accusative alignment: the subject of an intransitive verb, S, and the subject of transitive verb, A, appear in the same case (nominative), and the object, O, is in a distinct case (accusative). Tahitian in (38) is representative. Subjects are unmarked, and objects occur with the accusative particle *'i*.

(38) a.   *te   ma'ue nei   te   mau manu*   *Tahitian*

ASP fly   ASP DET PL   bird

'The birds are flying.'

    b.   *'ua 'ite te   tamaiti 'i   te   mau manu*

PERF see DET child   ACC DET PL   bird

'The child saw (the) birds.'

Numerous Austronesian languages show so-called neutral alignment: noun phrases show no overt case marking, and grammatical functions are distinguished by agreement and word order. Lewo is an example:

(39)   *omami   me-muni   wii*   *Lewo*

1PL.EXCL 1PL.EXCL.SUBJ-drink water

'We drank water.' (Early 1993: 73)

Finally, some Austronesian languages are ergative: the subject of an intransitive and the object of a transitive verb are expressed by an absolutive form, and the subject of a transitive is in the ergative case. This alignment is found in some Polynesian languages, such as Tongan:

(40) a. *na'e*   *'alu*   *'a*   *Sione*   *ki*   *he*   *ako*   *Tongan*

        PAST   go   ABS John   to   DEF   school

        'John went to school.'

   b. *na'e*   *fana'i*   *'e*   *Sione*   *'a*   *Mele*

        PAST   shoot   ERG   John   ABS   Mary

        'John shot Mary.'   (Otsuka 2000:16)

In addition to Western Polynesian languages, the ergative alignment is found in Roviana (Corston 1996, Corston-Oliver 2002), several languages of New Caledonia (Bril 1997, 2002; Moyse-Faurie 1983; Moyse-Faurie and Ozanne-Rivierre 1983), and Melanesian languages such as Motu (Lister-Turner and Clark 1931; Dixon 1994: 58), Hula (Pat 1996, Ball 2007), and Sinaugoro (Tauberschmidt and Bala 1992). Cf. example (2a) above from East Futunan and (38) from Nêlêmwâ:

(41) a. *i*   *aa-thu-maada*   *ø*   *âlô*   *hleny*   *Nêlêmwâ*

        3SG   NOM.AGENTIS-make-nostalgia   ABS   child   DEICTIC

        'This child is always sad.' (Bril 2002: 71)

   b. *i*   *fhe*   *me*   *ø*   *pwâ-ciic*   *hleny*   *ru*   *âlô*

        3SG   bring   DIR   ABS   fruit   DEICTIC   ERG   child

        'The child brought this fruit here.' (Bril 2002: 136)

A number of languages in Austronesian show alignment patterns that are difficult to describe in these established terms. Philippine languages have been particularly subject to controversy as to what kind of alignment they represent. Consider the following examples from Tagalog:

(42) a. *b<in>ili   ng babae   ang   isda*   *Tagalog*

       <ASP>Buy   NG   woman   ANG   fish

   b. *b<um>ili   ang   babae   ng   isda*

       <ASP>buy   ANG   woman   NG   fish

       'The woman bought fish.'

   c. *d<um>ating   ang babae*

       <ASP>arrive ANG   woman

       'The woman arrived.'

We have not qualified the markers *ang* and *ng* in any particular way, because their status is subject to the ongoing debate concerning the relationship between verbal morphology and nominal argument marking. Note that when the verb takes the inflection *–in-*, the marker *ang* appears on the object. When the verb takes the marking *–um-*, *ang* appears on the subject. Some researchers assume that *ang* is a case marker and that Tagalog and related Philippine languages must therefore be ergative. Under such an approach, clauses with verbs in *–in-* are transitive, and clauses with verbs in *–um-* are intransitive or antipassive. The marker *ang* marks the absolutive case, while *ng* marks ergative and/or oblique case (Manning 1996; Aldridge 2004, 2006, 2008).

On the other hand, Rackowski (2002) and Rackowski and Richards (2005) propose that Tagalog is an accusative language in which the nominative case is assigned by the finite T head to subjects, and the accusative case is assigned by the transitive light verb head to objects. Under this approach, the markers *ang* and *ng* are not indicators of case at all, and our glosses should probably remain the way they are in (39). The main case-marking work is done by verbal infixes.

In particular, the transitive perfective infix *–in-* on the verb registers agreement with the accusative case feature of the DP marked with *ang*. The intransitive infix *–um-* marks agreement with the nominative feature of the DP marked with *ng*. The main function of *ang* is to label the highest structural argument in a given configuration.

A similar approach is proposed for Malagasy by Pearson (2005); like Rakowski and Richards, Pearson characterizes the right-peripheral DP (pivot in his terminology) as the highest A′-argument (topic) without classifying Malagasy as an ergative language. As in other Philippine-type languages, the grammatical role of the pivot is specified by voice morphology on the verb. The sentences in (43), with the pivot underlined, illustrate the actor-topic (AT), theme-topic (TT), and circumstantial-topic (CT) forms, respectively. Pivot/voice alternations play a central role in Malagasy grammar; A′-extraction of a DP is only possible if the right "voice" form is chosen. Thus, the agent ("subject") extraction requires the AT form, and the theme ("object") extraction requires the TT form (Keenan 1976).

(43) a.   a.*n-i-vidy   ny   kadoa ho an-dreni-ny   ny   zaza*   *Malagasy*

        PAST-AT-buy   DET gift   for OBL-mother-3SG   DET child

        'The child bought a gift for his mother.'

    b.   *no-vid-in' ny   zaza   ho an-dreni-ny   ny   kadoa*

        PAST-buy-TT'DET child   for   OBL-mother-3SG   DET gift

        'The gift, the child bought for his mother.'

    c.   *n-ividi-an'ny   zaza   (ny) kadoa   ny   reni-ny*

        PAST-buy-CT'DET child   DET gift   DET mother-3SG

        'Mother, the child bought a gift for.'

According to Pearson's analysis, Malagasy clauses always contain an A′-position, and it is the position of the pivot, which must always be filled. "Voice" morphology expresses the Case

features of an A′-chain, making it analogous to wh-agreement in Chamorro (Chung 1994, 1998). As a result, Malagasy does not show any ergative properties.

5.2　Syntactic ergativity

One crucial issue in studies of ergativity is the existence of syntactic ergativity as opposed to morphological ergativity (Dixon 1979, 1994, Manning 1996, Aldridge 2008). Languages such as Tongan clearly show morphological ergativity, in which S and O are *morphologically* distinct from A. Syntactic ergativity exists when S and O additionally act *syntactically* distinctly from O with respect to various phenomena, such as control, pro-drop, and extraction. Tchekhoff 1979, 1981 and Otsuka 2000, 2010a argue that Tongan shows syntactic ergativity in addition to morphological ergativity. This appears most clearly in its zero anaphora (coreference) options. When two clauses are conjoined with *pea* 'and', both coreferential noun phrases must be in the absolutive position. The missing elements in the second clauses below must be absolutive, corresponding to the primitives S or O (Dixon 1979). It cannot correspond to A, which is ergative.

(44) a. *na'e   taa'i   'e   Mele$_i$ 'a   Hina$_j$ pea   tangi   e$_{i/*j}$ Tongan*

     PAST   hit   ERG   Mele   ABS   Hina   and   cry

     'Mele hit Hina and she (Hina) cried.'   (Otsuka 2000: 37)

   b. *na'e   'ave   'e   Sione$_i$ 'a   Mele$_k$ ki   he   palasi   pea*

     PAST   take   ERG   John   ABS   Mary   to   DET   palace   and

     fakamolemole'i 'e   he   kuini   e$_{k/*i}$

     forgive   ERG   DET   queen   (Otsuka 2000: (5.16))

     'John took Mary to the palace and the queen forgave her/*him.'

   c. **na'e   tangi   'a   Hina$_i$ pea   taa'i   e$_i$ 'a   Mele*

     PAST   cry   ABS   Hina   and   cry   ABS   Mele

     'Hina cried and hit Mele.'   (Otsuka 2000: 37)

The domain where syntactic ergativity seems most robust is that of A' movement, in particular, relativization.[10] The generalization is that absolutive arguments relativize using a distinct pattern from ergative arguments. The former typically relativize using a gap strategy, while the latter do not. Consider Tongan again. In the examples below, absolutive DPs must relativize with a gap, (45), but the ergative requires a resumptive pronoun in the relative clause, (46). A resumptive pronoun would be ungrammatical in (45), and a gap is in impossible in (46) (Otsuka 2000:117).

---

[10] Since argument wh-questions in these languages are formed using clefts or pseudo-clefts, their formation also relies on relativization. See section 7.2.2 below.

(45) a. *e   fefine   na'e   'alu   ki Tonga*   *Tongan*

          DEF woman PAST go   to Tonga

          'the woman who went to Tonga'   (Otsuka 2000:116)

    b. *e   fefine   'oku   'ofa'i   'e   Sione*

          DEF woman PRS   love   ERG Sione

          'the woman who Sione loves'   (Otsuka 2000:116)

(46) *e   siana   na'a   ne   langa 'a   e   fale*   *Tongan*

      DEF woman PAST 3SG   build ABS DEF house

      'the man who built the house'   (Otsuka 2000:117)

This indicator of syntactic ergativity is common in Austronesian, even when other signs of syntactic ergativity are absent.[11] Such a pattern is not unique to Austronesian: among the thirty-something morphologically ergative languages in WALS (Comrie 2008), only a handful allow A-bar movement of the ergative with a gap.

Based on control, reflexivization, incorporation, and genitive relative clause formation, Massam (2002) argues that the closely-related, morphologically-ergative language Niuean does not show syntactic ergativity. She shows that Niuean treats intransitive subjects, transitive subjects, and objects equally in pro-drop, quantifier float, relativization, and question formation, which is again incompatible with syntactic ergativity. Similarly, in a detailed analysis of several syntactic processes within Western Polynesian languages, Chung (1978) concludes that the ergativity in these languages is only morphological, observable at the level of case marking but not anywhere else. The existence of syntactic ergativity in Austronesian thus remains murky.

---

[11] A clear exception is Niuean, where both ergative and absolutive noun phrases relativize with a gap (Chung 1978, Seiter 1980).

Such languages can contribute to understanding the controversies surrounding syntactic ergativity by delimiting the phenomena that are relevant for classifying a language as syntactically ergative.

5.3   Case assignment in ergative languages

The presence of distinct relativization strategies in the absence of other signs of syntactic ergativity has led researchers to look elsewhere for an explanation of the above Tongan pattern. Many researchers have tried to link it to the way the absolutive and ergative cases are assigned—an issue of considerable significance in the theoretical literature (see Aldridge 2008, Legate 2008, Woolford 2006, a.o.).

All researchers conceive of the absolutive as a structural case, however, there is no general consensus with respect to the head which assigns such case. The general approach promoted in the work by Legate (2008) and Aldridge (2008) is that in many ergative languages, the *abstract absolutive* is assigned by the T head in intransitive clause, while the *v* head assigns the abstract accusative case. Since the relevant languages lack nominative and accusative case morphology (see also section 4.1 on such an approach as, for example, in Tagalog), both nominative and accusative are realized as a morphological default which is the "absolutive". This is the conception of the absolutive as a default case, and such ergative languages are not very different from nominative-accusative languages in terms of their case assignment; after all, their transitive *v* assigns the accusative, but it simply does not have the typical surface morphology associated with accusatives. The other type of ergative languages are languages which cannot assign a structural accusative, and in these languages the absolutive case is assigned by the finite T head. These are languages whose absolutive is like the nominative: the highest structural case is assigned in the derivation. Since these languages require a finite T for absolutive case assignment, they do not allow the absolutive to appear in non-finite clauses.

If we assume the division of ergative languages into the absolute-as-default and absolutive-as-nominative type, a question naturally arises what type is represented in the Austronesian family. Niuean, as Massam (2006) argues, is of the former type, and Seediq, as Aldridge (2004, 2008) suggests, is of the latter type. Since there is no full consensus as to which Austronesian languages are ergative, this division into types calls for further scrutiny.

Turning now to the ergative, most researchers suggest that it is an inherent case, that is, a case which is tightly connected to certain thematic roles, the main one being agent. Such a case, assigned to an external argument, is inherently licensed inside the vP. Following a number of other researchers, Woolford (2006) examines various diagnostics for structural vs. inherent case and finds most of them unreliable. Among the few diagnostics that survive her scrutiny is the preservation of case under raising. She illustrates the diagnostic with an example from Tongan (Chung 1978, Hendrick 2004), wherein the subject of a transitive embedded clause raises and retains its ergative marking:[12]

---

[12] We have slightly modified the glosses used in Woolford's paper.

(47) a. *'e   lava*   [*'o   ako 'e Pita   'a   e   lea   Tongan*

       TNS   possible/can COMP   learn ERG Peter   ABS   DET   language

faka-tonga]

Tongan

    'Peter can learn Tongan.' ('It is possible for Peter to learn Tongan.')

                        (Woolford 2006, from Hendrick 2004, (52))

   b. *'e   lava*   *'e   Pita* [*'o   ako ~~'e Pita~~ 'a   e   lea*

       TNS   possible/can ERG   P   COMP   learn   ABS   DET   language

faka-tonga]

Tongan

    'Peter can learn Tongan.' (Woolford 2006, from Hendrick 2004, (53))

Similar examples are found in Samoan (Chung 1978: 85; Mosel and Hovdhaugen 1992: 711), where the ergative is preserved under raising. Nevertheless, Otsuka 2000 argues that this construction does not instantiate true subject-to-subject raising. It thus would not indicate whether ergative is a structural or inherent case. Clearly ergative Austronesian languages have the potential to contribute to the issues surrounding the assignment of ergative and absolutive cases: what kinds of cases they are and what head the case is assigned or checked by.

5.4   Diachrony of morphological accusativity and ergativity

The diachronic origins of ergativity and the historical relationship between accusative and ergative patterns have long been the subject of debate. The reanalysis of a passive is often assumed as the common source of ergative alignment: the *by*-phrase is reanalyzed from adjunct to subject, and the subject of a passive is reanalyzed as a direct object (Kurylowicz 1964, Comrie 1978), (48). Since many Austronesian languages make extensive use of the passive, this picture

is particularly plausible for Austronesian, and the languages serve as a prime testing ground for theories of ergative diachrony.

(48) a. stage 1:

       Verb-PASS   DP-Subject/Theme   PP-Adjunct/Agent

                      NOMINATIVE   OBLIQUE CASE

    b. stage 2:

       Verb(-AFFIX)   DP-Object/Theme   DP-Subject/Agent

                      ABSOLUTIVE   ERGATIVE

Such a reanalysis would account for the null marking of the absolutive (as it develops from the unmarked nominative), overt marking of the ergative, and for VOSX languages, for the word order.

Alternatively, one could imagine that the ergative alignment predated the accusative alignment; the middle or antipassive construction would spread as the general transitive as shown below, and the former ergative could either disappear or be re-analyzed into a passive, in the reversal of (30).

(49) a. stage 1:

       Verb-MIDDLE/ANTI   DP-Subject/Agent   PP-Adjunct/Theme

                        ABSOLUTIVE   OBLIQUE CASE

    b. stage 2:

       Verb(-AFFIX)   DP-Subject/Agent   DP-Object/Theme

                      NOMINATIVE   ACCUSATIVE

Both diachronic analyses have been proposed in the literature for Austronesian, primarily in relation to Proto-Polynesian where the marker **e* is reconstructed as general oblique/ergative, **i*

as direct object/object of the middle marker, and *-Cia* as the suffix of passive. Following Hohepa (1969) and Hale (1968), Chung (1978) develops the passive-to-ergative reanalysis. Her main arguments for this direction of reanalysis have to do with the wide distribution of passives in Polynesian, the use of *i* with all transitive verbs (thus, not limited to middles), and the use of *e as a general oblique marker (see also Seiter 1980: Ch. 6 and Chung and Seiter 1980).

The opposite view is advanced by Clark (1973, 1976). Clark's arguments for the ergative-to-passive reanalysis rely on demographic evidence (ergative languages are spoken in Western Polynesia, which was settled earlier), distributional evidence (ergativity is found in two out of three branches of Polynesian), and the similarity of the *-Cia* reflexes outside Polynesian—according to Clark, these suffixes marked transitivity of the verb and were later re-analyzed as passive exponents (see Ota 2000 for a development of this view).[13]

In more recent work, Kikusawa (2002, 2003) has further developed Clark's arguments by bringing in more comparative evidence from outside Polynesian. She makes a greater connection between the functions of pronominal clitics and/or agreement markers and the grammatical functions of corresponding nouns doubled by these clitics (or indexed by agreement). The pronominal system of Proto-Oceanic seems to have operated on the basis of accusative alignment. As pronominal elements disappeared, for example, as in Rotuman, nouns developed the accusative pattern in their stead.

In arguing against Kikusawa's proposal, Ball (2008) emphasizes the scarcity of ergative languages in Central Pacific, questions her pronominal evidence, and suggests that the current

---

[13] This view is also supported by work on Māori. For example, Bauer (1993: 11) characterizes the grammatical function of direct objects as new, one which just recently developed in a formerly ergative system.

accusative systems could historically be related to locative patterns, thus backing Chung's analysis of them as middles.

Otsuka 2011 further argues for Clark's position by considering the situation in Eastern Polynesian languages, such as Hawaiian and Māori, more carefully. Under the passive-to-ergative reanalysis, these languages reflect the nominative/accusative case system of Proto-Polynesian, as exemplified by the Tahitian data in (38). Otsuka proposes that these languages are not actually accusative and thus cannot represent the older state. Instead, they have a symmetric voice system that arises naturally from the PPn ergative pattern through increased use of the middle construction shown as the first stage in (49).

There is no clear conclusion at this point, except that Austronesian languages have a great deal to contribute to the diachronic picture as well as the synchronic one.

6   Subject-only restriction

The essence of this restriction is that the only argument that can be extracted is the most prominent DP. This subject-only restriction is widespread in Austronesian: it occurs, for instance, in Malagasy, Philippine languages, Formosan languages, languages of Indonesia, and many Polynesian languages. From the discussion above, it is clear that it resurfaces as an absolutives-only restriction in some of the transparently ergative Polynesian languages, such as Tongan or Samoan. To illustrate, consider the following examples from the Formosan language Kavalan (Lin 2012):

(50) a. *tiana   q<m>an   tu   'may-ku?*

      who   <AV>eat   OBL   rice-1SG.GEN

      'Who eats my rice?'

   b. **tiana   p<m>ukun=isu?*

       who   <AV>hit=2SG.ABS

      ('Who do you hit?')

   c. **tiana   ala-an   ya   kelisiw-ku?*

       who   take-PV   ABS   money-1SG.GEN

      ('Who takes my money?')

The restriction has been the springboard for much syntactic theorizing since it was first discussed for Malagasy by Keenan (1972), who tied it to the Malagasy voice system. Since Keenan's work, the theoretical explanations offered have been, and continue to be, quite diverse. Many accounts of the subject-only restriction continue to be deeply intertwined with explanations of the Austronesian voice system discussed in section 4 above.

For instance, in their minimalist discussion of voice and extraction in Tagalog, Rackowski and Richards (2005) derive the subjects-only restriction from the Phase Impenetrability Condition, plus the claim that in this language, vP forms a phase. The existing voice markers (see *–um-* or *–in-* presented above) are instantiations of different v heads. Rackowski and Richards' analysis therefore comes close to explicitly maintaining the tight connection between voice and extraction originally posited for Austronesian by Keenan.

In contrast, in Pearson's (2005) discussion of Malagasy, there simply is no subject-only restriction. For Pearson, the so-called voices of Malagasy illustrated below are produced by wh-movement applying directly to different DP arguments. What is distinctive about Malagasy is that extraction is signaled morphologically in the verb, arguably by wh-agreement, which according to Pearson (2005) functions the same way the wh–agreement works in Chamorro

(Chung 1998). If this approach is on the right track, Malagasy is a language with wh-agreement but no highly articulated voice system as such. The inflection analyzed by others as voice instead serves to indicate which DP—subject, direct object, or applicative object—has undergone wh-movement.

The opposite tack to the subject-only restriction is taken by Gerassimova and Sells (2008), who analyze it as applied to wh-constructions in Tagalog. Gerassimova and Sells hypothesize that all wh-constructions in Tagalog are built from relative clauses, but that relativization in this language involves not A-bar-movement but rather A-movement, namely raising. If we adopt that analysis, Tagalog has no wh-movement whatsoever; the subject-only restriction follows from the generalization that A-movement across clauses must target an embedded subject (theoretical implementations of this generalization may vary). The limitation of raising to subjects of the embedding clause is independently well established, thus as a result of the analysis proposed by Gerassimova and Sells (2008), Austronesian languages appear rather unremarkable. In this analysis, the voice markers do what voice markers are supposed to do, namely promote a particular argument to the embedded subject position, thus making it accessible to subject-to-subject raising.

Some recent attempts have been made to broaden the scope of investigation, for instance, by exploring patterns of adjunct extraction in Austronesian languages (see Gärtner et al. 2006). Some Austronesian languages, such as Chamorro, Malagasy, and Indonesian, appear to allow adjuncts to extract freely, as long as the usual island constraints are obeyed; for example, in Malagasy (Potsdam 2006):

(51) a. taiza   no   nanafina   ny   lakileko   ny zaza?

       where FOC hide.ACT   the   key.1SG   the child

    b. taiza   no   nafenin'   ny   zaza   ny   lakileko?

       where FOC hide.PASS   the   child   the   key.1SG

    c. taiza   no   nanafenan' ny zaza   ny   lakileko?

       where FOC hide.CIRC   the child   the   key.1SG

       'Where did the child hide my key?'

In other Austronesian languages, adjunct extraction appears to be severely restricted. For example, in Futunan, the extraction of adjuncts is only possible if the adjunct is resumed by the pronoun *ai* at the extraction site (cf. (Moyse-Faurie 1997b: 27-28):

(52) a. le   gāne'a [e   kau   'eva'eva *(ai)]

      DET area IMPF 1SG walk   AI

      'the area where I go for walks' (Moyse-Faurie 1997b: 75)

    b. le   sele   [ke   tu'uti *(ai) le   ga   pane]

      DET knife PURP cut   AI DET CLF bread

      'the knife to cut bread' (Moyse-Faurie 1997b: 27)

We hypothesize that adjunct extraction could ultimately shed quite a bit of light on the peculiarly Austronesian interplay of voice and extraction that we have just surveyed. The difference in adjunct extraction suggests that the explanation for the subject-only restriction may differ across different Austronesian languages.

7   Other syntactic phenomena

7.1   Binding

A striking feature of many Oceanic languages is the absence of dedicated anaphors subject to binding theory rules. Instead, Oceanic languages use a generic pronoun coreferential with the antecedent to produce a reflexive interpretation. For example, in Tongan:

(53) *'Oku   tokanga'i   (pē)   'e   Mele   ia*   *Tongan*

      PRES   watch   INTENS   ERG   M   3SG

   (a) 'Mary looks after herself.'

   (b) 'Mary looks after him/her.'

Note that the reflexive interpretation is not categorical and is largely determined by the context. Crucially, the relationship between the "binder" and "bindee" is referential, not syntactic, and it is subject to preferences rather than binding theory rules.

The pronoun associated with the antecedent in the same clause can appear with an intensifier or "delimiter", cf. *pç* in the example above. This intensifier is often the same as a focus marker. The connection between reflexivization and intensifiers has long been noted: intensifiers can be used to reinforce reflexive pronouns (König and Siemund 2000). We hypothesize that the intensifier serves to limit the range of referents available to the pronoun, which facilitates the binding interpretation. Such a function is compatible with the intensifier's role as a focus element because focus restricts the pragmatically available set of alternatives selected for interpretation (Rooth 1992).

The same type of inferred binding with generic pronouns is found in reciprocals as well. For example, in Toqabaqita, the reciprocal interpretation is inferred in a clause with a pronominal

plural object (or a constituent of the object), similar to the pattern shown for the reflexives. Compare:

(54) *roo   wane   kero   laba-taqi   keeroqa   Toqabaqita*

    two   man   3DU.NONFUT affect_negatively-TRANS   3DU

    (a) 'The two men harm each other.'

    (b) 'The two men harm them (two).' (Lichtenberk 2000: 42)

There are also a number of morphological strategies used to mark verbs as reciprocals; the most common marking is similar to that of middles or pluractional verbs.

7.2   Questions

7.2.1   Yes-no (polar) questions

In some Oceanic languages, polar questions are marked by a particle which either appears clause-initially or following the predicate.

(55) *kuh   kom   mas?*   *Kosrae*

    INTERR   2SG   sick

    'Are you sick?' (Lee 1975: 328)

Of these languages, some restrict the initial polar question marker from occurring in wh-questions (for example, the Kosrae marker above is limited to yes-no questions only).[14] In those

---

[14] In other languages, that marker is possible in wh-questions, cf. in Rotuman:

languages where the question particle is initial, it can be analyzed as an embedding predicate, roughly with the meaning 'to be true or not' (cf. Bauer 1993: 139-140 and further references therein for Māori), either with an expletive subject or with the embedded clause as subject:

(56) [$_{TP}$ *(expl)* INTERR   [$_{TP}$ ....]]?

Another strategy in marking yes-no questions is the use of an interrogative marker which appears at the right edge of the predicate phrase, for example:

(57) *na'e lau tohi nai   'a   e   leka*?   *Tongan*
      PAST read   INTERR ABS DET   child
      'Did the child read?'

Such markers are compatible both with polar and wh-questions. Depending on the language, they have been analyzed as second position clitics (Paul 2001 for Malagasy), predicate particles (Bauer 1993, Massam 2001), or heads of separate projections. The latter analysis has been proposed, for instance, for the Marshallese interrogative marker *ke* (Willson 2007, 2008). This marker cannot be question-initial but can appear in a number of sentential positions in a regular yes-no question. In the following example, we show in parentheses all the possible placements of *ke:*

(i)   a. *ka   ia   noh 'e   Fiti?*
           INTERR 3SG live PRP Fiji
           'Does he live in Fiji?' (Churchward 1940: 30)

       b. *ka   tei   fā   tā?*
           INTERR where man DET
           'Where is the man?' (Churchward 1940: 43)

(58) *Herman e-n*   *(ke) bajjek (ke) kōṃṃan (ke) bade*   *Marshallese*

   Herman 3SG-should   just   make   party

   eo (ke) ñan   er (ke)?

   DET   for   3PL

   'Should Herman just throw a party for them?' (Willson 2007, ex. (4))

In negative yes-no questions, the interrogative *ke* has to appear sentence-finally. Willson proposes an analysis in which *ke* is the head of the interrogative phrase (IntP) in the articulated left periphery of the clause (Rizzi 2001), thus:

(59) [ForceP [TopicP   [IntP *ke* [TopicP [FocusP [TopicP … [Fin P …]]]]]]]

The particle does not move, however, portions of the clause can move to the specifier of a focus phrase below IntP, with subsequent remnant movement to one of the Topic positions available in the structure. While Willson offers language-internal evidence for such an analysis, it remains to be seen whether it is applicable to interrogative particles in other languages.

   Finally, there are some languages where polar questions do not receive any special segmental marking and are characterized by a special prosody only. The distribution of the three main strategies of yes-no question marking in Oceanic languages is not fully known, and better empirical coverage is much needed in this area.

7.2.2   Wh-questions

Cross-linguistically wh-questions can be formed by using different strategies. One of these strategies is *substitution*, or *wh-in-situ*: the wh-phrase remains in place, as in the following Manam and Saliba examples, where the wh-word appears in the same place as the constituent

that is questioned (60), (61). This strategy is common for SOV languages, and the Oceanic languages where it is observed are indeed SOV.[15]

(60) a. *tama-m   ina   i-lako?*   *Manam*

        father-2SG   where   3SG-go

        'Where did your father go?' (Turner 1986: 78)

   b. *kaiko   naita   zaiza   ka-pile~pile?*

        2SG   who   with   2SG-speak~REDUPL

        'Who are you speaking with?'   (Turner 1986: 74)

(61) a. *puwaka-ne   saha   se-he-kai-di?*   *Saliba*

        pig-DET   what   3PL-CAUS-eat-3PL.OBJ

        'What did they feed the pigs?' (Margetts 1999: 294, 309)

   b. *bosa   labui-wa   haedi?*

        basket   two-PREV_MENTIONED   where

        'Where are the two baskets?' (Margetts 1999: 301)

Displacement or movement, where a wh-phrase is moved to some privileged position, typically the front of a clause, is another strategy of wh-question formation; we will illustrate it with English:

(62) ***What*** *did you buy* ~~*what*~~*?*

---

[15] We do not know if all SOV Oceanic languages have wh-in-situ; for some, e.g., Manam, there is variation between fronting and in situ. In some cases it is hard to tell because many examples show wh-questions of subjects which appear clause-initially.

Questions can also be formed using a biclausal construction with a *cleft* or a *pseudo-cleft*. A pseudo-cleft is a biclausal equative construction in which the wh-phrase is the predicate and the subject is a nominalized relative clause:

(63) a. *[The thing you bought] is what?*

      b. *What is [the thing you bought]?*

A similar construction is the cleft, a biclausal impersonal construction in which the wh-phrase is a focused part of the predicate and the subject is an expletive:

(64) *[What] is it [that you bought]?*

In predicate-initial languages, the displacement, pseudo-cleft, and cleft strategies may all yield the same word order, with the wh-word in the first position. Thus, the following wh-question is three-way structurally ambiguous:

(65) *ko*   *ai   na   aumai i   te   puka?*   *Pukapukan*

     PRESENTATIONAL   who PAST bring   ACC DET book

     'How brought the book?' (Chung 1978: 338)

     a. ko ai na   aumai ~~ai~~ i te puka?   Movement

     b. [PredP ko ai][DP [CP na aumai i te puka]   Pseudo-cleft

     c. [PredP ko ai] [CP na aumai i te puka] *expl*   Cleft

The ambiguity is exacerbated by the fact that many Oceanic languages have null expletives and have no overt copula, which makes clefts and pseudo-clefts harder to distinguish. Even with careful syntactic analysis, it is difficult to determine which of these strategies of wh-question formation may be employed in a given language. In Potsdam and Polinsky (2011) we propose

diagnostics for identifying displacement, clefts and pseudo-clefts. Here we would like to offer some general considerations.

The main observation is that most languages for which we have detailed data use more than one strategy for wh-question formation. For example, in his detailed analysis of Tuvaluan wh-question formation, Besnier (2000: 18) shows that in situ, displacement, and clefting are all available for one and the same constituent, and this seems typical of interrogatives in a number of languages. If there is any preference for clefts/pseudo-clefts, it may be found in questions of core arguments, subject, and object. Adjuncts often appear in situ. Besnier (2000) shows this distribution for Tuvalu, where clefts are preferred with subjects and objects and in situ or fronting, with adjuncts.

Another important generalization has to do with the correlation between predicate-initial word order and the use of (pseudo-)clefts in wh-question formation. Under the predicate-initial structure, the wh-expression can serve as the matrix predicate, and the presuppositional clause is a headless relative in subject position, thus yielding the otherwise available Predicate-Subject order (cf. Paul 2001, 2008, Potsdam 2006, 2009).

7.3   Negation

Oceanic languages have a wide variety of negation patterns. Here we will discuss two patterns: negative matrix verbs and the expression of negative quantified expressions and negative polarity items. Other common features of Oceanic (and more broadly, Austronesian) languages include the availability of a negative existential which is lexically distinct from the affirmative existential (e.g., in Tuvalu, where *isi* is the positive and *seeai*, negative existential predicate (Besnier 2000:

121, 179))[16]; common use of discontinuous negation (Hovdhaugen and Mosel 1999 for Samoan); and a rich inventory of markers expressing prohibition (see Vonen 1999 for Tokelauan).

7.3.1   Negative verbs

A common characteristic of Oceanic languages is the use of a higher negative verb which selects a finite complement. Compare in Fijian, where the higher negative verb *sega* takes a complement clause introduced by the complementizer *ni* and shows the default third person agreement:

(66) *e   sega ni   la'o 'o   Pita*

     3sg   neg   comp go   det   P

     'Peter did not go.' ("It is not the case that Peter went.")

Other languages that have negative verbs include most of the Polynesian languages, Teop, and possibly Saliba (Hovdhaugen and Mosel 1999: 6).

The main arguments for analyzing the negative marker as a higher verb which takes the affirmative proposition as its complement are as follows: (a) the negative and the negated verb have independent tense-aspect marking; (b) the negated verb has marking which is characteristic of embedded predication; (c) the negative combines with typical verbal modifiers of a given language; (d) the negative can be followed by a marker of embedded proposition as in the Fijian example above; (e) the negative patterns with other stative verbs (e.g., in Māori—Hohepa 1969: 18-20; Biggs 1969: 76); (f) the negative can be causativized or nominalized using verbal nominalization strategies (e.g., in Tuvalu—Besnier 2000: 179-180); (g) negative predicates can also appear in embedded clauses, just as any other predicates do.

---

[16] Negative existential verbs probably develop from the coalescence of a negative particle and an existential predicate (Hovdhaugen and Mosel 1999: 18).

In some languages, negative verbs also allow subject raising (Clark 1976: 85-109; Chung 1978: 132-135; Bauer 1993: 139-141), for instance, in Māori (see also the next section):

(67) a. *kāore   anō*   [*kia   whiti   te   rā*]

         NEG   yet   COMP shine DET sun

    b. *kāore   anō   te   rā$_i$*   [*kia   whiti   t$_i$*]

         NEG   yet   DET sun COMP shine

    'The sun hasn't risen yet.' (Chung 1978: 134-135)

Because of the absence of inflectional morphology, it is sometimes difficult to decide whether the negative word in a particular language should be considered a verb or not. Superficial evidence is clearly not enough, and one needs to look for clear morphsyntactic evidence such as that outlined above.

7.3.2   Negative indefinites

Oceanic languages and Austronesian languages more broadly generally lack negative quantified expressions such as 'nobody', 'nothing', etc. To express the relevant content, these languages use a negative existential construction with the pivot modified by a relative clause, for example:

(68) *ahiki   ta   peha   te-nam   [to   nata   nana]*   *Teop*

     NEG   NON-SPEC   one   PRP-1EXCL REL know IMPERF:3SG

    'None of us knows it.' (lit.: "There is not one of us who knows it.") (Mosel and Spriggs 1999: 50)

(69) *kia*   *foliik*   [*o*   *na*   *axe*]   *Nêlêmwâ*

     NEG.exist   thing   IRR   1SG   see

     'I did not see anything/I saw nothing.' (lit.: "There is no thing that I saw.")   (Bril

     1999: 84)

The pattern is insidious; it seems absent in some SOV languages (e.g., in Saliba—see Margetts 1999) but is found everywhere else. The pervasiveness of this pattern may be due to the common restriction on subjects in Austronesian: subjects tend to be specific and referential—this is related to the subject-only restriction of Western Austronesian (see Pearson 2005; Gärtner et al. 2006). Under such a restriction the only way to express negative or arbitrary quantification is as the pivot (not subject) of the existential. On a related note, we do not find evidence for free choice items in the subject position; such items also get expressed as pivots of existentials.

7.4   Comparatives

Oceanic languages have much to offer to the ongoing study of the syntax and semantics of comparison. Kennedy (2009) notes that English has at least two modes of comparison: the familiar form which he terms 'explicit comparison', such as *John is taller than Mary*, and the less commonly discussed case of 'implicit comparison', exemplified by *Compared to Mary, John is tall*. He speculates that there may be languages that have only implicit comparison. Following up on Kennedy's general idea, Pearson (in press) argues that Fijian has neither overt nor covert comparative morphology; it has no morpheme with the semantics of English *–er* or *more*, nor superlative morphology (*-est, most*) or morphology used to form the comparative of inferiority (*less*). Consequently, comparisons must be made by other means, and Fijian is a language that has only implicit comparison.

Suppose that we are measuring items of furniture. We measure the length of the table and the height of the chair next to it. We notice that they are out of proportion with one another, a

situation that we can report with the implicit comparison sentence, *Compared to the length of the table, the height of the chair is surprising*, but not with the explicit comparison sentence, *The length of the table is more surprising than the height of the chair*. If Fijian comparatives involve implicit comparison, with no comparative morphology, we would expect that a comparative sentence in this language could be used to describe the situation we are considering. If on the other hand they involve explicit comparison, then they could not be used to describe this situation. Pearson reports that the sentence in (66) can be used to report this state of affairs.

(70) *na   balavu ni   teveli e   kurabuitaki   mai   na   cecere   ni dabedabe*
    DET length LNK table 3SG surprising   DIR DET   height   LNK chair

    'Compared to/given the height of the chair, the length of the table is surprising'.

Pearson also applies a test for implicit comparison first proposed by Kennedy, involving so-called minimum standard gradable adjectives such as *bent*. Now we are comparing two pipes, both of which are bent, though one more so than the other. In English, explicit comparison can be used to describe this scenario, but implicit comparison cannot: we can say *this pipe is more bent than that pipe*, but not *Compared to that pipe, this pipe is bent*. Pearson finds that Fijian comparatives behave like English implicit comparison in this respect:

(71) (*Context: Pipe A and Pipe B are both bent; Pipe A more so than Pipe B.*)
    #e   takelo na   vaivo oqo mai   na   vaivo oya
    3SG curved DET pipe   this DIR   DET pipe   that

    'This pipe is more bent than that pipe.'

The final test that we shall consider here explores what happens when the focus sensitive item *only* is added to a comparative sentence. Pearson's starting point is the observation that there is a second type of implicit comparison sentence that Kennedy does not discuss, which can be exemplified by *Of John and Mary, John is the tall one*. Like its counterpart with *compared to…*, this sentence indirectly communicates that John is taller than Mary without employing comparative degree morphology such as *–er*. A similar effect can be achieved by adding *only*, as in *Of John and Mary, only John is tall*. Similarly, *Of Peter and Mary, John only likes Peter* communicates that John likes Peter more than Mary (whom in fact he does not like at all). Explicit comparison behaves quite differently: *John only likes Peter more than Mary* must be interpreted with focus marking on the entire constituent [*likes Peter more than Mary*], and not only on *Peter* as in the case of the *of*-phrase comparative. Pearson finds that the Fijian comparative with *ga*, 'only', when inserted behaves like the English *of*-phrase comparative rather than like explicit comparison, as shown below. She treats this as additional evidence in favor of an implicit comparison analysis.

(72) *e   talei-taki Pita ga   'o   Jone mai vei Meri*
   3SG like   P   only DET J   DIR PRP M
   'Of Peter and Mary, John only likes Peter'.

Taken together with other diagnostics that we do not discuss for reasons of space, Pearson suggests that the facts summarized above point to the view that Fijian only has implicit comparison, with no degree morphology available either covertly or overtly. She proposes a semantics for the Fijian comparative that reflects this view. In a nutshell, the idea is that a Fijian sentence of form 'A is P *mai* B', introduces a presupposition that the domain of discourse is constrained just to A and B. The gradable predicate P introduces a contextually determined

comparison class argument; in this case, the set {A,B}, given the nature of the domain of discourse. The sentence asserts that A is P, leading to the result that A is more P than B in a parallel fashion to that already discussed for *compared to…* comparatives in English. An important question for future research is how many Oceanic languages behave like Fijian with respect to expressing comparison. So far, Hohaus (2010) has proposed that Samoan may be similar. If we find that implicit comparison is common to Oceanic, that may be due either to shared origins or to some structural characteristics common in Oceanic.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra 2010 *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aissen, Judith 1992   Topic and focus in Mayan. *Language* 68, 43-80.

Aissen, Judith 1996 Pied piping, abstract agreement, and functional projections in Tzotzil. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 447-491.

Aldridge, Edith   2004   *Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Aldridge, Edith   2006 Absolutive case in Tagalog. In Bunting, J., Desai, S., Peachey, R., Straughn, C., and Tomkov Z. (eds.), *Proceedings from the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Vol 1: The Main Session, 1-15. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Aldridge, Edith   2008 Generative approaches to syntactic ergativity. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2/5, 966–995.

Aldridge, Edith   2009 Minimalist questions for the nominalist analysis of Tagalog syntax. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35, 51-62.

Baker, Christopher M. 2006   Hawaiian relative clause structure. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 37, 1-12.

Baker, Mark   1988   *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark   1989   Object sharing and projection in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 513-553.

Baker, Mark   1991 On the relation of serialization to verb extensions. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.) *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative, and cognitive approaches*, 79-102. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baker, Mark, Kyle Johnson, and Ian Roberts   1989 Passive   arguments   raised.   *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 219-251.

Ball, Douglas 2007 On ergativity and accusativity in Proto-Polynesian and Proto-Central-Pacific. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46, 128-153.

Ball, Douglas 2008 *Clause structure and argument realization in Tongan*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Bauer, Winifred   1993 *Mâori*. London: Routledge.

Bauer, Winifred   1997 *The Reed reference grammar of Mâori*. Auckland: Reed.

Bauer, Winifred 2007 Typology to the rescue: Halting the infiltration of English into Maori syntax. *AFLA XIV*.

Bender, Byron   1969 *Spoken Marshallese: An intensive course with grammatical notes and glossary.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Bender, Andrea and Sieghard Beller   2006 Numeral classifiers and counting systems in Polynesian and Micronesian languages: Common roots and cultural adaptations. *Oceanic Linguistics* 45, 380-403.

Benton, Richard A. 1968 Numeral and attributive classifiers in Trukese. *Oceanic Linguistics* 7, 104-146.

Besnier, Niko 2000 *Tuvaluan*. London-New York: Routledge.

Bickel, Balthasar, and Johanna Nichols   2008 Obligatory possessive inflection. *World Atlas of Language Structures*, ch. 58.

http://wals.info/chapter/58

Biggs, Bruce   1969 *Let's learn Maori: A guide to the study of the Maori language*. Wellington: Reed.

Blust, Robert 1989 The adhesive locative in Austronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 22/23, 1-28.

Blust, Robert   2005   Review of Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002). *Oceanic Linguistics* 44, 544-558.

Bradshaw, Joel   1999 Null subjects, switch-reference, and serialization in Jabêm and Numbami. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38, 270-296.

Bradshaw, Joel   2004 Review of Crowley (2002). *Oceanic Linguistics* 43, 264-269.

Bril, Isabelle   1997 Split ergativity in the Nêlêmwâ language. In Cecilia Ode and Wim Stockhof (eds.). *Proceedings of ICAL-7*, 377-394. Leiden: Leiden University.

Bril, Isabelle   1999 Negation in Nêlêmwâ (New Caledonia). In Even Hovdhaugen and Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Negation in Oceanic languages*, 80-95. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Bril, Isabelle   2002 *Le nêlêmwa (Nouvele-Calédonie): Analyse syntaxique et sémantique*. Louvain: Peeters.

Broschart, Jürgen 1994   Praepositionen im tonganischen: Zur Varianz und Invarianz des Adpositionsbegriffs. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Broschart, Jürgen 1997 Why Tongan does it differently: Categorial distinctions in a language without nouns and verbs. *Linguistic Typology* 1, 123-165.

Carnie, Andrew   1995 *Non-verbal predication and head movement*. Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT.

Carnie, Andrew, Heidi Harley, and Sheila Ann Dooley (Eds.) 2005 *Verb first: On the syntax of verb-initial languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chung, Sandra   1978 *Case marking and grammatical relations in Polynesian*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Chung, Sandra   1994 Wh-agreement and "referentiality" in Chamorro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 1-44.

Chung, Sandra   1998 *The design of agreement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chung, Sandra   2006 Properties of VOS Languages. In Martin Everaert, Henk van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans, and Bart Hollebrandse (eds.). *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax (Syncom)*, 685–720. Malden–Oxford: Blackwell.

Chung, Sandra   2012   Are lexical categories universal? The view from Chamorro. *Theoretical Linguistics* 38, 1-56.

Chung, Sandra, and William Ladusaw   2003 *Restriction and saturation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chung, Sandra and James McCloskey 1987 Government, barriers, and small clauses in Modern Irish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 173–237.

Chung, Sandra, and William Seiter   1980 The history of raising and relativization in Polynesian. *Language* 56, 622-638.

Churchward, Maxwell 1940 *Rotuman grammar and dictionary*. Sydney: Methodist Church of Australia.

Clark, Ross   1973 Transitivity and case in Eastern Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12, 559-605.

Clark, Ross   1976 *Aspects of Proto-Polynesian syntax*. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

Collins, Chris   1997 Argument sharing in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 461-497.

Collins, Chris   2005 A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8, 81-120.

Comrie, Bernard 1978 Ergativity. In Winifred Lehmann (ed.). *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language*, 329–394. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Comrie, Bernard 1995 Serial verbs in Haruai (Papua New Guinea) and their theoretical implications. In Janine Bouscaren, Jean-Jacques Franckel, and Stéphane Robert (eds.).

Langues et langage: Problèmes et raisonnement en linguistique, mélanges offerts à Antoine Culioli, 25–37. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Comrie, Bernard 2008 Alignment of case marking. *World Atlas of Language Structures*, ch. 98-99.

http://wals.info/chapter/98

Cook, Kenneth   1996 The *Cia* suffix as a passive marker in Samoan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 35, 57-76.

Corston, Simon   1996 *Ergativity in Roviana, Solomon Islands*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Corston-Oliver, Simon 2002 Roviana. In John Lynch, Malcolm Ross, and Terry Crowley (eds.). *Oceanic languages*, 467-497. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Crowley, Terry   1982 *The Paamese language of Vanuatu*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Crowley, Terry   1987 Serial verbs in Paamese. *Studies in Language* 11, 35-84.

Crowley, Terry   2002 *Serial verbs in Oceanic: A descriptive typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, William, and Stanley Dubinsky 2001 Bypassing subjacency effects: How event structure amnesties extraction out of object NPs. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society (NELS 31),* 199-214. Amherst, MA: GSLA Publications.

Davis, Karen 2003 *A grammar of the Hoava language, Western Solomons*. Canberra: Australian National University.

den Dikken, Marcel 2003 *The structure of the noun phrase in Rotuman*. München: LINCOM Europa.

Dixon, R.M.W.   1979 Ergativity. *Language* 55, 59-138.

Dixon, R.M.W.   1994 *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donohue, Mark   1999 *A grammar of Tukang Besi.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dyen, Isidore 1965 *A sketch of Trukese grammar.* Washington, DC: American Oriental Society.

Early, Robert 1993 Layer serialization in Lewo. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32, 65-93.

Elbert, Samuel H.   1974 *Puluwat grammar*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Elbert, Samuel H., and Mary Kawena Pukui 1979 *Hawaiian grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Emonds, Joseph   1980 Word order in generative grammar. *Journal of Linguistic Research* 1, 33-54.

Ernst, Thomas.   2002 *The syntax of adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foley, William   2010 Events and serial verb constructions. In Mengistu Amberer, Brett Baker, and Mark Harvey (eds.). *Complex predicates: Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure*, 79-109. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foley, William, and Michael Olson 1985 Clausehood and verb serializations. In Johanna Nichols and Anthony Woodbury (eds.). *Grammar inside and outside the clause: Some approaches to theory from the field*, 17-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

François, Alexander 2007 Serial verb constructions in Mwotlap. In Alexandra Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.). *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, 223-238. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freeze, Ray1992 Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68, 553-595.

Freeze, Ray, and Carol Georgopoulos 2000 Locus operandi. In Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle (eds.). *The syntax of verb initial languages*, 163-184. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin, Paul Law, and Joachim Sabel 2006 Clause structure and adjuncts in Austronesian Languages: A critical introductory survey. In Hans-Martin Gärtner, Paul

Law, and Joachim Sabel (eds.). *Clause structure and adjuncts in Austronesian languages*, 1–42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gerassimova, Veronica, and Peter Sells 2008 Long-distance dependencies in Tagalog: The case for raising. In Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie (eds.). *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 190-198. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Gil, David 2004   Riau Indonesian *sama*: Explorations in macrofunctionality. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.). *Coordinating constructions*, 371–424. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gil, David 2005 Word order without syntactic categories: How Riau Indonesian does it. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.). *Verb first: On the syntax of verb-initial languages*, 243–263. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gil, David 2009 Austronesian nominalism and the thinginess illusion. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35, 95-114.

Goldberg, Lotus 2005 *Verb-stranding VP ellipsis: A cross-linguistic study*. Ph.D. Dissertation, McGill University

Greenberg, Joseph   1963 Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Joseph Greenberg (ed.). *Universals of language*, 73-113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung, and Lisa Travis 1992 Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 375–414.

Hale, Kenneth 1968 Review of Hohepa (1967). *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 77, 83-99.

Harrison, Sheldon, and Salich Albert 1976 *Mokilese reference grammar*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Hawkins, Emily   2000 Relative clauses in Hawaiian. In Steven Fischer and Wolfgang Sperlich (eds.). *Leo Pasifika: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics*, 127-141. Auckland: Institute of Polynesian Languages and Literatures.

Hawkins, John. A.   1999 Processing complexity and filler-gap dependencies. *Language* 75, 244-285.

Hendrick, Randall   2004 Syntactic labels and their derivations. Ms. University of North Carolina.

www.unc.edu/~hendrick/labels_preprint.pdf

Herd, Jonathon, Catherine Macdonald, and Diane Massam. 2011 Genitive subjects in relative constructions in Polynesian languages. *Lingua* 121, 1252-1264.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus   2005 The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Alexander K. Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds). 2005. *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar,* 110-181. London: Routledge.

Hiraiwa, Ken, and Adams Bodomo 2008 Object sharing as symmetric-sharing: Predicate clefting and serial verbs in Daagare. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 795-832.

Hohaus, Vera 2010 *The semantics of motion verbs and comparison in Samoan*. Masters Thesis, Tübingen University.

Hohepa, Patrick W. 1969 The accusative-to-ergative drift in Polynesian languages. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 78, 295-329.

Hopkins, Alberta P. 1992 *Ka lei ha'aheo: Beginning Hawaiian*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hovdhaugen, Even, and Ulrike Mosel   1999 Towards a typology of negation in Oceanic languages. In Even Hovdhaugen and Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Negation in Oceanic languages*, 1-19. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Hyslop, Catriona 2001 *The Lolovoli dialect of the North-East Ambae language, Vanuatu.* Canberra: Australian National University.

Hyslop, Catriona 2004 Adjectives in North-East Ambae. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.). *Adjective classes: A cross-linguistic typology*, 87-111. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaufman, Daniel 2009 Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35, 1-49.

Kayne, Richard   1994 *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Keenan, Edward L. 1972 Relative clause formation in Malagasy. In Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi, and Gloria C. Pharees (eds.). T*he Chicago which hunt: Papers from the relative clause festival,* 169-189. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Keenan, Edward L.   1976 Remarkable subjects in Malagasy. In Charles N. Li (ed.). *Subject and topic*, 247-301. New York: Academic Press.

Kennedy, Chris   2009 Modes of comparison. In Malcolm Elliott, James Kirby, Osamu Sawada, Eleni Staraki, and Suwon Yoon (eds.). *Papers from the 43rd Session of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 141-165. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Kikusawa, Ritsuko   1998 A formal analysis of the so-called 'passive' in Fijian. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 56, 111-139.

Kikusawa, Ritsuko   2002 *Proto Central Pacific ergativity: Its reconstruction and development in the Fijian, Rotuman and Polynesian languages.* Pacific Linguistics, 520. Canberra: Australian National University.

Kikusawa, Ritsuko   2003 A new view of the Proto-Oceanic pronominal system. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42, 161-186.

Kissock, Madelyn   2003 Transitivity and objecthood in Rotuman. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42, 144-160.

König, Ekkehard, and Siemund, Peter 2000 Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Traci S. Curl (eds.). *Reflexives: Forms and functions*, 41-74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koopman, Hilda and Anna Szabolcsi   2000 *Verbal complexes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kurylowicz, Jerzy   1964 *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Lee, Kee-Dong   1975 *Kusaiean reference grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Legate, Julie A.   2008 Morphological and abstract case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39, 55-101.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 1983a   Relational classifiers. *Lingua* 60, 147-176.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 1983b   *A grammar of Manam*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 1985 Possessive constructions in Oceanic languages and Proto-Oceanic. In Andrew Pawley and Lois Carrington (eds.). *Austronesian linguistics at the 15th Pacific Science Congress,* 93-140. Canberra: Australian National University.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 2000 Reciprocals without reflexives. In Zygmunt Frazyngier and Tracy S. Curl (eds.). *Reciprocals: Form and function*, 31-62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 2005a   On the notion "adjective" in Toqabaqita. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44, 113-144.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 2005b   Inalienability and possessum individuation. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges and David S. Rood (eds.). *Linguistic diversity and language theories*, 339-362. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek 2007 Serial verb constructions in Toqabaqita. In Alexandra Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.). *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, 254-272. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek   2009 Oceanic possessive classifiers. *Oceanic Linguistics* 48, 379-402.

Lin, Dong-yi 2012 Interrogative verbs in Kavalan: Implications for syntactic categories. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Meeting of Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*. Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY

Lister-Turner, R and J.B. Clark 1931 *A grammar of the Motu language of Papua*. 2nd Edition. Sydney, New South Wales: Government Printer.

Lynch, John   1973 Verbal aspects of possession in Melanesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12, 69-102.

Lynch, John   1997 On the origins of the possessive markers in Central Pacific languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36, 227-246.

Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross, and Terry Crowley (eds.)   2002 *The   Oceanic   languages.* Richmond: Curzon Press.

Manning, Christopher D. 1996 *Ergativity: Argument structure and grammatical relations*. Stanford: CSLI.

Margetts, Anna   1999 *Valence and transitivity in Saliba, an Oceanic language of Papua New Guinea.* (MPI Series in Psycholinguistics, 12.). Nijmegen: MPI.

Margetts, Anna   2007 Three participant events in Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46, 71-127.

Massam, Diane   2000 VSO and VOS: Aspects of Niuean word order. In Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle (eds.). *The syntax of verb initial languages*, 97-117. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Massam, Diane   2001 Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 153–197.

Massam, Diane   2002 Fully internal case: Surface ergativity can be profound. In Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards (eds.). *Proceedings of AFLA VIII: The Eighth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, 185-196. (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 44.). Cambridge, MA.

Massam, Diane   2005 Lexical categories, lack of inflection, and predicate fronting in Niuean. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley and Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.) *Verb first: on the syntax of verb-initial languages*, 227–242. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Massam, Diane   2006 Neither absolutive nor ergative is nominative or accusative. In Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije (eds.), *Ergativity: Emerging Issues*, 27-46. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Massam, Diane, and Carolyn Smallwood 1997 Essential features of predication in English and Niuean. In *Proceedings of the 27th North East Linguistic Society*, ed. Kiyomi Kusumoto, 263–272. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.

McCloskey, James   1991 Clause structure, ellipsis, and proper government in Irish. *Lingua* 85, 259–302.

Mithun, Marianne   1984 The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60, 847-894.

Miyagawa, Shigeru 2011 Genitive subjects in Altaic and specification of phase. *Lingua* 121, 1265–1282.

Mosel, Ulrike 2007 *Teop sketch grammar*. Ms. Kiel University.

http://www.linguistik.uni-kiel.de/mosel_publikationen.htm#download

Mosel, Ulrike, and Even Hovdhaugen 1992 *Samoan reference grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Mosel, Ulrike, and Ruth Saovana Spriggs   1999 Negation in Teop (Bougainville, North Solomon Islands). In Hovdhaugen, Even, and Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Negation in Oceanic languages*, 45-56. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Moyse-Faurie, Claire   1983 *Le drehu: Langue de Lifou (Iles Loyauté)*. Paris: Société d'Etudes Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.

Moyse-Faurie, Claire 1997a Phénomènes d'incorporation dans quelques langues océaniennes. *Studi Italiani di Linguistic Teorica e Applicata* 26, 227-246.

Moyse-Faurie, Claire   1997b   *Grammaire du futunien*. Nouvelle-Calédonie: CDP.

Moyse-Faurie, Claire, and Françoise Ozanne-Rivierre 1983 Subject case markers and word order in New Caledonia and Loyalty Islands languages. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol. 4: *Thematic Variation*, 113-152. Canberra: Australian National University.

Neeleman, Ad, and Kriszta Szendrői   2007 Radical pro-drop and the morphology of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, 671-714.

Nichols, Johanna, and Balthasar Bickel   2008 Possessive classification. World Atlas of Language Structures, ch. 59.

http://wals.info/chapter/59

Nicolae, Andreea, and Gregory Scontras   2010 What Austronesian tells us about *who*. *AFLA 17,* Stony Brook University.

Ota, Katsuhiro   2000 *Aspects of case-marking and transitivity in Polynesia*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii.

Otsuka, Yuko 2000 *Ergativity in Tongan*. Dr. Phil. Thesis, Oxford University.

Otsuka, Yuko 2005 Two derivations of VSO: A comparative study of Niuean and Tongan. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley and Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.). *Verb first: On the syntax of verb-initial languages*, 65–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Otsuka, Yuko 2010a   DP ellipsis in Tongan: Is syntactic ergativity real? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28, 315-342.

Otsuka, Yuko 2010b   Genitive relative constructions and agentless transitives in Tongan. In Raphael Mercado, Eric Potsdam, and Lisa deMena Travis (eds.). *Austronesian and theoretical linguistics*, 117-140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Otsuka, Yuko 2011 Neither accusative nor ergative: An alternative analysis of case in Eastern Polynesian. In Claire Moyse-Faurie and Joachim Sabel (eds.). *Topics in Oceanic morphosyntax*, 289-317. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Ozanne-Rivierre, Françoise   1976 *Le Iaai: Langue mélanésienne d'Ouvéa (Nouvelle-Calédonie): Phonologie, morphologie, esquisse syntaxique*. Paris: Société d'Etudes Linguistiques et Anthropologiques de France.

Palmer, Bill   2009a   Clause order and information structure in Cheke Holo. *Oceanic Linguistics* 48, 213-249.

Palmer, Bill   2009b   *Kokota grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Palmer, Bill and Dunstan Brown 2007 Heads in Oceanic indirect possession. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46, 199-209.

Pat, Fa'afo 1996 Transitive constructions in Hula. In John Lynch and Fa'afo Pat (eds.). *Oceanic studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics*, 271-292. Canberra: Australian National University.

Paul, Ileana   2001   Concealed pseudo-clefts. *Lingua* 111, 707–727.

Paul, Ileana   2008 On the topic of pseudo-clefts. *Syntax* 11, 91-124.

Paul, Ileana, and Eric Potsdam   2012 Sluicing without wh-movement in Malagasy. In Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson (eds.). *Sluicing: Cross-linguistic perspectives*, 164-182. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pearce, Elizabeth 2002 VP versus V raising in Mäori. In Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards (eds.). *Proceedings of AFLA VIII: The Eighth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, 225–240. (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 44.).

Pearson, Hazel 2010 On the presence of adjectives in Fijian and the universality of the category 'adjective'. *Proceedings of AFLA 17*.

Pearson, Hazel In press How to do comparison in a language without degrees: a semantics for the comparative in Fijian. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 14.

Pearson, Matthew 2005 The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'—element. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23, 381-457.

Potsdam, Eric 2006 More concealed pseudoclefts in Malagasy and the clausal typing hypothesis. *Lingua* 116, 2154-2182.

Potsdam, Eric 2009 Austronesian verb-initial languages and wh-question strategies. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, 737-771.

Potsdam, Eric 2010 VSO word order in Malagasy imperatives. In Raphael Mercado, Eric Potsdam and Lisa deMena Travis (eds.). *Austronesian and theoretical linguistics*, 231-248. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Potsdam, Eric, and Maria Polinsky 2011 Questions and word order in Polynesian. In Claire Moyse-Faurie and Joachim Sabel (eds.). *Topics in Oceanic morphosyntax,* 107-134. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Preminger, Omer 2009 Breaking agreements: Distinguishing agreement and clitic-doubling by their failures. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 619-666.

Rackowski, Andrea 2002 The structure of Tagalog: Specificity, voice, and the distribution of arguments. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Rackowski, Andrea and Norvin Richards 2005 Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 565-599.

Rackowski, Andrea, and Lisa Travis   2000 V-initial languages: X or XP movement and adverbial placement. In Andrew Carnie and Eithne Guilfoyle (eds.). The syntax of verb-initial languages, 117-141. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rehg, Kenneth 1981 *Ponapean reference grammar.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Richards, Norvin 2009   Nouns, verbs, and hidden structure in Tagalog. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35, 139-152.

Rizzi, Luigi 2001 On the position "Int(errogative)" in the left periphery of clause. In Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.). *Current studies in Italian syntax,* 287-296. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Rooth, Mats   1992 A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.

Ross, Malcolm   1998 Proto-Oceanic adjectival categories and their morphosyntax. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37, 85-119.

Sabbagh, Joseph A. 2005 *Non-verbal argument structure: Evidence from Tagalog.* Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Sabbagh, Joseph A. 2009 Existential sentences in Tagalog. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, 675-719.

Schütz, Albert, and Tevita Nawadra   1972 A refutation of the notion "passive" in Fijian. *Oceanic Linguistics* 11, 88-109.

Sebba, Mark   1987 *The syntax of serial verbs: An investigation of serialization in Sranan and other languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Seiter, William   1980 *Studies in Niuean syntax*. New York: Garland.

Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. New York: Routledge.

Sohn, Ho-Min 1975 *Woleian reference grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Song, Jae Jung 1994 The verb-object bonding principle and the pronominal system: With special reference to Nuclear Micronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 33, 517-565.

Sperlich, Wolfgang   1993 Serial verb constructions in Namakir of Central Vanuatu. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32, 95-110.

Sproat, Richard   1985 Welsh syntax and VSO structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 173–216.

Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence Reid   1982 The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, and Stephen Wurm (eds.). *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Vol. 2: Tracking the travellers*, 145-170. Canberra: Australian National University.

Tauberschmidt, Gerhard, and Alfred Bala   1992 Transitivity and ergativity in Sinaugoro. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 23, 179-191.

Tchekhoff, Claude   1979 *La construction ergative en avar et en tongien*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Tchekhoff, Claude   1981 *Simple sentences in Tongan*. Canberra, A.C.T., Australia: Australian National University.

Topping, Donald, and Bernadita Dungca 1973 *Chamorro reference grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Turner, Blaine 1986 *A teaching grammar of the Manam language*. Ukarumpa, PNG: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Vamarasi, Marit   2002 Rotuman subject suffixes and stative-active distinction. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Oceanic Languages. Canberra, January 2002.

van Geenhoven, Verle   1998 *Semantic incorporation and indefinite descriptions: Semantic and syntactic aspects of noun incorporation in West Greenlandic*. Stanford: CSLI.

Vonen, Arnfinn   1999 Negation in Tokelauan. In Even Hovdhaugen and Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Negation in Oceanic languages*, 141-162. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Willson, Heather 2002 *The Marshallese complementizer phrase*. MA Thesis, Arizona State University.

Willson, Heather 2007 Remnant movement and the position of the Marshallese question particle. *Proceedings of 5th Asian GLOW*.

http://linguistics.byu.edu/faculty/hwills1/index.html#publications

Willson, Heather 2008 *Subject positions in Marshallese*. PhD dissertation. UCLA.

Willson, Heather 2010 Passives and resultatives in Marshallese. *Oceanic Linguistics* 49, 233-258.

Wilson, William, H. 1982 *Proto-Polynesian possessive marking*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Woolford, Ellen 2006 Lexical case, inherent case, and argument structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 111-130.

Xrakovsky, Victor (ed.) 2001 *Typology of imperative constructions*. München: Lincom Europa.

Yamada, Fumiko S. 2006 The pronoun system in Galeya: Arguments against a clitic analysis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 45, 474-490.

Zwicky, Arnold 1985 Clitics and particles. *Language* 61, 283-305.

Zwicky, Arnold, and Geoffrey Pullum 1983 Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't. Language* 59, 502-513.