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The main goal of this paper is to describe some morphosyntactic characteristics that are common to a majority of Oceanic languages. Amidst the typological variety of Oceanic languages, the author defines a canonic language type, i.e., a type widely represented both genealogically and geographically. This type is SVO and has prepositions. Subjects are coreferenced by a prefix or proclitic to the verb, objects by a suffix or enclitic. Verbs often fall into morphologically related pairs with a transitive and an intransitive member. In some languages these verb pairs in turn fall into two classes.

With A-verbs, the subject of both members is the Actor. With U-verbs, the subject of the intransitive is the Undergoer, which is to say, it corresponds to the object of the transitive. Against this background the (de-)transitivising morphology of Oceanic languages is described.

Possession in the canonic language type takes two forms, direct and indirect. The direct construction encodes inalienable possession, the indirect (which entails a possessive classifier) encodes alienable possession.

The paper finishes with a discussion of interclausal relationships in canonic languages. Adverbial and complement clauses display little desententialisation. It is also suggested that subjects in canonic languages generally have only a semantic function, not a reference-tracking function.
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1. Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to describe some morphosyntactic characteristics that are common to a majority of Oceanic languages. In particular I shall look at the verb phrase and the syntactic roles (subject, object) associated with it, and at the way in which these behave in interclausal constructions. The article focuses particularly on the characteristics of the subject in Oceanic languages and its interaction with other issues in Oceanic typology.

The Oceanic languages are a closed subgroup within the Austronesian language

* I am grateful to Isabelle Bril and to an anonymous referee for comments on this paper.
family, a fact first demonstrated by Dempwolff (1937). By “closed subgroup”, we mean that all the members of the subgroup are descended from a single protolanguage. The protolanguage ancestral to all Oceanic languages is known as Proto Oceanic, and was probably spoken in the Bismarck Archipelago of Papua New Guinea around 1500 BC (Figure 1). On a conservative count, there are about 450 Oceanic languages. The internal genealogical grouping of Oceanic is complex: Table 1 gives some indication of the position of Oceanic within Austronesian and Table 2 of the internal subgrouping of Oceanic, but there are many areas in need of more research, and Table 2 should not be taken too exactly.1 There is also considerable typological variety among Oceanic languages. Of all Oceanic languages, those of Polynesia have received the greatest attention in the literature, but there are only 30-40 members of the Polynesian subgroup, and they are anything but typical Oceanic languages. About 240 Oceanic languages belong to the Admiralties and Western Oceanic groups and are located in New Guinea and the northwest Solomons, a further 165 or so in the rest of Melanesia (southeast Solomons, Vanuatu, New Caledonia, Fiji), and 15 in Micronesia.


The typological variety of Oceanic languages is such that it is not possible to survey it here. Happily, however, we can roughly identify what I shall call a canonic Oceanic language type, exemplars of which are geographically and genealogically far more widely distributed than are languages of any other type. The canonic type is probably also a reflection of the morphosyntax of Proto Oceanic, as many of its features are shared with the languages of the Central Malayo-Polynesian linkage and the South Halmahera/Papua family (cf. Table 1), as briefly described by Klamer (2002). Indeed, the major typological divide within the Austronesian family is not between Oceanic and the rest, but between innovating Central/Eastern Malayo-Polynesian and the conservative rest—the rest being Western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages. Some of the features (e.g., the organisation of possessive marking) attributable to the canonic type are also found in Oceanic languages which in other respects are decidedly non-canonic.

---

1 Table 1 represents the now generally accepted subgrouping of Austronesian, first proposed by Blust (1977). Table 2 is drawn from Chapter 5 of Lynch, Ross, & Crowley (2002). This work also includes a listing by genealogical grouping of known Oceanic languages.
1. Formosan languages: a number of first-order groupings of Austronesian languages, all located on the island of Taiwan (Blust 1999; does not include Yami)
2. Malayo-Polynesian languages: a single first-order grouping containing all Austronesian languages outside Taiwan
   a. Western Malayo-Polynesian languages: a large number of groups in the Philippines, western Indonesia, Malaysia and Madagascar (also Chamorro and Palauan in Micronesia) whose inter-relationships are not well understood
   b. Central/Eastern Malayo-Polynesian linkage
      i. Central Malayo-Polynesian linkage: the languages of eastern Indonesia (excluding the province of Papua) and East Timor
      ii. Eastern Malayo-Polynesian family
         A. South Halmahera/Papua family: languages spoken in the southern part of Halmahera (northeast Indonesia) and in the northwestern part of the Indonesian province of Papua
         B. Oceanic family (see Table 2)

Table 2: A genealogical grouping of Oceanic languages (incomplete)
A few individual languages are listed, either because they form a single-language subgroup or because they are mentioned in the text: they are shown in italics.

1. Admiralties family (Manus, its offshore islands and small islands to the west): Loniu
2. St Matthias group: Mussau, Tench
3. Yapese
4. Western Oceanic linkage (WOc): the north coast of the Indonesian province of Papua, Papua New Guinea excluding the Admiralties, and the northwest Solomons;
   a. North New Guinea linkage (north coast of mainland New Guinea and western New Britain)
      i. Schouten linkage
      ii. Huon Gulf family
      iii. Ngero/Vitiaz linkage
          A. Ngero family
          B. Vitiaz linkage: Mangap-Mbula, Arop-Lukep
   b. Papuan Tip linkage (southeast mainland Papua New Guinea)
   c. Meso-Melanesian linkage
      i. Bali-Vitu (French Islands, north of New Britain)
      ii. Willaumez linkage (north-central coast of New Britain)
      iii. New Ireland/Northwest Solomonic linkage
          A. Tungag/Nalik family (north New Ireland and New Hanover)
B. Tabar linkage (north-central New Ireland)
C. Madak linkage (central New Ireland)
D. St George linkage
   — South New Ireland languages (south New Ireland and east New Siar)
   — Northwest Solomonic linkage (Buka, Bougainville and northwest Solomon Islands): Hoava, Kokota

5. Central/Eastern Oceanic (CEOc): almost all areas of Oceania not included in the Admiralties and Western Oceanic
   a. Southeast Solomonic family: Longgu
   b. North Vanuatu linkage: NE Ambae, Tamambo
   c. Central Vanuatu linkage
   d. Southern Vanuatu family
   e. New Caledonian family: Nêlêmwa
   f. Central Pacific linkage
      i. Fijian linkage: Boumaa Fijian, Wayan Fijian
      ii. Polynesian family
   g. Micronesian family
      i. Nauruan
      ii. Nuclear Micronesian family: Mokilese

Although I shall suggest below (§5) that the notion of subject refers to somewhat different phenomena in different languages, I shall use it here to give an approximate idea of the basic constituent orders that occur in Oceanic languages. For the moment, it is enough to define the subject as the syntactic role that represents the single argument of an intransitive verb or non-verbal predicate, and the actor argument of a transitive. The notion of basic constituent order is also somewhat troublesome in the Oceanic context, as (i) there are both verbal and non-verbal clause types, and their predicate/subject orders are not always the same; (ii) transitive verbal clauses in, say, narrative discourse, often consist of just a verb phrase (see (1), for example), or a verb phrase with a single noun phrase argument. However, for most languages there is a consistent citation order occurring when clauses with core noun phrases are elicited with minimal context, and this is the constituent order referred to here.

On this basis we can make an initial approach to the canonic Oceanic type by setting aside three types of language significantly diverging from it.

The first two types are eliminated on the basis of constituent order. We can make an initial division between languages with (non-canonic) verb-final order and languages with (canonic) verb-initial or verb-medial order. All verb-final languages have the order
SOV (where S = subject, O = object, V = verb phrase), and almost all of them are located on or near the mainland of New Guinea and belong to the North New Guinea and Papuan Tip linkages (Table 2). Most of them also have postpositions rather than prepositions. Since the Papuan (non-Austronesian) languages of mainland New Guinea mostly have SOV order and postpositions, it is a reasonable hypothesis that the presence of this order in the Oceanic languages of the region is the outcome of contact (Lynch 1981, Ross 1996, 2001).

There is another, much smaller, non-canonic type also regionally based. This consists of verb-second languages, i.e., languages in which the verb phrase is the second constituent of the clause and where the first constituent is a core noun phrase or adjunct. The choice of the first constituent appears to be based on considerations of discourse (dis-)continuity. If the subject is not the first constituent, then it is relegated to a position after the verb. Languages of this type are some of those located on Bougainville, Choiseul and Santa Ysabel (all members of the Northwest Solomonic group).

The third type of language which I shall set aside as non-canonic is not geographically based but typological, as its members have a fully ergative-absolutive alignment of syntactic roles, departing completely from the nominative-accusative canonic norm. Above, I defined the subject as the syntactic role that represents the single argument of an intransitive predicate and the actor argument of a transitive verb. Most Oceanic languages mark the two argument-types in the same way, i.e., they have nominative-accusative marking. The canonic norm is that a verb takes a prefix or proclitic indicating the person and number of the subject, and, if transitive, a suffix or enclitic indicating the person and number of the object. In these examples from NE Ambae the third person non-singular subject is marked by the proclitic \( ra= \) in both intransitive (1a) and transitive (1b), whilst a third person non-singular object is marked by enclitic \( =ra \) in (2).

---

2 Two Northwest Solomonic languages—Torau and Mono-Alu—also have SOV order and postpositions.

3 Brief sketches of two of these languages, Taiof and Sisiqa, are provided in Lynch, Ross, & Crowley (2002), but they are not well understood and are in need of further research.

4 Abbreviations used in interlinear glosses are as follows: 1, 2, 3 first, second, and third persons; ACC accusative; APPLIC applicative; ART article; ASP aspect; CAUS causative; Cl classifier; CI Clause; COLL collective; CONJ conjunction; COMP complementiser; CSTR construct suffix; D dual; D: disjunctive pronoun; DAT dative; DEHORT dehortative; DEIC deictic; DETR detransitiviser; DIR directional; DUB dubitative; EMPH emphatic; EP exclusive plural; FUT future; IMM immediate; INCLIN inclination; INTENT intention; IP inclusive plural; IRR irrealis; ITR intransitive; NEG negative; NEUT neutral modality; NOM Nominalisation; NS non-singular; NSR nominaliser; O: object pronoun; P plural; P: possessor pronoun; PASS passive; PC paucal; PERF perfective; PREP preposition; PROG progressive; PURP purposive; R realis; RECIP reciprocal; REDUP reduplication; RP remote plural; S singular; S: subject pronoun; SPEC specific; SUBJ
There is, however, a scattering of languages which (i) have lost this system of bound coreferencing pronouns either partially or entirely and (ii) mark core noun phrases with preposed case-markers on an ergative-absolutive pattern. I treat these as non-canonic. Roviana (NW Solomonic) has an absolutive morpheme preceding a noun phrase which is the sole argument of an intransitive subject or the undergoer argument of a transitive (Corston 1996). The language has lost its subject proclitics, but retains its object suffixes. This is normally considered to be a non-occurring pattern in accusative languages, and its occurrence here is perhaps associated diachronically with the ergative alignment of the language.\(^5\) A number of Polynesian languages also have ergative marking. Here, both ergative and absolutive NPs are marked by preposed case markers, and the system of bound coreferencing pronouns has disappeared.

Some languages depart in a less spectacular way from the nominative-accusative norm. They retain the system of bound coreferencing pronouns with their nominative-accusative alignment, but mark core noun phrases with case-markers on an ergative-absolutive pattern. A few languages with this pattern are found in the Papuan Tip linkage (Motu, Sinaugoro, Maisin), others in New Caledonia. The former have SOV order and so are in any case treated as non-canonic (e.g., by Tauberschmidt 1999). The New Caledonian languages include Nêlêmwa, which I treat here as canonic, as in other respects it adheres to canonic norms.\(^6\)

This leaves us with a canonic Oceanic type with nominative-accusative marking of subject determiner; SVC serial verb construction; Tel telic aspect; TR transitive; UNACC unaccomplished.

Abbreviations of protolanguage names are given in Figure 2.

\(^5\) More work is needed on Roviana to determine its place in relation to the typology developed below. We can be confident that a language ancestral to Roviana had subject proclitics, as they still occur in closely related Ganoqa (Kettle 2000). In closely related Hoava (Davis 2003), they have also been lost, but the language has no ergative-absolutive marking (i.e., it belongs to the supposedly non-occurring language type).

\(^6\) A pragmatic reason for retaining Nêlêmwa in this survey is that there is an excellent and detailed grammar (Bril 2002).
the kind described above and non-verb-final constituent order. Three patterns are found within this type. They are as follows, with a rough indication of the locations where they occur (Lynch, Ross, & Crowley 2002:49):

**SVO** Papua New Guinea: Mussau (St Matthias group), Admiralty Islands, some languages of the North New Guinea linkage located in the Markham Valley, north Huon Peninsula, the Siasi islands and New Britain, the Meso-Melanesian languages of New Britain and New Ireland, and some on Bougainville; most of SE Solomons, most of Vanuatu, some on mainland New Caledonia, most of Micronesia.

**VOS** Gela (Central Vanuatu), Anejom (South Vanuatu), many on mainland New Caledonia, Loyalty Islands (New Caledonia), Kiribati (Nuclear Micronesian), Fijian.

**VSO** Yapese, some in Santa Isabel (NW Solomonic), some on mainland New Caledonia.

Of these, SVO is geographically and genealogically the most widely distributed pattern, VSO the least. VOS languages are typologically closer to SVO than might appear, for four reasons: (i) in both, there is a verbal subject proclitic/prefix; (ii) both have VO order; (iii) the subject noun phrase is often missing, as in (1), (2), and (7), and so VO clauses occur in both types; (iv) when a subject noun phrase does occur in a VOS language, it is quite often topicalised, giving an SVO clause.

From this point onward, I shall often abbreviate the label canonic Oceanic simply to canonic. Canonic languages are typologically “well-behaved” in that they have prepositions rather than postpositions and the possessor noun phrase follows the possessed in possessive noun phrases. They also have postnominal adjectives. Among languages that have these canonic patterns, however, there is a considerable amount of variation in the details of their grammatical organisation.


---

7 Some SVO languages in the New Guinea area resemble their SOV neighbours in having a mixture of prepositions and postpositions and possessor-possessed order. All New Guinea area Oceanic languages have postnominal adjectives (the fact that adjective-noun order remains unchanged when other orders do change is not surprising in view of Dryer’s (1992) finding that adjective-noun is unrelated to other orders cross-linguistically).
The genealogical affiliations of these languages are shown in Table 2. The distribution of these languages is patchy. Only Mangap-Mbula is located in Papua New Guinea, and NE Ambae and Tamambo are geographically quite close to each other, but in a region of considerable linguistic diversity. The first three are Western Oceanic, the other six Central/Eastern Oceanic languages. No detailed grammar of an Admiralties language exists. However, the grammar sketches of Admiralties and Western Oceanic languages in Lynch, Ross, & Crowley (2002), as well as Hamel (1994) on Loniu and D’Jernes and D’Jernes (n.d.) on Arop-Lukep indicate that the features described below also occur in Admiralties and Western Oceanic canonic languages.

2. Pronominals and the verb phrase in canonic languages

The NE Ambae clauses in (1) and (2) provide but a small taste of the canonic verb phrase, but they already reflect its most important feature, namely the prefix or proclitic indicating the person and number of the subject and the suffix or enclitic indicating the person and number of the object. I shall refer to these respectively simply as the subject prefix, subject proclitic or subject marker and the object suffix, object enclitic or object marker.

Canonic languages almost always have rather complex pronominal systems, and subject and object markers form two of the four pronominal paradigms that are usually found in canonic languages: disjunctive (= independent), subject marker, object marker, and possessor suffix. In glosses I abbreviate these as D:, S:, O: and P: respectively. The NE Ambae paradigms shown in Table 3 are typical of canonic pronominal paradigms in several respects. There is no gender distinction. Non-singular first person pronominals distinguish between inclusive and exclusive. There is a number distinction between singular, dual, and plural; and dual is marked by a reflex of Proto Oceanic *rua ‘two’ (in some languages there is also a trial or a paucal or occasionally both, again marked by a morpheme derived from a numeral). It is quite common for non-singular numbers to be neutralised as plural in the subject and object paradigms, as happens in the NE Ambae object paradigm. It is also common for the object paradigm to lack non-singular non-third-person members: these are replaced by disjunctive pronouns. as in (3).

---

8 There are a number of grammars of Nuclear Micronesian languages. Harrison’s happens to be the most detailed.
9 There are other detailed grammars of Oceanic languages from Papua New Guinea, e.g., Lichtenberk (1983) on Manam, Ezard (1997) on Tawala, Jones (1998) on Mekeo, but they are not canonic languages.
10 Evans (1995) discusses this feature in relation to Oceanic languages in general and to their history.
(3) Ra=u hui i kide  
\(S:3P=TEL \text{ ask ART } D:1IP\)  
‘They asked us.’ (Hyslop 2001:235)

A little less commonly, the subject paradigm in canonic languages is defective in the same way (e.g., in Longgu, cf. (25) below from Hill 2002).\(^{11}\)

**Table 3**: NE Ambae pronominal paradigms (Hyslop 2001:95-96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 INCLUSIVE</th>
<th>1 EXCLUSIVE</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disjunctive = Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>neu</td>
<td>nike</td>
<td>nje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>kide-ru</td>
<td>kama-ru</td>
<td>kimi-ru</td>
<td>karue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>kide</td>
<td>kamai</td>
<td>kimiu</td>
<td>nje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>na=, no=</td>
<td>ko=</td>
<td>o=, na=</td>
<td>vi=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>da-ru=</td>
<td>ka-ru=</td>
<td>ne-ru=</td>
<td>ra-ru=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>da=</td>
<td>ka=</td>
<td>ne=</td>
<td>ra=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>=eu</td>
<td>=ko</td>
<td>=a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>=ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-gu</td>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>-da-ru</td>
<td>-ma-ru</td>
<td>-mi-ru</td>
<td>-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>-da</td>
<td>-mai</td>
<td>-miu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most canonic languages, including NE Ambae, the subject proclitic occurs whether or not there is a noun phrase subject, as with *taŋalo toomue-ki* ‘the first people’ and *ŋire* ‘they (disjunctive pronoun)’ in (4).

(4) …*taŋalo toomue-ki ra=u toka*
\(\text{people first-NSR S:3P=TEL live}\)
\(\text{lolo ureure, ŋire ra=u hua u siaka}\)
\(\text{PREP earth D:3P S:3P=TEL find TEL hard}\)
‘… when the first people lived on the earth, they found it difficult.’ (Hyslop 2001:243)

The object enclitic is also retained in most canonic languages when there is an object noun phrase object, but not in NE Ambae, as (5b) shows.

\(^{11}\) This is discussed in diachronic perspective by Lynch, Ross, & Crowley (2001: Ch.4).
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(5) a. Ko=mese wehe=ra
   s:2S=DEHORT hit=O:3P
   ‘Don’t hit them.’

b. Ko=mese wehe i netu-gu
   s:2S=DEHORT hit ART child-P:1S
   ‘Don’t hit my children.’ (Hyslop 2001:235)

The Longgu (SE Solomonic) sentence in (6) displays the canonic pattern whereby the
object enclitic =ra O:3P and the object noun phrase pipisi=ki ‘clothes’ cooccur.

(6) Amolu ke taʔasi=ra pipisi=ki
   D:2PC must throw=O:3P cloth=P
   ‘You (few) should throw (away) the clothes.’ (Hill 2002)

Disjunctive pronouns function like proper nouns in NE Ambae (as in many canonic
languages) in that they are preceded by the personal article i, as in (3). Noun phrases in
canonic languages usually consist minimally of article + noun, with a distinction between
a common article and a personal article that is used with a proper personal name, a kin
term used to name someone, or a disjunctive pronoun. In NE Ambae the common article
is a or na, as in na boe ‘a/the pig’ and the personal article is i, as in i netu-gu ‘my
child(ren)’. In standard Fijian the distinction is between na and o: na koro (ART village)
‘a/the village’ but o Tomasi ‘Thomas’.

The occurrence of a disjunctive pronoun coreferential with either a subject or object
marker in canonic languages is often described in the literature as “optional”. This
presumably means that its occurrence is determined by referential (dis-)continuity, but I
am not aware of any study of this phenomenon. A disjunctive pronoun is often used in
canonic languages as the subject of a clause with a non-verbal predicate, or (in Nélémwa,
for example; Isabelle Bril pers. comm.) for topicalisation, focus, or emphasis.

Possessor suffixes will concern us here mainly because of their role in nominalisations.
An outline of the possessive system of canonic languages is given in §4.

Beside the subject and object markers, the other major feature of the canonic verb
phrase is the presence of mood and aspect markers. 12 There is usually a distinction
between realis (R) and irrealis (IRR) mood and often between various aspects. 13 Mood
and aspect markers, if they occur, usually come immediately before or immediately after

12 Most canonic languages also have postverbal aspect and directional markers, but these do not
interact formally with the object markers and will not concern us here.

13 There is typically no tense as such in canonic languages. The irrealis by default denotes the
future, though it also has other uses. The realis denotes present and PAST. However, there are
exceptions to these generalisations.
the subject marker. Sometimes the form of the subject marker is determined by an accompanying mood or aspect marker, and sometimes the subject and mood markers combine to form a portmanteau morpheme. Thus in NE Ambae s:1s ‘I’ is no= with the realis marker mo in (7a) and na= with the irrealis marker ni in (7b) (Hyslop 2001:232, 237).

(7) a. No=mo suru
   D:1S=R be snotty
   ‘I have a snotty nose.’
   b. Na=ni hui=ko m”ere vake...
      S:1S=IRR ask=O:2S like too
      ‘I will ask you this as well...’

Another frequently occurring marker in NE Ambae is telic u, which occurs when the completion or perfectiveness of an event is specified, as in (1b), (3), and (4). The third singular subject forms shown in Table 3 are zero in the realis mood and telic aspect, vi= in the irrealis, and na= when mood is unmarked. The negative marker hi follows the mood and aspect marker, and the dehortative marker mese follows the subject marker, as in (2). A number of other less frequently used aspect markers also occur in this slot (Hyslop 2001: ch. 9).

A morphologically more complex preverbal system occurs in Siar (Ross 2002). Here the subject marker paradigm is highly defective, with only one member, a s:1s. Otherwise, the disjunctive pronouns serve as subject markers, and this to the degree that one occasionally finds a sequence with two tokens of the disjunctive pronoun, one serving as a subject noun phrase, the other as a subject marker:

(8) (met) bil met el nek
    D:1EP NEG S:1EP S:3:IRR weep
    ‘We shall not cry.’

This odd structure, with its seeming conflict of persons, needs explaining. The paradigm in (9) shows the portmanteau mood-and-subject markers used with singular subjects (it happens that the 2s and 3s disjunctive pronouns which double up as subject markers are also monosyllabic: u and i).

(9)  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>2s</th>
<th>3s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s:</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R:s:</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s:IRR</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT:s:IRR</td>
<td>kal</td>
<td>kol</td>
<td>kel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1S possibilities are set out in (10). Here yau D:1S ‘I’ is the optional subject noun phrase, not a constituent of the verb phrase:

(10)  
S:1S    (yau) a ŋek  ‘I am crying’, ‘I cried’  
R:S:1S:  (yau) ka ŋek  ‘I cried’  
S:1S:IRR (yau) al ŋek  ‘I shall (probably) cry’  
FUT:S:1S:IRR (yau) kal ŋek  ‘I shall (certainly) cry’  
NEG S:1S:IRR (yau) bil al ŋek  ‘I shall not cry’

When the subject is non-singular, the subject pronoun (which is identical to the disjunctive pronoun) precedes any mood morpheme, and the latter takes its 3S form. For example:

(11)  
S:1EP    (met) met ŋek  ‘we are crying’, ‘we cried’  
S:1EP R:S:3S  (met) met ki ŋek  ‘we cried’  
S:1EP S:3S:IRR (met) met el ŋek  ‘we shall (probably) cry’  
S:1EP FUT:S:3S:IRR (met) met kel ŋek  ‘we shall (certainly) cry’  
NEG S:1EP S:3S:IRR (met) bil met el ŋek  ‘we shall not cry’

The sentence in (8) is identical to the bottom line of this paradigm.

The point of interest here is not the mood markers themselves, but the configuration of the pronominal morphemes. The fact that there is one distinct subject marker, a S:1S, suggests that there was once a fuller subject marker paradigm (probably the defective set mentioned above, consisting of singulars and third person non-singulars) and that its other members have been lost. Alternatively, u 2S and i 3S in (9) may reflect earlier subject markers which have either replaced or merged with separate disjunctive forms; this scenario is suggested by the apparent incorporation of all three singular forms into the portmanteau markers in (9). Either way, what is interesting is the filling of the subject marker slot with disjunctive forms, attested in (11). This is a process appearing to have happened repeatedly at different times and in different places in the history of Oceanic, making the reconstruction of Proto Oceanic subject markers quite a jigsaw puzzle.

A similar process appears to have happened in Mokilese, as Table 4 shows. Here, there is a disjunctive pronoun set, all of whose members may be used as either subject or object (there are also possessive suffixes, but they do not concern us here). However, in the first and second persons singular, the subject is more usually marked by the shorter members of the subject paradigm. They appear to be derived historically from the disjunctive forms. If this is so, then all earlier subject markers have been lost and the

---

14 The “remote plural” (RP) set appears to be little used and refers to usually large groups of people most of whom are not present at the time/place of reference.
language reflects the partial creation of a new set.

Mokilese departs from the canonic norm in that no subject-marking pronoun appears if there is a subject noun phrase. Thus the first clause in (12) has the subject *cippo* and no subject pronoun, but the second clause has no noun phrase subject and therefore the subject pronoun *ī*. However, the behaviour of Mokilese subject pronouns in subordinate clauses is that of subject markers, not disjunctive pronouns, as we shall see below (§§5.2, 5.3).

(12) Cippo pirin kicouto lakap. *ī* pirin itanto ɔi mēk
ship INTENT arrive tomorrow D:3S INTENT bring CL.P:1S thing
‘The ship will arrive tomorrow. It will bring my things.’ (Harrison 1976:91)

Table 4: Mokilese pronoun paradigm (Harrison 1976:88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 INCLUSIVE</th>
<th>1 EXCLUSIVE</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disjunctive = Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>əŋi</td>
<td>kəwə</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>kisa</td>
<td>kama</td>
<td>kam’a</td>
<td>ara, ira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>kisai</td>
<td>kamai</td>
<td>kam’au</td>
<td>arai, irai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP:</td>
<td>kīs</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>kim’i</td>
<td>ūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>kū</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP:</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One might well ask why the subject marker paradigm should undergo continuing replacement, or why its maintenance should be important. The answer, it seems to me, lies in the fact that there are discourse-related reasons why the subject marker paradigm is important in canonic Oceanic languages, and that these have to do with its interaction with other parts of the grammar. The same is presumably true of the object marker paradigm, but it has been less subject to attrition, apparently due to the chance fact that in most Oceanic languages there have been no postverbal morphemes that have bonded with its members. In §5 I turn to the reasons why subject marker paradigms are important

---

15 The tendency of certain morphological paradigms to keep undergoing repair has been observed by others, e.g., Goddard (1993) with regard to Algonquian languages.
in canonic languages. But the discussion there presupposes knowledge of transitivity and possession, which are discussed briefly in §3 and §4 respectively.

3. Transitivity

3.1 A- and U-verbs

In English—and many other languages—one-participant semantic relations can be divided up into those which intrinsically have only one participant, like ‘die’, ‘fall’, ‘go’, and ‘swim’, and those which could have a second but unidentified participant, like ‘eat’, ‘kick’, and ‘hunt’. When I say that these have a second but unidentified participant, I mean that they occur in English as both intransitive and transitive verbs. Now, it is a basic fact of the organisation of semantic relations in English that a one-participant verb with a second but unidentified participant always has the actor as its single argument. That is, one says John ate or John ate the bread, but not *The bread ate (meaning that someone ate it). In some canonic languages, however, there is a subclass of intransitive verbs which do work like ate in *The bread ate. They denote a one-participant semantic relation with a potential second participant, but the subject of the verb is the undergoer, not the actor, as in the Boumaa Fijian sentence in (13):

(13) e gagi a dovu
    S:3S crush ART sugarcane
    ‘The sugarcane is being crushed.’ (Dixon 1988:204)

The potential second participant is of course the actor, who emerges in the transitive version of the verb (which in this—but not every—case has the same form as the intransitive).

(14) au gagi-a a dovu
    S:1S crush-O:3S ART sugarcane
    ‘I’m crushing the sugarcane.’

I call these verbs U-verbs (“undergoer verbs”; Ross 1998b:21-27). Their existence in Fijian has long been recognised (Arms 1974a, Biggs 1974, Foley 1976), and has also been explicitly documented for Longgu by Hill (1992) and for Hoava by Davis (2003:

---

16 It is worth noting that in two of the three non-canonic types mentioned in §1, subject and object marker paradigms have not been maintained. In some of the verb-second languages, both sets have undergone considerable attrition (Ross 1982) whilst, as already noted, ergative Roviana has lost its subject markers.
Evans (2003:26-32) suggests that U-verbs are quite common in canonic languages. In Hoava, for example, as Evans points out, we find:

(15) a. tuke sa leboto
    throw away ART:s bushknife
    ‘The bushknife was thrown away.’

    b. tuke-a rao sa leboto
    throw away-O:3S D:3S ART:s bushknife
    ‘I threw the bushknife away.’ (Davis 2003:113)

Longgu also has U-verbs:

(16) a. /ai e /ave-?ave
    stick S:3S REDUP-bend
    ‘The stick is bent.’

    b. m"ane e ?ave-a ?ai
    man S:3S bend-O:3S stick
    ‘The man bent the stick.’ (Hill 1992:46)

Languages like Fijian and Hoava have two other subclasses of intransitive verb. One is the subclass containing stative or ‘adjectival’ verbs, as in this Boumaa Fijian example:

(17) e loaloa a ?oli ?oli
    S:3S be black ART dog this
    ‘This dog is black.’

These also have an undergoer subject. An extensive study of these from both typological and diachronic perspectives has been published elsewhere (Ross 1998a, c), so I shall not dwell on them here.

Contrasting with U-verbs are A-verbs (“actor verbs”), which resemble English intransitives in that the actor is the subject both of the intransitive and of its transitive counterpart.

(18) a. au rabe
    S:1S kick
    ‘I’m kicking.’

    b. au rabe-t-a a polo
    S:1S kick-TR-O:3S ART ball
    ‘I’m kicking the ball.’

17 Reduplication probably has a detransitivising function, i.e., the intransitive form is derived. However, this does not matter: the intransitive form here is a U-verb, in (20) an A-verb.
Similarly in Hoava we find:

(19) a. soko sa makariva
    chop ART:S boy
    ‘The boy chopped.’

b. soko-a sa makariva sa gato
    chop-O:3S A RT:S boy ART:S tree
    ‘The boy chopped the tree.’ (Davis 2003:121)

And in Longgu:

(20) a. e ovo-ovo
    S:3S REDUP-fight
    ‘He is fighting.’

b. e ovo-a
    S:3S fight-O:3S
    ‘He is fighting him.’ (Hill 1992:45-46)

It is, I think, a fair observation that many of the semantic relations that are expressed as intransitive U-verbs in Fijian and Hoava would not occur as intransitives at all in other languages. The U-verbs in (13) and (15) are ‘crush’ and ‘throw away’, and their English counterparts are always transitive. Dixon (1988:205) says that Boumaa Fijian A-verbs are mostly verbs of motion like ‘go’, ‘jump’, ‘creep’, ‘fly’, etc., whereas U-verbs are mostly verbs of affect: ‘crush’, ‘bend’, ‘fold’, ‘squeeze’, ‘tie up’, etc. ‘Bend’, ‘twist’, ‘dip’, and ‘roll’ are among the Longgu U-verbs noted by Hill (1992). This is noteworthy, because it means that U-verbs denote semantic relations which one would expect to be prototypically transitive (Hopper and Thompson 1980)—and of course they do have transitive counterparts, as (14) and (15b) illustrate.

Most canonic languages lack a passive voice, although there are exceptions—Hoava, Fijian, and some Micronesian languages, all with passives differing formally from one another and appearing to be local innovations. One may speculate that there is a systematic relationship between the existence of intransitive U-verbs and the absence of a voice system. It is striking that the most natural English translations for clauses containing U-verbs are passive: ‘The sugarcane is being crushed’ and ‘The bushknife was thrown away’.

This raises the question: how do the passives in languages that have them differ from U-verbs? The answer appears to be that the passives allow an actor adjunct or imply the presence of an actor, whereas U-verbs do not (Dixon 1988:222, Lee 1975:190), but more research is needed into this question. The Hoava passive, which has apparently grown out of the Proto Oceanic “spontaneous intransitive” formative *tu-, does allow an
actor adjunct. Its presence is marked on the verb by the applicative suffix -ni and by what would otherwise be an object suffix (Davis 2003:213).

(21) a. Ta-hogi rao  
PASS-gore D:1S  
‘I was gored.’

b. Ta-hogi-ni-a rao sa boko  
PASS-gore-APPLIC-O:3S D:1S ART:S pig  
‘I was gored by the pig.’ (Davis 2003:213)

Dixon (1988:222-223) argues that the Fijian passive can also have an actor adjunct, but the majority opinion appears to be that it cannot, and that the “passive” is a way of deriving a U-verb from a transitive (Kikusawa 1998).

3.2 Transitivising morphology

Canonic Oceanic languages have quite a rich array of valency-changing morphemes, which interact with A- and U-verbs in various ways to shift semantic roles from subject to object or vice versa (but only very rarely to add a second object). These are all lexical derivations. In other words, they are partially unpredictable. They are rearrangements of semantic relationships, and lack the productivity of a voice system, which simply maps the same semantic relationship onto the subject in two different ways.

Table 5 (from Ross 1998b:21) summarises the valency-changing devices putatively used with the three verb classes in Proto Oceanic. This situation remains more or less unchanged in canonic languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>forms a</td>
<td>forms a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-verbs</td>
<td>transitive?</td>
<td>causative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U-verbs</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stative verbs</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 2 indicates a difference between the two classes of undergoer-subject verbs: U-verbs, like A-verbs, formed transitives, but statives did not. The easiest way to understand how transitivising morphology works in canonic languages is to look at the reconstructed Proto Oceanic system. Canonic languages usually have two transitivising suffixes, one derived from Proto Oceanic *-i, the other from Proto Oceanic *-akin[i]. The
resulting transitive verb is then followed by an object enclitic. These are derivational affixes, and one cannot predict with any certainty whether a particular derived lexical item will occur in the lexicon of a given language.

When Proto Oceanic *-i was added to an A-verb, its valency was increased by the addition of an object. When it was added to a U-verb, the undergoer subject became the object and its valency was increased by the addition of an actor subject. It is formally somewhat inaccurate to talk about Proto Oceanic *-i, although much of the literature does just this, as it had a zero alternant. Proto Oceanic verb roots were mostly disyllabic and either consonant-final or vowel-final, that is, (C)V(C)VC or (C)V(C)V. The canonic shape of the root alone determined its transitivising morphology. The transitive of a consonant-final root was formed by adding *-i, but with a vowel-final root like *wase- ‘share (s.t.) out’ or *kati- ‘husk (s.t.) with teeth’, no transitive suffix occurred and the object enclitic was added directly to the root (Evans 1997, 2003:96-99, 106-118). The one possible exception to this is formed by roots ending in *-a, where the suffix *-i- may have occurred between the root and the object enclitic, at least when the enclitic itself began with *a (*au O:1S, *a O:3S). Below are some reconstructed Proto Oceanic A-verbs and U-verbs, both consonant-final and vowel-final, with their corresponding transitives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>intransitive</th>
<th>corresponding transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-verbs *kinit</td>
<td>‘pinch’</td>
<td>*kinit-‘pinch (s.o/s.t)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*inum</td>
<td>‘drink’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*kati</td>
<td>‘husk with teeth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*muri</td>
<td>‘follow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-verbs <em>p</em>osa(k)</td>
<td>‘be cracked open’</td>
<td><em>p</em>osak-‘crack (s.t) open’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*lonoR</td>
<td>‘be audible’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*soka</td>
<td>‘pierce, stab’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*wase</td>
<td>‘be shared out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*poli</td>
<td>‘be bought’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto Oceanic *-akin[i] was an applicative suffix which increased the valency of an intransitive verb by the addition of an object (or in some cases perhaps simply replaced *-i on a transitive verb that no longer had an intransitive counterpart). Whereas the object of a verb formed with *-i (or zero) was typically a patient, however, the object of a verb formed with *-akin[i] typically had some other semantic role. With a motion A-verb, for example, it was a concomitant (the entity that accompanied the actor); with a psychological or emotional A-verb it was a cause or stimulus; with a U-verb it was an instrument or beneficiary (Evans 2003:125-133).

Reconstructing the history of forms descended from Proto Oceanic *-akin[i] is difficult. It is probable that there was also a Proto Oceanic preposition or prepositional
verb *(a)kini, and that many of the verbs that appear to reflect *-akin[i] in modern languages are in fact the result of more recent preposition-capture. It is also unclear what happened when the suffix was added to a vowel-final root. However, these are diachronic issues that lie beyond the scope of this paper. (See Evans 2003 for a detailed investigation.)

As I have noted, in Proto Oceanic, these suffixes were often added to an intransitive root with a final consonant, like *tanjis ‘weep’, but in most Oceanic languages word-final consonants have been lost, with the result that when the ancient consonant is retained before a transitive affix it is interpreted as part of the suffix, as is Fijian /ð/ here:

(23) Proto Oceanic  *tanjis  *tanjis-i-a  *tanjis-aki-a
Fijian  tanji  tanji-ða  tanji-ðaka
      weep  weep-TR:O:3S  weep-TR:O:3S
      ‘weep’  ‘cry for’  ‘cry because of’

Because there was a variety of root-final consonants in Proto Oceanic, an outcome of this process is that the transitive morphemes in Fijian and other Oceanic languages have acquired a variety of allomorphs, e.g., Fijian -ða, -ta, -ka, -va, -na, etc., and similarly -ðaka, -taka, and so on.

The alternation between intransitives and transitives reflecting *-i or zero is illustrated for Boumaa Fijian in (13)/(14) and (18) and for Hoava in (15) and (19). The pairs of Boumaa Fijian transitive sentences in (24) and (25) illustrate the contrast between transitive verbs with reflexes of *-i or zero and *-akin[i]. In (24a) the object is the patient, but in (24b) it is not. (It is hard to define the semantic role here but this does not matter.) In (25a) the object is the patient, but in (25b) it is the instrument (with a semantic organisation rather different from English).

(24) a. au na tala-i Elia i ñorovou
    S:1S FUT send-TR Elia PREP ‘Orovou
    ‘I’ll send Elia to ‘Orovou.’ (Dixon 1988:216)

    b. au na tala-va?ini Filo
    S:1S FUT send-TR Filo
    ‘I’ll send for Filo.’ (Dixon 1988:217)

(25) a. au aa ñolo-vaa e dua a toa
    S:1S PAST throw-TR:O:3S S:3S one ART fowl
    ‘I threw (s.t.) at a fowl.’

    b. au aa ñolo-ta?ina e dua a vatu
    S:1S PAST throw-TR:O:3S S:3S one ART stone
    ‘I threw a stone.’ (Dixon 1988:217)

Table 5 shows that all three Proto Oceanic verb classes could form causatives. Indeed,
this was the only way that a transitive verb could be formed from a stative. Causatives were formed with one of the two prefixes *pa- or *paka-, whose reflexes are widespread, usually accompanied by the transitiviser *-i. The causative adds an actor argument, the causer, to the verb, as these Boumaa Fijian examples show. The verb vuli ‘learn’ in (26a) is an A-verb, so its subject argument is the same as that of the transitive in (26b). The causative in (26c) introduces the causer argument o Jone ‘John’, and the actor becomes its object. The object of (26b), ‘arithmetic’, is an oblique in both the intransitive of (26a) and the causative of (26c). This suggests, as Dixon (1988:185-186) notes, that the causative is derived from the intransitive, not from the transitive.

\[(26)\] a. au saa vuli (i-na fika)
s:1S ASP learn PREP-ART arithmetic
‘I am learning (about arithmetic).’
b. au saa vuli-ða a fika
s:1S ASP learn-TR:O:3S ART arithmetic
‘I am learning arithmetic.’
c. e saa va?a-vuli-ði au o Jone (i-na fika)
s:3S ASP CAUS-learn-TR O:1S A RT John P REP-ART arithmetic
‘John is teaching me (arithmetic).’ (Dixon 1988:50)

The sentences in (27) indicate that this analysis is correct. The verb ?au ‘take, carry’ is a U-verb, so its subject ‘letter’ in (27a) becomes the object of the transitive in (27b) and of the causative in (27c). The best explanation here is that the causative is derived from the intransitive, and that the subject of the intransitive becomes the object of the causative, regardless of whether the intransitive is an A-verb or a U-verb.

\[(27)\] a. e ?au yane a ivola
s:1S take thither ART letter
‘The letter is being taken/sent.’
b. e ?au-ta yane a ivola a ðauravou
s:1S take-TR thither ART letter ART youth
‘The youth is taking the letter.’
c. e va?a-?au-ta yane a ivola a marama
s:1S CAUS-take-TR thither ART letter ART woman
‘The woman is posting (= causing to be sent) the letter.’ (Dixon 1988:185)

Boumaa Fijian, like other canonic languages, has no ditransitive verbs, so one of the three roles potentially associated with the causative must become an oblique or disappear, and this is what happens in (26) and (27).

The situation I have just described with regard to transitivisation and causativisation in Boumaa Fijian also holds with some complications or simplifications in many other
canonic languages (and in a good many that are non-canonic, too, as a perusal of Pawley 1973 reveals). In Longgu, for example, causatives are formed with the prefix vaʔa-, and, whilst the majority also have a reflex of *-i, as in Fijian, some occur in variants with and without it. Thus mae ‘die’ is the root of both vaʔa-mae-a ‘(a person) kill her/him’ (where -a is O:3S) and vaʔa-mae-si-a ‘(a sickness) kill her/him’. In Hoava, some statives form a transitive with -i. In NE Ambae there appear to be no U-verbs (other than statives), and Hyslop (2001:320) comments that there are few verb roots that form alternative transitives with the Ambae reflexes of both *-i and *-akin[i]. Canonic languages in the Western Oceanic group and in the Admiralties (i.e., in the New Guinea area) seem to have few U-verbs, but this may be an artifact of descriptive deficiencies, as Hoava, which is also Western Oceanic, certainly has them.

Some canonic languages also have detransitivising morphology, although its role is much less significant than the transitivising and causativising morphology discussed above. It takes three forms. Two are straightforward detransitivisation: reduplication, and prefixation of a reflex of one of Proto Oceanic *ma- and *ta-. The third is prefixation of a reflex of Proto Oceanic *paRi- to form a reciprocal verb.

4. Possession

Possessive construction systems in canonic languages are defined along four parameters (Lichtenberk 1985, Ross 1998c):

(28) a. whether the possessed noun is alienable or inalienable;
b. how many subtypes of alienable possession occur;
c. whether the possessor is a pronoun, a common noun phrase, or a personal noun phrase;
d. whether a noun phrase possessor is specific or non-specific.

Inalienable nouns typically include most kinship terms and body parts, as well as a number of locative parts like ‘inside’, ‘behind’, ‘front’, etc. All other nouns are inalienable. However, languages vary as to the degree to which nouns fall into two major classes, alienable and inalienable, and to the degree to which a possessed noun may occur with the morphosyntax of either class. Pawley and Sayaba (1990) find that Wayan Fijian falls between these two extremes: some nouns can occur in either class (and in more than one alienable subclass), whilst others only ever occur in a single class. This situation also seems to prevail in other Central/Eastern Oceanic canonic languages and in the Admiralties, whereas canonic Western Oceanic languages have a stricter division between alienable
and inalienable nouns. 18

Inalienable nouns are marked by the presence of a possessor suffix (cf. Table 3), at least when the possessor is pronominal. Sometimes the possessor is also marked by a disjunctive pronoun, as in the Kokota example in (29).

The canonic form for alienable possession, illustrated by Kokota, NE Ambae, Boumaa Fijian and Mokilese in (29), consists of a classifier (on which more below) to which a possessor suffix is attached, followed by the possessed noun. (Sometimes the possessed noun precedes the classifier-suffix combination.) It is fairly common, however, to find alienable constructions of other kinds, especially ones where the possessor is marked by a preposition, as in Arop-Lukep below, where ki- is the source (‘from’) preposition. Longgu reflects a rarer development, whereby the possessor is simply expressed by a disjunctive pronoun (nau below). However, Longgu retains the classifier construction in possessive pronouns; e.g., na-gu-a CL-P:1S-a ‘mine’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(29)</th>
<th>Inalienable</th>
<th>Alienable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arop-Lukep</td>
<td>rima-ki</td>
<td>gau-ni-ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wife-P:1S</td>
<td>dog PREP-1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokota</td>
<td>nan-ji-gu ara</td>
<td>no-gu pohe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shadow-P:1S D:1S</td>
<td>CL-P:1S clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longgu</td>
<td>lima-gu hand-P:1S</td>
<td>lumu nau-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘my hand/arm’</td>
<td>house D:1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vulu-gu hair-P:1S</td>
<td>no-gu bue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘my hair’</td>
<td>CL-P:1S knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Ambae</td>
<td>tama-k父亲-P:1S</td>
<td>no-ku bwalata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘my father’</td>
<td>CL-P:1S mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamambo</td>
<td>a li-ja-mu ART hand-P:2S</td>
<td>a o-mu tamata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘your hand’</td>
<td>ART CL-P:2S person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boumaa Fijian</td>
<td>ria-m’ brother-P:2S</td>
<td>nī-m’ pin-cell=DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘your brother’</td>
<td>CL-P:2S pencil=DEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many canonic languages make a distinction between at least two subtypes of alienable possession, marking each subtype with a dedicated classifier. The minimal distinction is usually between things for eating and all other alienable possessions. A three-way distinction between things for eating, things for drinking and all other alienable possessions is also quite common, as in the Tamambo examples in (30) and the Boumaa Fijian examples in (31). Tamambo, like a number of its neighbours, also has a classifier for valuable items.

---

18 This is a generalisation which has, as far as I know, never been carefully tested.
The two other parameters—whether the possessor is a pronoun or a noun phrase, and whether a noun phrase possessor is specific or non-specific—overlap with each other. In Proto Oceanic there were apparently four distinct constructions for nouns possessed by a possessor noun phrase: inalienable/specific possessor, inalienable/non-specific possessor, alienable/specific possessor, and alienable/non-specific possessor (Hooper 1985, Lichtenberk 1985). The Proto Oceanic constructions were apparently as in (32).

Each of these distinctions survives in some canonic languages (Ross 1998c), but most languages show some simplification of the system.

There was also another complication, as somewhat different constructions were used according to whether a specific noun phrase possessor was proper or common. Constructions with a personal noun phrase possessor are ignored here.

In Longgu there is the three-way distinction shown in (33): the constructional difference between the two non-specific possessor constructions has been lost and _ni_ is now used for both:

(30) a. ma-m ti CL-P:2S tea ‘your tea (for drinking)’
b. ha-ku bweta CL-P:1S taro ‘my taro (for eating)’
c. bula-na toa CL-P:3S chicken ‘his/her chickens (valuable items)’
d. no-ra tano CL-P:3P garden ‘their garden/s’

(31) a. a me-na wagona ART CL-P:3S kava ‘his/her kava (for drinking)’
b. a ?e-mu madrai ART CL-P:2S bread ‘your bread (for eating)’
c. a wee-taru isele ART CL-P:1ID knife (wee- is an allomorph of o- in (29))

(32) inalienable *a qaqe-ña tam wa t a ART leg-P:3S man ‘the man’s leg’
/specific possessor

inalienable *a natu qi boRok ART child qi pig (lit. ‘child of pig’)
/non-specific possessor

alienable *a na-ña Rumaq tam’ata ART CL-P:3S house man ‘the man’s house’
/specific possessor

alienable *a polo ni niuR ART liquid ni coconut (lit. ‘liquid of coconut’) /non-specific possessor
Tamambo makes the same three-way distinction, but uses different means. As (34) shows, the morpheme -i is used where Longgu has ni, and -ni is now used for the inalienable/specific possessor construction. As well as the collapse of categories, Tamambo illustrates two things which are common in Central/Eastern Oceanic languages: the suffixation of reflexes of *qi and/or *ni to the possessed noun as ‘construct’ suffixes and the extension of the function of a construct suffix so that it now marks a specific possessor.

Category collapse in Western Oceanic languages often works in a different way. There is a tendency for the non-specific possessor constructions to be lost altogether. Their functions are either taken over by the specific constructions or are replaced by simple juxtaposition. Thus in Kokota the difference in the specificity of the possessors is no longer carried by the possessive construction but by the marking of specificity on the possessor (gazu tauao ‘this tree’).

But simple juxtaposition also occurs in Kokota. We find meresini kastom ‘custom (= traditional) medicine’, where Longgu, for example, would insert ni between the two words.
5. Clauses, sentences and subjects

To do typology effectively, we need a framework within which languages can be described and compared. The problem with this is that theoretical frameworks tend to propose morphosyntactic parameters for comparing languages without first ensuring that the parameter has a universal basis. For example, in a famous article Nichols (1986) posits the distinction between head-marking and dependent-marking structures. This presupposes that “head” and “dependent” are universal syntactic categories, but Zwicky (1993) and Croft (2001:246-268) each make a case that the notion of “head” is based on a collection of semantic and morphosyntactic features which quite often fail to correspond with each other. Croft argues that a crosslinguistic definition of “head” must be based on semantic considerations (2001:259).

Much the same is true of the notions of “subject” and “object”. They vary from language to language, and the features that define them do not always match within a language, let alone across languages (Dryer 1997). Probably all languages have at least one intransitive clause construction; that is, a construction consisting of a predicate and a single argument (S). In most languages there is a transitive clause construction which has a predicate (typically a verb) and two arguments, one of which is coded in the same way as S. The argument which is coded similarly in intransitive and transitive clauses is the subject. Thus in the English intransitive clause *John works hard* and the transitive clause *John loves Mary*, the verbs *works* and *loves* are both suffixed with *-s*. This coding indicates that the subject John is third person singular in both clauses.

Because of the need to illustrate typological parameters, comparisons will be made with English in this section. I am not implying that comparing Oceanic with English is sufficient to establish a typological parameter: it simply happens to be sufficient to illustrate the points made here.

Many—perhaps most—languages code S and the more actor-like (A) argument of the transitive in the same way and code the more undergoer-like (U) argument differently, as in the English clauses above. The S+A category is the subject, the U category is the object, and such languages are said to be accusative languages. A smaller number of languages code U in the same way as S and code the A differently and are said to be ergative languages (Comrie 1978, Dixon 1979). Whether or how one applies the term “subject” to these languages is a matter of debate, but one which will not concern us.

---

19 Exceptions to this generalisation are Split-S languages. Here the single argument of an intransitive clause appears with one of two codings, according to whether it is treated as more actor-like or more undergoer-like. These two codings are also used for the two arguments of a transitive clause.

20 Some writers, like Kroeger (1993), also call the S+U category the subject. Kroeger’s choice of
here, as canonic Oceanic languages have accusative subject corefencing in the verb phrase (§1). Instead, the question to be addressed is a subtler one: How does the subject in canonic Oceanic languages differ from the subject in languages like English?

To answer this question, we need to examine the constructions in which the subject participates, since it is these which define what the subject is (Croft 2001:25-26, 56-57). Following Keenan (1976), Croft (2001:148-149) divides the features of subjects into coding features and behavioural features. Coding features are morphosyntactic markers of the subject (like verbal -s agreement in the English examples above, or nominative case marking, or clause-initial position). Behavioural features are constructions whose function is to track referents between clauses.

Behavioural features of the subject in English and in Oceanic languages occur in three situations: in certain cases of coordination, in certain adverbial clauses, and in certain complement clauses. In each case, the subject noun phrase of a second clause is missing and is coreferential with a core argument of the first clause. Whether this is the subject or object of the first clause is determined by the construction and by the verb of the first clause. In this tracking use, the subject is often called the ‘pivot’ (Heath 1975, Dixon 1979, Foley and Van Valin 1984:108-124).

5.1 Coordination

In English we can combine the two independent clauses John punched Jack and John fell down into the coordinate construction John, punched Jack and "fell down", omitting the second occurrence of John because it is the subject of both clauses. This construction is known as coordination reduction, and the missing subject of the second clause is said to be “controlled” by the subject of the first. Alternatively, we can say that it is the pivot of its clause. If the subjects of consecutive clauses are both third person singular or third person plural and the first clause is transitive, then the presence or absence of the subject can be crucial to interpretation. If there is coordination reduction, as in John, punched Jack and "fell down", it is John who fell down (despite the meaning, which leads us to expect that Jack would have fallen down). But if there is no reduction, as in John punched Jack and then he fell down, the subject of the second clause, he, may

---

the term “subject” is determined by his theoretical framework, Lexical Functional Grammar, which posits “subject” as a universal category. Other scholars (e.g., Anderson 1976) reserve “subject” for S and A even in ergative languages where S and A are coded differently from one another.

21 Subject behavioural features may appear in other situations. In many languages the zero or relative marker/relative pronoun representing the relativised noun phrase must be the subject. However, this is true neither of English nor of any Oceanic language.
refer to either John or Jack, depending on context and intonation.

Interestingly, most canonic Oceanic languages do not have coordination reduction constructions. Instead, if the third person subjects of successive clauses are omitted (as they often are), leaving only the prefix or proclitic to the verb to indicate the person and number of the subject, then the identity of the missing subject must be inferred from context. The Arop-Lukep clause sequence in (36) is a case in point, as the free English gloss shows. The subject referent of the second clause is the same as the first, ‘the bush spirit’, but the subject referent of the third is ‘his wife’ (the object of the first clause):

(36) Matong [mada garup i-kan-a rima-na-a] then. r bush spirit female s:3S-eat-o:3S wife-p:3S-and then [i-ton-a-a] s:3S-swallow-o:3S-and then [i-du kapo-no lo-no] s:3S-go down stomach-p:3S inside-p:3S

‘Then (the) female bush spirit ate his wife, and (the spirit) swallowed (the wife) and (the wife) went down inside (the spirit's) stomach.’ (D’Jernes and D’Jernes, n.d.)

The clause sequence in (37) is from a Kokota text describing birth. The subject of the first clause is sulĩ ana ‘that child’. The second and third clauses lack subject noun phrases. It is clear from the context that they refer to the woman who is giving birth, not to the child.

(37) an-lau [ye kata n-e=u sulĩ ana] that-SPEC CONJ bite R-S:3=be thus child that
an-lau [ye g-e=lao-ŋa ka=ia suga] that-SPEC CONJ NEUT-S:3=go-IMM PREP=ART house [g-e=fa=doli=ni=a sulĩ e=u] NEUT-S:3=CAUS=live-o:3S=ART child s:3=be thus

‘That, then the child bites; that, then she (the mother to be) goes to the house (and) gives birth to the child.’23 (Palmer 1999:275)

That is, presence or absence of a subject noun phrase in Kokota makes no difference to interpretation. There is no coordination reduction construction, as omission of a subject

---

22 There are exceptions. Lynch (2000:149) reports a coordination reduction construction in Anejõm (South Vanuatu), whereby the subject marker is missing if the implicit subject is the same as that of the preceding verb. The presence or absence of a subject marker also has semantic implications in Nêlêmwa, differentiating between simultaneous and sequential events (Bril 2002:430-431).

23 ‘The child bites’ denotes labour pains.
noun phrase is not determined by the coreferentiality or otherwise of subjects.

The same is true of the clause sequence from Longgu (Southeast Solomonic) in (38). In the second clause there is an explicit third person plural subject noun phrase ‘the women and the men of the village’; in the three clauses that follow it, all beginning with \textit{m-ara} ‘and they’ (where \textit{ara} is a subject proclitic), it is clear from the further context of the story that ‘they’ refers not to the people of the village but to the children whom they were addressing in the first clause. Again there is no coordination reduction construction (Hill 1992:296).

\begin{verbatim}
(38) [“amu la nana’i va’i-ni-a Titipohonam”ela”]
   D:2P go stay PREP-TR-O:3S man’s name child
   [ara una gira-nja geni-na komu-i-na ma vanoa-gi-na]
   S:3P say D:3P-emph woman-p:3S village-s-deic CONJ people-p-DEIC
   [m-ara ade a-da [m-ara to’i-i siñilo gira-gi-na] [m-ara lae]
   CONJ-S:3P take food-p:3P CONJ-S:3P hold-o:3P basket D:3P-p-DEIC CONJ-S:3P go
   “You go and stay with Titipohona, children,” said the women and the men (lit: people)
   of the village, and they took their food and they held their baskets and they went …”
   (Hill 1992:318)
\end{verbatim}

The inference from these examples is that the subject marker has no reference-tracking function, i.e., no pivot function, in coordination in these languages.

### 5.2 Adverbial clauses

In the English coordination construction, a subject is deleted without further changes to the clause. Adverbial and complement clauses, however, often display what Lehmann (1988:193-200) calls ‘desententialisation’.\(^{24}\) Across languages, desententialisation typically involves the following steps, usually in this order (Croft 1991:93; Cristofaro 2003):

\begin{verbatim}
(39) a) elimination of tense-mood-aspect/addition of special morpheme;
   b) elimination of subject-verb agreement;
   c) encoding of the S or A as a possessor or an oblique;
   d) encoding of the U as a possessor or an oblique.
\end{verbatim}

If the subject of a desententialised clause is coreferential with an argument of the main clause, then the coreferential subject is often deleted from the desententialised subordinate clause. In the bracketed adverbial clause of purpose of \textit{John, saved up [’to go overseas]},

\(^{24}\) The terms ‘deverbalisation’ (Croft 1991:93) and ‘deranking’ (Cristofaro 2003) have also been used for some or all of the processes denoted by desententialisation.
the missing argument is controlled by John, the subject of the main clause. This deletion represents another of the subject’s pivot functions.

Cristofaro finds a universal tendency which she sums up in a hierarchy of adverbial desententialisation:

(40) Adverbial desententialisation hierarchy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Reality Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, we shall find that in a given language no adverbial clause type will be more desententialised than any type to its left. This means that in a particular language we shall expect an adverbial clause of purpose to be the most desententialised type (or one of the most desententialised types). In English, adverbial clauses of other types may also be desententialised; like John visited Mary [before i going overseas], but in spoken English this is more likely to be a full clause: John visited Mary [before he went overseas].

In canonic Oceanic languages, desententialisation in adverbial clauses is rare, even in purpose clauses. Examples from eight languages are shown in (41), and the purpose clause in each is fully sentential, even though the subject of the purpose clause is coreferential with the subject of the main clause. (The purpose clause lacks a subject noun phrase in each case, but the clause is fully sentential, as core noun phrases are not necessary in verbal clauses.)

(41) a. Mangap-Mbula:
Salum i-la Lae [be i-ngiimi kini]
Salum s:3S-go Lae COMP s:3S-buy food
‘Salum went to Lae to buy food.’ (Bugehagen 1995:274)

b. Arop-Lukep:
Am-wur [be am-nama Bakai]
s:1EP-sit COMP s:1EP-wait Bakai
‘We sat down in order to wait for Bakai.’ (Hyslop 2001:419)

c. NE Ambae:
No=mo lehe=a [huri vo na=ni ilo-ilo]
s:1S=R see=O:3S COMP say s:1S=IRR REDUP-know
‘I’m looking at it so that I will know.’ (Hyslop 2001:419)

d. Tamambo:
O-mbo lai taksi [matan o jivo Naone Ban]
s:2S-FUT take taxi COMP s:2S go down Naone Ban
‘You’ll get a taxi in order to go down to Naone Ban.’

e. Nêlêmwa:
Na p*e [p*ayat me na xuwo]
s:1S fish PURP COMP s:1S eat
‘I fish to (have something to) eat.’ (Bril 2002)
f. Boumaa Fijian (Central Pacific):

Rau saa gei biu-ta a oo-drau ititi?oti?o yaa,
S:3D ASP then leave-TR ART CL-P:3D residence there
[me rau va?a-iti?oti?o i Nasau]
COMP S:3D CAUS-residence at Nasau

‘The two of them left their residence there, to make a home at Nasau.’

(Dixon 1988:287)

The structure of the purpose clause and its verb phrase in each of these languages is identical to the corresponding independent clause structures. That is, desententialisation does not occur in these purpose clauses and subject deletion does not usually have a reference tracking function in the adverbial clauses of canonic Oceanic languages. It is a moot point how the term “subject deletion” should be applied in this context. There has been some debate in the literature (see particularly Bresnan and Mchombo 1987) about whether the similarly functioning subject and object markers in Bantu languages should be regarded as pronominal subjects/objects or as agreement markers. If they are the latter, then arguably subject deletion (deletion of a subject noun phrase) has occurred. If the former, then there is no subject deletion. But the question is irrelevant in the present context. What matters is that the adverbial clause structures are the same as the structures of independent clauses, where subject noun phrases are also often omitted, and reference tracking is performed, if at all, by subject markers. Again, the subject does not function as pivot.

Hoava and Mokilese depart from the canonic norm by lacking subject markers. Hoava has no subject marker paradigm, whilst Mokilese has just first and second person singular subject markers (Table 4). For pronominal subjects Hoava uses disjunctive pronouns, and Mokilese uses them wherever it has no subject marker. This is a general characteristic of verbal clauses in these languages, not a feature of purpose clauses in particular, so we can still say that the purpose clause is not affected by desententialisation. However, the question now arises, does coreferential subject deletion take place? In the case of Mokilese in (42a) the answer is no: the subject pronoun ŋɔ is repeated in the purpose clause (as ŋɔ-) and functions like a subject marker in other canonic languages. In the Hoava of (42b), however, the (disjunctive) subject pronoun ria is not repeated in the purpose clause, and coreferential deletion does occur. Here, then, the subject does function as a pivot.

(42) a. Mokilese:

ŋɔ kicaŋ nā pēnno [p’a ria-n insin-ki]
S:1S take P:3S pen COMP S:1S-UNACC write with it

‘I took his pen so that I could write with it.’ (Harrison 1976:263)
b. Hoava:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Va}i-\text{n}i-a \text{ gato ria [de zoma-e vua-na]} \\
&\text{take-APPLIC-O:3S stick D:3P COMP poke down-TR:O:3P fruit-P:3S}
\end{align*}
\]

‘They took sticks to poke down its fruit.’ (Davis 2003:279)

In all the languages in (41) and (42), the purpose clause is introduced by a morpheme glossed COMP, for complementiser. In each language the same morpheme also introduces an unrealised event. This is interesting, as an English purpose clause (John saved up [to go overseas]) also has the structure of an unrealised event complement like I want [to go shopping] or I want you [to go shopping]. (See §5.3.) Wierzbicka (1988:29) suggests that this is so in English because an unrealised event complement and a purpose clause have in common the semantic feature of ‘thinking of wanting’ an event to occur. It seems that her insight may have an application beyond English.

Mangap-Mbula, Hoava, NE Ambae, Tamambo and Boumaa Fijian appear to allow no desententialisation in adverbial clauses. It would be incorrect, however, to suggest that adverbial desententialisation does not occur among canonic languages. As an alternative to (41e) Nêlêmwa allows the construction in (43). However, Bril stresses that the two constructions do not have the same meaning: the sentence below means roughly ‘I fish for eating’ and represents a closer semantic bond than (41e).

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Na p}\text{'e p}'\text{ayat xuwo} \\
&\text{S:1S fish PURP eat}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I fish to eat [not to make money].’ (Bril 2002)

In Kokota, coreferential subject deletion does occur, as in (44). This is because irrealis subordinate clauses often lack subject markers.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{N-e lao [mala tabara viri]} \\
&\text{R=S:3S go PURP buy tobacco}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He went to buy tobacco.’ (Palmer 1999:306)

In Longgu, as in other languages, the purpose clause construction reflects the unrealised event complement, but here the complement construction is desententialised: there is a bare verb stem with no subject marker and no preverbal tense/aspect/mood marker.

---

25 The morphosyntactic status of Boumaa Fijian me is not entirely clear as it forms a one-member class (Dixon 1988:289-293). However, its distribution is similar to that of complementisers in other canonic languages.
The sentences in (43), (44), and (45) are all desententialised and all three show coreferential subject deletion, i.e., a pivot function of the subject. In Nêlêmwa and Kokota, however, this function is far less widespread than in English and Longgu.

Two languages in the sample use nominalisations in temporal adverbial clauses. These are illustrated in (46):

(46) a. Kokota:

\[
\text{[Legu-na } [n-e-ke zaho-na maneil]} \text{ ara n-a bula-nau-na}
\]

\[
\text{behind-P:3S R-S:3S-PERF go-P:3S D:3S D:1S R-S:1S feel angry-O:1S-IMM}
\]

‘After he had left, I felt angry.’ (Palmer 1999:298)

b. Mokilese:

\[
\eta\tilde{\eta}\text{ m\text{\textael}rla } [m^*eri-n \text{ ai l\text{\textael}kcit]}
\]

\[
s:1S \text{ sleep behind-STR CL.P:1S go fishing}
\]

‘I fell asleep after I had gone fishing.’ (Harrison 1976:260-261)

In both languages the temporal clause is introduced by an inalienable locative-part noun meaning ‘behind, after’, and the rest of the clause consists of a nominalised verb phrase. In Mokilese the nominalisation is straightforward, forming an alienably possessed noun phrase of which \textit{oai} is the suffixed 1S form of the ‘thing’ classifier (see §4). In Kokota nominalisation is only partial. The verb \textit{zaho} ‘go’ is marked as an inalienable possessed noun phrase by the addition of -\textit{na P:3S}, but the tense-mood-aspect marking and subject-verb agreement of \textit{n-e-ke} is retained.

In both cases in (46) the potential subject (S or A) appears as a possessor suffix. This represents the desententialisation stage (39c). Arguably, this contradicts the adverbial desententialisation hierarchy in (40), as these temporal adverbial clauses are seemingly more desententialised than purpose clauses in the same languages (see (41g) and (44)). However, one might argue, as Harrison (1976:261) does for Mokilese, that these are not adverbial clauses but location nouns with possessors.

Taking stock, we find that coreferential subject deletion in adverbial clauses is quite rare. In half the sampled languages it does not occur. In Nêlêmwa and Kokota it occurs in limited contexts due to desententialisation. But desententialisation does not always entail coreferential subject deletion, as the nominalisations in (46) show. In Hoava coreferential subject deletion occurs without desententialisation because the language lacks subject markers across the board. In Longgu desententialisation is atypically widespread and brings about coreferential subject deletion.
5.3 Complement clauses

Basically, the points made with regard to adverbial clauses in canonic languages apply equally to complement clauses. However, the conceptual space typically covered by complement clauses is more complex than the conceptual space covered by adverbial clauses. As a result the set of complement constructions in a language is often syntactically more varied than the set of adverbial clause constructions, and mappings between syntax and meaning often seem rather messy. The complements in the sentences in (47) exemplify four syntactic types, but these types do not correspond fully with the conceptual categories they denote (shown in parentheses).26

(47)  a. I saw [that he had gone]. (proposition)
    b. I saw him [going]. (event)
    c. I want him [to go]. (unrealised event)
    d. I want [to go]. (unrealised event)
    e. I began [to go]. (semantic head)

The complements in (47a) and (47b) denote respectively a proposition and a “state of affairs”, to use the terms favoured in the literature (Dik 1997:136-137, Cristofaro 2003).27 Less formally, we can say that the complement in (47a) refers to the fact that an event has occurred and the complement in (47b) to the event itself. The complements in (47c) and (47d) both denote what I call an unrealised event: an event which the speaker wishes to happen. Both show coreferential subject deletion: in (47c) coreference is with him, the object of the main clause (I want him, [ºi to go]), while (47d) shows coreference is with I, its subject (I want [ºi to go]).28 The complements in (47d) and (47e) share a single structure, but have different meanings. The complement in (47d) denotes an unrealised event, but the complement in (47e) follows what Dixon (1991:88, 90) calls a “secondary” verb, a complement-taking verb which modifies the meaning of the verb in its complement but adds no new semantic roles to it.

The complement in (47a) entails no desententialisation, but the other four complements in (47) are all desententialised. Cristofaro (2003) proposes a universal complement desententialisation hierarchy based on categories proposed by Noonan.

26 These sentences by no means represent the full complement system of English. Among other things, I have omitted wh- complements from the discussion of both English and Oceanic languages.
27 I do not like the term “state of affairs”, as it implies something static. In fact a “state of affairs” in this sense is often an event. Lyons (1977:443-444) refers to a “state of affairs” as a “second-order entity”, and to a proposition as a “third-order entity”.
28 This analysis is not the only one possible, but this issue is irrelevant to the theme of this paper.
(1985). Again, more desententialised categories are to the left:

(48) Complement desententialisation hierarchy
phasal, desiderative, modal < manipulation < perception < propositional attitude, knowledge < utterance

What is tricky here is that the categories are applied by Noonan and others to classes of verbs. But a single verb may take different complements and thereby fall into different conceptual classes. For example, *see* functions as a perception verb in (47b), where the complement is the perceived event. But in Noonan’s terms *see* in (47a) is a knowledge verb, as the complement refers to the knowledge acquired by the subject of *see*. This difference is signaled by the complement construction.

If the hierarchy in (48) represents a universal conceptual space for complement constructions, then we should expect complement constructions to map onto contiguous parts of it (Croft 2001:96) and to do so in a sequence reflecting increasing desententialisation from right to left. This appears to happen in both English and canonic Oceanic languages, although (not surprisingly) the mappings differ. An incomplete and approximate mapping for English is given in (49). It is incomplete and approximate because some conceptual categories and some complement constructions are missing, because the semantic features of some verbs block their match with a complement construction we might expect them to co-occur with, and because the oddities of history sometimes interfere with otherwise consistent mappings.

(49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phasal,</th>
<th>desiderative,</th>
<th>perception</th>
<th>Propositional attitude,</th>
<th>utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modal</td>
<td>manipulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing VP</td>
<td>-ing VP</td>
<td><em>that</em> + Clause</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>that</em> + Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to VP&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>to VP&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mappings of the *that* + Clause (proposition) construction are illustrated in (50). The verbs represent respectively utterance, propositional attitude, and knowledge.

(50) *I said/thought/knew [that he had gone].

The verbs illustrating the *-ing* VP (event) construction in (51) represent propositional attitude, knowledge, perception and manipulation:

(51) *I recalled/understood/saw/suggested him going.*
The verbs illustrating the *to* VP₁ (unrealised event) construction in (52) represent respectively the desiderative and manipulative categories:

(52) I wanted/asked (John) to go.

The verbs illustrating the *to* VP₂ (semantic head) construction in (53) are respectively phasal and modal.

(53) I began/ought to go.

The complement systems of canonic Oceanic languages are simpler than the English system in two ways. First, there are usually fewer complement constructions per language (although there may be several complementisers), so that each construction maps onto a larger part of the conceptual space. This sometimes means that the same construction is used for propositions and for events, but a separate construction is used for unrealised events. Longgu, Boumaa, and Mokilese use nominalisations to denote events. Second, the syntax of complement constructions resembles the syntax of adverbial constructions: there is typically less desententialisation and less coreferential subject deletion than in English. In English, all complement constructions in the complement desententialisation hierarchy to the left of propositional attitude/knowledge are desententialised, as (49) shows. In canonic languages, full clause complements are often found right across the hierarchy, as the mappings in (54), (56), (58), and (60) show. As with adverbial constructions, Longgu (65) is the exception in distributing desententialisation much as English does, and Hoava again has coreferential subject deletion without desententialisation.

The mapping for Mangap-Mbula is given in (54).

(54) Mangap-Mbula:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>phasal, modal</th>
<th>desiderative, manipulation</th>
<th>perception</th>
<th>Propositional attitude, knowledge</th>
<th>utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>be</em> + Clause</td>
<td><em>be</em> + Clause</td>
<td><em>be</em> + Clause</td>
<td><em>ta</em> + Clause</td>
<td><em>ta</em> + Clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition complements set in the past of present relative to the main clause verb are introduced by *ta*, glossed “specific” by Bugenhagen, as in (55a).²⁹ The perception complement construction is illustrated in (55b).

There is a break in (54) in the contiguity of the construction *be* + Clause. The probable reason for this is that it has three distinct functions. With utterance and propositional

²⁹ The morpheme *ta* is also used as the numeral for ‘one’ and marks a noun phrase as specific but indefinite. It also introduces relative clauses.
attitude verbs\(^{30}\) it introduces a proposition complement set in the future relative to the
time of the main clause verb, as in (55c). With desiderative and manipulation verbs it
denotes an unrealised event, as in (55d), and in (55e) it occurs with a phasal verb. After a
modal, in (55f), be may be omitted.

\[(55)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. Nio aŋ-ute [(ta) Apei i-mar neeri na] som} \\
\text{D:1S S:1S-know SPEC Apei D:3S-come yesterday GIVEN NEG} \\
\text{‘I didn’t know that Apei came yesterday.’ (Bugenhagen 1995:254)} \\
\text{b. Nio aŋ-re i [i-kem mburu ku]} \\
\text{D:1S S:1S-see O:3S S:3S-steal things LOC.2S} \\
\text{‘I saw him steal your things.’ (Bugenhagen 1995:254)} \\
\text{c. I-so pio [be gaaga to i-mar]} \\
\text{s:1S-say DAT.1S COMP tomorrow then s:1S-come} \\
\text{‘He told me that he would come tomorrow.’ (Bugenhagen 1995:269)} \\
\text{d. Ti-manjan yo [be aŋ-kam pizin]} \\
\text{s:3P-urge O:1S COMP s:1S-do DAT.3P} \\
\text{‘They urged me to give it to them.’ (Bugenhagen 1995:272)} \\
\text{e. Aŋ-manga [be aŋ-po ruumu]} \\
\text{s:1S-stand up COMP s:1S-tie house} \\
\text{‘I started to build the house.’} \\
\text{f. Nio aŋ-rao [(be) aŋ-so sua i-la iwalbiibi mata-n na som]} \\
\text{D:1S S:1S-can COMP s:1S-say talk s:3S-go crowd eye-P:3P GIVEN NEG} \\
\text{‘I am not able to speak in front of a large crowd.’ (Bugenhagen 1995:271)}
\end{align*}\]

There is no desententialisation in Mangap-Mbula. The preverbal subject marker is
retained in all complement clauses, whether it is coreferential with an argument of the
main verb or not. Thus the situation is the same in complement clauses as in adverbial
clauses (§5.2).

It would take too much space to present the complement systems of all my sample
languages in even the limited way that I have done for Mangap-Mbula. Instead I shall
limit myself to a generalised account and to some exceptions.

The mappings for Ambae and Tamambo are similar (but not identical) to the
Mangap-Mbula mapping in (54) insofar as—ignoring serial verb constructions (SVC)—
all complement constructions are full clauses (Cl) with subject markers and no
desententialisation. This means that in these languages there is no coreferential subject
deletion, i.e., no pivot-like subject behaviour. I take NE Ambae as an example. Its
mapping is shown in (56):

\(^{30}\) No examples have been found with knowledge verbs.
A majority of Ambae complements are introduced by *huri vo*, sometimes abbreviated to *vo*: (*huri* is the allative/purposive preposition, *vo* a grammaticised form of the verb ‘speak’ (Hyslop 2001:386)). No constructional distinction is made between a proposition and an unrealised event, except in the mood marking (realis/irrealis) of the complement verb. Example (57a) contains a propositional attitude predicate and its complement, (57b) a desiderative verb and its complement. In (57c) the complement-taking verb is a verb of perception, the complement a plain clause. Finally, in (57d) the phasal concept of ‘finishing’ is expressed by an SVC. I shall not discuss SVCs here, partly because an SVC is usually considered to be a single complex predicate, and the issue of reference tracking across clauses therefore does not arise, and partly because they are one of the most discussed topics in the grammar of Oceanic languages, with a readily accessible literature (Bradshaw 1983, 1993, Crowley 1987, 2002, Durie 1988, Early 1993, Sperlich 1993, Bril and Ozanne-Rivierre, eds, forthcoming).

(57) a. Danuta mo lado hogo [huri vo Pauline vi=ni hage Australia]
   Danuta S:3S.R think true COMP say Pauline S:3S.IRR=IRR go up Australia
   ‘Danuta believed that Pauline would go to Australia.’ (Hyslop 2001:397)
b. No=mo roŋo [vo na=ni g’alo]
   s:1S=R feel say s:1S=IRR fight
   ‘I want to fight.’ (Hyslop 2001:387)
c. Neu no=mo roŋo [na sivi mo vanai]
   D:1S S:1S.R hear ART boat s:3S.R come
   ‘I heard the boat coming.’ (Hyslop 2001:390)
d. Mo vatu na veveo mo rovo…
   s:3S.R weave ART weaving s:3S.R finish
   ‘She finished the weaving …’ (Hyslop 2001:275)

The mapping for Boumaa in (58) introduces one more element, nominalisation. Here there is a basic three-way division between a proposition complement introduced by *ni*, an unrealised event complement introduced by *me*, and a nominalised event complement; but each of these constructions has functions which extend beyond these characterisations.
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The ni + Clause complement is illustrated in (59a), the me + Clause complement in (59b), and the nominalisation complement in (59c). There is neither desententialisation nor coreferential subject deletion in the first two constructions. Nominalisation is marked by the presence of the article and in (59c) by possessor morphology. The potential subject of the nominalised complement is the pig, which takes the form of a possessor. In (59d) it is debatable whether coreferential subject deletion occurs or not: is this ‘my climbing of the hill’ or just ‘climbing of the hill’ in the abstract?

(59) a. Au ?ila-a ni na gei mate a gase yai
    S:1S know-TR COMP FUT then die ART old person this
    ‘I know that this old person will die.’ (Dixon 1988:269)

b. Au vina?a me-u voli-a e dua a motokaa
    S:1S want-TR COMP-S:1S buy-TR S:3S one ART car
    or COMP-S:1S CAUS-spouse-APPLIC S:3S one ART girl
    ‘I want to buy a car or marry a pretty girl.’ (Dixon 1988:289)

c. Au aa tai-ða a ?e-na va?a-mate-i a pua?a
    D:1S PAST see-TR ART CL-P:3S CAUS-die-PASS ART pig
    ‘I watched the pig being killed.’ (Dixon 1988:277)

d. Au rawa-ta a ðabe i-na ulunivanua yai
    D:1S achieve-TR ART climb of-ART hull this
    ‘I can achieve climbing this hill.’ (Dixon 1988:283)

Mokilese, Hoava, Kokota and Longgu each depart from the canonic norm. In Mokilese, Hoava and Longgu these departures are similar to those witnessed in connection with adverbal clauses.

The mapping for Mokilese is shown in (60). There is a pwa + Clause proposition construction, a nominalised event construction (Harrison 1976:270), and an en + Clause unrealised event construction.

---

31 Dixon (1988) provides far more detail than I have summarised here. There is, for example, a complementiser se which introduces wh- complements.
I noted earlier that Mokilese has subject markers only in the first and second persons singular (Table 4). The gaps in the subject marker paradigm are filled by disjunctive pronouns. I also noted in §5.2 that Mokilese undergoes no coreferential deletion in purpose clauses. The same is true of complement clauses: the subject-marking pronoun is repeated in the complement clause. This is so whether it is a dedicated subject marker (S:1S or S:2S), as in (61a), or a disjunctive employed as a subject marker, as in (61b). Despite its defective subject marker paradigm, then, the behaviour of Mokilese is similar to that of other canonic languages with regard to coreferential subject deletion in subordinate clauses: it does not occur. Desententialisation does not occur in clauses introduced by a complementiser pwa or en, but does occur in the form of nominalisation, where the subject is expressed as a possessor as in (61c).

(61) a. ŋç# inau-ki-ŋ kωŋ p"aŋ p\"aŋ pirin p"ili
    S:1S agree-A PPLIC-DIR D:2S COMP S:1S INTENT come
    ‘I promise that I’ll come.’ (Harrison 1976:269)
b. Kisa inau-kī-di p"a kīsā-n āupene lakap w
    D:1ID agree-A PPLIC-DIR COMP D:1ID-UNACC meet tomorrow
    ‘We agreed to meet tomorrow.’ (Harrison 1976:268)
c. ŋç carō-kī-di ści pokō-la wāl-lo
    D:1S be ashamed-A PPLIC-DIR CL.P:1S beat up-D IR man-that
    ‘I’m ashamed of beating up that man.’ (Harrison 1976:272)

Hoava makes a simple division between a proposition construction with the complementiser pu or no complementiser, in (62a), and an unrealised proposition construction with the complementiser de, in (62b). All complement-taking verbs except phasal (‘begin’, etc.) verbs take the third person singular object marker, signaling that what follows is a complement. Hence pu is omitted in (62a) because the object marker -a of yilali-a ‘know’ renders it semi-redundant.

(62) a. Kae yilali-a rao sa sēye mae pa kapa hore
    NEG know-TR.O:3S D:1S ART:S crocodile come PREP beside canoe
    ‘I did not know the crocodile came up beside the canoe.’ (Davis 2003:287)
b. Hiva-ni-a ria de pule mae sa geto
   want-APPLIC-O:3S D:3P COMP return come ART:S war party
   ‘They wanted the war party to come back.’ (Davis 2003:288)

c. Haku=haku-ni-a ria de nagali-a
   REDUP=be tired of-APPLIC-O:3S D:3P COMP carry.TR-O:3S
   ‘They were tired of carrying it.’ (Davis 2003:288)

As I noted in §5.2, there is no desententialisation in Hoava adverbial clauses, but
Hoava lacks subject markers and is the one language in my sample in which coreferential
deletion takes place and the subject therefore has a pivot function. The same is true of
complement clauses. This is illustrated in (62c), where the disjunctive pronoun subject
ria is not repeated in the complement clause.

Kokota complementation is a complex and fascinating topic lying beyond the scope
of this article. Suffice it to say that Kokota, like Boumaa and Mokilese, has three basic
complement constructions. The proposition complement is a plain clause, the unrealised
event complement an irrealis clause, and the event complement a nominalisation. The
complication lies in the irrealis clause, which has two forms, illustrated with the verb
manahayi ‘want’ in (63). One form is a plain clause with an irrealis verb, shown in (63a).
In the other form, the complementiser ta effectively replaces the irrealis subject marker,
as in (63c) and (63d). Where the subject of the complement is coreferential with the
subject of manahayi, as it is in (63d), there is no further complication. Where it is not,
subject-to-object raising occurs, as in (63c), much as in the parallel English raising
construction in I want you to hit that dog, where the potential subject of the embedded
clause (you) hit that dog (which has a different referent from the subject of the matrix
clause) is ‘raised’ to be object of the matrix clause I want you… The construction in (63b)
is an alternant to (63a): it copies the raising of (63c), although it is functionally unnecessary,
as the person of the complement subject is also marked on the complement verb.

   (63) a. ara manahayi-ni [o-poma-i ayo mheke ana]
      D:1S want-O:3S S:2.IRR-hit-O:3S D:2S dog that
      ‘I want you to hit that dog.’ (More literally, ‘I want that you hit that dog.’)
      (Palmer 1999:284)
   b. ara manahayi-niyo ayo [o-poma-i mheke ana]
      D:1S want-O:2S D:2S s:2.IRR-hit-O:3S dog that
      ‘I want you to hit that dog.’ (Palmer 1999:285)
   c. manahayi-gau yau [ta mala fa lehe-i-na naitu ao-hi]
      want-O:2P D:2P COMP PURP CAUS die-O:3S-this devil this-EMPHATIC
      ‘We want you all to kill this devil.’ (Palmer 1999:293)
   d. teo ge manahayi-ni-u yai [ta haye-na ade]
      NEG NEUT want-O:3S-PROG D:1EP COMP ascend-this here
      ‘We don’t want to come up here.’ (Palmer 1999:293)
The event complement of a perception predicate is formed by nominalisation. The subject of the complement is expressed both by subject-to-object raising (ago in (64) and a possessor suffix (-mu) on the nominalisation (as in inalienable possession)). This double marking of the complement subject resembles the construction in (63b).

\[(64) \text{ara n-a nomh-i-nigo ago reha-mu-na} \]
\[\text{I hear-TR-O:2S you.s shout-P:2S-this} \]
\[\text{‘I heard you shout.’ (Bill Palmer, pers. comm.)} \]

The Kokota raising and coreferential deletion patterns both represent pivot uses of the subject. But of the four alternant constructions in (63), the default form in (63a) has the canonic Oceanic pattern. The coreferential deletion in (63c) and (63d) is rare in canonic languages. I know of no other language in which raising occurs, as it does in (63b), (63c), and (64).

Now we return to Longgu. Predictably, its complement clauses behave much like its adverbial clauses: it allows more desententialisation than most canonic languages. Exceptionally among canonic languages, the Longgu mapping in (65) resembles the English mapping in (49), with full clause complements restricted to the right-hand end of the hierarchy. Desententialised complements include \(ni + \text{VP}\), plain VP, and nominalisations, but the semantics of these are less clear than in the languages I examined above.

\[(65) \text{Longgu:} \]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{phrasal, modal} & \text{desiderative, perception} & \text{Propositional attitude, utterance} \\
\text{nomination} & \text{knowledge} & \text{Clause} \\
\text{NOM} & \text{NOM?}\text{12} & \text{Clause} \\
\text{ni + VP} & \text{VP} & \\
\text{Auxiliary} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Example (66a) is a full-clause complement with an utterance verb in the main clause, (66b) a \(ni + \text{VP}\) complement clause which has been stripped of its subject marker, (66c) a similarly stripped down VP complement (note that it retains its aspect/mood morphemes), and (66d) a nominalisation complement marked by the singular NP marker -i. In (66b) the missing complement subject is coreferential with the dative argument of the main clause, in (66c) and (66d) with the main clause subject. In both cases, then, the complement subject behaves as a pivot.

\[32\text{Hill (1992:262) refers to this usage but provides no example.}\]
As in Hoava and Kokota, the main clause verb in all three sentences has a third person singular object marker coreferential with the complement.

Because of their complexity beside other linguistic systems, the complement systems of the languages I have examined here appear superficially somewhat diverse. But some commonalities can be observed, if we set Longgu aside. First, there are complement constructions dedicated at least to distinguishing between propositions/events and unrealised events. Boumaa, Mokilese and Kokota also use nominalisations to denote events as opposed to propositions. Second, full clause complements are found right across the hierarchy: the one exception is Longgu. A consequence of the prevalence of full clause complements is that desententialisation plays a lesser role than it does in English. However, desententialisation and coreferential subject deletion are not necessarily coterminous in canonic Oceanic languages, as I observed at the end of §5.2. Our search for pivot-like subject behaviour has found coreferential deletion in Hoava complements (without desententialisation) and coreferential deletion resulting from desententialisation in certain contexts in Kokota and Longgu.

6. Subjects and typology

Earlier I asked this question: How does the subject in canonic Oceanic languages differ from the subject in languages like English? I looked for an answer by looking at the constructions in which the subject participates.

The behavioural features of subjects are defined by their roles in reference tracking across clauses, and I examined coordination, adverbial clauses (especially of purpose), and complement clauses. In its referent-tracking function, the subject may serve as a “pivot” between clauses. It does so in English, where coordination reduction determines that the missing subject of a clause is interpreted as coreferential with the subject of the previous clause. A variety of adverbial and complement constructions, whose non-finite
verb forms themselves give no clue to the identity of their subject, determine that a
missing subordinate clause subject is coreferential with a specified argument of the main
clause.

The situation in canonic Oceanic languages proves to be rather different. In those
canonic languages for which appropriate data are available, there is usually no
coordination reduction (exceptions are noted above). If the third person subject noun
phrase of coordinate clauses is omitted, its identity must be inferred from context. That is,
the subject does not function as a pivot between coordinate clauses. In subordinate
clauses, both adverbial and complement clauses, there is much less desententialisation
and less coreferential subject deletion than there is in English. This is directly associated
with the major coding feature of the subject, namely that the person and number of the
subject is usually coded on the verb by a prefixed or proclitic subject marker. Since this
usually applies equally to verbs in main and subordinate clauses, the subject remains
coded on the verb, and there is thus no coreferential subject deletion and no pivot
function for the subject.

What does this discussion tell us about the typology of canonic languages? The
English subject functions as a “pivot” in the sense that it is the element where two clauses,
whether two independent clauses or a main and a subordinate clause, intersect to form a
combined construction. The examples in (67) show that coordination reduction and
raising (in the to VP₁ and -ing constructions; cf. (49)) work in conjunction with an
alternate voice—the passive—that allows either argument of the transitive verb of the
second clause to be the pivot. The two go together.

(67) a. John, punched Jack and then øi was punched by Bill.
b. John, punched Jack, and then Bill punched him;j.
c. I want him [to hit that dog].
d. I want that dog [to be hit (by you)].
e. I saw him [coming].
f. I saw him [being beaten].

Canonic Oceanic languages generally lack the pivot function of the subject, so it
comes as no surprise that most canonic languages lacking a pivot also lack a passive
voice. It happens that two of my sample languages, Hoava and Boumaa Fijian, do have a
passive, and it is noteworthy that one of them, Hoava, is the one language in my sample
where the subject has strong pivot functions. One may speculate that the innovation of a
passive in Hoava was a consequence of the subject acquiring pivot functions. This, in
turn, flowed from the loss of subject markers.

The absence of pivot functions leaves the transitive subject in most canonic
languages with only one function: to represent the semantic role of actor, which is
mapped straight onto the subject without interference from a voice alternation. The semantic role of undergoer is similarly mapped onto the object of a transitive verb. I showed in §3.1 that intransitive verbs are divided into two classes with regard to their subject: those where the actor of the corresponding transitive is mapped onto the subject, and those where the undergoer is thus mapped. The latter include prototypically transitive verbs of affect like ‘crush’, ‘bend’, and ‘fold’, and one wonders whether U-verbs were innovated at some stage in the history of Oceanic as “pseudo-passives”.33

I have dwelt at some length on the functions of the subject and on the organisation of semantic relations in canonic languages because this is, it seems to me, a matter that has been largely overlooked in discussions of Oceanic. All too often (and I have done it myself), Oceanic languages are declared to be SVO or VOS or whatever, with no regard for the fact that S might here mean something rather different from what it means when we talk about languages in other families. However, the typological distinction between subjects in languages like English on the one hand and those in languages like Fijian, Hoava, Longgu, and Kokota on the other is not new. Foley and van Valin (1984:114-119) call the former “pragmatic pivots”, the latter “semantic pivots”.34 Important is not just the fact that the functions of the subject in Oceanic languages differ from those of the English subject and are perhaps more limited: it is the basic systemic difference between languages of the two types that is significant.

33 It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that U-verbs reflect Proto Malayo-Polynesian undergoer voice verbs, but their lack of derivational morphology does not fit the prehistory of Oceanic as I understand it (Lynch, Ross, & Crowley 2002:58-63).
34 ‘Pragmatic pivots’ are so called because Foley and van Valin believe that they represent the syntacticisation of discourse factors in clause-level grammar. This, it seems to me, is a matter in need of much more research. “Semantic pivots” are so called because the pivot denotes whatever semantic relation its verb apportions to it, without interference from a voice alternation. “Pivot” is a rather inappropriate term in the latter case, as the semantic pivot performs no pivotal function in unifying clauses.
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大洋洲語言之構詞及句法類型研究

Malcolm D. Ross
澳洲國立大學

本文旨在闡述部分大洋洲語言構詞及句法中之普遍特徵。從大洋洲語言豐富多樣之類型中，作者界定出一種在譜系上與地域上都極具代表性之「典型」語言型態。此型態為 SVO 詞序，並具有前置詞；主語反映於動詞的前綴或前附加詞；賓語則反映於動詞的後綴或後附加詞；動詞通常形成構詞上相關而配對出現的及物與不及物動詞組，某些語言中，這些動詞再分為兩類：主語不論在及物與不及物動詞中均為主事者的 A- 類，以及不及物動詞主語與及物動詞賓語均為受事者之 U-。作者以此動詞分類作背景，進一步討論大洋洲語言及物化與去及物化的構詞型態。

典型大洋洲語言的領屬結構，分為「直接」與「間接」兩種。直接領屬結構用以標記不可分離之領屬關係，而必用表所有之量詞之間接領屬結構用以標記可分離之領屬關係。

本文以針對典型大洋洲語言分句關係之探討作結。作者指出，副詞分句與補語分句鮮有去語句化現象，而主語一般僅有語意上功能，而無追蹤指稱的語用功能。

關鍵詞：大洋洲語言，典型語言，構詞及句法類型，動詞上之主語標記，動詞上之賓語標記，及物化與去及物化的構詞型態，領屬結構，分句間關係，主語功能