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<td>djct</td>
<td>Adjectival (verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg</td>
<td>Ergative (CF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fint</td>
<td>finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genitive (CF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>General (number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.M.</td>
<td>intended meaning (in the translation of a sentence which is not acceptable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ifct</td>
<td>instrumental effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins</td>
<td>Instrumental (CF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irr.</td>
<td>irregular change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lctn</td>
<td>location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lcv</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lfct</td>
<td>locational effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locus (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Means (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nfct</td>
<td>undergoer effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun (WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Nominative (CF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndrg</td>
<td>undergoer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nstr</td>
<td>instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>Oblique (CF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pre/postposition (WC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAT
Pc
perf
Pl
plrl
pnc
t
Prd
prdc
prn
prog
prpr
psnl
pssv
rmt
root

rstr
Sg
Sp
spkr
trns

+trns = transitive;
−trns = intransitive

unsp
V
WL

unspecified tense
Verb (WC)
the Wailevu Communalect of Fijian

pr
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro
pro

= Marks the following noun as a clitic to the verb.
@ndex Indicates the relative position of a lexical item. The symbol “@” is a variable (see §2.1).
/ Indicates the beginning of a lexical item.
/ Indicates the end of a lexical item.
. Indicates the position where a phonological segment alternates.
? Indicates that the following element is implied in the word.
< Indicates that the lexical item must precede the lexical item that is indicated after this symbol (see §2.1).
> Indicates that the lexical item must follow the lexical item that is indicated after this symbol (see §2.1).
Acknowledgements

I received the assistance of so many people throughout the time I worked on this project, that it seems almost impossible to list all to whom I am indebted.

First of all, I would like to thank many people in Fiji, who always warmly welcomed me, allowed me to share their homes, and spent generous amounts of time and effort helping me learn their languages and cultures. These include Kitione and Seini Leqeti and their family in Kadavu, Ratu Semione Vusonitokalau and family in Nadrau, and Roberto and family in Wainiyabia. The visits and stays in various places in Fiji would not have been possible without the generous help of Dr Paul Geraghty, Adi Bera Kurusiga, and Ms Inisei Koroi of the Institute for the Study of Fijian Languages and Culture in Suva. My thanks also go to Apisai Bativakalolo from Viwa, Fiji and Feleti Ka Wolfgramm from Nuku'alofa, Tonga, for their patient help in the meetings I had with them in Tokyo.

The original version of this study was submitted to the University of Hawai‘i as a PhD thesis, and my thanks go to many people there. In particular, I would like to thank Professor Lawrence A. Reid for his patient guidance as my Adviser, especially for the many hours of fruitful discussion we had on syntactic reconstruction and language change. My dissertation topic was born in one such discussion, and it was through the effort of explaining and defending my ideas that the hypotheses presented in this study were developed and formalised. Both the formal and informal academic interaction I had with the people in Honolulu have all fed into my project in one way or another. Professor Kenneth Rehg was the first person to draw my attention to the role of comparative linguistics in understanding the prehistory of people in the Pacific. His constant interest in my work was always a big encouragement for me and was what kept me moving on. Professor Stanley Starosta introduced me to Lexicase Dependency Grammar, which was the first formal syntactic theory I encountered, and which is used in this study. I also wish to thank each of those who were on my dissertation committee, Professors Byron W. Bender, Robert Blust, Miriam Myerhoff, Barry Rolett, and Albert J. Schütz.

I was fortunate to be able to receive many helpful suggestions and comments on a draft from Professor Andrew Pawley and Dr Malcolm Ross of the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University, and Dr Isabelle Bril at LACITO-CNRS. Many of their comments are reflected in the final version, while others have been kept as future research topics.

Occasional stimulating discussion with various people who are interested in similar research topics has fed a lot into this study. I would like to especially thank Ms Bethwyn Evans, Dr William Foley, Mr Alexandre François, Dr Shelly Harrison and Ms Apolonia Tamata for such opportunities. I am also indebted to many people who kindly sent me their published and unpublished materials. These include Dr Isabelle Bril, Dr Hiro J. Ota, Dr Hans Schmidt, and Dr Marit Varamasi.

I have received generous financial support from various institutions as well. For my PhD studies and dissertation research, I received a Crown Prince Akihito Scholarship, a Nihon
Ikueikai Scholarship, and a University of Hawai‘i Arts and Sciences Advisory Council Award. I received two Japan Ministry of Education Conference Travel Grants to present parts of this study at international conferences. The revision of the thesis and some additional research became possible as a part of the research conducted at the Australian National University funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. I wish to thank each of the organisations that provided these grants.

Last, but not least, I would like to acknowledge my parents, Kenji Kikuzawa and Motoko Kikuzawa, to whom this work is dedicated, for having provided me with a firm foundation for my education both as a person and as a scholar. Thanks to you, it seems that at last I have my two feet on the ground.
Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This study examines the basic syntactic structures and pronominal forms of Central Pacific languages, specifically focusing on their actancy systems. By comparing both structural and morphological characteristics found in the daughter languages, it reconstructs the basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific, including its actancy system. It claims that Proto Central Pacific was a right-branching ergative language with Genitive and Nominative clitic pronoun sets and a set of independent pronouns that were neutral in terms of their case. It will also claim that full noun phrases were not casemarked in Proto Central Pacific, but that morphological ergative casemarking prepositions developed in Proto Polynesian. This study also illustrates how the reconstructed system must have developed into the daughter languages which show either accusative or ergative system today, and what kind of subgrouping hypothesis the proposed syntactic changes imply.

The results of this study are of interest from both descriptive and theoretical points of view. The following points are of particular interest.

First, it provides clear cases where the actancy system changed from ergative to accusative. The reconstructed sentence structures proposed in this study are not just "abstract patterns", but come with the following specific information: transitivity, reconstructed casemarking forms, reconstructed clitic pronouns, the presence of co-occurring full noun phrases, and their possible word order. The same information is provided for sets of sentence structures that are considered to be the result of innovations in the daughter languages. Furthermore, when a change is suggested, the exact feature that has changed, and any pre-existing conditions for the suggested change, are provided. Therefore, the proposals made in this study must be of interest for the general study of diachronic typology and language change.

Second, in this study, the traditional comparative method based on sound correspondences and lexical comparison is combined with the process of syntactic reconstruction. It will be shown that syntactic change and morphological and/or lexical change are synthesised, sometimes one being the direct cause of a change that takes place in the other. In so doing, it introduces new insights into historical linguistics.

Third, this study provides typological descriptions of three Central Pacific languages, namely Standard Fijian, Rotuman, and Tongan, applying a consistent theoretical framework, namely modified Lexicase Dependency Grammar. There are two specific syntactic features that are focused on and described in the course of this study, namely the nature of syntactic transitivity in Fijian languages, and the syntactic status of the Tongan "clitic pronouns". A different analysis from the traditional one is proposed for each. Because of the application of a single theoretical framework, the analyses are more useful for cross-linguistic examination.
than traditional analyses that too often interpret syntactic structures from a semantic point of view.

Finally, the reconstructed structures proposed for Proto Central Pacific in this study are in many respects similar to those in many ergative Western Austronesian languages. This suggests that Proto Oceanic was probably also ergative, and not accusative as has been generally assumed. It also suggests that Austronesian people must have spread through the Pacific from west to east retaining these sentence structures up until the time Proto Polynesian split off. This suggests that there must be more independent innovations, possibly parallel innovations, in Oceanic languages than are currently considered to have taken place. It furthermore suggests that it may be necessary to re-examine the currently accepted subgrouping hypotheses of Oceanic languages in the light of syntactic change, and, as a consequence, currently assumed migration routes as well.

The discussion is presented in the later chapters as follows.

Chapter 1, this chapter, is an introduction. In the rest of this chapter, the specific objectives and significance of this study will be explained with a brief introduction to previous studies. Relevant currently accepted subgrouping hypotheses are introduced.

Chapter 2 is a theoretical introduction. This study is conducted applying a single theoretical framework, namely Lexicase Dependency Grammar. Basic Lexicase notations that are applied in this study are introduced, along with the definitions of terms used in this study, such as the definitions of ergative and accusative casemarking systems, and of transitivity. The typological description of three selected Central Pacific languages applying this particular framework is also provided.

Chapter 3 presents a detailed description of the actancy systems observed in various Central Pacific languages. First, systems observed in the Rotuman and Fijian languages are presented. Although these languages are all considered to show clear accusative systems, their casemarking strategies vary depending on the language. These different accusative casemarking strategies are described in detail, and compared with each other. Second, actancy systems observed in Polynesian languages are described. Polynesian languages consist of languages that have been analysed as having ergative, accusative, and split-ergative systems. The morphological casemarking on noun phrases of some of these languages has been analysed in two or three different ways, ergative, accusative and split, depending on the analyst. It will be shown first how a single language could be analysed as having different casemarking systems depending on how transitivity is determined. Then the morphological casemarking system on noun phrases of two languages will be shown, one of Tongan, an ergative language, and the other of Hawaiian, an accusative language. Another aspect that is relevant to the actancy systems in Polynesian languages, the clitic pronoun systems, will also be described.

The actancy systems of Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian are reconstructed in Chapter 4. By combining the comparison of syntactic structures and of singular pronominal forms observed in daughter languages today, it will be shown that Proto Central Pacific must have had an ergative-pattern clitic pronoun system with Genitive and Nominative clitic pronoun sets, in addition to a set of independent pronouns. It will also be shown that this system was retained without change in Proto Polynesian. The forms of singular pronouns are reconstructed. As for the casemarking on regular noun phrases, it will be claimed that, in Proto Central Pacific, there was no morphological casemarking. The Ergative casemarking preposition found in Polynesian languages today appears to have developed from the personal noun marking preposition *i, which is reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific.
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Chapter 5 provides a reconstruction of the basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific and explains the historical changes that took place in daughter languages, based on the description and analyses provided in the previous chapters. How the daughter languages today have developed from the reconstructed system will be shown with sentences composed with reconstructed and potentially reconstructable forms. A list of reconstructed morphological forms along with the supporting evidence will also be provided in this chapter.

Chapter 6 discusses the problems with the current subgrouping hypotheses of Central Pacific and proposes a new subgrouping hypothesis based on shared innovations in morphology and syntax.

1.2 Objective and significance of this study

The general objective of this study is to determine what kind of actancy system Proto Central Pacific had and to clarify what changes must have taken place in the history of its daughter languages that have resulted in the various actancy systems that are observed in these languages today.

The term “ACTANCY SYSTEMS”, following Lazard (1997), is used here as a generic term that indicates the patterns of the PATIENT and AGENT casemarking systems, such as those that are commonly referred to as ergativity and accusativity. The Austronesian language family, of which the Central Pacific languages constitute a lower-order subgroup as seen in Figure 1.1, is considered to consist of both ergative and accusative languages. Languages that belong to the same language family are considered to have developed from the same protolanguage. The fact that both ergative languages and accusative languages are observed among Austronesian languages implies that some change(s) between an ergative system and an accusative system took place in their history. It is possible that the change from one actancy system to the other might have taken place more than once if the change of actancy systems is, in fact, not as unusual as one might expect.

Proto Austronesian has been claimed to be an ergative language (Starosta, Pawley, and Reid 1981, Starosta and Reid pers. comm.). Western Austronesian languages have long been considered to be somewhat “unusual” in their syntactic structures. These structures have often been described with the notion “focus”, which was considered to be exclusively applicable to this particular language family. However, once the more generally applicable notion of “syntactic transitivity” started being applied to these languages, many Western Austronesian languages were analysed as ergative, having intransitive structures with one or two complement phrases and several transitive structures. According to Gibson and Starosta (1990:196), at least as far as Tagalog and some other languages spoken in the Philippines are concerned, not only Lexicase but Relational Grammar, the Government and Binding framework, Categorial Grammar, and various other theoretical approaches have described these languages as ergative.

The situation is not simple in the eastern side of the family either. Proto Polynesian, which is the eastern-most branch (see Figure 1.1 for its position in the Austronesian language family), has been claimed by some to be ergative (for example, Clark 1976, Harrison 1991, Ota 1999), and by others to be accusative (for example, Hohepa 1969 and Chung 1978). There have also been studies of specific language(s) where the author makes claims in support of one or the other of these hypotheses (for example, Seiter 1980). Although the debate regarding the actancy system of Proto Polynesian has a long history, there is still no consensus among scholars today as to whether Proto Polynesian was ergative or accusative, and whether
it was the change from ergative to accusative, or vice versa, that took place in the history of its daughter languages. Gibson and Starosta (1990) point out that the judgment of actancy systems may differ depending on which sentence structure in a target language is considered to be the canonical transitive. They propose a set of criteria for the determination of the canonical transitive structure in a language, and then apply them to Tongan, Samoan, and Māori, and claim that these three Polynesian languages are all ergative. Based on this analysis, they claim that Proto Polynesian must have been ergative, rather than accusative. However, Ota (1999) questions their analysis and, based on his own observation of Māori, claims that the language should be analysed as having an accusative system. He claims, nevertheless, that Clark’s hypothesis that Polynesian languages must have changed from ergative to accusative seems to be more plausible than the reverse. So, it seems that examining actancy systems of individual Polynesian languages can never solve the question as to whether Proto Polynesian was ergative or accusative.

Consider the languages that are situated geographically between Western Austronesian languages and Polynesian languages, we find that there has been relatively little work, especially of a comparative nature, that focuses on the actancy systems either of the daughter languages or of their protolanguages in this area. Pawley has reconstructed “grammatical”
structures for Proto Central Pacific (1970) and Proto Oceanic (1973), where the main focus is on the structure of the “verb phrase” in these protolanguages. Proto basic sentence structures are provided with reconstructed grammatical forms, such as auxiliary verbs and adverbs, but there is no mention as to what kind of actancy system these languages had. Ross (in press) shows that the clitic pronouns in Oceanic languages appear to have developed from at least three different sets, but the original ergative system was probably “being lost” in Proto Oceanic.

As far as I am aware, no one has ever made an explicit claim as to the kind of actancy system(s) these languages had. Nevertheless, it has been commonly assumed that Proto Oceanic and possibly Proto Central Pacific were accusative. And even to suggest that they might be ergative has been characterised as being “eccentric”. This view is probably based on the fact that there are few languages spoken in Oceania (outside Polynesia) that have been reported to be ergative,1 and that Standard Fijian, a Central Pacific language with a relatively rich description, is clearly an accusative language.

If Proto Oceanic (and/or Proto Central Pacific) was in fact accusative, and if the claim that Proto Austronesian was ergative is in fact also correct, then we have to assume that the actancy system of the languages has changed from ergative to accusative at least once. If Proto Polynesian is assumed to have had an ergative system, that would mean that the language switched back to ergative from the Proto Oceanic accusative system, while if Proto Polynesian is assumed to be accusative, then Tongan and other Polynesian languages must have started switching back to an ergative system independently. Here, two questions arise: first, when the actancy systems of these protolanguages are discussed, are the same syntactic phenomena being referred to? That they may differ depending on the analyst will be shown in §3.4.1.2. Second, if it is in fact true that it is relatively easy for a language to change its actancy system, what are the mechanisms that bring this about?

This study focuses on the actancy systems observed in the Central Pacific language family, and tries to determine what kind of actancy system Proto Central Pacific had. It will examine the actancy systems and related syntactic phenomena observed in languages that belong to this family, more specifically Rotuman, some Fijian languages, and Tongan. These were selected based on the currently accepted subgrouping hypotheses and the availability of substantial primary and/or secondary sources. Proto Central Pacific pre-dated Proto Polynesian, and therefore, a reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific should at least be suggestive of the kind of system Proto Polynesian must have had.

There are good reasons to examine non-Polynesian Central Pacific languages. First, as will be summarised in §3.4.1.2, the two hypotheses, one of which claims that languages have changed from ergative to accusative and the other which claims that they changed from accusative to ergative, in fact do not differ very much from each other. They are looking at formally equivalent linguistic phenomena, but are interpreting them differently. This suggests that it may prove useful to look for evidence in closely related languages outside the Polynesian family that could provide clues as to the correct reconstruction of Proto Polynesian. Second, some Polynesian languages have been claimed to be ergative languages, while some have been analysed as either ergative, split ergative, or accusative. On the other

1 Recently, however, some Austronesian languages spoken in the Melanesian area have been claimed to be ergative (for example, Corston 1996). It has also been claimed that New Caledonian languages are likely to have developed from an ergative language (Bril 1997a and b).
hand, the two Central Pacific languages outside Polynesia, namely Fijian and Rotuman, have been constantly analysed as accusative. It is worth noting that while there are a considerable number of descriptive accounts of Fijian languages, none of them ever mentions even the possibility that Fijian might have (or have had) an ergative system. This is interesting especially when we consider the fact that Tongan, which is often taken as a model case of an ergative system (for example, Manning 1996, Kittilä 1999), is considered to be closely related to Fijian, and also is spoken in an area geographically close to Fiji. A comparison of the systems observed in these two "clearly" accusative languages with the ergative system of a language that is known to have developed from a commonly shared ancestral language should provide useful information regarding the change of actancy systems in general.

1.3 Sources of language data

The language data presented in this study are based on both published and unpublished materials and my own fieldnotes. Example sentences cited from sources compiled by others are reanalysed applying the Lexicase grammatical framework. Lexicase does not allow word-internal boundaries (see §2.1 for details), and this renders the interpretation of the word boundary often differently from what is presented in the original material. For this reason, it should be noted that, although the phonological sequence of the whole sentence remains the same, the decision as to where a word starts and where it ends may be different from the data in the source. To take care of the difference in the analyses proposed in this study and that in the source materials, and also the difference observed in orthography systems, each example sentence is presented as follows in this study: the first line (language data) uses either the orthography used in the source material, or the standard orthography. Where no standard convention has been established, the data are transcribed following the orthographic system of the standard language. The second line indicates the same data with spacing only between what are considered to be separate lexical items in Lexicase. Sounds are also shown with phonemic orthography. Free translations are cited as given in the sources, unless specified otherwise.

1.4 A summary of relevant subgrouping hypotheses

There are two major language groups that are relevant to the discussion. One is the Central Pacific language group and the other is the Polynesian language group. This study begins with the assumption that these subgrouping hypotheses are correct, although a modification of the position of Proto Polynesian will be proposed later in Chapter 6.

1.4.1 Subgrouping hypotheses of Central Pacific languages

The Central Pacific hypothesis, which groups the Fijian, Rotuman, and Polynesian languages together, was first proposed by Grace (1959). The subgroup was later named ‘Central Pacific’ (Grace 1967). The biggest modifications to the original subgrouping hypothesis were proposed in Geraghty (1983, especially Chapter 7) and Pawley (1996) that claimed that, rather than developing from a single parent language, Fijian, Rotuman, and Proto Polynesian developed from a dialect chain. Figure 1.2 provides a summary of the most
recently proposed subgrouping hypotheses where, following Ross (1988), a doubled line indicates a dialect chain.

Figure 1.2: A summary of the hypotheses of the development of Central Pacific languages (Based on Geraghty 1983:348-349 and Pawley 1996:94-95, 110-111)

As can be seen in Figure 1.2, Proto Central Pacific is considered to have developed into a dialect chain that spread across Fiji and possibly a part of Western Polynesia (Pawley 1996:94). The following is a scenario that illustrates how this dialect chain developed into the situation currently observed in the Central Pacific. The Proto Central Pacific dialect chain developed into two parts, namely the Proto Tokalau–Polynesian dialect chain and the Proto Western and the Central Fijian and Rotuman dialect chains, which had formerly been the eastern part and the western part of the original dialect chain respectively. The Proto Tokalau–Polynesian dialect chain is considered to have spread across the Lau Islands and the eastern part of Vanua Levu in Fiji (which Geraghty named “Tokalau Fijian”) and a part of Western Polynesia. Proto Polynesian is considered to have eventually split off from the eastern end of this dialect chain. Likewise, the parent language of Rotuman (Pre-Rotuman) separated from the western end of the Proto Western and Central Fijian and Rotuman dialect chain. The separation of Proto Polynesian and Pre-Rotuman left Western and Central Fijian and Tokalau Fijian to evolve together, separately from those which had already split off. Subsequently, Western Fijian and Eastern Fijian began to develop separately, resulting in what is now observed as the Western Fijian and the Eastern Fijian dialect chains.
1.4.2 Subgrouping hypotheses of Polynesian languages

The Polynesian language group is one of the most well-established subgroups in Oceania. Rotuman was formerly included in the group, but as has already been mentioned in §1.4.1, is currently considered to have developed from the western end of the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain separately from Polynesian languages. The most recent subgrouping of Polynesian languages is that proposed by Marck (1999, 2000), which is shown in Figure 1.3. Marck’s hypothesis primarily keeps the basic outline of what had been formerly proposed, but proposes more detailed internal subgroups.

![Diagram of Polynesian subgrouping](image)

**Figure 1.3:** Polynesian subgrouping (based on Marck 1999, 2000)
2 Theoretical framework and sample descriptions

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an orientation to the theoretical framework applied in this study, namely, Lexicase dependency grammar. Sections 2.2 to 2.5 will outline major characteristics of this theory, followed by descriptions of features that indicate syntactic information implied in nouns and verbs. The definition of actancy systems and three characteristics for typological classification of languages in Lexicase will also be provided. For detailed explanations of this specific theoretical framework, refer to Starosta (1988, 1996a, 1998). Section 2.6 provides a description of the casemarking system, verb-agreement system, and other relevant syntactic structures of the three Central Pacific languages—namely Standard Fijian, Rotuman, and Tongan—applying Lexicase.

2.2 Principles and basic notations

Lexicase is a monostatal syntactic theory that claims that the information for well-structured sentences is implied in each lexical item as its FEATURES. Lexicase practices what is known as SEAMLESS MORPHOLOGY, and by a “lexical item” is meant a word. Being a version of Dependency Grammar, it analyses a sentence pairwise as a sum of REGENT (or “head”) and DEPENDENT relations. A regent carries features that specify what kind of dependents it must take, it may take, and it cannot take. When all the regents in a sentence have dependents to meet all such features, this sentence is well-formed and “grammatical”. For example, the features of an English locative preposition to include the following: i) it has to take a noun as its dependent; ii) its dependent noun has to be Accusative; iii) it must be followed by a dependent noun. The phrase to her, where the preposition to is followed by the form her, is well-structured, since the form her satisfies all the features (and others that are implied in the form to, but were not mentioned above). The phrase to Amsterdam is also well-structured, the form Amsterdam being neutral or unmarked as to case. These are shown applying Lexicase formalism in (2.1).
(2.1) **English—Preposition to and well-formed phrases with to**

a. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{to} \\
\text{@ndex} \\
P \\
?\left[ \text{N} \right] \\
?\left[ \text{N, Acc} \right] \\
@ < ?[N]
\end{array}
\]

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{to} \\
\text{her} \\
\text{1ndx} \quad \text{2ndex} \\
P \quad \text{N} \\
2[ \text{N} ] \quad \text{Acc} \\
2[ \text{N} ] \quad \text{Acc} \\
1 < 2[N]
\end{array}
\]

c. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{to} \\
\text{Amsterdam} \\
\text{1ndx} \quad \text{2ndex} \\
P \quad \text{N} \\
2[ \text{N} ] \\
2[ \text{N} ] \\
1 < 2[N]
\end{array}
\]

(2.1a) describes the features of the form `to` listed above as i) to iii). It is indicated here that the form `to` is a Preposition (P) that requires `[N], [N, Acc]` as dependents, and has to be followed by the `[N]`. The following paragraph provides an explanation of the notation in (2.1).

The symbol "?" indicates that whatever follows this symbol is required as a dependent by this form. For example, ?[N] indicates that this form requires a Noun dependent, and ?[N, Acc] indicates that this form requires a Noun that is Accusative. An optionally required element is indicated with parentheses. For example, ?([N]) would mean that the form may take a Noun as its dependent.

The feature "@ndex", which is written right under the form `to`, indicates the respective position of this particular form in a sentence. The symbol "@" is a variable number to be filled in according to the position of this particular form in a sentence. For example, if this form appears in the third position in a sentence, @ is realised as "3", while if it appears in the eleventh position, @ is realised as "11". This feature is used to indicate word order requirements, that is the relative position in a sentence in which a form should occur. The form `to` has the feature @ < ?[N]. In this notation, the symbol @ indicates the position of the form itself, while ?[N] as a whole stands for the position number of the required element [N] that has already been indicated above. The use of the symbol "<" is the same as that in mathematics; that is, @ has to be smaller than ?[N]. Thus, @ < ?[N] means the form `to` has to be followed by the required Noun.
Once an actual sentence or phrase is formed, all the "@" are automatically filled with the appropriate position numbers and each "?" looks for the position number of an entity that satisfies the requirement. When something is found, the "?" mark is substituted with the appropriate position number of its dependent. For example, in (2.1b), the form her follows the form to and the "@" under both to and her are replaced with "1" and "2" to indicate their respective positions. The "?" in ?[N] is replaced with "2", since it finds a Noun in the phrase that has the position number 2. Likewise, the "?" in ?[N, Acc] is also replaced with "2", since it finds an Accusative Noun in the phrase. The "@" in @< ?[N] becomes "1", since that is the position number of the form to itself, and then the following "?" becomes "2", which is the position number of the required Noun. Thus, all the "?" are satisfied, and since 1 < 2 is not contradictory, the phrase is recognised as well-formed. Likewise, (2.1c) is well-formed.

It should be noted that the requirement ?[N, Acc] is satisfied also, since the form Amsterdam is unmarked as to case, and therefore does not conflict with the requirement implied by the verb.

Examples of phrases that are not well-formed are given in (2.2). Example (2.2a) is recognised as ungrammatical, since the element she, which is interpreted as its dependent [N, Acc], does not actually satisfy the requirement that it should be Accusative. Example (2.2b) is also ungrammatical, since the word order requirement @< ?[N] is not correctly satisfied (2 < 1).

(2.2) **English—Preposition to in ill-formed phrases**

a. *to she*

```
 1ndex   2ndex
P   N
2[ N ]   Nom
*2 [ N ]

1< 2[N]
```

b. *Amsterdam to*

```
 1ndex   2ndex
N   P
 1[ N ]
 1 [ N ]

Acc

*2< 1[N]
```

Although only a few limited features are indicated for the forms to, Amsterdam, her and she in the examples given above, these forms each have an inventory with many more features. These include features that indicate the kind of dependents each must or may take, as well as other features of their own, such as [+prpr] (plus proper) or [+prnn] (plus pronoun). When all the features that each lexical item that appears in a sentence are satisfied, the whole
sentence is recognised as grammatical.\footnote{In analyses presented in this study, however, to avoid unnecessary complication, only features that are relevant to the discussion are indicated. Features which are not indicated should be understood as not affecting the well-formedness of the sentence or the phrase.} An example of a well-formed sentence is given in (2.3a). Further explanation of the details of features used in this theory will follow. The dependency relationships among words may be indicated by stemma as in (2.3b), where a dependent is indicated as a lower element hanging from its regent. Slanted lines and horizontal lines indicate two different regent-dependent relationships that exist as a part of the definition of word categories. Lines that are slanted indicate \textit{endocentric} relationships where a construction has a regent and its dependent, such as a verb and one of its noun dependents. In this relationship, the dependent with a specific word category is not obligatorily required by the regent. For example, a verb may require a noun as its dependent, but it may occur without requiring any dependent as well. On the other hand, horizontal lines indicate \textit{exocentric} relationships where a construction has a regent and its dependent(s) that are required as a part of the definition of the word category of the regent, such as a preposition and a noun. When a preposition occurs, it always has to have a dependent, such as a noun, and thus the relationship with a dependent required by the preposition is obligatory.

(2.3) English—Well-formed sentence shown with Lexicase notations

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] \textbf{I went to Amsterdam.}
\begin{itemize}
\item 1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex
\item N V P N
\item Nom -trns Lcv +lctn
\item PAT 4 \hspace{1cm} +prpr
\item actr 3 \hspace{1cm} LOC^2\end{itemize}
\item[b.] \textbf{I went to Amsterdam.}
\begin{itemize}
\item 1ndex 2ndex
\item N -trns P
\item Nom \hspace{1cm} 4ndex
\item PAT 1 [ N ] \hspace{1cm} Lcv
\item actr 4 \hspace{1cm} +prpr
\end{itemize}\end{itemize}

\footnote{In a prepositional phrase, the case relation is considered to be assigned to the noun by the preposition, and in the standard Lexicase notation, the case relation is indicated underneath the preposition. However, in this study, for the sake of clearer presentation of the features that are carried by each noun, the case relation is indicated underneath the noun along with its caseform and, when applicable, the macrorole.}
**Theoretical framework and sample descriptions**

Word categories, or "parts of speech" are the primary classes of words and are determined solely from their syntactic distribution. The word category of a lexical item is recognised as a separate feature from its function. While word categories are determined solely from their syntactic distribution, the function of words is a grammatical property that the words in each category carry. For example, a Determiner is defined as the form that occurs as a dependent of and only of a noun, always occurring at the outer edge of an NP (on either side). It never occurs as an immediate dependent of a pronoun. "Determiner" is a word category, and the definition above is applied cross-linguistically. A Determiner, however, may have various functions such as indicating a case form, marking definiteness, etc. Which one of these functions a Determiner carries depends on each specific language.

There are eight word categories defined in Lexicase, namely Noun (N), Verb (V), Determiner (Det), Adjective (Adj), Adverb (Adv), Pre/Postposition (P), Conjunction (Conj), and Sentence particle (Sprt), each of which is strictly defined by its syntactic distribution. Table 2.1 shows the distribution of each word category. Words in each category are further classified into subcategories, again according to their syntactic distribution.

**Table 2.1: Word categories and dependency relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Det</th>
<th>Conj</th>
<th>Sprt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each column indicates whether the word category indicated in the top (shown in italics) can be a dependent of the word category indicated in the left (shown in bold). The symbol "+" indicates that it may, and the symbol "-" indicates that it cannot. Abbreviations: Adj = Adjective, Adv = Adverb, Conj = Conjunction, Det = Determiner, N = Noun, Sprt = Sentence Particle, V = Verb.

As has been shown above, the lexical item is the basic unit that carries a set of syntactic features, and is thus the basic unit in Lexicase. It is, therefore, crucial to recognise where syntactic word boundaries actually occur. This becomes particularly relevant, for example, in the analyses of such forms as intransitive verbs with an incorporated noun that are analysed as a single lexical unit in Lexicase. Similarly, whether the so-called "subject pronouns" in Fijian are actually pronouns—indeed dependent words, or verb-initial phonological sequences that alternate according to the person and number of the actor—is another such example.

As has been mentioned earlier, Lexicase practices what is known as seamless morphology and does not allow any word-internal boundaries. Therefore, features such as those described
above are assumed to be carried by the whole word, and not by a part of it—that is, by what are usually referred to as “affixes”. For example, the English verb *eats* as a whole implies a third person singular “subject” and it is not the final *s* that implies it. The word *eat*, which implies a non-third person singular “subject”, and the word *eats* are considered to be two different lexical items, and the relationship between these two is formally indicated by a **Word Formation Strategy** (WFS). An example of a WFS is shown with a pair of example words, *eat* and *eats*, in (2.4). It should be noted that here, the person and number is indicated by an abbreviated form, namely 3Sg, although this is not a Lexicase notation (see §2.3.3).

(2.4) **English—Formalisation to indicate derivational relationship between *eat* and *eats***

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{eat} & \text{eats} \\
V & V \\
?\left[\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{Nom}
\end{array}\right] & ?\left[\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{Nom}
\end{array}\right] \\
?\left[\begin{array}{c}
-3\text{Sg}
\end{array}\right] & ?\left[\begin{array}{c}
+3\text{Sg}
\end{array}\right] \\
\end{array}
\]

The colon “:” indicates that the word on the left and the one on the right are in a derivational/inflectional relationship. Because derivation is considered to be bi-directional, there is no device such as an arrow to indicate the direction of derivation. The difference between the two forms is indicated by a pair among the indicated features where they have different but corresponding features such as ?[N, -3Sg] and ?[N, +3Sg] in the example. The phonological difference that is observed in the two forms is indicated in the bottom line. In this example, it is \(J : sJ\), which means the right form has an extra *s* at the end of the word that does not appear on the form in the left. The closing bracket “\(\rangle\)” indicates the end of the word. The word-initial position is indicated by an opening bracket “\(\langle\)”. Although words are considered to be indivisible units in this theory, a period (.) is sometimes used to mark phonological segments that alternate according to certain syntactic conditions, as in *eats*, when a certain segment is referred to in the discussion.³

The syntactic structures and associated systems, which are examined in this study, are analysed according to the basic notions described above, and are described utilising combinations of various features. There are two systems examined in this study that are relevant to the determination of transitivity and ultimately of the actancy system itself: i) Casemarking. This is commonly reflected either in the morphological marking of nouns, namely by the form of the noun itself, or by the Pre/Postposition or Determiner that is in construction with the noun, and/or its relative word order. The casemarking system of a language is either ergative or accusative. These are defined using the basic notions in

³ It should be noted that there is presently no convention in Lexicase for distinguishing the part of a word that alternates from that part which remains constant. Alves (2000) uses hyphens to mark phonological boundaries within a syntactic word. Starosta (in press) marks alternating segments for “rhetorical purposes” by font changes and underlining (Starosta, pers. comm.).
Lexicase, namely, \textit{CASE RELATIONS}, \textit{CASE FORMS} and the \textit{MACROROLE}. An explanation of how these terms are defined in Lexicase, as well as other relevant noun features, will be given in §2.3; ii) Verb agreement. These are the patterns of agreement features implied in the verb, which may or may not be reflected in the actual form of the verb. A language may have an [actr] (actor) verb agreement system (the so-called "accusative pattern verb agreement system") or a [PAT] (Patient) verb agreement system (the so-called "ergative pattern verb agreement system"). Full description of the verb agreement systems, their formalisations and agreement-like semantic features are introduced in §2.4. In addition to these two systems, the following will be described for each language. iii) Branching. This is the tendency found in the word order between a regent and its dependents in a language. A language is usually either right- or left-branching. The characteristics of right- and left-branching languages are described in §2.5.

It should be noted that, although there are many other syntactic phenomena observed in a language other than those mentioned in this chapter, this study focuses only on the actancy systems and related phenomena, and more specifically, on the following three typological features with which a language can be generally characterised. The first is branching, that is whether a language is right- or left-branching. The second is the nature of its actancy system, that is whether it is accusative or ergative. The third is the pattern of its verb agreement system (in languages that have one) as being either an [actr] agreement system, or a [PAT] agreement system.

\section*{2.3 Casemarking systems and relevant features carried by nouns}

\subsection*{2.3.1 Case relations, case forms and the macrorole}

In Lexicase, there are three types of case assigned to nouns, namely case relations, case forms and the macrorole. The correct assignment of these cases enables one to capture various language-internal and cross-linguistic grammatical generalisations, especially generalisations shared by both ergative and accusative types of languages (discussed especially in Starosta 1988 and 1996b). A case relation and a case form are assigned to every noun. There are five case relations. These are Patient (PAT), which every verb (including all intransitive verbs) has as a complement, Agent (AGT), which every transitive verb has as an additional complement, and Locus (LOC), Means (MNS), and Correspondent (COR) (Starosta 1988, 1996b). In addition, there is a predicate (prdc), which indicates the nominal predicate of a sentence and grammatically commutes with case relations. Case relations reflect the way an event (real or imaginary) is perceived and encoded by the speaker. A situation is described with various syntactic structures depending on how the speaker perceives it. For example, the fact that "John hit Mary" may be encoded not only as \textit{John hit Mary}, but also as \textit{Mary was hit by John}, \textit{It was John who hit Mary}, etc. In Lexicase, a case relation is determined by how each entity is encoded (usually realised by the same case form, for example \textit{John} 'Nominaive' in the first sentence, and \textit{Mary} 'Nominaive' in the second sentence). Thus, case relations are defined perceptually and grammatically, and not situationally as in many other grammatical theories (which would treat \textit{John} in the first sentence and \textit{John} in the second sentence as the same, or as being derived from the same underlying entity, because "they play the same role in the event"). Case forms refer to any morphological and/or syntactic configurations that characterise a noun phrase in a sentence, and are realisations of
the case (thematic) relation of the nouns with the regent verb. They are named as follows (Starosta 1988:126 and pers. comm.):

i) The case form that indicates both the [PAT] of intransitive sentences and either the [PAT] or the [AGT] of transitive sentences must be Nominative (Nom). Nominative is the case form that is shared by all languages.4

ii) The case form that marks the [PAT] of transitive sentences in an accusative language must be Accusative (Acc).

iii) If a case form only marks the [AGT] of a transitive clause, then it is an Ergative case form (Erg). However, if it also marks instruments, it is Instrumental (Ins), and if it also marks adnominal possessors, it is Genitive (Gen).

iv) A case form that only marks (non-directional) LOC is Locative (Lev).

The number of case forms that occur in a language may differ depending on each specific language.

There is only one macrorole, “actor” ([actr]), which is assigned to the same noun as the [AGT] of a transitive clause or the [PAT] of an intransitive clause.

In sentences (2.5) to (2.8), case relations, case forms and the macrorole are shown with English and West Greenlandic examples.

(2.5) **English—Intransitive sentence**

I dined at Azul.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>actr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-trns]</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sentence (2.6), the case form of the word *frogs* cannot be determined from the form of the word itself, but is determined by its immediate post-verbal word order and by the potential alternation with an accusative pronoun *them*.

(2.6) **English—Transitive sentence**

I ate frogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGT</th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>actr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+trns]</td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) In Lexicase, a single term “Nominative” is used for both the actor of accusative languages and the Patient of ergative languages since the forms are structurally identical. It has been shown that the use of a separate term “absolutive” for the [PAT] of ergative languages hinders several language-internal and cross-linguistic generalisations especially between ergative languages and accusative languages which are easily found when a consistent term “Nominative” is used both for the single argument in a simple intransitive sentence and for the [PAT] of a transitive sentence in an ergative language (see Starosta 1996b).
Theoretical framework and sample descriptions

(2.7) **West Greenlandic—Intransitive sentence (Rischel 1971:228)**

*Matu matu -vuq.*
door closed-3Sg

PAT [-trns] ..... case relation
Nom ..... case form
actr ..... macrorole

'The door is closed.'

(2.8) **West Greenlandic—Transitive sentence (Rischel 1971:228)**

*Ajuqi -p matu matu -va -a.*
catechist-Gen door close-INDICATIVE-3Sg

AGT PAT [+trns] ..... case relations
Gen Nom ..... case forms
actr ..... macrorole

'The catechist closes the door.'

Roughly speaking, the notion [PAT] corresponds to the thematic roles PATIENT and THEME in Case Grammar, and the theta role PATIENT in Government and Binding theory. The case form Nominative roughly corresponds to what is often referred to as the "(grammatical) subject", and the notion [actr] to what is often referred to as "logical subject".

### 2.3.2 The definition of actancy systems

Ergative and accusative languages are defined as follows in the Lexicase framework. An ergative language has a casemarking system in which Nom (the Nominative case form) coincides with [PAT] (patient), while an accusative language has a system in which Nom (the Nominative case form) coincides with the [actr] of the verb. This is schematically shown in Figure 2.1.

As can be seen in sentences (2.5) and (2.6), English is analysed as accusative, while in (2.7) and (2.8), West Greenlandic is analysed as ergative. It should be noted that verb agreement systems, word order, and casemarking systems are often considered to reflect the same syntactic characteristics in the analyses of the actancy system of languages. When, for instance, a language is described as having an accusative system, that may be referring to its verb agreement system or to its casemarking system. However, in Lexicase, the verb agreement system is considered to be a separate system that is independent of the casemarking system, as pointed out in Kikusawa (1998b). As will be described in §2.4.2, a verb agreement system carries syntactic features that imply the person and number (and/or other features) of either [actr] (and the [PAT] in addition when it is transitive) or [PAT] (and the [actr] in addition when it is transitive). These are different from those carried by the casemarking system in a language, and therefore they should not be treated as equivalent. Linguistic phenomena involved with the determination of the actancy system of a language are the

---

5 Case relations, case forms and the macrorole have been added to the original data in examples (2.7) and (2.8).
morphological marking (either the form of the noun itself or the existence/non-existence of a Determiner or Preposition) of nouns and/or word order.

Problems in the common definition of ergativity—that is, the one where it is defined with “A”, “O/P” and “S”—and how Lexicase takes care of them will be discussed in detail in §3.4, in the context of analyses of Polynesian languages.

![Diagram of Accusative and Ergative Casemarking in Lexicase (Starosta 1996a:6)](image)

Figure 2.1: Accusative and ergative casemarking defined in Lexicase (Starosta 1996a:6)

2.3.3 Other relevant noun features

The following subcategorisation features are also relevant to later discussion.

1) Pronominal or non-Pronominal ([+prnn] or [−prnn]).
   Nouns are either [+prnn] (plus pronominal) or [−prnn] (minus pronominal). Nouns with a [+prnn] feature and those with [−prnn] often occur in different syntactic environments.

2) Proper or non-Proper ([+prpr] or [−prpr]).
   Non-pronominal nouns are subcategorised into [+prpr] (plus proper) or [−prpr] (minus proper).

3) Person and number.
   In the Lexicase formalisation, person and number features are expressed with binary features, including [±plrl] (plus or minus plural), [±spkr] (plus or minus speaker) and [±adrs] (plus or minus addressee). For example, first person singular is expressed as [−plrl, +spkr, −adrs], that is plus speaker, minus addressee, minus plural. Figure 2.2 shows a subcategorisation of the Fijian pronominal system where each person and number is interpreted as a sum of five binary features. However, since the person and number features are not something that affect the discussion in this study, I will use
conventional terms, such as first, second, and third person, inclusive and exclusive, and singular, dual, paucal and plural to indicate the person and number of pronominal elements. The terms are also used to refer to the person and number of dependents that are implied in verbs.

2.4 Verb agreement systems and other relevant features carried by verbs

2.4.1 Transitivity, and complement and adjunct phrases

In Lexicase, transitive verbs and intransitive verbs are defined as follows. A verb that takes or implies a [PAT] complement noun phrase and an [AGT] complement noun phrase is transitive. A verb that takes or implies a [PAT] complement noun phrase but not an [AGT] noun phrase is intransitive.

Complement noun phrases and Adjunct phrases of verbs are defined as follows. A complement phrase is a phrase the head word of which is obligatorily implied in the verb, while an adjunct phrase is one that optionally occurs as one of the dependents of the verb, and is irrelevant to the subcategorisation of the verb. The number of complement phrase(s) that a verb can take as its dependent(s) is fixed, while the number of adjunct phrase(s) is variable. Examples are given in (2.9).

(2.9)  

| English—Sentences with complement [LOC] phrase, adjunct [LOC] and complement [PAT] |
| a. | I looked at him. |
| Nom [−trns] | Lcv Acc LOC |
| PAT actr |
| b. | I ate at three. |
| Nom [−trns] | Lcv Acc LOC |
| PAT actr |
| c. | I saw him. |
| Nom [+trns] | Acc PAT |
| AGT actr |

Example (2.9a) is a sentence with a complement [LOC] phrase. The verb look requires a prepositional phrase at followed by an Accusative noun as its obligatory complement, while

---

6 It should be noted that the verb look, such as the one in Look!, is considered to be a homophone of the form look in example (2.9a). It is a distinct lexical item.
The features [±SPkr] (plus/minus speaker), [±adrs] (plus/minus addressee), and [±plrl] (plus/minus plural) are considered to be universal in Lexicase. The features [±dual] (plus/minus dual) and [±rstr] (plus/minus restricted) and their positions in the whole system are still under examination.

Figure 2.2: Person and number system of Standard Fijian stated in Lexicase notation
the phrase *at three* in (2.9b) is optional and is thus an adjunct. The Accusative noun *him* in (2.9c) is the [PAT] of the sentence, and is obligatorily required by the verb, and is thus a complement.

It should be noted that an intransitive verb may take two complement noun phrases. It cannot be defined as a verb with a single argument, because some intransitive verbs require two complement noun phrases. Typically, they are a [PAT] noun phrase and a [LOC] as in (2.9a), or a [PAT] and a [MNS] noun phrase as in (2.10).

(2.10) **English—Sentence with a complement [MNS]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Det</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2 **[PAT] and [actr] agreement systems**

A verb agreement system is a system where a verb implies what kind of features its [PAT] or [actr] complement should carry. A sentence is grammatical when a noun meets this requirement by either carrying the specified features implied by the verb, or by being neutral as to them. An example is given in (2.11) and (2.12).

(2.11) **English—Verb carrying [actr] agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGT +trns Adj PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr 1[ actr ] 3Sg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2.12) **Spanish—Verb carrying [actr] agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Sg give this pen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR +trns PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat m[ actr ] 1Sg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'I (will) give you this pen.'

In (2.11), the verb *eats* implies a third person singular [actr]. In this sentence, the [actr] is *John*, which carries the feature of third person singular and thus meets the agreement feature implied by the verb. Sentence (2.12) is an example where the verb implies the features of the [actr] but the [actr] is not expressed with an overt noun phrase. The verb *doy* implies a first person singular [actr] and thus, although there is no actual pronoun "I" in the sentence, the sentence is interpreted as an event that is done by "I". This is indicated by the symbol "m", which implies that the information can be recovered from discourse.

The verb may agree with either ʔ[actr], or ʔ[PAT], the former corresponding to the so-called “accusative pattern” agreement system and the latter to the so-called “ergative pattern”
agreement system. The actancy system and the pattern of verb agreement do not always correspond to each other in a language. A language may be ergative with an [actr] agreement system or a [PAT] agreement system, although an accusative language with a [PAT] agreement system is not known so far (see Dixon 1994:94).

2.4.3 Agreement-like semantic features

A verb may carry a feature that specifies the nature of its [PAT] dependent. A typical usage of such features is found in the description of a language where there is more than a single transitive sentence that corresponds to an intransitive sentence. This usage will be illustrated here with specific sentence examples given in (2.13) taken from the Ivatan language spoken in the Philippines. This is an ergative language and the [AGT] of a transitive sentence is realised in the Genitive case form.

(2.13) Ivatan—Verbs with various “effect” features (based on Reid 1966:22-23 and pers. comm., my analysis)

a. Mangamoqmo no qo tao so motdeh.
frighten Nom man Obl child
1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V P N P N
-trns PAT COR
actr

‘The man is frightening a child.’

b. Qamoqmohen no tao qo motdeh.
frighten Gen man Nom child
1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V P N P N
+trns AGT PAT
$\text{[+dfct]}$
actr

‘The man is frightening the child.’

c. Qipangamoqmo no tao qo boday.
frighten.for Gen man Nom snake
1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V P N P N
+trns AGT PAT
$\text{[+dfct]}$
actr

‘The man is frightening (someone) with the snake.’
d.  *Pangamoqmoan no tao qo vahay.*
frighten.in Gen man Nom house
1index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V P N P N
+trns AGT PAT
5 PAT actr

'The man is frightening (someone) in the house.'

e.  *Qipangamoqmo no tao qo kayvana.*
frighten.for Gen man Nom his.friend
1index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V P N P N
+trns AGT PAT
5 PAT actr

'The man is frightening (someone) for his friend.'

Sentence (2.13a) is intransitive, while the other four are transitive and take a [PAT] with different natures. In example (2.13b), the verb carries a feature [+dfct] (plus direct effect). This feature requires a [PAT] that can be interpreted as a directly affected entity. Likewise, in examples (2.13c) to (2.13e), each verb carries one of the features [+ifct] (plus instrumental effect), [+lfct] (plus locational effect), and [+bfct] (plus benefactive effect) and requires a [PAT] that can be interpreted as an instrument, a location, and a beneficiary respectively.

'Effect' features, such as those described above, indicate the nature of the [PAT] regardless of the transitivity of the verb. In some languages, such as Fijian, a transitive verb always has a corresponding intransitive verb that carries the same "effect" feature, as in *dabeca* and *dabeci* in (2.14).

(2.14) *Wailevu Communalect of Fijian—Transitive and intransitive verbs with the same "effect" feature*

a.  *E dabeca na itutuvi na agone.*

sit.on Det blanket Det child
1index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
+trns PAT AGT
+dfct actr

5[AGT 3Sg ]
3[PAT 3Gn ]
5[PAT +dfct ]

'The child sat on a blanket.'
2.4.4 Other relevant verb features

The following subcategorisation of verbs is also relevant to the later discussion.

1) Whether a verb is a root verb or not ([+root] or [-root]).
   The feature [+root] (plus root) is used to refer to the highest verb in a grammatically independent sentence—that is, the verb that is the regent of other verbs but is not a dependent of any other.

2) Whether a verb is finite or non-finite ([+fInt] or [-fInt]).
   Verbs that may take a Nominative dependent are finite while those which do not are non-finite. For example, the form *take* in an English sentence *I went to take a nap there* cannot take a Nominative noun phrase as its dependent and thus is [-fInt]. On the other hand, the form *went* may, and has the Nominative dependent *I*, and thus is [+fInt].
   It should be noted that the definition of finite and non-finite verbs in Lexicase differs from those that are commonly used; that is, a verb that carries no tense is treated as non-finite (for example, Jacobs 1995). However, that definition is not applicable to languages, such as Thai, that do not have tense marking on the verb (for example, Radford 1997:507-508 for a similar definition).

3) Whether a verb is an auxiliary verb or not ([+xlry] or [-xlry]).
   An intransitive verb is either [+xlry] (plus Auxiliary) or [-xlry] (minus Auxiliary). An [+xlry] verb is a kind of verb that obligatorily requires another verb as its immediate dependent. For example, the English auxiliary verb *must* requires a verb as its dependent. In an English sentence *you must go to take the exam*, the verb *go* satisfies this requirement. On the other hand, the verb *go* does not require any verb as its dependent.

---

7 When a word obligatorily requires a verb as its dependent, this is described with the feature [+xtns] (plus extension). Thus, all [+xlry] verbs have the feature [+xtns].
2.5 Branching

Being a version of dependency grammar, Lexicase characterises the word-order typology of a language by noting the relative order of heads and their dependents. Possible dependents of a noun include (but are not limited to) a relative clause(s), which is a [prdc](predicate) adjunct of the regent noun, Adjectives and other Nouns. Possible dependents of a verb include Adverbs, Prepositional and Noun phrases, and other Verbs.

A language shows a tendency to have dependents either on the right side (following the head) or on the left side (preceding the head). The former is called a “right-branching language” while the latter is called a “left-branching language”. Example (2.15) is an example from a right-branching language, and example (2.16) is an example from a left-branching language.

(2.15) Tagalog—Right branching
Binili ng babae ang bigás na nakitamu. ‘The woman bought the rice that you saw.’

(2.16) Japanese—Left branching
Taroo wa gakkoo e itta. ‘Taroo went to school.’

A right-branching language does not always have dependents on the right side, just as a left-branching language does not always have dependents on the left side. Especially, determiners may occur on the other side as seen in example (2.15). Yet, this classification is still useful in determining the syntactic structure of a language.
Chapter 2

2.6 Typological description of three selected languages

2.6.1 A typological description of Rotuman

The analysis of Rotuman given here is based on the data and descriptions provided in the following published and unpublished materials (especially, Churchward 1940; Kissock 2000; Schmidt 1999, in press; Vamarasi 1997, 1999).

Rotuman is a right-branching accusative language. Verb agreement is observed only in intransitive verbs in inchoative aspect (called "ingressive tense" by Churchward) where the person and number of the [PAT, actr] (the Patient actor, or the Nominative noun) is implied in the verb.

2.6.1.1 Branching

Rotuman is right-branching, except that the [actr] noun phrase occurs preceding the predicate, instead of following it, as shown in (2.17). The word order of other elements follows general characteristics of right-branching languages, adverbs follow their head verb and relative clause and adjectives follow their head noun, as shown in (2.18) and (2.19).

(2.17) Rotuman—Sentence with 'Nominative and Accusative noun phrases (Schmidt in press:14)

\[
\text{Iria 'imo-a 'e-ria ti.} \quad \text{'Iria 'imoa 'eria ti}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{1ndex} & \quad \text{they} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{theirs} & \quad \text{te} \\
\text{Nom} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{N}
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{2ndex} & \quad \text{drink} & \quad \text{ti} & \quad \text{4ndex} \\
\text{Nom} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{N}
\end{aligned}
\]

'\text{They were drinking their (cups of) tea.}'
Rotuman—Sentence with adverbs (Kissock 2000:74)

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Ka gou kal ‘es hoi’dk ra ‘e ‘aea. ‘and I will not have you any more’} \\
&\text{ka ‘ou kal ‘es hoi?ek ra ‘e ?æa}
\end{align*}\]

(2.18)

Rotuman—Sentence with relative clause (Schmidt in press:6)

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Ta’a-g nu’sure-t ne mou se irisa-g.} \\
&\text{ta?an? nu?suret ne mou se irisan?}
\end{align*}\]

‘That is the door which belongs to them.’

(2.19)

2.6.1.2 Transitivity and casemarking in Rotuman

In a Rotuman sentence, a verb is usually preceded by a noun which is casemarked as Nominative by its position, as ia ‘he’ in example (2.20). In a transitive sentence, the verb is followed by a bare noun (that is, a noun which is not preceded by any prepositions), which indicates the [PAT] and thus is casemarked as Accusative, as iris ‘them’ in (2.20). A verb which is not followed by a bare noun, as in (2.21), is always intransitive.

8 Ornamental (+rnmnt) forms are used in “polite language” (Schmidt in press:6).
(2.20) **Rotuman—Transitive sentence** *(Churchward 1940:121, my analysis)*

\[
\text{Ia a/ 'ak iris.} \\
\text{la al'lek iris} \\
\text{he kill them} \\
\text{1ndex 2ndex 3ndex} \\
\text{N V N} \\
\text{Nom +trns Acc} \\
\text{AGT 1[ AGT ] PAT} \\
\text{actr 3[ PAT ]} \\
\text{'He killed them.'}
\]

(2.21) **Rotuman—Intransitive sentence** *(Churchward 1940:123, my analysis)*

\[
\text{Iris 'a.} \\
\text{iris ëa} \\
\text{they eat} \\
\text{1ndex 2ndex} \\
\text{N V} \\
\text{Nom -trns} \\
\text{PAT 1[ PAT ]} \\
\text{actr 3[ actr ]} \\
\text{'They ate.'}
\]

An intransitive verb may take a Dative or a Locative/Instrumental complement noun phrase. A Dative complement noun is marked by the preposition *se* ‘to’, as in (2.22), and a Locative/Instrumental complement noun is marked by the preposition *e* as in (2.23).

(2.22) **Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with complement *se* phrase** *(Churchward 1940:22, my analysis)*

\[
\text{Gou festa' se irisa.} \\
\text{gou fesia? se irisa} \\
\text{I hate to they} \\
\text{1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex} \\
\text{N V P N} \\
\text{Nom -trns DtV COR} \\
\text{PAT 1[ PAT ]} \\
\text{actr 4[ COR ]} \\
\text{'I hate them. (Lit., I feel-hatred to them.)'}
\]
(2.23) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with complement ‘e phrase (Churchward 1940:34, my analysis)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gou} & \quad \text{feə} & \quad \text{‘e} & \quad \text{irisə}. \\
\text{ŋou} & \quad \text{feə} & \quad \text{ʔe} & \quad \text{irisə} \\
\text{I} & \quad \text{afraid} & \quad \text{with} & \quad \text{they} \\
\text{N} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{P} & \quad \text{N} \\
\text{Nom} & \quad \text{–trns} & \quad \text{nstr} & \quad \text{COR} \\
\text{PAT} & \quad 1 & \quad \text{PAT} & \quad 2 \\
\text{actr} & \quad \text{actr} & \quad 3 & \quad \text{4[COR]}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I am afraid of them.’

There are two sets of pronouns, namely, short forms (what Churchward calls “incomplete phase”) and long forms (what Churchward calls “complete phase”). Short-form pronouns occur in Nominative and Accusative case positions, while long-form pronouns occur when preceded by a preposition. Compare irisə ‘they, them’ in (2.20) and (2.21) and irisa in (2.22) and (2.23). A list of the forms of the two pronoun sets is given in Tables 2.2 and 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2: Rotuman short-form pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3: Rotuman long-form pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All nouns are casemarked in the way described above, regardless of whether they are pronominal or non-pronominal, proper or non-proper. Sentences with non-pronominal complement noun phrases are given in (2.24) to (2.27). Sentences with proper noun (personal noun) complements are given in (2.28) to (2.30).
(2.24) Rotuman—Transitive sentence with non-pronominal complements (Churchward 1940:17, my analysis)

Ta le‘ kat ‘ea ra ta te.

one person neg say not one thing

Nom +xlrty +tms Acc

AGT 1[AGT] 5[PAT] PAT

actr actr

‘No one said anything. (Lit., A person did not say a thing.)’

(2.25) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with non-pronominal complement (I) (Churchward 1940:15, my analysis)

Hån fisit al.

woman white die

Nom -tms

PAT 1[PAT] PAT

actr actr

‘A white woman died.’

(2.26) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with non-pronominal complements (II) (Churchward 1940:15, my analysis)

‘eap folu mou se hån ta.

mat three belong to woman Sg.def

PAT 1[PAT] PAT

actr actr

‘The three mats belong to the woman.’
(2.27) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with non-pronominal complements (III) (Churchward 1940:17, analysis and literal translation are mine)

\[
\text{'ou puk 'ie 'e mel ta.}
\]

yours letter exist in mail Sg.def

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex

N N V P N Det

PAT 1 PAT

actr 2 PAT

‘There are some letters for you in the mail. (Lit., Your letters exist in the mail.)’

(2.28) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with proper noun complement (Churchward 1940:99, my analysis)

\[
\text{Le Tu'e pa f\"{a}eag.}
\]

person T. wish.to.speak

Index 2ndex 3ndex

N N V

Nom -trns

PAT 2 PAT

actr 2 actr

‘Tu'a wishes to speak.’

(2.29) Rotuman—Transitive sentence with proper noun [PAT] (Churchward 1940:99, my analysis)

\[
\text{Gou 'aligen le Tu'e.}
\]

you refer.to.person T.

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex

N V Det N

Nom +trns Acc

AGT 1 AGT PAT

actr 4[PAT]

‘I refer to Tu’a.’
(2.30) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with proper prepositional phrase complement
(Churchward 1940:99, my analysis)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Gou} & \text{fæeag} & \text{se} & \text{le} & \text{Tue'} & \text{ta} \\
\text{you} & \text{fæeæ} & \text{se} & \text{le} & \text{tue} & \text{ta} \\
\text{I speak} & \text{to person T. commoner} \\
\text{1ndex} & \text{2ndex} & \text{3ndex} & \text{4ndex} & \text{5ndex} & \text{6ndex} \\
\text{N} & \text{V} & \text{P} & \text{N} & \text{N} & \text{N} \\
\text{Nom} & \text{−trns} & \text{Dtv} & \text{COR} \\
\text{PAT} & \lfloor \text{PAT} \rfloor \\
\text{actr} & \lfloor \text{actr} \rfloor \\
\text{5[ COR]} \\
\end{array}
\]

'I spoke to Tu'a.'


2.6.1.3 Verb-agreement and coreferential expressions in Rotuman

Rotuman has a verb-agreement system and a structure with coreferential elements. These two systems both occur under limited conditions, and it is possible that the two structures have developed from the same historical source. However, further examination is necessary to confirm this.

2.6.1.3.1 Verb-agreement system

Some intransitive verbs imply the person and number of their dependent [PAT, actr] noun, that is the Nominative noun, when they are in inchoative aspect. The inchoative aspect is what is described as "progressive tense" by Churchward, meaning that the verb implies that an action has started taking place. The ending of such verbs alternates depending on the person and number of the Nominative noun of the sentence. In (2.31), it can be seen that the form of the verb jön (the short variant of joni) 'run away' alternates with joniers and jonien.

(2.31) Rotuman—Intransitive inchoative with [PAT, actr] agreement

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
a. & \text{Ia} & \text{pa} & \text{jön} \\
\text{he} & \text{want} & \text{run away} \\
\text{1ndex} & \text{2ndex} & \text{3ndex} \\
\text{N} & \text{V} & \text{V} \\
\text{Nom} & \text{−trns} \\
\text{PAT} & \lfloor \text{actr} \rfloor \\
\text{actr} & \lfloor \text{3Sg} \rfloor \\
\end{array}
\]

'He wishes to run away.' (Churchward 1940:24, my analysis)
b. Iris jonieris.
   iris jonieris
   they run. away
   1 Index 2ndex
   N V
   Nom -trns
   PAT +inch
   actr [a] actr
   [ 3PI ]
   [a] PAT
   [ 3PI ]

   ‘They have run away. (1940:128)/They fled. (1940:24)’

c. Fā ta jonien.
   fā ta jonien
   man Sg.def run. away
   Index 2ndex 3ndex
   N Det V
   Nom -trns
   PAT +inch
   actr [a] actr
   [ 3Sg ]
   [a] PAT
   [ 3Sg ]

   ‘The man fled. (1940:24)/The man has run away. (my translation)’

A list of the forms of the verb endings is given in Table 2.4.9 A verb with such an ending can never take a bare noun (that is, an Accusative noun) following it and thus is always intransitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lex</th>
<th>lin</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>..toua</td>
<td>..ta</td>
<td>..ua</td>
<td>..na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>..tomira</td>
<td>..tara</td>
<td>..mura</td>
<td>..ria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>..tomisa</td>
<td>..sa</td>
<td>..musa</td>
<td>..ria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs are classified into two categories according to whether they occur with an agreement ending or not in the inchoative aspect. Those which do not take this person and number

---

9 It should be noted that each form has a corresponding short form (the form without the final a) that occurs depending on certain conditions, for example ..etou] ‘1Sg’ in (2.37) as opposed to ..etoua] given in Table 2.4.
ending take the .. 'iaj ending instead. For example, pajön 'ia has started to wish to run away' is considered to be the inchoative form of pajön 'wish to run away'. It has the ending ..'iaj and does not imply any specific person and number of the Nominative noun (data from Churchward 1940:128, my analysis). Semantically, the verbs which take a person and number ending usually indicate action, and the ones which take the .. 'iaj ending indicate state.

Since verb agreement is observed only with intransitive verbs, there is no pattern which unites [actr]s or [PAT]s in both intransitive and transitive sentences. Therefore, Rotuman is considered to have neither an [actr] agreement system nor a [PAT] agreement system, although this does not mean that the language does not have an agreement system at all as can be seen from the description above.

2.6.1.3.2 Structures with coreferential elements

There are some sentences that are considered by Churchward to have "two subjects". In these sentences, two noun phrases occur, one of which precedes the verb while the other follows the verb. A noun phrase which follows the verb in such a sentence may or may not be identical in form to the one which precedes the verb. Example (2.32) is a sentence in which the two nouns are the same. When the two nouns are different, the second noun may indicate a part of what has been referred to by the first noun as in (2.33), or it may restate the content of the first noun which is pronominal as in (2.34).

(2.32) Rotuman—Intransitive imperative sentence with identical coreferential phrases (Churchward 1940:110, my analysis)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{\textit{au}} & \text{la} & \text{fúrmaria} & \text{\textit{au}}. \\
?\text{au} & \text{la} & \text{fòrmaria} & ?\text{au} \\
\text{you} & \text{future} & \text{be.comfortable} & \text{you} \\
\text{N} & \text{V} & \text{V} & \text{N} \\
\text{Nom} & +\text{xlry} & -\text{trns} & \\
\text{PAT} & 1\text{[PAT]} & \\
\text{actr} & \text{actr} & \\
\end{array}
\]

"Be comfortable. (Lit., Make comfortable yourself.)"

(2.33) Rotuman—Intransitive imperative sentence with coreferential phrases (Churchward 1940:110, my analysis)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{\textit{ou}} & \text{se} & \text{rù} & \text{\textit{ou}} & \text{huga}. \\
?\text{æe} & \text{se} & \text{rù} & ?\text{ou} & \text{huña} \\
\text{you} & \text{not} & \text{be.grieved} & \text{yours} & \text{mind} \\
\text{N} & \text{V} & \text{V} & \text{N} & \text{N} \\
\text{Nom} & +\text{xlry} & -\text{trns} & \\
\text{PAT} & 1\text{[PAT]} & \\
\text{actr} & \text{actr} & \\
\end{array}
\]

"Be not grieved. (Lit., You not be grieved your mind.)"
(2.34) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with coreferential phrases (Churchward 1940:110, my analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iris</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>pū</th>
<th>sio</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>lelea'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iris</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>pū</td>
<td>sio</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>lelea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>of?</td>
<td>some:people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex
N V V Adv P? N
Nom +xlrty -trns
PAT
actr

‘Some of them would go down. (Lit., They would go down out of some persons.)’

It is possible that the sentences given above are transitive and what Churchward analyses as the second “subject” is actually the [PAT] of the sentence. However, it is difficult to decide what the more appropriate analysis is, based only on the currently available information. A repeated Nominative NP is observed also in equational sentences as in (2.35).

(2.35) Rotuman—Equational sentence with coreferential phrases (Churchward 1940:110, my analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Te'is</th>
<th>'ou</th>
<th>av</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>te'is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>te'is</td>
<td>'ou</td>
<td>av</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>te'is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>indef</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
N N N N N
Nom +prdc

‘This is your time (or opportunity). (Lit., This is your time this.)’

2.6.1.4 Verbs with “incorporated nouns”

Rotuman has a process of “noun incorporation”,10 as many Central Pacific languages do. Example sentences are given in (2.36) showing a transitive verb followed by an Accusative noun, namely h'ī-puku ‘write the letters’ and a corresponding derived verb h'ī-puku ‘do letter-writing’. Note the difference of the position of the adverb e ‘there’ which occurs after the verb and before the following complement and/or adjunct phrases in the two sentences.

10 This is described as “verb with complement” by Churchward (1940:121-122).
(2.36) Rotuman—Transitive sentence and the corresponding intransitive sentence with “incorporated noun” (Churchward 1940:123, my analysis)

a. terñnit ne iris fσ'í e puku
   terñnit ne iris fo?i e puku
   the.day that they wrote then the.letters
   1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex
   N     P     N     V     Adv    N
   Nom   +trns  Acc
   AGT   3[AGT] PAT
   actr  6[PAT]

‘the day on which they wrote the letters’

b. terñnit ne iris fσ'-puku e
   terñnit ne iris fσ?puku e
   the.day that they do.letter.writing then
   1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
   N     P     N     V     Adv
   Nom   -trns
   PAT   1[PAT]
   actr  1Sg  1Sg

‘the day on which they did letter-writing’

A verb with an “incorporated noun” may further undergo some of the inflectional and/or derivational processes that other intransitive verbs do. An example of the inchoative form of fa'-puku ‘letter-writing’ is given in (2.37), and a sentence with a transitive form which has a derivational relationship with the verb rak'âk ë ‘teach things’ is given in (2.38).

(2.37) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with “incorporated noun” in inchoative aspect (Churchward 1940:122, my translation)

Gou fa'-pukuetou.
ηou fe?pukuetou
I letter.writing
1ndex 2ndex
N     V
Nom   -trns
PAT   1[PAT]
actr  1Sg  1Sg

‘I have started letter-writing.’
(2.38) Rotuman—Intransitive sentence and corresponding transitive sentence with "incorporated noun" (Churchward 1940:122, my analysis)

a. \( \text{Ia} \quad \text{rak}'\text{ak}-\text{ẽ} \quad \text{se} \quad \text{irisa}. \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
<th>4ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>Dtv</td>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>[PAT]</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>[actr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'It teaches them. (Lit., He teaches things to them.)'

b. \( \text{Ia} \quad \text{rak}'\text{ak-ẽ} \quad \text{iris}. \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>[AGT]</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>[actr]</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'He teaches them.'

2.6.2 A typological description of Standard Fijian

The analysis of Standard Fijian provided in this study is based on both published materials (especially, Arms 1974; Kikusawa 1999; Milner 1956; Schütz 1985) and my fieldnotes.

Standard Fijian is a right-branching accusative language with an [actr] agreement system.

2.6.2.1 Branching

In Standard Fijian, dependents usually follow their regents.11 A predicate phrase is followed by other phrases in the sentence, as in (2.39); noun phrases follow the head verb, as in (2.40); a relative clause and adjectives follow the modifying noun, as in (2.41a) to (2.41c); and adverbs follow the verb, as in (2.42). Exceptions are: i) The determiner \( \textit{na} \) always precedes its regent noun as can be seen in (2.41b) and (2.41c); and ii) A topicalised noun/prepositional phrase precedes its regent verb or predicate, as in (2.43a) and (2.43b).

11 See also §4.2.1.
(2.39) **Standard Fijian—Sentence with predicate followed by its dependents**

\[ O \text{ koya} \ o \text{ Rupeni.} \]

'\text{Rupeni is he (the one who is standing over there).}'

\[ o \text{ koya} \ o \text{ rupeni} \]

(2.40) **Standard Fijian—Sentence with verb followed by its dependents**

\[ \text{Eratou via kana} \ o \text{ ratou.} \]

'They wanted to eat. They were hungry.'

\[ \text{eratou} \ \beta \text{ia kana} \ o \text{ ratou} \]

(2.41) **Standard Fijian—Noun followed by its dependents**

\[ \text{na iyaya ni Japani era dau volitaki mai Viti} \]

'the products of Japan which are sold in Fiji'

\[ \text{na iyaya ni } \text{Japani era } \text{dau volitaki mai Viti} \]
b. *na noqu ika lailai*  
na noŋgu ika lailai  

‘my small fish’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{na} \\
\text{noqu} \\
\text{ika} \\
\text{lailai}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Det} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{Adj}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Index} \\
\text{2ndex} \\
\text{3ndex} \\
\text{4ndex}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{mine} \\
\text{fish} \\
\text{small}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{na} \\
\text{me} \\
\text{mme}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Index} \\
\text{2ndex} \\
\text{3ndex} \\
\text{4ndex}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{Adj}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{o ratou na gone} \\
o ratou na gone
\end{array}
\]

‘the children (lit., they the children)’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
o \\
\text{ratou} \\
a \\
gone
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{they.few} \\
\text{child}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Index} \\
\text{2ndex} \\
\text{3ndex} \\
\text{4ndex}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{Det} \\
\text{N}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{+prnn}
\end{array}
\]

(2.42) **Standard Fijian**—Verb followed by adverbs

...

*me tara tale beka?*

me tara tale mbeka

‘(If a building is damaged in a hurricane,) isn’t it built again?’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{me} \\
tara \\
tale \\
beoka
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{should} \\
b.e.built \\
\text{again}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{2ndex} \\
\text{3ndex}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{beoka} \\
\text{may.be}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{+xlrn}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Adv}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Adv}
\end{array}
\]
(2.43) **Standard Fijian—Topicalised noun preceding its regent**

a. *Na isulu, sā sava oti.* ‘As for the clothes, they have already been washed.’

   
   
   
   
   

b. *O koya o Rupeni.* ‘As for him, (he is) Rupeni./(This person,) he is Rupeni.’

When more than one verb occurs in a sentence, dependent verbs follow their regent verb(s). A sentence must have one and only one non-auxiliary verb, which carries either the [+trns] (transitive) or [−trns] (intransitive) feature. For example, Sentence (2.42) has two verbs, namely *me* and *tara*, where *tara* is the dependent of, and follows the auxiliary verb, *me*.

### 2.6.2.2 The verb-agreement system and transitivity in Standard Fijian

In a sentence in Standard Fijian, the person and number of the [actr] are always implied in the root verb. The root verb is the first verb of a sentence and carries the feature [+fint] (plus finite). It can be either an auxiliary verb or a non-auxiliary verb. An example sentence with an auxiliary root verb is given in (2.44) and an example sentence with a non-auxiliary root verb is given in (2.45). In both of the examples, the root verb implies a third person dual [actr]. Table 2.5 shows the verb-initial sequences, which alternate depending on the features of the [actr].
(2.44) **Standard Fijian—Sentence with auxiliary root verb**

\[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\text{Erau} & \text{na} & \text{lako} & \text{tale} & \text{mai} & \text{na} & \text{luvequ.} \\
\text{erauna} & \text{lako} & \text{tale} & \text{mai} & \text{na} & \text{lu\textquoteright}e\text{3} & \\
\text{future} & \text{go} & \text{again} & \text{hither} & \text{→prpr} & \text{my.child} \\
\text{1ndex} & \text{2ndex} & \text{3ndex} & \text{4ndex} & \text{5ndex} & \text{6ndex} \\
V & V & \text{Adv} & \text{Adv} & \text{Det} & \text{N} \\
+\text{xlr} & \text{→tms} \\
6\text{actr} & 3\text{Di} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘My (two) children will come again.’

(2.45) **Standard Fijian—Sentence with a non-auxiliary root verb**

\[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\text{Erau} & \text{lako} & \text{tiko} & \text{mai} & \text{na} & \text{luvequ.} \\
\text{eraulako} & \text{lako} & \text{tiko} & \text{mai} & \text{na} & \text{lu\textquoteright}e\text{3} & \\
\text{go} & \text{progressive} & \text{hither} & \text{→prpr} & \text{my.child} \\
\text{1ndex} & \text{2ndex} & \text{3ndex} & \text{4ndex} & \text{5ndex} \\
V & \text{Adv} & \text{Adv} & \text{Det} & \text{N} \\
\text{→tms} \\
5\text{actr} & 3\text{Di} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘My (two) children were on the way here.’

Table 2.5: **Standard Fijian verb-initial forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[au]</td>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>[(e)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di</td>
<td>[(e)darau]</td>
<td>[(e)irau]</td>
<td>[(e)drau]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>[(da)to]</td>
<td>[(e)to]</td>
<td>[(o)drau]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>[(e)to]</td>
<td>[(e)imami]</td>
<td>[(o)n\text{ī}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A verbal sentence contains one and only one non-auxiliary verb. It is either transitive or intransitive.\(^{13}\) A transitive verb implies the person and number of the [PAT]. In examples (2.46) and (2.47), the non-auxiliary transitive verbs \textit{lakovi iratou} (lako\text{ī}iratou) and \textit{erau lakovi iratou} (eraulako\text{ī}iratou) respectively, imply a third person paucal [PAT].

---

\(^{12}\) These forms in Standard Fijian and the equivalent forms in other Fijian languages are referred to with various terms, such as “subjects (but the term not exclusively used for these forms)” (Schütz 1985), “subject pronouns” (Dixon 1988), “sentence-initial preverbal pronouns” (Geraghty 1977), “preverbal (subject-marking) pronouns” (Geraghty 1983), and “verbal pronoun” (Capell 1991).

\(^{13}\) As for the detailed discussion about syntactic transitivity of the Fijian languages, see Kikusawa (2000b). For a semantically based approach to Fijian transitivity, see Schütz (1985).
(2.46) **Standard Fijian—Sentence with transitive non-root verb**

\[
\text{Erau na } \text{lakovi iratou na } \text{gasenivuli na } \text{luvequ.}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future</th>
<th>go</th>
<th>teacher</th>
<th>my.chld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2ndx</td>
<td>3ndx</td>
<td>4ndx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Det</td>
<td>Det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlry</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AGT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
6^\text{actr} \quad 4^\text{PAT}
\]

‘My (two) children will go to see the teachers.’

(2.47) **Standard Fijian—Sentence with transitive root verb**

\[
\text{Eraulakovi iratou tiko mai na } \text{gasenivuli na } \text{luvequ.}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go</th>
<th>progressive</th>
<th>hither</th>
<th>teacher</th>
<th>my.chld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2ndx</td>
<td>3ndx</td>
<td>4ndx</td>
<td>5ndx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Det</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
7^\text{actr} \quad 5^\text{PAT}
\]

‘My (two) children were on the way here to see them few.’

(Lit., My (two) children are coming for the teachers.)

Standard Fijian is a so-called “pro-drop” language, and a sentence often does not have an [actr] or a [PAT] which is overtly expressed by an independent noun. Compare (2.47) with (2.48).

(2.48) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with no overtly expressed [actr] nor [PAT]**

\[
\text{Eraulakovi iratou tiko mai.}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go</th>
<th>progressive</th>
<th>hither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2ndx</td>
<td>3ndx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+trns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
4^\text{actr} \quad 3^\text{DI} \quad 3^\text{PC}
\]

‘They two were on the way here to see them few.’

The person and number distinction in Standard Fijian is as follows: person distinctions are first person exclusive and inclusive, second person, and third person; number distinctions are singular (indicates one), dual (indicates two), paucal (indicates more than two individuals
constituting a small group), and plural (indicates many). In addition to these, the [PAT] agreement system includes third person general number, which refers to a third person entity the number of which is not marked. An example sentence with a third person general [PAT] is given in (2.49), and the transitive verb endings are given in Table 2.6. The given “transitive verb endings” are different from what have been traditionally called “transitive suffixes”. Detailed discussion regarding transitivity and verb forms is presented in Kikusawa (2000b).

(2.49) Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with marked third person general [PAT]

Erau na gunuva na moli na luvequ.

erenauna lJunu13 a na moli na lu13elJgu future drink

Index V +xlry 3ndex Det N Det N V +trns PAT AGT

6[ actr ] 4[ PAT ] 3Gn actr

'My two children will have an/the/some orange(s).'

Table 2.6: Standard Fijian transitive verb endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 in</th>
<th>lex</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>iau/</td>
<td>iko/</td>
<td>ikoyaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pe</td>
<td>ikedatou]</td>
<td>ikeitou]</td>
<td>ikemudou]</td>
<td>iratou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that a transitive verb which implies a third person general [PAT] usually has an .a/ ending (as in gunuva), as has been shown in (2.49), but this is not always true. See example (2.50), where the verb cigo ‘catch (something)’ is also a transitive verb which implies a third person general [PAT]. With a verb such as this, the form of the verb does not give any information regarding its transitivity.15

---

14 In earlier analyses, these forms were often analysed as syntactically independent forms and called “objects” (for example, Schütz 1985). Kikusawa (2000b) examines the syntactic status of these forms.

15 For more examples of the verbs of this type and a discussion from a different perspective, see Schütz (1985:150).
(2.50) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with unmarked third person general [PAT]**

\[ \text{Erau na ciqo na polo na luvegu.} \]

\[ \text{erauna ci^9go na polo na lu\text{\^{e}}gu} \]

future catch -prpr ball -prpr my. child

\( \text{1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex} \)

V V Det N Det N

+xlry +trns PAT AGT

\( 6 \begin{bmatrix} \text{actr} \\ \text{3D1} \end{bmatrix} 4 \begin{bmatrix} \text{PAT} \\ \text{3Gn} \end{bmatrix} \)

\text{actr}

'\text{My (two) children will catch a/the/some ball(s).}'

Table 2.7 is a summary of the basic forms of intransitive and transitive verbs where \( \ldots X \) indicates the ending which alternates according to the features of the [PAT]. The features \([\text{PAT}, +\text{prpr}]\) indicate that the verb requires a proper [PAT]. Examples follow in (2.51).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transitivity</th>
<th>verb form</th>
<th>examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>( \ldots i )</td>
<td>\text{lako} \text{lakovi} \text{lakovaki}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+trns, [\text{PAT, +prpr}]</td>
<td>( \ldots i )</td>
<td>\text{lakovi Mere} \text{lakovaki Mere}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+trns, [\text{PAT, -prpr}]</td>
<td>( \ldots X )</td>
<td>\text{lakovi ira, lakova} \text{lakovaki ira, lakovaka}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2.51) **Standard Fijian—Sentence examples of the verbs given in Table 2.7**

a. \( E \text{lako na gone.} \)  [-trns]  'The child goes/went.'

\( \text{elako na } \text{\^n} \text{one} \)

b. \( E \text{lakovi na gone.} \)  [-trns]  'The child is/was gone for.'

\( \text{elako\^j} \text{\^n} \text{one} \)

c. \( E \text{lakovi Mere na gone.} \)  [+trns]  'The child goes/went for (to see/fetch) Mere.'

\( \text{elako\^j} \text{\^n} \text{one} \)

d. \( E \text{lakovi ira na gone.} \)  [+trns]  'The child goes/went for (to see/fetch) them.'

\( \text{elako\^ji} \text{\^n} \text{one} \)

e. \( E \text{lakova na gone na yalewa.} \)  [+trns]  'The child goes/went for (to see/fetch) the woman.'

\( \text{elako\^j} \text{\^n} \text{one} \text{na yalewa} \)

f. \( E \text{lakovaki na gone.} \)  [-trns]  'The child is/was gone with.'

\( \text{elako\^j} \text{\^n} \text{one} \)

g. \( E \text{lakovaki Mere na gone.} \)  [+trns]  'The child goes/went with Mere.'

\( \text{elako\^j} \text{\^n} \text{one} \text{Mere} \)

h. \( E \text{lakovaki ira na gone.} \)  [+trns]  'The child goes/went with them.'

\( \text{elako\^ji} \text{\^n} \text{one} \)

i. *E lakovaka na gone o koya.* [+trns] ‘He goes/went with the child(ren).’
elakožaka na ñone o koya

2.6.2.3 The casemarking system of Standard Fijian

In Standard Fijian, pronouns, proper nouns and non-pronominal non-proper nouns (common nouns) are all differently casemarked.

There is only one set of pronouns in Standard Fijian. These are assigned Nominative case by a preceding preposition *o* (or its free variant *ko*), as in (2.52) and (2.53). As seen in the translation, when there is a pronoun which indicates the [actr] in a sentence, the [actr] is emphasised. Table 2.8 shows the forms of Standard Fijian pronouns.

(2.52) Standard Fijian—Intransitive sentence with Nominative pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Erau na</em></th>
<th><em>lako o rau.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erauna</td>
<td>lako o rau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>go +prpr they. two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ndex</td>
<td>2ndex 3ndex 4ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V V P N</td>
<td>+xlry -trns Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3[ actr ]</td>
<td>PAT 3Dl actr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘They two will go *themselves.*’

(2.53) Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with Nominative pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Erau na</em></th>
<th><em>gunuvu na moli o rau.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erauna</td>
<td>nunuža na moli o rau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>drink -prpr orange +prpr they. two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ndex</td>
<td>2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V V Det N P N</td>
<td>+xlry +trms PAT Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6[ actr ]</td>
<td>4[ PAT ] 3Gn actr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘They two will have *a/the/some orange(s) themselves.*’

---

**Table 2.8: Standard Fijian pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td><em>yau</em></td>
<td><em>iko</em></td>
<td><em>koya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl</td>
<td><em>kēdaru</em></td>
<td><em>keira</em></td>
<td><em>kemudrau</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td><em>kedatou</em></td>
<td><em>keitou</em></td>
<td><em>kemudou</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td><em>keda</em></td>
<td><em>keimami</em></td>
<td><em>kemuni</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no Accusative pronouns. The person and number of the [PAT] of a transitive verb are expressed by verb agreement features as in *erau lakovi iratou* (eraulakoβiiratou) in (2.48) and in *kacivi iko* (kaβiβiiko) in example (2.54). No independent pronominal form can occur in a sentence to indicate the [PAT], as shown in (2.55).

(2.54) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with implied [PAT]**

*Erau na kacivi iko.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erauna</th>
<th>kaβiβiiko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ndex</td>
<td>2ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlry</td>
<td>+trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m[actr]</td>
<td>m[PAT]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m[3Dl] m[2Sg]

‘They (two) will call you.’

(2.55) **Standard Fijian—Unacceptable transitive sentence with a pronominal [PAT]**

*Erau na kacivi iko o iko.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erauna</th>
<th>kaβiβi iko o iko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ndex</td>
<td>2ndex 3ndex 4ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V P N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlry</td>
<td>+trns Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m[actr]</td>
<td>m[PAT] PAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m[3Dl] m[2Sg]

‘I.M. They (two) will call you.’

Proper nouns, which include place names and titles (such as Doctor, Mother), as well as personal names, are casemarked as follows. A proper noun is assigned Nominative case by a preceding preposition o (or its free variant ko), as *Mere* in (2.56). A proper noun is assigned Accusative case when it is cliticised to a transitive verb as *Mere* in (2.57). By “cliticised”, I mean that the form is syntactically an independent lexical item (thus it is not “incorporated” as is suggested in some analyses of Fijian), and that it always immediately follows the regent verb with no other forms intervening between the two. In addition, its position contrasts with the position of other nouns carrying the same case relation, which may not occur in this position.
(2.56) **Standard Fijian—Intransitive sentence with Nominative proper noun**

\[ E \text{ na } lako \ 0 \ Mere. \]

enq lako o mere
future go +prpr Mere
1Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex
V V P N
+xlry -trns Nom
4[ actr ] PAT
3Sg actr

‘Mere will go.’

(2.57) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence example with Accusative proper noun**

\[ A u \text{ na } raici \ Mere. \]
auna raiçi =mere
future see Mere
1Index 2ndex 3ndex
V V N
+xlry +trns Acc
m[ actr ] PAT
1Sg

‘I will see Mere.’

Unlike pronouns and proper nouns, a non-pronominal non-proper noun is never overtly casemarked. The case relations are determined contextually, such as by the semantics of the verb, discourse, and/or circumstantial context. Examples (2.58) and (2.59) illustrate this situation. Sentence (2.58) is syntactically ambiguous.\(^{16}\) Neither of the complement noun phrases in the sentence, namely, *na gonevuli* ‘the student’\(^ {17}\) and *na qasenivuli* ‘the teacher’ is casemarked, and therefore either could be interpreted as the [actr] implied by the verb *erau na* (erauna), or as the [PAT] implied by the verb *raica*. Two interpretations are shown as a. and b.

\(^{16}\) For relevant discussion regarding the factors that disambiguate sentences in actual language use, see Schütz (1985:394-396).

\(^{17}\) It should be noted that although some noun phrases are translated as definite, Fijian nouns preceded by the Determiner *na* in isolation are unmarked as to definiteness and number.
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(2.58) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with two common noun complements (I)**

a. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Erua na raica na gonevuli na qasenivuli.} \\
\text{erauna raiga na } \text{jonebili na } \text{gasenibi} \\
future \text{ drink } \text{-prpr student } \text{-prpr teacher} \\
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \quad 5\text{ndex} \quad 6\text{ndex} \\
V \quad V \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
+x\text{lry} \quad +\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT} \quad \text{AGT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{actr} \\
\text{3Dl} \\
\text{4PAT} \\
\text{3Gn}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

‘The (two) teachers will watch a/the/some student(s).’

b. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Erua na raica na gonevuli na qasenivuli.} \\
\text{erauna raiga na } \text{jonebili na } \text{gasenibi} \\
future \text{ drink } \text{-prpr student } \text{-prpr teacher} \\
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \quad 5\text{ndex} \quad 6\text{ndex} \\
V \quad V \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
+x\text{lry} \quad +\text{trns} \quad \text{AGT} \quad \text{PAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{actr} \\
\text{3Dl} \\
\text{6PAT} \\
\text{3Gn}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

‘The (two) students will watch a/the/some teacher(s).’

Examples in (2.59) illustrate a situation where the case relation is determined semantically. Either of the complement noun phrases, *na moli* ‘oranges’ and *na gone* ‘the child’, could satisfy the [actr] agreement features of *e na* (ena), or the [PAT] agreement features of *gunuva*. However, because *na moli* ‘oranges’ is not animate and does not do the activity of ‘drinking’, the [actr] has to be *na gone*, and not *na moli*.18 Thus, among the two possible interpretations shown in (2.59), only the first reading is acceptable.

(2.59) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with two common noun complements (II)**

a. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{E na gunuva na moli na gone.} \\
\text{ena juneba na moli na jone} \\
future \text{ drink } \text{-prpr orange } \text{-prpr child} \\
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \quad 5\text{ndex} \quad 6\text{ndex} \\
V \quad V \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
+x\text{lry} \quad +\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT} \quad \text{AGT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{actr} \\
\text{3Sg} \\
\text{4PAT} \\
\text{3Gn}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

‘The child will have a/the/some orange(s).’

---

18 In a situation such as in a children’s story where an orange is personalised, the word for ‘orange’ would be a derived personalised form *Rā moli* ‘Mr/Ms Orange’ and would be casemarked as a proper noun.
b. *E na gunuva na moli na gone.
ena nunuβa na moli na none
future drink –prpr orange –prpr child
lndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex
V V Det N Det N
+xlry +trns AGT PAT
4\[ actr \] 6\[ PAT \] actr

\[ 3Sg \] [3Gn]

‘The orange will drink a/the/some child(ren).’

Note that although there is a tendency in Standard Fijian for a [PAT] to precede an [AGT], the opposite word order is possible, as shown in (2.60).

(2.60) Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with [AGT] preceding [PAT]

\[ E na gunuva na gone na moli. \]
ena nunuβa na none na moli
future drink –prpr child –prpr orange
lndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex
V V Det N Det N
+xlry +trns AGT PAT
4\[ actr \] 6\[ PAT \] actr
\[ 3Sg \] [3Gn]

‘The child will have an/the/some orange(s).’

Table 2.9 provides a summary of the case forms in Standard Fijian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subclass of the Noun</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronoun [+prnn]</td>
<td>by the preceding form (k)o</td>
<td>(no Accusative form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper noun [+prpr]</td>
<td>by the preceding form (k)o</td>
<td>by cliticisation to the verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-pronominal, non-proper noun [-prnn, -prpr]</td>
<td>not formally marked, assigned by the context</td>
<td>not formally marked, assigned by the context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.4 Other relevant syntactic characteristics of Standard Fijian

2.6.2.4.1 "Incorporation"

Some intransitive verbs in Standard Fijian have a form with a so-called “incorporated noun”. An example is given in (2.61a) where the verb voli madrai (volimadrai) appears to be a sequence of a verb followed by a bare noun. Compare it with the corresponding transitive sentence given in (2.61b).
(2.61) Standard Fijian—Sentence with an “incorporated noun” and corresponding transitive sentence

a. 

\[
\text{Au sa voli madrai tiko.} \\
\text{ausa bolima"rai tiko}
\]

REAL bread.buying progressive
Index 2ndex 3ndex
V V Adv
+xlry -trms

'I'm bread-buying now.'

b. 

\[
\text{Au sa volia tiko na madrai.} \\
\text{ausa bolia tiko na ma"rai}
\]

REAL buy progressive -prpr bread
Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V V Adv Det N
+xlry +trms PAT

5 [PAT] [3Gn]

'I'm purchasing bread now.'

In (2.61a), the form voli and the form madrai together form one lexical item, which is an intransitive verb. Semantically, it can only be interpreted generically and cannot be modified, while an independent noun could be. Syntactically, adverbs follow the form .. madrai}. Typically, adverbs follow the verb and precede noun phrases in a sentence. Therefore, it is more appropriate to analyse the whole form voli madrai (volimadrai) as an intransitive verb meaning 'bread-buying', rather than as a verb followed by a [PAT] noun (see also Starosta, in press).

2.6.2.4.2 Features of verbs which indicate the nature of the [PAT]

Although Standard Fijian has an [actr] verb-agreement system, the semantic feature of the [PAT], both in intransitive and transitive verbs, is implied in certain verbs. The features are reflected in the so-called “transitive suffixes”. “Transitive suffixes” are the verb endings which have been schematically referred to as either -C(i) and -Cak(i) and have been described as forms which indicate that the verb is transitive" (Arms 1974, Pawley 1986, and Geraghty 1983; for a different analysis as to the “transitivity” of Fijian, see Schütz 1981 and 1985). Verbs with these endings have been classified as “transitive verbs”. However, as can be seen in Table 2.7 and examples in (2.51), a verb which has one of the so-called “transitive suffixes” may occur as either transitive or intransitive. In example (2.51), the verb either ends with ..vi], ..viXj, or ..va} (in [2.51b] to [2.51e]), or ..vaki], ..vakiXj, or ..vaka} (in [2.51f] to [2.51l]). The first three correspond to what Pawley has described as -Ci and -C-, that is "short transitive suffixes", and the latter three correspond to what Pawley has described as -Caki and -Cak-, that is "long transitive suffixes". As can be seen in the given examples, forms which have these endings can be either transitive or intransitive. However, it is true
that the so-called "transitive endings" alternate according to certain conditions. Forms of such verbs are repeated here in (2.62) and (2.63).

(2.62) **Standard Fijian—Verbs with the so-called “short transitive suffix” and their syntactic transitivity**

a. \( \text{lakovi} \) [-trns] ‘be gone for’

b. \( \text{lakova} \) [+trns] ‘go for’

(2.63) **Standard Fijian—Verbs with the so-called “long transitive suffix” and their syntactic transitivity**

a. \( \text{lakovaki} \) [-trns] ‘be gone with, be carried, be brought’

b. \( \text{lakovaka} \) [+trns] ‘go with’

Forms in (2.62), which have a so-called “short transitive suffix”, both imply a [PAT] which is the location or the goal of the activity, while the forms in (2.63), which have a so-called “long transitive suffix”, both imply a [PAT] which is the instrument used to accomplish or accompany the activity. The former thus carry the semantic feature [+dfct] (plus direct effect), while the latter carry the semantic feature [+ifct] (plus instrumental effect).

2.6.2.4.2.1 *Verb forms with [+dfct]*

A detailed description of the features carried by the verbs in (2.62) is given in (2.64). In the examples, both \( \text{elakova} \) and \( \text{elakovi} \) carry the feature [+dfct]. This feature indicates that the verb requires a [PAT] which can be interpreted as [+ndrg] (plus undergoer). In each of the examples, \( \text{na suka} \) ‘the sugar’ is the undergoer [PAT]. Because \( e \ \text{lakova} \) (elakova) is a transitive verb (it implies a third person general [PAT] and a third person singular [actr]), its undergoer [PAT] is the so-called “object” of the sentence. Conversely, because \( e \ \text{lakovi} \) (elakovi) is an intransitive verb (it implies a third person [PAT, actr]), its undergoer [PAT] is the so-called “subject” of the sentence. The verb in example (2.64c), which is given for the purpose of comparison, does not carry such a feature. An additional set of examples with verbs which carry [+dfct] is given in (2.65).

---

19 For descriptions that focus on the meanings of the verbs with these endings rather than on the syntactic features, see Arms (1973) and (1974), and Schütz (1981) and (1985).
(2.64) **Standard Fijian**—**Sentences with verbs carrying the feature** [+dfct] (I)

a. \( E \) lakova \( na \) suka \( na \) gone.

\( elako\betaa \) \( na \) suka \( na \) \( \etaone \)

go, for \( -prpr \) sugar \( -prpr \) child

1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex

+trns  \( PAT \)  \( AGT \)

+dfct  \( \text{actr} \)

5\( [\text{actr}] \)

3\( [\text{3Sg}] \)

3\( [\text{PAT}] \)

3\( [\text{3Gen}] \)

3\( [\text{PAT}] \)

\(+\text{ndrg}\)

‘The child went for (to get) sugar.’

b. \( E \) lakovi \( na \) suka.

\( elako\betai \) \( na \) suka

be, gone, for \( -prpr \) sugar

1ndex 2ndex 3ndex

-\( trns \)  \( PAT \)

+\( \text{dfct} \)  \( \text{actr} \)

3\( [\text{actr}] \)

3\( [\text{3Gen}] \)

3\( [\text{PAT}] \)

\(+\text{ndrg}\)

‘The sugar was gone for.’

c. \( E \) lako \( na \) gone.

\( elako \) \( na \) \( \etaone \)

go \( -prpr \) child

1ndex 2ndex 3ndex

-\( trns \)  \( PAT \)

3\( [\text{PAT}] \)

\( [\text{actr}] \)

‘The child went.’
(2.65) **Standard Fijian—Sentences with verbs carrying the feature [+dfct] (II)**

a.  
\[E \text{ dabeca } na \text{ itutuvi } na \text{ gone.}\]
\[e^{da^m}be\text{d}a \text{ na } \text{ itu}tu\text{bi } \text{ na } \text{ } \text{gone.}\]
\[\text{sit.on} \quad \text{prpr} \quad \text{blanket} \quad \text{prpr} \quad \text{child}\]
\[1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \quad 5\text{ndex}\]
\[\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT} \quad \text{AGT}\]
\[\text{+dfct} \quad \text{actr}\]
\[5[\text{AGT}]\]
\[3[\text{PAT}]\]
\[3[\text{PAT}]\]
\[+\text{ndrg.}\]

'The child sat on a blanket.'

b.  
\[E \text{ dabeci } na \text{ itutuvi.}\]
\[e^{da^m}be\text{di } na \text{ itu}tu\text{bi}\]
\[\text{be.sat.on} \quad \text{prpr} \quad \text{blanket}\]
\[1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex}\]
\[\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT}\]
\[\text{+dfct} \quad \text{actr}\]
\[3[\text{actr}]\]
\[3[\text{PAT}]\]
\[+\text{ndrg.}\]

'A blanket was sat on.'

c.  
\[E \text{ dabec } na \text{ gone.}\]
\[e^{da^m}be \text{ na } \text{gone}\]
\[\text{sit} \quad \text{prpr} \quad \text{child}\]
\[1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex}\]
\[\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT}\]
\[3[\text{actr}]\]
\[3[\text{Sg}]\]

'The child sat down.'

2.6.2.4.2.2 **Verb forms with [+ifct]**

Both *lakovaka* and *lakovaki* in (2.66) carry the semantic feature [+ifct] (plus instrumental effect), which indicates that the verb requires a [PAT] that can be interpreted as [+nstr]. In both (2.66a) and (2.66b), *na suka ‘the sugar’* can be interpreted as [+nstr] (plus instrument), and is interpreted as the entity which accompanies the activity. Additional examples are given in (2.67) which includes both examples of verbs with the feature [+ifct] and related verbs that have the feature [+dfct].
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(2.66) **Standard Fijian—Sentences with verbs carrying the feature [+ifct]**

a.  
\[ E \text{ lakovaka} \ na \ suka \ na \ gone. \]
\[ elako\text{\textbf{\textbar}}aka \ na \ suka \ na \ njone \]
\[ go.\text{\textbar}with \ -prpr \ sugar \ -prpr \ child \]
\[ 1\text{\textbar}ndex \ 2\text{\textbar}ndex \ 3\text{\textbar}ndex \ 4\text{\textbar}ndex \ 5\text{\textbar}ndex \]
\[ +\text{trns} \ PAT \ \text{AGT} \]
\[ +\text{ifct} \ \text{actr} \]
\[ 5\text{\textbar} \text{actr} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{Sg} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{PAT} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{Gn} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} +\text{nstr} \]

‘The child went with (=carried) sugar.’

b.  
\[ E \text{ lakovaki} \ na \ suka. \]
\[ elako\text{\textbar}aki \ na \ suka \]
\[ go.\text{\textbar}with \ -prpr \ sugar \]
\[ 1\text{\textbar}ndex \ 2\text{\textbar}ndex \ 3\text{\textbar}ndex \]
\[ -\text{trns} \ PAT \]
\[ +\text{ifct} \ \text{actr} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{actr} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{Sg} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{PAT} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} +\text{nstr} \]

‘The sugar was gone with.’

(2.67) **Standard Fijian—Sentences with verbs that contrast [+ifct] and [+dfct]**

a.  
\[ E \text{ viritaka} \ na \ vatu \ na \ gone. \]
\[ ebiritaka \ na \ \betaatu \ na \ njone \]
\[ pelt.\text{\textbar}with \ -prpr \ stone \ -prpr \ child \]
\[ 1\text{\textbar}ndex \ 2\text{\textbar}ndex \ 3\text{\textbar}ndex \ 4\text{\textbar}ndex \ 5\text{\textbar}ndex \]
\[ +\text{trns} \ PAT \ \text{AGT} \]
\[ +\text{ifct} \ \text{actr} \]
\[ 5\text{\textbar} \text{AGT} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{Sg} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{PAT} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} \text{Gn} \]
\[ 3\text{\textbar} +\text{nstr} \]

‘The child pelted stones (at someone).’
b. \textit{E viritaki} \textit{na} \textit{vatu.}

\begin{verbatim}
be.pelted.with -prpr stone
+pr
   1ndex   2ndex 3ndex
   -trns   PAT
   +ifct   actr
3 actr
3Sg
3PAT +nstr
\end{verbatim}

'The stones were pelted with.'

c. \textit{E virika} \textit{na} \textit{toa} \textit{na} \textit{gone.}

\begin{verbatim}
be.pelted -prpr chicken -prpr child
+trns   PAT AGT
+dfct   actr
5 actr
3Sg
3PAT
3Gn
3PAT [+ndrg]
\end{verbatim}

'The child pelted the chicken.'

d. \textit{E lauviri}^{20} \textit{na} \textit{toa.}

\begin{verbatim}
be.pelted -prpr chicken
+trns   PAT
+dfct   actr
3 actr
3Sg
3PAT [+ndrg]
\end{verbatim}

'The chickens were pelted.'

Thus, the forms that have been traditionally called "transitive suffixes" reflect a semantic feature of the verb, rather than its transitivity. Table 2.10 is a summary of the verb forms. The relationship between the verb forms and transitivity in Fijian is discussed in detail in Kikusawa 2000b.

^{20} The sequence /lau... is another form which derives an intransitive [+dfct] verb from the corresponding transitive form.
Table 2.10: Derivational relations and verb forms in Standard Fijian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic derivation</th>
<th>Syntactic derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+dfect]</td>
<td>[+trs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+ifect]</td>
<td>[-trs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci, [lau..]</td>
<td>Si, [Sagi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Caki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXi, [Ca]</td>
<td>CmX[, Caka]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.3 A typological description of Tongan

The analysis of Tongan here is based on data given in published materials (Broschart 1997; Chung 1978; Churchward 1953; Dukes 1996; Lynch 1969, 1972; Shumway 1971; Tchekhoff 1991; Tsunoda 1983) as well as on my own fieldnotes.21

Tongan is a right-branching ergative language with an [actr] agreement system. Sections 2.6.3.1 to 2.6.3.4 present an overview. A detailed discussion of the Tongan casemarking and verb-agreement systems is given in §2.6.3.5.

2.6.3.1 Branching

Tongan has the same kind of branching system as Standard Fijian. Examples (2.68) to (2.72) are given in the order that corresponds to those given for Standard Fijian from (2.39) to (2.43).

(2.68) **Tongan—Sentence with prepositional predicate followed by its dependent**

(Churchward 1953:26)

*Ko e Fisi au.*

'I am a Fijian.'

ko
e                      fisi
P    1ndex           N
+prdc 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex
   Det    N       I

---

21 Data comes from an interview with Mr Feleti Ka Wolfram (born in 1960) from Nuku'alofa, in Tokyo in 1997.
(2.69) **Tongan—Sentence with verb followed by its dependent**

'Oku ou 'alu au.  
'I am going myself.'

\[
\frac{\text{Oku ou 'alu au}}{\text{present}} \quad \frac{\text{au}}{\text{go}} \\
\frac{\text{V}}{\text{2ndex}} \quad \frac{\text{3ndex}}{\text{Index}} \\
\frac{\text{+xlry}}{\text{V}} \quad \frac{\text{N}}{\text{Index}} \\
\frac{3\text{ actr}}{\text{PAT}} \quad \frac{\text{trns}}{\text{actr}} \\
\]

(2.70) **Tongan—Noun followed by its relative clause dependent**

a. 'Oku mahino 'a e me'a na'a nau fai.  
'The thing which they did is clear.'

\[
\frac{\text{Oku mahino ?a e me?a na?a nau fai}}{\text{present}} \quad \frac{\text{mahino}}{\text{clear}} \\
\frac{\text{?a}}{\text{thing}} \\
\frac{\text{me?a}}{\text{past}} \quad \frac{\text{na?anau}}{\text{do}} \\
\frac{\text{4ndex}}{\text{Det}} \quad \frac{\text{5ndex}}{\text{V}} \quad \frac{\text{6ndex}}{\text{V}} \quad \frac{\text{7ndex}}{\text{V}} \quad \frac{\text{3actr}}{\text{3Pl}} \\
\]

\[
\frac{\text{+trns}}{\text{actr}} \\
\frac{\text{3actr}}{\text{+trns}} \\
\]

\[
\frac{\text{5actr}}{\text{3Sg}} \\
\frac{\text{3Sg}}{\text{actr}} \\
\]

\[
\frac{\text{+trns}}{\text{actr}} \\
\frac{\text{5actr}}{\text{3Sg}} \\
\]
(2.71) Tongan—Verb followed by adverbs (Tchekhoff 1981:64, my analysis)

\[ ... \text{na'e folau} \text{ atu 'a e eiki lahi ko Lo'au...} \text{ 'a great chief Lo'au sailed away...'} \]

\[ \text{na'e folau atu 'a e eiki lahi ko lo'au} \]

(2.72) Tongan—Topicalised noun preceding its regent (Churchward 1956:210, my analysis)

a. \[ \text{Ko e hā 'okū ke halopa hono feingāi.} \]

\[ \text{ko e hā 'okū ke halopa hono feingāi} \]

‘What are you exerting yourself trying to do?’

2.6.3.2 The verb-agreement system in Tongan\textsuperscript{22}

Tongan, like Standard Fijian, has an [actr] verb-agreement system implied in the root verb. Sentences with agreement features are given in examples (2.73) and (2.74). The forms of agreement endings and of pronouns are given in Tables 2.11 and 2.12 respectively. It should be noted that, in Tongan, third person singular agreement may imply the dual and plural numbers when the [actr] is expressed with a non-pronominal full noun phrase as in example (2.75). This is the same as Fijian third person singular agreement.

\textsuperscript{22} See §2.6.3.5 for a more detailed discussion.
Theoretical framework and sample descriptions

(2.73) Tongan—[actr] agreement marking in intransitive sentence (Shumway 1971:280, my analysis)

‘Oku ou ‘alu (au).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>1stsg</th>
<th>2ndsg</th>
<th>3rdsg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1sg [actr]  

‘I’m going (myself).’

(2.74) Tongan—[actr] agreement marking in transitive sentence (Shumway 1971:280, my analysis)

‘Oku tauhi au ‘e hoku tokouá.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>1stsg</th>
<th>2ndsg</th>
<th>3rdsg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AGT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3sg [actr]  

‘My bother takes care of me.’

Table 2.11: Tongan agreement endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lex</th>
<th>lin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12: Tongan pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lex</th>
<th>lin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dl</td>
<td>kitaua</td>
<td>kimaua</td>
<td>kimoua</td>
<td>kinaua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>kitautolu</td>
<td>kimaautolu</td>
<td>kimoutolu</td>
<td>kinautolu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2.75) Tongan—3Sg [actr] agreement marking with plural [actr] (Shumway 1971:285, my analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Oku</th>
<th>tauhi</th>
<th>au</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>'eku</th>
<th>mātu'á.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?oku</td>
<td>tauhi</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>?e</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>?eku</td>
<td>mātu'e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

present take care of I Erg specific mine parents

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex

5 [actr] +trns PAT AGT COR

3 [3Gn] Nom actr

'My parents take care of me.'

2.6.3.3 The casemarking system of Tongan

In Tongan, both pronouns and non-pronominal nouns are formally casemarked but in slightly different ways.

A pronoun is Nominative when it is not preceded by any other elements, while it is ergative when it is preceded by the preposition 'e. This is shown in examples (2.76) and (2.77).

(2.76) Tongan—Intransitive sentence with pronominal [PAT]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Oku</th>
<th>ou 'alu</th>
<th>au.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?oku</td>
<td>ou 'alu</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

present go I

Index 2ndex 3ndex

V V N

+xtrly -trns Nom

3 [actr] PAT

1Sg actr

'I go myself.'

(2.77) Tongan—Transitive sentence with pronominal [PAT] and [AGT]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Oku</th>
<th>ou ui koe 'e au.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?oku</td>
<td>ou ui koe ?e au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

present call you Erg I

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex

V V N P N

+xtrly +trns Nom Erg

5 [actr] 3[PAT] PAT AGT

1Sg actr

'I myself call you.'

Non-pronouns, both proper nouns and non-proper nouns, are casemarked as Nominative by the sequence of the preposition 'a and the determiner e, or simply by the determiner e. They are casemarked as Ergative by the preposition 'e. The determiner he may also occur preceding a non-proper Ergative noun. Examples with non-pronominal non-proper [PAT] and [AGT] are given in (2.78) and (2.79), and those with proper noun [PAT] and [AGT] are given.
in (2.80) and (2.81). Table 2.13 is a summary of the Tongan Nominative and Ergative casemarking system.

(2.78) **Tongan—Transitive sentence with non-pronominal [PAT] and [AGT] (Shumway 1971:201, my analysis)**

\[
\begin{align*}
Kuo & \ kai & e & he & kului & e & moa. \\
kuo & kai & ?e & he & kului & e & moa \\
past & eat & Erg & dog & Nom & chicken \\
1\text{ndex} & 2\text{ndex} & 3\text{ndex} & 4\text{ndex} & 5\text{ndex} & 6\text{ndex} & 7\text{ndex} \\
V & V & P & Det & N & Det & N \\
+xlry & +tms & Erg & Nom \\
3 & [actr] 7[\text{PAT}] & AGT & PAT \\
3[3Sg] & actr & \\
\end{align*}
\]

'The dog has eaten the chicken.'

(2.79) **Tongan—Intransitive sentence with non-pronominal [PAT] (Churchward 1953:68, my analysis)**

\[
\begin{align*}
Na'e & \ lea & ('a) & e & talavoû. \\
na?e & lea & ?a & e & talavoû \\
past & spoke & Nom & youngman \\
1\text{ndex} & 2\text{ndex} & 3\text{ndex} & 4\text{ndex} & 5\text{ndex} \\
V & V & P & Det & N \\
+xlry & -tms & Nom \\
3 & [actr] & PAT \\
3[3Sg] & actr \\
\end{align*}
\]

'The young man spoke.'

(2.80) **Tongan—Transitive sentence with proper [PAT] and [AGT] (Churchward 1953:67, my analysis)**

\[
\begin{align*}
Na'e & \ tama'et'i & e & Tevita & 'a & Kõlaiate. \\
na?e & tamaeti'y?e & têvita & ?a & kõlaiate \\
past & kill & Erg & Tevita & Nom & Kõlaiate \\
1\text{ndex} & 2\text{ndex} & 3\text{ndex} & 4\text{ndex} & 5\text{ndex} & 6\text{ndex} \\
V & V & P & N & P & N \\
+xlry & +tms & Erg & Nom \\
3 & [actr] 6[\text{PAT}] & AGT & PAT \\
3[3Sg] & actr \\
\end{align*}
\]

'Tevita killed Kõlaiate.'
(2.81) Tongan—Intransitive sentence with non-pronominal [PAT] (Churchward 1953:68, my analysis)

\[
\text{Na'a } \text{lea} \quad 'a \quad \text{Tolu.}
\]

\[
n\text{a}a \quad \text{lea} \quad ?a \quad \text{tolu}
\]

\[
past \quad \text{speak} \quad \text{Nom} \quad \text{Tolu}
\]

\[
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex}
\]

\[
V \quad V \quad P \quad N
\]

\[
+\text{xlr}y \quad -\text{trns} \quad \text{Nom}
\]

\[
3\text{Sg} \quad \text{actr}
\]

'Tolu spoke.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>bare pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>preceded by 'a'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-pronominal, non-proper noun</td>
<td>preceded by ('a) e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.13: Nominative and Ergative case assignment in Tongan

2.6.3.4 Verbs with "incorporated nouns"

Tongan has intransitive verbs with an "incorporated noun". Examples are given in (2.82).

(2.82) Tongan—Sentences with intransitive verb with an "incorporated noun"

a. \textit{Oku ikai teu inu kava.}

\[
\text{?oku ikai teu inukava}
\]

\[
present \quad \text{not} \quad \text{irealis} \quad \text{kava.drinking}
\]

\[
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex}
\]

\[
V \quad V \quad V \quad V
\]

\[
+\text{xlr}y \quad -\text{trns} \quad +\text{xlr}y \quad -\text{trns}
\]

\[
3\text{Sg} \quad \text{actr} \quad +\text{xtns} \quad 3\text{Sg} \quad \text{actr}
\]

'I do not drink kava.'

b. \textit{Na'e inu kava 'a Sione.}

\[
\text{na'e inukava} \quad ?a \quad \text{sione}
\]

\[
past \quad \text{kava.drinking} \quad \text{Nom} \quad \text{Sione}
\]

\[
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex}
\]

\[
V \quad V \quad V \quad V
\]

\[
+\text{xlr}y \quad -\text{trns} \quad P \quad \text{PAT}
\]

\[
4\text{Sg} \quad \text{actr}
\]

'Sione did not do kava-drinking.'
2.6.3.5 The verb-agreement system in Tongan: a detailed examination

Tongan has been described as having two sets of pronouns (Tchekhoff 1991), one of which is often called "preverbal pronouns". The other set is referred to as "postverbal pronouns". These are listed in Table 2.14. The two pronoun sets differ from each other morphologically, as seen in the table, and their syntactic distribution also differs one from the other. Preposed pronouns precede the thematic verb, that is the so-called "main verb", and typically immediately follow an auxiliary verb. Postposed pronouns follow the thematic verb. For example, in sentence (2.83), a first person singular preposed pronoun \( u \) occurs between the auxiliary verb \( t e \) and the thematic verb \( 'a v e \) 'take', and the third person singular postposed pronoun \( i a \) follows \( 'a v e \).

Table 2.14: Preverbal and postverbal pronouns in Tongan
(Adopted from Shumway 1971:94 with a change of order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preposed pronouns</th>
<th>postposed pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>( u, ou ) (present), ( ku ) (past)</td>
<td>( au )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exDl</td>
<td>( ma )</td>
<td>( kimaua )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl</td>
<td>( mau )</td>
<td>( kimautolu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inDl</td>
<td>( ta )</td>
<td>( kitaua )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPl</td>
<td>( tau )</td>
<td>( kitautolu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>( ke )</td>
<td>( koe )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Dl</td>
<td>( mo )</td>
<td>( kimoua )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pl</td>
<td>( mou )</td>
<td>( kimoutolu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>( ne )</td>
<td>( ia )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Dl</td>
<td>( na )</td>
<td>( kinaua )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl</td>
<td>( nau )</td>
<td>( kinautolu )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2.83) Tongan—Sentence with “preposed” and “postposed” pronouns

\[ t e \ u \ 'a v e \ i a \ ki \ k o l o. \]

\[ t e \ u \ ?a v e \ i a \ ki \ k o l o \]

future 1Sg take 3Sg to village

'I'll bring him to the village.'

Tchekhoff states that the preposed pronouns indicate the "subject" of both intransitive and transitive sentences, while the postposed pronouns indicate the "object" of transitive sentences and thus the pronoun system of Tongan is accusative. Examples (2.84) and (2.85) show Tchekhoff's analysis (1991:502) re-stated in a lexicase formalisation.

---

23 In many other papers where the actancy system of Tongan is discussed, this "preverbal" pronoun system is often simply ignored.

24 The forms are also referred to as "clitic pronouns", or "subject pronouns".
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(2.84) Tongan—Tchekhoff’s analysis of intransitive sentence restated in Lexicase

`Oku ou `alu.
?

present Nom.1Sg go PAT –trns actr

‘I am going.’

(2.85) Tongan—Tchekhoff’s analysis of transitive sentence restated in Lexicase

`Oku ou ui koe.
?

present Nom.1Sg call Acc.2Sg AGT +trns PAT actr

‘I call you.’

In Tchekhoff’s analysis, the Nominative pronoun ou indicates the [actr] in both an intransitive sentence (2.84) and a transitive sentence (2.85). The pronoun that follows the verb, for example koe in (2.85), expresses the [PAT] of a transitive sentence and is analysed as accusative. Therefore, the pronoun system as a whole is analysed as accusative. However, this analysis does not account for the “Accusative” pronoun that is inserted “for the sake of emphasis or greater explicitness” (Churchward 1953:37) in such sentences as example (2.86) below.

(2.86) Tongan—Sentence where accusative analysis of “postposed pronoun” is not appropriate (I) (Churchward 1953:37, my analysis)

Kuo `alu ia ki kolo.
kuo ?alu ia ki kolo

perfect go Acc?? 3SG to village -trns PAT actr

‘He has gone to town himself.’

The problem in this analysis becomes more apparent when the [PAT] of an intransitive sentence is emphasised, or made explicit, as in sentence (2.87) below, where the same participant—[PAT, actr]—is indicated by both Nominative and Accusative.
Theoretical framework and sample descriptions

(2.87) Tongan—Sentence where accusative analysis of “postposed pronoun” is not appropriate (II)

\[ 'Oku \, ou \, 'alu \, au. \]

\[ ?oku \, ou \, ?alu \, au \]

\[ \text{present} \quad \text{Nom.1Sg} \, \text{go} \quad \text{Acc.1Sg} \]

\[ \text{PAT} \quad \text{actr} \, \text{trms} \quad \text{PAT} \, \text{actr} \]

‘I am going myself.’

In the following section, I will propose an alternative analysis that accounts for the kind of sentences shown above.

2.6.3.5.1 “Preposed pronouns” as verb-agreement endings

I argue that the so-called “preposed pronouns” are not syntactically pronouns but are agreement-marking endings of the auxiliary verb. I will refer to them as “agreement markers” hereafter, and will use the symbol ‘?’ to indicate the property of the [actr] indicated by the agreement marker in the gloss. For example, ??1Sg means that the actor dependent implied by the verb is a first person singular noun. The agreement marker is a part of the sentence-initial verb that in Tongan is an “auxiliary” verb that indicates “tense”, and since the forms in question are endings and not pronouns, they may not carry any case form or case relation. Although agreement-marking endings are written as independent words in the conventional orthography, the forms show morphological and syntactic features that suggest that they should be analysed as a part of the auxiliary word as shown in the following sections.25

2.6.3.5.2 Syntactic evidence

The situation described above is better described when the so-called “preverbal pronouns” are treated as agreement-marking endings and an auxiliary verb with its agreement-marking ending is considered to be syntactically a single unit. The “postverbal pronoun”, or the bare pronoun that follows the thematic verb is analysed as Nominative. By this analysis, a single set of pronouns is consistently assigned a single case form avoiding the kind of conflict we noted above. Example (2.87) is reanalysed in (2.88) below. There is also an advantage in that we do not have to have two verbal dependents that have the same case relation, which is not impossible in the theory, but not typical either.

25 There are some phonological phenomena that also support this claim. For example, according to Shumway (1971:6), in the combination of the tense marker na’a and the singular subject pronouns, “the accent falls as though the combination were one word”.

In the following section, I will propose an alternative analysis that accounts for the kind of sentences shown above.
(2.88) Tongan—Reanalysed sentence (2.87)

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Oku ou} & \text{alu} & \text{au} \\
?okuou & ?alu & au \\
present & \text{go} & \text{I} \\
1\text{ndex} & 2\text{ndex} & 3\text{ndex} \\
V & V & N \\
+x\text{lry} & -\text{trns} & \text{Nom} \\
3 & \text{actr} & \text{PAT} \\
1\text{Sg} & \text{actr} \\
\end{array}\]

'I myself am going.'

In the analysis proposed here, the [PAT] is always indicated by the Nominative NP, either the morphologically unmarked pronoun that follows the thematic verb, or a full NP preceded by the Nominative preposition 'a. Thus, examples (2.84) and (2.85) are reanalysed as follows.

(2.89) Tongan—Reanalysed sentence (2.84)

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Oku ou} & \text{alu} \\
?okuou & ?alu \\
present & \text{go} \\
1\text{ndex} & 2\text{ndex} \\
V & V \\
+x\text{lry} & -\text{trns} \\
m & \text{actr} \\
1\text{Sg} \\
\end{array}\]

'I am going.'

(2.90) Tongan—Reanalysed sentence (2.85)

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Oku ou} & \text{ui} & \text{koe} \\
?okuou & \text{ui} & \text{koe} \\
present & \text{call} & \text{you.Sg} \\
1\text{ndex} & 2\text{ndex} & 3\text{ndex} \\
V & V & N \\
+x\text{lry} & +\text{trns} & \text{Nom} \\
3 & \text{actr} & \text{PAT} \\
1\text{Sg} & \text{actr} \\
\end{array}\]

'I call you.'

In the intransitive sentence (2.89), there is no overt NP that indicates the actor of the sentence. However, we still know that the actor is first person singular from the agreement marker 'ou]. When the [actr] (or, the [PAT]) is made explicit, or emphasised, it is expressed with a Nominative pronoun as has already been shown in (2.88). Likewise, the transitive sentence (2.90) does not have any overt NP for the actor either. In this case, when the actor (or, the [AGT]) is expressed explicitly, or emphasised, a pronoun preceded by 'e—an ergative preposition—occurs as shown in (2.91). In this analysis, the [AGT] is indicated by, and only by, an NP preceded by the preposition 'e as in (2.91), regardless of whether the noun is a
pronoun, or a common noun. Compare (2.91) with sentence (2.92) where the [AGT] is third person singular and expressed with a non-pronominal NP.

(2.91) **Tongan—Reanalysed transitive sentence with full noun phrase (I)**

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\hline
& 'Oku ou & ui & koe & 'e & au. \\
\hline
\textbf{?okuou} & ui & koe & \textbf{'e} & au \\
\textbf{present} & call & you & \textbf{Erg} & I \\
\textbf{Index} & 2ndex & 3ndex & 4ndex & 5ndex \\
\textbf{V} & V & N & P & N \\
\textbf{+xlr} & +trns & PAT & \textbf{AGT} \\
\textbf{3} & actr & & & & \\
\textbf{1Sg} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

'I myself call you.'

(2.92) **Tongan—Reanalysed transitive sentence with full noun phrase (II)**

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\hline
& Na 'e & tā'i & koe & 'e & Sione. \\
\hline
\textbf{na'\textasciitilde{\textipa{e}}} & tā'i & koe & \textbf{'e} & sione \\
\textbf{past} & hit & you & \textbf{Nom} & \textbf{Erg} & S. \\
\textbf{Index} & 2ndex & 3ndex & 4ndex & 5ndex \\
\textbf{V} & V & N & P & N \\
\textbf{+xlr} & +trns & PAT & \textbf{AGT} \\
\textbf{3} & actr & & & & \\
\textbf{3Sg} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

'Sione hit you.'

This analysis also takes care of the situation given in example (2.86). Although the initial auxiliary verb appears to stand by itself without any agreement-marking ending, the actor is always third person singular in an actual sentence with the auxiliary verb of this form. This implies that the bare auxiliary verb is actually the form for third person singular agreement. Accordingly, sentence (2.86) is reanalysed in (2.93).

(2.93) **Tongan—Reanalysed intransitive sentence with full noun phrase**

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\hline
& Kuo 'alu & ia & ki & kolo. (=2.86) \\
\hline
\textbf{kuo} & ?alu & ia & ki & kolo \\
\textbf{perfect} & go & he & Lcv & village \\
\textbf{Index} & 2ndex & 3ndex & 4ndex & 5ndex \\
\textbf{V} & V & N & P & N \\
\textbf{+xlr} & -trns & PAT & LOC \\
\textbf{3} & actr & & & & \\
\textbf{3Sg} & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

'He has gone to town himself.'

As shown in the examples above, the Nominative NP always indicates the [PAT] in this analysis and the pronouns also show a pure ergative system in Tongan.
2.6.3.5.3 Morphological evidence

Morphological alternation regarding the combination of the auxiliary verb and the agreement-marking ending supports the claim that the so-called "preverbal pronouns" are in fact agreement-marking endings that are morphologically part of the sentence-initial verb. Morphological variation found in Tongan suggests that the auxiliary plus the agreement-marking ending is syntactically a single word rather than a sequence of two words. Table 2.15 is a paradigm that shows the alternation of the forms of the sequence of an auxiliary with an agreement-marking ending.

Table 2.15: Forms of the tense-marking auxiliary verbs in Tongan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>PERFECT</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>teu</td>
<td>'okuou</td>
<td>na'a'aku, na'a'u</td>
<td>kuou</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exDi</td>
<td>tema</td>
<td>'okuma</td>
<td>na'a'ama</td>
<td>kuoma</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl</td>
<td>temau</td>
<td>'okumau</td>
<td>na'a'amau</td>
<td>kuomau</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inDi</td>
<td>teta</td>
<td>'okuta</td>
<td>na'a'ata</td>
<td>kuota</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPl</td>
<td>tetau</td>
<td>'okutau</td>
<td>na'a'atau</td>
<td>kuotau</td>
<td>tau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>teke</td>
<td>'okuke</td>
<td>na'a'ake</td>
<td>kuoke</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Dl</td>
<td>temo</td>
<td>'okumo</td>
<td>na'a'amo</td>
<td>kuomo</td>
<td>mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pl</td>
<td>temou</td>
<td>'okumou</td>
<td>na'amou</td>
<td>kuomou</td>
<td>mou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>tene, 'e</td>
<td>'okune, 'oku</td>
<td>na'a'ane, na'e</td>
<td>kuone, kuo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Dl</td>
<td>tena</td>
<td>'okuna</td>
<td>na'a'ana</td>
<td>kuona</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl</td>
<td>tenau</td>
<td>'okunau</td>
<td>na'anau</td>
<td>kuonau</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, as seen in Table 2.15 above, it appears possible to identify unambiguously most of the endings that alternate according to the agreement features of the verb. However, this is not always true. For example, an auxiliary verb that carries a first person singular agreement feature alternates between teu, na'a'uku or na'a'u, 'okuou and kuou; likewise, those with a third person singular agreement feature alternate between tena, 'e, 'okune, 'oku, na'a'ene, na'e, kuone, kuo. This implies that the auxiliary verbs carrying agreement features are better analysed as single units, rather than as two separate words. Examples of auxiliary verbs that imply a first person singular [actr] are given in (2.94).
(2.94) Tongan—Sentences with auxiliary verbs implying 1Sg [actr]

a. \(Te u \ 'alu.\)
   \(\text{teu} \ \ ?alu\)
   future go
   1Index 2Index
   V V
   +xlrY -trns
   m[ actr ] 1Sg
   ‘I’ll go.’

b. \(Na'a ku \ manatu'i \ ia.\)
   \(\text{na?aku} \ \ manatu?i \ \ ia\)
   past remember he
   1Index 2Index 3Index
   V V N
   +xlrY +trns Nom
   m[ actr ] 1Sg
   ‘I remembered him.’

c. \(Oku ou \ manatu'i \ 'a \ e \ sianá.\)
   \(\text{?okuou} \ \ manatu?i \ \ ?a \ e \ sianá\)
   present remember Nom non.specific man
   1Index 2Index 3Index 4Index 5Index
   V V P Det N
   +xlrY +trns PAT
   m[ actr ] 1Sg
   ‘I remembered him.’

d. \(Kuou \ 'osi \ makona \ au.\)
   \(\text{kuou} \ \ ?osi \ akona \ au\)
   perfect already full I
   1Index 2Index 3Index 4Index
   V V P N
   +xlrY -trns Nom
   4 [ actr ] 1Sg actr
   ‘I am already full.’

Another way to look at the irregular forms in Table 2.15 is to compare past-tense forms. There are two forms, namely \(na'e\) and \(na'u\), that do not have the sequence \(/na'a/\) that occurs as part of all other past-tense forms. Examples (2.95) and (2.96) show a past-tense form that does not have this sequence, and a past-tense form that does. The form \(na'e\) may alternate
with *na 'a ne* (na?ane) when the actor dependent of the verb is third person singular, and *na 'u* may alternate with *na 'a ku* (na?aku) when the actor dependent of the verb is the first person singular.

(2.95) Tongan—Sentence with past tense auxiliary verb with sequence *na 'a*

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
Na 'a & ke & kai & 'a & e & ika & ?ane 'e?\\
na 'ake & kai & ?a & e & ika & ?ane fo
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{V} & V & \text{P} & \text{Det} & \text{N} & \text{Adv}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{m} & \text{actr} & \text{PAT} & \text{2Sg}
\end{array}
\]

'When did you eat the fish?'

(2.96) Tongan—Sentence with past tense auxiliary verb without sequence *na 'a*

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
Na 'u & 'eke & atu & 'a & Tonga & kia & koe.\\
na 'u & ?eke & atu & ?a & tonga & kia & koe
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{V} & \text{Adv} & \text{Det} & \text{PAT} & \text{LOC}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{m} & \text{actr} & \text{1Sg}
\end{array}
\]

'I was asking you about Tonga.'

The alternation between *na 'e* and *na 'a ne* (na?ane) is conditioned in some way that requires further analysis.\(^\text{26}\) As for the auxiliary verbs with third person singular agreement, it seems that *na 'e* is used when the actor is indicated explicitly with a full Nominative NP, either a common NP or a pronoun, as in sentences (2.97), (2.98), and (2.100), while the explicit agreement marker *..ne* has to occur when there is no NP that indicates a specific actor as in (2.99) and (2.101). This gives an impression that the third person singular agreement ending *..ne* and a Nominative NP (*ia* in example (2.98) and *e ngaue* in (2.100)) alternate with each other. However, it should be noted that it is clear that *na 'e* implies a third person singular actor and alternates with *na 'a ne* (na?ane). The form *na 'e* occurs only when the actor dependent is third person singular and there is no other auxiliary verb that implies some other person and number.

\(^{26}\) Shumway (1971:184-185) claims that, with intransitive verbs, the tense marker "often stands alone, the pronoun *ne* being understood", while in transitive constructions, "the tense marker is always accompanied by the pronoun". However, this claim does not appropriately describe the situation observed in sentences such as (2.99) and (2.100).
(2.97) **Tongan—Sentence with form *na‘e* with non-pronominal full Nominative NP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Na‘e</th>
<th>mohe</th>
<th>‘a</th>
<th>Tolu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na?e</td>
<td>mohe</td>
<td>?a</td>
<td>tolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Indx</td>
<td>2Indx</td>
<td>3Indx</td>
<td>4Indx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+xlry -trns

\[ \text{m}\left[ \text{actr} \right] \text{[3Sg]} \]

‘Tolu slept.’

cf. *Na‘a ne mohe ‘a Tolu.*

(2.98) **Tongan—Sentence with form *na‘e* with pronominal full Nominative NP (Moyse-Faurie 1997:8, my analysis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Na‘e</th>
<th>puke</th>
<th>ia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na?e</td>
<td>puke</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>sick</td>
<td>s/he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Indx</td>
<td>2Indx</td>
<td>3Indx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+xlry -trns

\[ \text{m}\left[ \text{actr} \right] \text{[3Sg]} \]

‘She was sick.’

(2.99) **Tongan—Sentence with form *na‘ane* without cooccurring full NP (Moyse-Faurie 1997:8, my analysis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Na‘ane</th>
<th>puke.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na?ane</td>
<td>puke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Indx</td>
<td>2Indx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+xlry -trns

\[ \text{m}\left[ \text{actr} \right] \text{[3Sg]} \]

‘She was sick.’
(2.100) Tongan—Sentence with form na 'e with co-occurring Ergative NP (Shumway 1971:185; my analysis)

Na 'e fai 'e Pita e ngāuē?
na?e fai ?e pita e ŋauē

past do Erg P. non-specific work
1index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex
V V P N Det N
+xlry +trns
m [actr ] 3Sg

‘Did Peter do that work?’

(2.101) Tongan—Transitive sentence with form na 'ane as response to (2.100) (Shumway 1971:185; my analysis)

‘Io, na 'a ne fai e ngāuē.

?io na?ane fai e ŋauē

yes past do non-specific work
1index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V V Det N
+xlry +trns
m [actr ] 3Sg

‘Yes, he did the work.’

The condition for the alternation between na 'u and na 'a ku (na?aku) is not clear yet either. I will just show a sentence with na 'a ku (na?aku) in (2.102).

(2.102) Tongan—Sentence with form na 'aku

Na 'a ku inu kava mo Tolu 'anepō.
na?aku inukava mo tolu ?anepō

past drink.kava with T. last.night
1index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
V V P N Adv
+xlry -trns COR
m [actr ] 1Sg

‘Tolu and I drank kava last night. (Lit., Tolu and I did kava-drinking last night.)’

Imperative/request forms work in the same way. Examples are given in (2.103).

27 According to Shumway (1971:140), the preposition 'a, which marks Nominative case, appears consistently in written Tongan, but has virtually disappeared from the spoken language.
Theoretical framework and sample descriptions

(2.103) Tongan—Sentences with imperative auxiliary verbs (Shumway 1971:155; my analysis)

a. \( \text{Tau} \quad \tilde{o} \quad \text{mo} \quad \text{Tevita?} \)
   tau \quad \tilde{o} \quad \text{mo} \quad \text{tevita} 
   imperative \quad \text{go} \quad \text{with} \quad T. 
   1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} 
   V \quad V \quad P \quad N 
   \text{+xlry} \quad \text{−trns} 
   \text{m} \quad \text{[actr]} \quad \text{1\text{inPl}} 
   
   'Shall we (all together) go with David?'

b. \( \text{Mou} \quad \text{kumi} \quad \text{′a} \quad \text{Kepu!} \)
   mou \quad \text{kumi} \quad \text{ʔa} \quad \text{kepu} 
   imperative \quad \text{look for} \quad \text{Nom} \quad K. 
   1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} 
   V \quad V \quad P \quad N 
   \text{+xlry} \quad \text{+trns} 
   \text{m} \quad \text{[actr]} \quad \text{2\text{Pl}} 
   
   'Look for Kepu!'

2.6.3.5.4 Negative constructions

One might claim that it is not appropriate to state that the agreement marker merges with the sentence-initial auxiliary verb because, in a negative construction, the so-called "negative marker" 'ikai te, or \( \text{ikai ke} \) appears between the agreement marker and the auxiliary verb (cf. Moyse-Faurie 1997:7). For example, in sentence (2.104), \( \text{ikai te} \) appears to intervene between the auxiliary verb \( \text{oku} \) and the agreement-marking ending \( \text{..ne} \).

(2.104) Tongan—Negative verb intervening between an auxiliary verb and its ending
(Shumway 1971:198; my analysis)

\( \text{′oku} \quad \text{ikai te} \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{fiema}′u \text{ au.} \)
\( \text{ʔoku} \quad \text{ʔikai te} \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{fiemaʔu au} \)
present not 3\text{Sg}? want I 
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \quad 5\text{ndex} 
V \quad V \quad ? \quad N 
\text{+xlry} \quad \text{−trns} 
\text{m} \quad \text{[actr]} \quad \text{3\text{Sg}} 

'He does not want me.'

However, it has already been pointed out in §2.6.3.2 that \( \text{oku} \) by itself is an auxiliary verb that agrees with the third person singular [actr]. Besides, \( \text{naʾe} \) is the only form that may occur preceding \( \text{ikai} \) when the sentence is in past tense. These facts, along with the fact that no
other agreement marker may be suffixed to the auxiliary verb that precedes ‘ikai, imply that
the initial auxiliary verb agrees with the third person singular, and ‘ikai is the thematic verb.
This is supported by the fact that ‘ikai requires either a sentential or a nominal complement.
Sentence (2.104) is re-analysed in (2.105) taking the above discussion into consideration. The
literal meaning of the sentence is, therefore, ‘It is not that he want(s) me’. Sentence (2.106) is
an example with a different agreement marker. Its literal meaning is, ‘It was not that I
want(ed) to go’. Sentence (2.107a) is an example with a nominal complement, while sentence
(2.107b) is an example in which the sentential complement is an equational sentence.

(2.105) Tongan—Reanalysed sentence (2.104)

'Oku 'ikai te ne fiema 'u au.

'He does not want me.'

(2.106) Tongan—Sentence with verb ‘ikai followed by auxiliary implying 1Sg [actr]

Na e 'ikai te u fie 'alu.

'I did not want to go.'

(2.107) Tongan—Sentence with verb ‘ikai without a following auxiliary verb (Shumway 1971:518; my analysis)
a. 'Oku 'ikai si 'aku.

'I have nothing. (Lit., There is not mine.)'
b. ‘Oku ‘ikai ko e faiako au.

?oku ?ikai ko e faiako au

present not predicate Nom teacher Nom
Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex
V V P Det N N
+xirly -trns prdc PAT

m[ actr ]

‘I am not a teacher.’

Here I would like to point out that the form that follows the verb ‘ikai is not part of the negative verb, as has often been analysed as shown in (2.104). Rather, I treat it here as a separate auxiliary verb that is obligatorily required by the negative verb ‘ikai. It is identical with what has usually been referred to as the “future” auxiliary verb, as in Table 2.15. Seeing that this form occurs both in future tense and negation, I would like to suggest that it should be called “irrealis” to cover both. The form tene alternates with ke and not ‘e, when it occurs in this environment as in (2.108). Table 2.16 is a revised version of the full forms of Tongan tense verbs.

(2.108) Tongan—Sentence with form ke alternating with tene

Na’e ‘ikai ke fie ‘alu ‘a Pita.

na?e ?ikai ke fie ?alu ?a pita past not want go Nom P.
Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex
V V V V V P N
+xirly -trns +xirly +xtrn -trns PAT

m[ actr ] m[ actr ]

‘Pita didn’t want to go.’

Table 2.16: Forms of the tense-marking auxiliary verbs in Tongan (revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Irrealis</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Imperative/request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>teu</td>
<td>‘okuou</td>
<td>na’a’aku, na’u</td>
<td>kuou</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exDl</td>
<td>tema</td>
<td>‘okuma</td>
<td>na’ama</td>
<td>kuoma</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl</td>
<td>temau</td>
<td>‘okumau</td>
<td>na’amau</td>
<td>kuomau</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inDl</td>
<td>teta</td>
<td>‘okuta</td>
<td>na’ata</td>
<td>kuota</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPl</td>
<td>tetau</td>
<td>‘okutau</td>
<td>na’atau</td>
<td>kuotau</td>
<td>tau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>teke</td>
<td>‘okuke</td>
<td>na’a’ake</td>
<td>kuoke</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Dl</td>
<td>temo</td>
<td>‘okumo</td>
<td>na’amou</td>
<td>kuomou</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Dl</td>
<td>temou</td>
<td>‘okumou</td>
<td>na’amou</td>
<td>kuomou</td>
<td>mou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>tene, ‘e, ke</td>
<td>‘okune, ‘oku</td>
<td>na’a’ne, na’e</td>
<td>kuone, kuo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DI</td>
<td>tena</td>
<td>‘okuna</td>
<td>na’anu</td>
<td>kuona</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl</td>
<td>tenau</td>
<td>‘okunau</td>
<td>na’anau</td>
<td>kuonau</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3  Actancy systems in the Central Pacific languages

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the various actancy systems and casemarking strategies observed in the Central Pacific languages.

Rotuman and Fijian both have clear accusative systems but with different casemarking strategies. The Rotuman system is relatively simple. It is the word order that nominatively and accusatively marks nouns, and these nouns are not morphologically casemarked. The Rotuman system is described in §3.2. On the other hand, a variety of casemarking strategies is found in the Fijian languages. In some languages, nouns are never casemarked either morphologically or by their position. The “doer” and the “recipient of the action” are understood through the agreement on the verb, or other non-formal aspects, such as the meaning of the verb, and/or the context. In other Fijian languages, whether a noun is casemarked or not depends on the nature of the noun, namely on whether a noun is pronominal or non-pronominal, and when non-pronominal, whether it is proper or non-proper. The different casemarking strategies observed in the Fijian languages are described in §3.3.

Unlike the situation with Rotuman and Fijian, which have always been analysed as accusative, the judgement as to whether a Polynesian language is ergative or accusative is controversial. Two factors that are responsible for the disagreement in the discussion of actancy systems of Polynesian languages will be pointed out in §3.4, followed by a description of the actancy system of Tongan and some other Polynesian languages.

3.2 The Rotuman actancy system: accusative marking by word order

Rotuman transitive and intransitive sentence structures are shown in (3.1) followed by example sentences (3.2) and (3.3). A verb is usually preceded by a noun phrase, which is marked as Nominative by its position. The forms *ia* ‘he’ in (3.2) and *iris* ‘they’ in (3.3) both precede the verb and are Nominative. A transitive verb is followed by another noun phrase, namely Accusative noun phrase, as in example (3.2). The form *iris* in (3.2) is marked as Accusative by its position. As can be seen in the form *iris* occurring as Nominative in (3.2) and as Accusative in (3.3), pronouns are not morphologically casemarked.
(3.1) **Rotuman—Simple sentence structures**

**Transitive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V)</td>
<td>(+xlry) +trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intransitive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V)</td>
<td>(+xlry) -trns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3.2) **Rotuman—Transitive sentence with pronominal complement noun phrases**

**Ia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>al‘āk</th>
<th>iris.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>alʔek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>kill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**N**

| V       | N     |

| Nom     | +trns |

| AGT     | PAT   |

| actr    |       |

| 1       | PAT   |

| 3       | PAT   |

‘He killed them.’ (Churchward 1940:121, my analysis)

(3.3) **Rotuman—Intransitive sentence with pronominal complement noun phrase**

**Iris**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ã</th>
<th>ã</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iris</td>
<td>ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Index   | 2ndex |

| N       | V     |

| Nom     | -trns |

| PAT     |       |

| actr    |       |

| 1       | PAT   |

| actr    |       |

‘They ate.’ ‘They are eaten.’ (Churchward 1940:123, my analysis)

An intransitive verb may take a complement prepositional phrase, which indicates the semantic undergoer of an event. The structure of such a sentence is given in (3.4) followed by sentence examples (3.5) and (3.6).

1 Semantically, a Rotuman intransitive verb may express either active or passive voice:

Many, perhaps most, trans[itive] verbs may be used either in an active or in a passive sense (without any change of form). E.g., both *iris hoa* and *iris hoa kia* may mean either ‘they took’ or ‘they were taken’ according to the context. (Churchward 1940:22, italics are mine)

This is considered to reflect a syntactic change that took place in Proto Rotuman–Fijian. See §5.4 for discussion.

2 An intransitive sentence with a Locative complement noun phrase often has a corresponding transitive sentence. Compare example (3.5) with the following: *Gou fesi’en iris.* ‘I hate them.’ (Churchward 1940:22).
(3.4) **Rotuman—intransitive sentence structure with a complement noun phrase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>(V)</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>(Adv)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>(V)×lry</td>
<td>–trns</td>
<td>Dtv</td>
<td>COR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3.5) **Rotuman—intransitive sentence with complement se phrase**

Gou *fesia* se *irisa.*

Gou *fesia? se irisa*

I hate to they

1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex

N V P N

Nom –trns Dtv COR

PAT 1 [PAT] actr 4 [COR]

‘I hate them. (Lit., I feel-hatred to them.)’ (Churchward 1940:22, my analysis)

(3.6) **Rotuman—intransitive sentence with complement ‘e phrase**

Gou *fe'a e irisa.*

Gou *fe'a ʔe irisa*

I afraid with they

1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex

N V P N

Nom –trns nstr COR

PAT 1 [PAT] actr 4 [COR]

‘I am afraid of them.’ (Churchward 1940:34, my analysis)

As has been shown in §2.6.1.2, this casemarking system applies to non-pronominal nouns, both proper and non-proper. Regardless of the nature of the noun, a noun is marked Nominative when it occurs preceding the verb, while it is marked Accusative when it follows the verb. Additional examples are given from (3.7) to (3.9) below.

---

Footnote:

3 The difference of the form of the pronoun for ‘they’ in examples (3.5) and (3.6) from those in examples (3.2) and (3.3) is due to the presence or absence of a preceding preposition. See Tables 2.2 and 2.3.
(3.7) Rotuman—Sentences with proper complement noun phrases

a. Noa'tau fakrava-an Oinafa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>1[AGT]</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>[actr]</td>
<td>3[PAT]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noa'tau defeat Oinafa

'Noa'tau defeated Oinafa.' (Schmidt in press:12, my analysis)

b. Joe a'mou noh 'e Suva.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
<th>4ndex</th>
<th>5ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>1[PAT]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>[actr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joe usually live in Suva

'Joe used to live in Suva.' (Vamarasi 1999:78)

(3.8) Rotuman—Sentences with non-proper [PAT] noun phrase

a. Terqnit ne iris fa'i e puku.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
<th>4ndex</th>
<th>5ndex</th>
<th>6ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>3[AGT]</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>[actr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The.day that they wrote then the.letters

'the day on which they wrote the letters' (Churchward 1940:123, my analysis)

b. Tan ta sun-'ia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>2ndex</th>
<th>3ndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>-trns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>1[PAT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td>[actr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

water definite hot.emphatic

'The water is hot.' (Schmidt in press:13)
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Note that an Accusative noun phrase should be distinguished from the form that is a part of the verb, that is the so-called “incorporated noun”. Compare the position of the Adverb e in (3.8a), where the form puku is an independent noun and is casemarked as Accusative, with that in (3.9) where the form puku is a part of the verb indicating ‘letter-writing’.

(3.9) Rotuman—Transitive sentence and the corresponding intransitive sentence with “incorporated noun”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teranit</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>iris</th>
<th>fa'i puku</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the day</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>do.letter.writing</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>2ndex</td>
<td>3ndex</td>
<td>4ndex</td>
<td>6ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>-tms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>3(PAT)</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘the day on which they did letter-writing’ (Churchward 1940:123, my analysis)

3.3 Fijian accusative systems

The casemarking strategies observed in Fijian vary. In this section, first, some commonly shared syntactic features in Fijian languages that are relevant to the discussion are described in 3.3.1. These include verb agreement systems, and the forms na and ko that precede nouns. The Nadrau and Tubai systems, which do not have formal casemarking on noun phrases, are described in 3.3.2. Standard Fijian and some of the other Fijian languages that show casemarking on some proper noun phrases are described in 3.3.3.

3.3.1 Relevant syntactic characteristics in Fijian

3.3.1.1 Verb agreement systems in Fijian

All Fijian languages have [actr] (or “subject”) agreement on the sentence-initial verb, and most Fijian languages in addition have [PAT] (or “object”) agreement marking on the transitive verb.

The [actr] agreement forms occur on the sentence-initial verb (regardless of whether it is an auxiliary or not) and indicate the person and number of the [actr] (or “subject”) of the sentence. These forms are often analysed as a kind of pronoun, and have been referred to with various terms (see §2.6.2.2). In (3.10) and (3.11), each [actr] agreement-marking form and its corresponding noun phrase are indicated with underlines.
(3.10) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with 3DI [actr] agreement marking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erau na</th>
<th>lakovi iratou</th>
<th>tiko</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>gasenivuli</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>luvegu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erauna</td>
<td>lakōbiriiratou</td>
<td>tiko</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>gase ni buli</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>lu bēbēgu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

future.3D1 go    progressive -prpr teacher -prpr my.child
1ndex    2ndex    3ndex    4ndex    5ndex    6ndex    7ndex
V          V          Adv          Det          N          Det          N
+xlyr +trns
7[actr] 5[3DI PAT] 3Pc

'My (two) children will be seeing the teachers.'

(3.11) **Standard Fijian—Intransitive sentence with 3DI [actr] agreement marking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erau na</th>
<th>lako</th>
<th>tale</th>
<th>mai</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>luvegu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erauna</td>
<td>lako</td>
<td>tale</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>lu bēbēgu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

future.3D1 go    again hither -prpr my.child
1ndex    2ndex    3ndex    4ndex    5ndex    6ndex
V          V          Adv          Adv          Det          N
+xlyr +trns
6[actr] 3DI

'My (two) children will come again.'

The actual forms of the [actr] agreement markers differ depending on the language, and the number distinction varies from a dual opposition (singular and plural) up to four distinctions (singular, dual, paucal, and plural).

In most Fijian languages, [actr] agreement marking is observed only on one verb, either auxiliary or non-auxiliary. However, Geraghty (1977) describes a situation in Waidina where a sequence of forms occurs, each of which indicates the person (but not number) of the [actr]. An example sentence is cited in (3.12). Tables 3.1 and 3.2 shows the forms of some auxiliary verbs in Waidina that alternate depending on the person and number of the [actr].

(3.12) **Waidina—Sentence example (terms for person and number adjusted to the ones used in this paper)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(u) su</th>
<th>gu</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>bau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u su</td>
<td>bēgu</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>bēbau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ex perfective.1ex consecutive.1ex Pc go

'then we (exclusive paucal) went' (Geraghty 1977:11)

---

4 For details of the variety found in Fijian languages, see Geraghty (1983), especially pp.205-210.
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Table 3.1: Some Waidina auxiliary forms (Geraghty 1977:10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person marker</th>
<th>'if'</th>
<th>'so that'</th>
<th>'perfective'</th>
<th>'consecutive'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ex</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Waidina number markers (Geraghty 1977:11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>Dl</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ex</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>daru</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>drau</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>rau</td>
<td>rato</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some Fijian languages, including Standard Fijian and Lau (Geraghty 1977), an independent pronoun may occur preceding verbs, the frequency and the flexibility differing depending on the language.

Transitive verbs are marked for [PAT] agreement, indicating the person and number of the [PAT] of the sentence. Example (3.13) is the same as (3.10), but the [PAT] agreement marking form and the corresponding noun phrase are indicated with underlines.

(3.13) Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with 3Pc [PAT] agreement marking

Erau na lakovi iratou tiko na qasenivuli na luvequ.

erauna lakobiiritou tiko na gasenibu na luvebu
future.3Dl go progressive -prpr teacher -prpr my.child
1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex
V V Adv Det N Det N
+xlyr +tmns PAT AGT
7 [actr] 5 [PAT 3Pc] actr

'My (two) children will be seeing the teachers.'

Again, the forms that indicate agreement marking vary depending on the language. For example, in Standard Fijian, the [PAT]-marking forms are identical to the (independent) pronouns and have been traditionally analysed as pronouns occurring in the object position. Some languages have basically the same system as Standard Fijian but with differences between the forms that occur in this position and independent pronoun forms. Some languages have two different forms occurring in this position for certain persons and numbers. The number distinctions also differ depending on the language.

---

5 For “object” pronoun analyses, see “object” in Schütz (1985:250) and “postverbal (Object-Marking) pronouns” in Geraghty (1983), for example.

3.3.1.2 The occurrence of the forms na and ko

There are two forms that occur preceding certain nouns. One is the form na and the other is represented by ko.

The form na occurs throughout the languages in Fiji, preceding non-pronominal, non-proper complement nouns, which are often referred to as “common nouns”. This form is analysed as a determiner. The form ko and its free variants ko-xo-o occur preceding proper nouns. In Standard Fijian, these forms also occur preceding pronouns, and are analysed as prepositions. In most of the other languages, they occur before some pronouns, but not all. In these languages, the ko-like forms occurring before pronouns are analysed as a part of the pronouns, while the form ko that occurs before a proper noun is analysed as a determiner.

3.3.2 No casemarking on noun phrases: Nadrau and some Western Fijian languages

In Nadrau, the complement noun phrases are not casemarked either morphologically or by position. This system is described in 3.3.2.1. According to Geraghty (1983:230), this is also true with the Western Fijian languages except for those spoken in Nakoroboya and Waya. Among these, Tubai seems to differ from the rest in that it does not have any [PAT] agreement marking on the verb. A preliminary characterisation of the Tubai system is illustrated in 3.3.2.2.

3.3.2.1 The Nadrau system

The Nadrau transitive and intransitive sentence structures are schematically shown in (3.14). There is no marking on complement nouns, and therefore a noun phrase in a transitive sentence could be interpreted either as [AGT] or as [PAT], thus making the sentence syntactically ambiguous. This is shown with specific sentences in (3.15) and (3.16). The form gone ‘child’ is interpreted as the [PAT] in (3.15a), while the same form (in an identical sentence) is interpreted as the [AGT] in (3.15b). Likewise, the form gone ‘child’ is interpreted differently in (3.16).

(3.14) Nadrau—Simple sentence structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive (V)</th>
<th>V (Adv)</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+xlry) +trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AGT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive (V)</th>
<th>V (Adv)</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Nom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+xlry) −trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actor agreement on the sentence initial verb.
*[PAT] agreement on transitive verbs.
(3.15) Nadrau—Transitive sentences with two complement noun phrases

a. *Ratou zive qaca na gone na qasenivuli.*

ratou "diße ⁴gaśa na ṇone na ⁷gasenibuli

see.3Pc.3Gn finish -prpr child -prpr teacher

1nex 2nex 3nex 4nex 5nex 6nex

V Adv Det N Det N

+trns PAT AGT

3Pc actr

4 PAT 3Gn

‘The (few) teachers have already seen the child.’

b. *Ratou zive qaca na gone.*

ratou "diße ⁴gaśa na ṇone na ⁷gasenibuli

see.3Pc.3Gn finish -prpr child -prpr teacher

1nex 2nex 3nex 4nex 5nex 6nex

V Adv Det N Det N

+trns PAT AGT

3Pc actr

4 PAT 3Gn

‘The (few) children have already seen the teacher.’

(3.16) Nadrau—Transitive sentences with one overtly expressed complement noun phrase

a. *Ratou zive qaca na gone.*

ratou "diße ⁴gaśa na ṇone

see.3Pc.3Gn finish -prpr child

1nex 2nex 3nex 4nex

V Adv Det N

+trns PAT

3Pc actr

4 PAT 3Gn

‘They (few) have already seen the child.’
b. Ratou zive qaca na gone.
  ratou'diβe ŋgaða na ηone
  see.3Pc.3Gn finish -prpr child
  1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex
  V Adv Det N
  +trns ACTR
  4 [actr
  3Pc]
  3Gn]
  'The (few) children have already seen it.'

Proper noun [AGT]s and [PAT]s are expressed in the same way, except that they are preceded
by the form o instead of na as Jone ' (personal name) ' as in example (3.17).

(3.17) Nadrau—Transitive sentences with a proper complement noun
a. Sā zive qaca o Jone.
  sā 'diβe ŋgaða o tJone
  3Sg.aspect see.3Gn finish +prpr Jone
  1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
  V V Adv Det N
  +xlry +trns PAT
  5 [actr 3Gn]
  'He has already seen Jone.'

b. Sā zive qaca o Jone.
  sā 'diβe ŋgaða o tJone
  3Sg.aspect see.3Gn finish +prpr Jone
  1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex
  V V Adv Det N
  +xlry +trns ACTR
  5 [actr 3Gn]
  'Jone has already seen (it).'
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(3.18) Nadrau—Transitive sentence with pronominal complement noun phrase

\[ Au \quad sâ \quad zivi \quad xexo \quad qaca \quad oyau. \]
\[ ausâ \quad "dë\text{bixexo} \quad "gâ\text{d}a \quad oyau \]
\[ 1\text{Sg.real} \quad \text{see.2Sg} \quad \text{finish} \quad I \]
\[ 1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \]
\[ V \quad V \quad \text{Adv} \quad \text{N} \]
\[ +\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT} \quad \text{AGT} \]
\[ 4\text{[actr]} \quad m\text{[PAT]} \quad \text{actr} \]
\[ 1\text{Sg} \quad 2\text{Sg} \]

‘I, myself, have already seen you.’

3.3.2.2 Possible variation with no [PAT] agreement: the Tubai system

The information given about Tubai by Geraghty (1983:211) suggests that this language has a simplified version of the system described in §3.3.2.1.\(^7\) It appears that the language has a system where i) the noun phrases are not casemarked, either morphologically or by the position, as in the Nadrau system described above. In addition, ii) the transitive verbs end with ..aJ, instead of alternating the ending according to the person and number of the [PAT]. This means there is no [PAT] agreement on the verb. Sentence examples given in Geraghty (1983) are cited here in (3.19). Compare especially the position of kokō ‘you’ in (3.19a) with that of ..xexo ‘2Sg’ in (3.18).

(3.19) Tubai—Transitive sentence with a pronominal [PAT]

a. Qu \[ raiia \quad o \quad kokō. \]
\[ g\text{uraia} \quad o \quad kokō \]
\[ 1\text{Sg.see} \quad +\text{prpr} \quad 2\text{Sg} \]
\[ 1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \]
\[ V \quad P \quad \text{N} \]
\[ +\text{trns} \quad \text{PAT} \]
\[ m\text{[actr]} \quad 1\text{Sg} \]
\[ 3\text{[PAT]} \]

‘I saw you.’ (Geraghty 1983:211, my analysis)

\(^7\) “...incorporation of pronoun objects is not required in Tubai. Like other proper objects, it [a proper noun object] remains marked by a preceding o outside the verb phrase”. Geraghty (1983:212) also claims, however, that Tubai, along with Batiwai and Magodro, “incorporate[s] independent forms for the first and second person non-singular” where the “incorporated” form is a sequence of the form ko and the corresponding full pronoun.
Details of the other aspects of Tubai are not known. Possible Tubai sentence structures are shown in (3.20).

(3.20) **Tubai—Simple sentence structures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(V) V (Adv)</td>
<td>(V) V (Adv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+x lyr) +tms</td>
<td>(+x lyr) -tms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP PAT AGT actr</td>
<td>NP Nom PAT actr</td>
<td>* Actor agreement on the sentence initial verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* No [PAT] agreement on transitive verbs. A transitive verb usually ends with ..a].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3 Different casemarking depending on the nature of the noun

Some Fijian languages have a system in which the casemarking strategy differs depending on the nature of the [PAT] noun, viz. whether it is pronominal or non-pronominal, and when it is non-pronominal, whether it is proper or non-proper. According to Geraghty (1983:229-230), this is observed in Standard Fijian, Boumaa Fijian and all other Eastern Fijian languages except for Nadrau. Some Western Fijian languages, such as Wayan and Nakoroboya, also share this system. The Standard Fijian system, which has been described in §2.6.2, is restated below comparing it with the systems observed in other Fijian languages.

#### 3.3.3.1 No casemarking on common nouns; position marking on proper nouns: Standard Fijian and some other Eastern Fijian languages

The simple sentence structures of Standard Fijian are shown in (3.21). There are two transitive structures, as the position of the [PAT] differs depending on whether the [PAT] noun phrase is proper or non-proper.8

8 “Proper” nouns in Fijian languages in general include placenames and titles, as well as personal names in Standard Fijian, as described in §2.6.2.
(3.21) **Standard Fijian—Simple sentence structures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Actor Agreement</th>
<th>[PAT] Agreement on Transitive Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>(V) V (Adv) NP NP</td>
<td>PAT AGT</td>
<td>[PAT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with non-proper [PAT])</td>
<td>(+xlrty) +trns</td>
<td>-prpr actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>(V) V =NP (Adv) NP</td>
<td>Nom PAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with proper [PAT])</td>
<td>(+xlrty) +trns Acc</td>
<td>PAT AGT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+prpr Actr</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>(V) V (Adv) NP</td>
<td>Nom PAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+xlrty) -trns</td>
<td>PAT actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actor agreement on the sentence initial verb.
* [PAT] agreement on transitive verbs.

Non-proper nouns are not casemarked either morphologically or by position, in the same manner as noun phrases in Nadrau, and thus allows two interpretations as shown in (3.22). Sentences (3.22a-b) correspond to the Nadrau sentences given in (3.15a-b).

(3.22) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentences with non-proper complement nouns**

a. *Erau na raici iratou oti na gonevuli na qasenivuli.*
future.3D! see.3Pc progressive -prpr student -prpr teacher
1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex
V V Adv Det N Det N
+xlrty +trns PAT AGT
7 [actr 3DI] 5 [PAT 3Pc] actr

'The two teachers will see the (group of) students.'

b. *Erau na raici iratou oti na gonevuli na qasenivuli.*
future.3D! see.3Pc progressive -prpr student -prpr teacher
1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex
V V Adv Det N Det N
+xlrty +trns AGT PAT
5 [actr 3DI] 7 [PAT 3Pc] actr

'The two students will see the (group of) teachers.'

An intransitive sentence with a non-proper noun phrase is given in (3.23).
Actancy systems in the Central Pacific languages

(3.23) Standard Fijian—Intransitive sentence

a. \( E \) na \( lako \) na \( gonevu\).  
   \( \text{future.3Sg} \text{ go} \) -\text{prpr} \text{ student}  
   \( 1\text{ndex} \ 2\text{ndex} \ 3\text{ndex} \ 4\text{ndex} \ 5\text{ndex} \ 6\text{ndex} \) \( V \ V \ \text{Det} \ N \) \( +\text{xnlry} \ -\text{trns} \ \text{PAT} \) \( 5 \ \text{actr} \ 3\text{Dl} \)  

‘The student will go.’

Unlike non-proper nouns, proper nouns are clearly casemarked by position and the presence or absence of a preceding form \( ko \). An accusative proper noun is cliticised to the verb without being preceded by the form \( ko \) and behaves as though it were a part of the verb; that is, no element can intervene between the verb and the noun. Adverbs occur following the noun. This is shown with the form \( Vasita \) in example (3.24a). A Nominative proper noun occurs following the Adverb, preceded by the form \( ko \), as \( Rupeni \) in (3.24b). Because of the casemarking on proper nouns, there is no syntactic ambiguity when the complement nouns, or one of the complement nouns in a transitive sentence is proper as can be seen in (3.24a) and (3.24b). Intransitive sentences with complement proper nouns are given in (3.25).

(3.24) Standard Fijian—Transitive sentences with proper complement nouns

a. \( E \) na \( raici \) \( Vasita \) oti o \( Rupeni \).  
   \( \text{future.3Sg} \text{ see} \) \( Vasita \) \( \text{finish} \) +\text{prpr} \( Rupeni \)  
   \( 1\text{ndex} \ 2\text{ndex} \ 3\text{ndex} \ 4\text{ndex} \ 5\text{ndex} \ 6\text{ndex} \) \( V \ V \ \text{N} \ \text{Adv} \ \text{Det} \ N \) \( +\text{xnlry} \ +\text{trns} \ \text{Acc} \) \( \text{Nom} \) \( 6 \ \text{actr} \ 3\text{Sg} \ \text{PAT} \) \( \text{PAT} \) \( \text{AGT} \) \( \text{actr} \)  

‘Rupeni will have seen Vasita.’

b. \( E \) na \( raici \) \( Rupeni \) oti o \( Vasita \).  
   \( \text{future.3Sg} \text{ see} \) \( Rupeni \) \( \text{finish} \) +\text{prpr} \( Vasita \)  
   \( 1\text{ndex} \ 2\text{ndex} \ 3\text{ndex} \ 4\text{ndex} \ 5\text{ndex} \ 6\text{ndex} \) \( V \ V \ \text{N} \ \text{Adv} \ \text{Det} \ N \) \( +\text{xnlry} \ +\text{trns} \ \text{Acc} \) \( \text{Nom} \) \( 6 \ \text{actr} \ 3\text{Sg} \ \text{PAT} \) \( \text{PAT} \) \( \text{AGT} \) \( \text{actr} \)  

‘Vasita will have seen Rupeni.’
(3.25) Standard Fijian—Intransitive sentences with proper complement nouns

a.  
\[ E na \quad lako \quad o \quad Mere. \]
\[
\text{ena} \quad \text{lako} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{mere} \\
\text{future.3Sg} \quad \text{go} \quad \text{+prpr} \quad \text{student} \\
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
+\text{xlry} \quad -\text{trns} \quad \text{Nom} \\
\text{4[actr]} \quad \text{PAT} \\
\text{3Sg} \quad \text{actr} \\
\]
‘Mere will go.’

b.  
\[ E na \quad laurai \quad oti \quad o \quad Mere. \]
\[
\text{ena} \quad \text{laurai} \quad \text{oti} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{mere} \\
\text{future.3Sg} \quad \text{be.seen} \quad \text{finish} \quad \text{+prpr} \quad \text{student} \\
1\text{ndex} \quad 2\text{ndex} \quad 3\text{ndex} \quad 4\text{ndex} \quad 5\text{ndex} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{Adv} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
+\text{xlry} \quad -\text{trns} \quad \text{Nom} \\
\text{5[actr]} \quad \text{PAT} \\
\text{3Sg} \quad \text{actr} \\
\]
‘Mere will have been examined (e.g. by a doctor).’

When a verb requires a proper [PAT], the noun phrase that expresses the [PAT] must occur, and the same structure but without an Accusative proper noun would be interpreted differently, as shown in examples (3.26a and b).

(3.26) Standard Fijian—Transitive and intransitive sentences with the same verb form

a.  
\[ Au \ viriki \quad Mere. \]
\[
\text{auviriki} \quad =\text{mere} \\
\text{pelt} \quad \text{M.} \\
\text{m[actr]} \quad \text{1Sg} \\
\text{2[PAT]} \quad \text{+prpr} \\
\]
‘I pelted Mere.’

b.  
\[ Au \ viriki. \]
\[
\text{auviriki} \quad \text{be.pelted} \\
\text{m[actr]} \quad \text{1Sg} \\
\]
‘I was pelted.’

As in Nadrau, an [actr] pronoun may occur in a full noun phrase for emphasis as in (3.27), but the [PAT] of a transitive verb may not be expressed by an independent pronoun. It may only be implied in the verb, as shown in (3.28).
(3.27) **Standard Fijian—Pronoun expressed in a full noun phrase**

\[
\begin{align*}
E \text{ na} & \quad lako \quad o \quad koya. \\
en \text{a} & \quad lako \quad o \quad koya \\
\text{future.3Sg} & \quad \text{go} \quad +\text{prpr} \quad \text{he} \\
\text{1index} & \quad \text{2index} \quad \text{3index} \quad \text{4index} \\
V & \quad V \quad \text{Det} \quad N \\
+xlr_{y} & \quad -\text{trns} \quad \text{Nom} \\
4\left[ \text{actr} \right] & \quad \text{PAT} \\
3\text{Sg.} & \quad \text{actr} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'He, himself, will go.'

(3.28) **Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with implied pronominal “object”**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Erau} \text{ na} & \quad rai\text{ci iratou} \quad oti. \\
\text{erauna} & \quad rai\text{doi iratou} \quad oti \\
\text{future.3Dl} & \quad \text{see.3Pc} \quad \text{finish} \\
\text{1index} & \quad \text{2index} \quad \text{3index} \\
V & \quad V \quad \text{Adv} \\
+xlr_{y} & \quad +\text{trns} \\
\text{m}\left[ \text{actr} \right] & \quad \text{m}\left[ \text{PAT} \right] \\
3\text{Dl} & \quad 3\text{Pc} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'They two will have already seen them few.'

3.3.3.2 **Accusative-marking preposition i on proper noun [PAT]s: Wayan and the languages in Lau**

The Wayan casemarking system is basically the same as that of Standard Fijian, except that in Wayan a proper noun is Accusatively marked by a preposition \(i\) when it is the [PAT] of a transitive sentence. For example, in (3.29), the Accusative proper noun \(\text{Mere}\) is preceded by the accusative preposition \(i\). As in Standard Fijian, the sequence \(i\ Mere\) behaves as though it is a part of the verb and no element can intervene between the verb and the form \(i\), or the form \(i\) and \(Mere\) (Pawley pers. comm.). However, examples such as in (3.30) suggest that the form \(i\) should be analysed separately from the verb ending.

(3.29) **Wayan—Transitive sentence with proper [PAT]**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Qi} & \quad \text{tolavфи} \quad \text{Mere} \quad \text{nо}.^{9} \\
\text{gitolaфи} & \quad =i \quad \text{mere} \quad \text{nо} \\
\text{see.1Sg} & \quad \text{Acc} \quad \text{M. continue} \\
+\text{trns} & \quad \text{P} \quad \text{N Adv} \\
\text{PAT} & \quad \text{PAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'I’m watching Mere.' (Pawley and Sayaba n.d. \(i_2\), my analysis)

---

9 Although Pawley and Sayaba analyse the form \(i\) as a separate syntactic element from the verb, they write it as a part of the verb ending when the verb ends with the sound \(i\). For example, \(tolavфи\ Mere\), rather than \(tolavi\ i\ Mere\). See Pawley and Sayaba (n.d. \(i_2\)) for a description.
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(3.30) **Wayan—Sequence of the form \( i \) and a proper noun occurring in isolation**

\[
\begin{align*}
I & \quad ei? & I & \quad Mere. \\
i & \quad ei & i & \quad mere \\
\text{Acc} & \quad \text{who} & \text{Acc} & \quad M. \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Whom?’ ‘Mere.’ (Pawley and Sayaba n.d. \( i_2 \), my analysis)

The [PAT] agreement endings appear to parallel the [PAT] proper noun; that is, a pronominal form is preceded by the form \( i \) as can be seen in (3.31). However, these forms cannot occur in isolation preceded by the form \( i \), while proper nouns can as in (3.30) (Pawley pers. comm.).

(3.31) **Wayan—Sentence with a transitive verb**

\[
\begin{align*}
Qi & \quad sā & vakaatuni & ikora & na & \quad driadriavuli. \\
'gisā & \quad βakaatuniikora & na & "ria"rīβuli & \quad \text{realise.1Sg} & \quad \text{put.in.rows.3Pl} & \quad \text{−prpr} & \quad \text{school.children} \\
+xlry & \quad +\text{trns} & \quad \text{PAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I put the school children in lines.’ (Pawley and Sayaba n.d. \( atu_2 \), my analysis)

The following description by Geraghty suggests that the Lau and Vanua Balavu languages have a similar casemarking system for proper nouns as the one in Wayan described above.

In Lau...proper noun objects following the verb phrase are marked with \( i \) (1983:391)

The Wayan, and possibly also the Lau and Vanua Balavu system is summarised in (3.32).

(3.32) **Wayan (and possibly Lau)—Simple sentence structures**

transitive (with non-proper [PAT])

\[
(V) \quad V \quad \text{(Adv)} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{NP}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(with non-proper [PAT])} & \quad \text{PAT} & \quad \text{AGT} \\
\text{transitive} & \quad \text{atr} \\
\text{(with proper [PAT])} & \quad \text{atr} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(V) \quad V \quad i \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{(Adv)} \quad \text{NP} \\
(+xlry) +\text{trns} \quad \text{Acc} \quad \text{Nom} \quad \text{AGT} \quad \text{atr}
\]

\[
(V) \quad V \quad \text{(Adv)} \quad \text{NP} \\
(+xlry) −\text{trns} \quad \text{Nom} \quad \text{PAT} \quad \text{atr}
\]

* Actor agreement on the sentence-initial verb.
* [PAT] agreement on transitive verbs.

3.4 Actancy systems in the Polynesian languages

Most of the discussions of the actancy system of a Polynesian language focus only on the pattern of the morphological marking on nouns. However, in addition to distinct
morphological marking on nouns, some Polynesian languages also have a set of clitic pronouns or agreement-marking forms, occurring cliticised to or on the sentence-initial auxiliary verb, which show either an accusative or an ergative pattern depending on the language. The systems of morphological marking of nouns in Polynesian languages are described and problems in determining the actancy system of a Polynesian language will be discussed in §3.4.1. The systems of clitic pronouns will be described in §3.4.2. I will show that a set of basic sentence structures can be shown to be shared by most, if not all, of the Polynesian languages, despite the different interpretation as to the casemarking of these structures in the description of each language. Section §3.4.3 is a summary.

3.4.1 Morphological marking on nouns

3.4.1.1 Ergative and accusative casemarking systems in Polynesian languages

In a Polynesian language, a noun is usually casemarked by a preposition, or the absence of it. Typical ergative- and accusative-marking patterns are shown in (3.33) and (3.34).

(3.33) Polynesian—Ergative morphological casemarking system

a. Intransitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Intransitive (antipassive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>ki/(‘i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Lcv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Transitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(‘e)</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg</td>
<td>AGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3.34) Polynesian—Accusative morphological casemarking system

a. Intransitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Transitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+trms</td>
<td>ki/(‘i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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c. Intransitive (passive) V (‘)e NP NP
   -trms Agt Nom
   MNS PAT actr

It should be noted that, in both systems, the pattern of the occurrence of the forms that consist of sentences is basically the same; namely in both systems, Sentence a. consists of one unmarked noun phrase, Sentence b. consists of one unmarked noun phrase and one noun phrase that is preceded by the forms kil i, and Sentence c. consists of one unmarked noun phrase and a noun phrase that is preceded by the form (‘)e. The difference between the two analyses (ergative or accusative) depends entirely on which structures out of the three are analysed as transitive, and which as intransitive. Certain endings may occur on the verb in the third sentence of each set (Sentence c.), which are typically analysed as “transitive suffixes” in the ergative system while they are analysed as “passive marker” in the accusative system. In both systems, the order of the two noun phrases (where there are two) is not limited to the order shown above. Although additional prepositions and determiners may occur depending on the nature of the noun in each language, the pattern of the morphological marking by prepositions shown above is regularly observed.

The ergative analysis, shown in (3.33), is commonly applied to Tongan (Chung 1978, Dukes 1996), Niuean (Seiter 1980), Samoan (Chung 1978, Mosel and Hovdaugen 1992), Tokelauan (Tokelau Dictionary 1986, Hooper 2000), Tuvaluan (Besnier 2000), East Futunan (Moyse-Faurie 1992), and some Polynesian outlier languages (for example, Dougherty 1983). Sentences from Tongan and Tokelauan are shown in (3.35) and (3.36) to illustrate it. In (3.35), sentences a., b., and c. correspond to the intransitive, intransitive anti-passive, and transitive structures respectively.

(3.35) Tongan—Sentences illustrating the ergative system

a. Na‘e lavea ‘a e kulii.
   past hurt Nom Det dog +xlry -trms PAT actr
   ‘The dog was hurt.’

b. Na‘e kai ‘a e stianá ‘i he ika.
   past eat Nom Det man Lcv Det fish +xlry -trms PAT actr COR
   ‘The man ate (part of) the fish.’

---

10 For a comparison of the occurrence of such forms in Polynesian languages, see Harrison (1991).

11 For a description and discussion of various semantic and syntactic aspects of ergative and accusative Polynesian languages, see Ota (1999).
c. Na'e kai 'e he sianā 'a e ika.
    past eat Erg Det man Nom Det fish
    +xlry +trns AGT PAT actr

   'The man ate the fish.'

In example (3.36), a. is analysed as an intransitive sentence, b. and c. are analysed as intransitive anti-passive sentences, and d. and e. as transitive sentences.

(3.36) Tokelauan—Sentences illustrating the ergative system

a. Kua fono ia Malia.
   kua fono ia malia
   perfect go +prpr Malia
   +xlry -trns PAT actr

   'Malia has gone.' (Hovdhaugen et al. 1989:50, my analysis)

b. Ko te tama, e alofa ki te teine.
   ko te tama e alofa ki te teine
   topic def.Sg boy non.past love to def.Sg girl
   PAT +xlr -trns Lcv COR actr

   'The boy loves the girl.' (Hovdhaugen et al. 1989:48, my analysis)

c. Tago ki te ika.
   tano ki te ika
   grab at def.Sg fish
   -trns Lcv LOC

   'Grab the fish.' (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxi)

d. Na fau e ia tona fale.
   na fono e ia tona fono
   pnct build Erg he his house
   +xlry +trns AGT PAT actr

   'He built his house.' (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxviii)

e. Na kaumai te polo e te taumaiti.
   na kaumai te polo e te taumaiti
   pnct bring def.Sg ball Erg def.Sg child
   +xlry +trns PAT AGT actr

   'The child brought the ball.' (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxi)
Example sentences are shown from Tahitian and Hawaiian in (3.37) and (3.38) to illustrate the application of the accusative analysis shown in (3.34), following the analysis presented by Ota (1999). In (3.37), a. is an intransitive sentence, while b. and c. are transitive sentences, and d. is an intransitive passive sentence. In (3.38), a. is an intransitive sentence, b. is a transitive sentence, c. is an intransitive passive sentence.

(3.37) Tahitian—Sentences illustrating the accusative system\(^\text{12}\)

a. ‘ua ta ‘oto ‘ōna i reira.
   perf sleep he at there
   +xlry -trns PAT LOC
   actr
   ‘He slept there.’ (Ota 1999:93, restated in Lexicase notations)

b. Te hōpo‘i nei au i te tomati i te mātete.
   prog take here 1 Acc def tomato Lcv def market
   +xlry +tms Adv AGT PAT LOC
   actr
   ‘I am taking the tomatoes to the market.’
   (Ota 1999:93, originally in Cadousteau 1985:20, restated in Lexicase notations)

c. ‘ua hohoni te ‘uri ‘i te tamāroa.
   perf bite def dog Acc def boy
   +xlry +tms AGT PAT
   actr
   ‘The dog bit the boy.’ (Ota 1999:128, restated in Lexicase notations)

d. ‘ua hohoni hia te tamaroa ‘e te ‘uri.
   perf bite def boy by def dog
   +xlry -trns PAT MNS
   actr
   ‘The boy was bitten by the dog.’ (Ota 1999:128, restated in Lexicase notations)

(3.38) Hawaiian—Sentences illustrating the accusative system

a. Ua moe ka wahine.
   perf sleep def woman
   +xlry -trns PAT
   actr
   ‘The woman slept.’ (Ota 1999:87, restated in Lexicase notations)

---

\(^{12}\) The representation of the initial glottal stop in the preposition (‘)i is not consistent in Ota (1999).
3.4.1.2 Problems in determining the actancy system of Polynesian languages

In the previous section, the actancy systems of some Polynesian languages were described as though the judgement as to whether a language is ergative or accusative was always clear. However, whether a Polynesian language is (synchronically) ergative or accusative can be a controversial issue. For example, among the seven studies that have examined the ergativity or accusativity of Māori, five have concluded that Māori is accusative (Hale 1968, Hohepa 1969, Clark 1976, Chung 1977 and 1978, and Ota 1999), while two have claimed that it is ergative (Sinclair 1976, and Gibson and Starosta 1990). The difference in these analyses has hinged on the manner in which the transitivity of each sentence was determined. In the rest of this section, a set of data from Tongan will be used to illustrate how the determination of the transitivity of sentences affects the analysis of the casemarking system.

The Tongan morphological casemarking system has been analysed as accusative (Lynch 1972), split ergative (Clark 1976, Foley 1976), and ergative (Lynch 1969, Tsunoda 1983). The differences in these analyses, as in the differences in the analyses of Māori, are the result of different interpretations of the transitivity of the relevant sentence structures. Figure 3.1 provides a schematic characterisation of the three basic sentence types of Tongan using the semantic labels S, A and O following Dixon (1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>‘a’</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>‘a’</td>
<td>‘ilki’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>‘e’</td>
<td>‘a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.1:** The basic sentence structures of Tongan (schematic)
Structure I allows only one complement noun phrase and is therefore intransitive. Following Dixon's conventions, it is labelled “S”. There are two potentially transitive structures, namely Structures II and III. The semantic “subjects” and “objects” are indicated by the symbols “A” and “O” respectively.

The judgement of the transitivity of particular structures in actual analyses often depends on semantics, or on the transitivity of the sentence into which the target language is translated. In some analyses, Structure II is considered to be transitive and Structure III is considered to be an intransitive passive. In such a case, the language would be analysed as accusative. In other analyses, Structure III is considered to be transitive and Structure II is considered to be an intransitive anti-passive. In a case such as this, the language would be analysed as ergative. Further, when both Structures II and III are treated as transitive, then the language would be analysed as having a “mixed” or “split” system.

Sentences given in (3.35) are repeated in (3.39), to illustrate the sentence structures shown in Figure 3.2. Examples (3.40) to (3.42) show three possible analyses of these sentences.

(3.39) Tongan—Sentence examples (Sentence I: Lynch 1972:13; Sentences II and III: my fieldnotes)

I
Na'e lavea 'a e kulii.
past hurt Det dog
‘The dog was hurt.’

II
Na'e kai 'a e siana 'i he ika.
past eat Det man Det fish
‘The man ate (part of) the fish.’

III
Na'e kai 'e he siana 'a e ika.
past eat Det man Det fish
‘The man ate the fish.’

(3.40) Tongan—Ergative analysis

I
Na'e lavea 'a e kulii.
past hurt Nom Det dog
-trms PAT actr
‘The dog was hurt.’

II
Na'e kai 'a e siana 'i he ika.
past eat Nom Det man Lcv Det fish
-trms PAT actr COR
‘The man ate (part of) the fish.’
The same set of analyses are also possible for other Polynesian languages, including Māori (see especially Sinclair 1976 and Chung 1977, Ota 1999:110-121). It is necessary to be aware
of this fact when we deal with typological and/or historical comparison of Polynesian languages.

In the case of Tongan, there is a relatively clear correspondence between sentence structures and semantic transitivity. As can be seen in the translation, Structure III shows semantically higher transitivity than the corresponding Structure II. In the given example, Structure III implies a completion of the consumption of the fish, while Structure II does not. Gibson and Starosta (1990) proposed a set of criteria to help consistently determine syntactic transitivity cross-linguistically. One of the criteria notes that structures that are higher in semantic transitivity are more likely to be syntactically transitive than those that are lower in semantic transitivity. The application of this criterion to Tongan leads us to the conclusion that Tongan should probably be analysed as ergative, as in (3.40) above. However, these criteria are not problem-free when applied to other languages. For example, Ota (1999) questions the way Gibson and Starosta applied their criteria to Māori, and argues against their conclusion that Māori is ergative.

I would like to reiterate here that all Polynesian languages share the same sentence patterns, each of which consists of the same casemarking elements, despite the various labels, namely ergative, accusative, or split ergative, found in their descriptions. This is in contrast to the situation found in Rotuman and the Fijian languages, where the languages have all been analysed as "accusative", even though they show considerable variety in their casemarking strategies, as has been described in §3.2 and §3.3.

The shared sentence patterns of Polynesian languages are listed again in (4.43), with their NPs labelled according to their morphosyntactic functions. Where these functions differ depending on the language the labels are left blank. Both (non-clitic) pronouns and non-pronominal nouns (both proper and non-proper) occur as the heads of NP positions. Clitic pronoun systems will be discussed in the next section. The structures may contain additional Prepositions, Determiners, Adverbs, etc. depending on the language. See the description of Tongan in §2.6.3 for one such example.13

13 Discussion about the actancy system of Proto Polynesian in previous studies reflect this fact. Compare the following two different reconstructions:

Reconstruction of Sentence Structures in Proto-Polynesian proposed in Clark (1976) ("mixed ergative")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>i/ki NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3.43) Polynesian—Shared sentence structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V trns</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V trns</th>
<th>ki/(')i NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V trns</th>
<th>(')e NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Verb-agreement and clitic-pronoun systems in Polynesian languages

One of the additional elements that occurs in most, if not all, of the Polynesian languages is the tense-aspect marker, which is the auxiliary verb that occurs preceding all other verbs in the sentence. In addition, many Polynesian languages have pronominal forms that either co-occur, or alternate with, the noun phrases. Morphologically, these pronominal forms are shorter than the independent pronouns. Although the morphosyntactic function of such pronominal forms differs depending on the language, the forms always occur on the sentence-initial auxiliary verb, which indicates tense and/or aspect, usually following it.\(^{14}\) The occurrence of these forms appears to be restricted to non-Eastern Polynesian languages (Clark 1974:590-591). However, within non-Eastern Polynesian languages, there is no clear correspondence between the occurrence of such forms and any particular subgroup(s). Figure 3.2 shows a part of the subgrouping hypothesis and the occurrence of the clitic pronouns or alike.

---

Reconstruction of Sentence Structures in Proto-Polynesian proposed in Chung (1978) (accusative)

a. V N intransitive
   - trns PAT
   actr

b. V NP i NP canonical transitive
   + trns AGT PAT
   actr

c. V NP i/ki NP middle transitive
   + trns AGT PAT
   actr

d. V e NP NP passive
   - trns MNS PAT
   actr

\(^{14}\) An exception is Tokelauan, where when a negative auxiliary verb occurs, a short pronominal form occurs following the sequence of a tense-aspect marking auxiliary verb and the negative auxiliary verb. See sentences in (3.44) for examples.
Although the forms that occur in this position are morphologically similar, the pattern of their occurrence differs depending on the language. The forms in Tongan, that are analysed as verb agreement forms in this study, indicate the [actr] and therefore show an accusative pattern. Samoan has pronominal forms that are cliticised to the sentence-initial auxiliary verb. Their occurrence in principle corresponds to the [actr] of the sentence, and there are forms for all person and numbers. However, Mosel (1987) describes that the occurrence of the third person singular clitic pronouns in Samoan is restricted to the [AGT] of transitive sentences, and that the forms cannot co-occur with the corresponding independent pronouns (for example, Chung 1978:35). In Tokelauan and Tuvaluan, clitic pronouns occur only to indicate the [AGT] of transitive sentences, thus showing an ergative pattern, and the occurrence of clitic pronouns is always accompanied by the occurrence of the verb endings ..a/, ..gia/ and ..ajia/(Tokelauan: Hooper 2000:162-163, Tuvaluan: Besnier 2000). Some languages show other variations in the forms and/or the pattern of occurrence. The Tongan [actr] verb agreement system has been examined and described in detail in §2.6.3. In the rest of this section, Tokelauan and Tuvaluan ergative clitic pronouns, East Futunan, and West Futuna–Aniwan clitic pronoun systems are described.

15 A possible historical account of the Samoan system is provided in §4.2.3.5.
3.4.2.1 Ergative clitic pronouns: Tokelauan and Tuvaluan

Tokelauan and Tuvaluan have a set of "short" pronominal forms that are encliticised to the sentence-initial tense-aspect marker, or a negative auxiliary verb when there is any. They function as the [AGT] of the sentence, thus showing an ergative pattern. The pronominal agent of a transitive sentence can be expressed either with one of these "short" pronominal forms, or with an independent pronoun preceded by the ergative-marking preposition e. Example sentences showing this alternation are given in (3.44) and (3.45). Compare (3.44a) with (3.44b), (3.44c) with (3.44d, e), and (3.45a) with (3.45b). The clitic pronoun forms are indicated with bold font.

(3.44) Tokelauan—Alternation of clitic pronoun and the corresponding noun phrases

a. \( E \he ko iloa.\)\(^{16}\)
   non.past neg 1Sg know
   'I don't know.' (Hovdhaugen et al. 1989:43)

b. \( E \he iloa e au.\)
   non.past neg know Erg I
   'I don't know.' (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxi)

c. \(Na ia veloa te ika.\)
   pnct 3Sg spear def.Sg fish
   'He speared the fish.' (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxxv)

d. \(Na velo e ia te ika.\)
   pnct spear Erg it def.Sg fish
   'He speared the fish.' (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxxv)

e. \(Na kai te ika e Leone.\)
   pnct eat def.Sg fish Erg Leone
   'Leone ate the fish.' (Hovdhaugen 1986:85)

(3.45) Tuvaluan—Alternation of clitic pronoun and the corresponding noun phrases

a. \(Ne lotou fakamaligigia ttaa paelo kao.\)
   non.past 3PI spilled ours.DI bucket sour.toddy
   'They spilled our bucket of sour toddy.' (Besnier 2000:378)

b. \(Ne fakamaligigia nee laatou ttaa paelo kao.\)
   non.past spilled Erg they.Pl ours.DI bucket sour.toddy
   'They spilled our bucket of sour toddy.' (Besnier 2000:378)

\(^{16}\) Vowel length is not marked in the source.
According to Hooper (2000: 162-163), this use of a clitic pronoun to indicate the [AGT] of transitive sentences “is quite productive, especially for first and second person...and is accompanied by suffixation of the verb with "-al-/rial-/apia" in Tokelauan. Similarly, in Tuvaluan, these forms “can only appear in transitive clauses where the verb is suffixed with the transitive suffix (which has several forms)...” (Besnier 2000:377).

The forms of the clitic pronouns and independent pronouns are given Tables 3.3 and 3.4. It should be noted that the forms of some clitic pronouns are identical with the corresponding independent pronouns in dual, and identical in plural.

**Table 3.3: Pronominal forms in Tokelauan**
*(based on Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxiii-xxiv)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clitic pronouns</th>
<th>independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1exSg kō</td>
<td>au, kita*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exD1 kimå</td>
<td>kimåua, kimå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl kimeterou</td>
<td>kimeterou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inD1 kita</td>
<td>kitaua, kita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPl kitåtou</td>
<td>kitåtou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg ke</td>
<td>koe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D1 koulua</td>
<td>koulua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pl koutou</td>
<td>koutou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D1 kilå</td>
<td>kilåua, kilå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl kîlåtou</td>
<td>kîlåtou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The form kita is “quite common in the spoken language, and is used when the speaker wishes to arouse the hearer’s sympathy or fellow-feeling, for example when he is telling a story about some predicament he was in” (Tokelau Dictionary 1986:xxiv).

**Table 3.4: Pronominal forms in Tuvaluan**
*(based on Besnier 2000:386-387)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clitic pronouns</th>
<th>“coalesced-pronouns”*</th>
<th>independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1exSg kau, aku</td>
<td>mooku</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exD1 maa</td>
<td>momaa</td>
<td>maaua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl motou</td>
<td>momotou</td>
<td>maatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inD1 ttaa</td>
<td>motaa</td>
<td>taaua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPl ttou</td>
<td>motou</td>
<td>taatou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg kee</td>
<td>moou</td>
<td>koe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D1 oulua, lua, oolu</td>
<td>molua, moulua, moluu</td>
<td>koulua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pl ouotou, tou, kootou, ootou</td>
<td>mootou, mooutou</td>
<td>koutou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg ana</td>
<td>moona, moana</td>
<td>Ø, ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D1 laa</td>
<td>molaa</td>
<td>laaua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl latou</td>
<td>molotou</td>
<td>laatou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This column lists various forms of the “purpose conjunct” moo which alternates according to the person and number of the [AGT] of the following sentence. These forms will be referred to in §4.3.6.
3.4.2.2 The East Futunan system: clitic pronouns indicating both [PAT] and [AGT]

Clark, citing from Biggs (n.d.), describes the clitic pronoun system of East Futunan where a clitic pronoun may occur expressing either a [PAT] or [AGT]. Examples are cited in (3.46) as they appear in Clark (1974) (bold and italic are mine). The forms of the clitic pronouns in East Futunan are given in Table 3.5. Unfortunately, there is no further information available.

(3.46) East Futunan—Sentences with clitic pronouns

a. Na kau ano.
   T[ense] I go
   +xIry PAT -tms actr
   ‘I went.’ (based on Clark 1974:590)

b. Na kau totogi le kumete.
   I buy A [sic] canoe
   +xIry AGT +tms PAT actr
   ‘I bought the canoe.’ (based on Clark 1974:590)

c. Na kau ti'akie e loku tinana.
   I reject my mother
   +xIry PAT +tms AGT actr
   ‘My mother rejected me.’ (based on Clark 1974:590)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.5: Clitic pronoun forms in East Futunan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(based on Pawley 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clitic pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exSg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exDl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inDl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Dl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Dl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2.3 West Futuna–Aniwan: a transition from an ergative to an accusative pattern

It appears that West Futuna–Aniwan “pronominal clitics” originally had an ergative pattern, but have changed to, or are in the process of changing to an accusative pattern.
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West Futuna–Aniwan has a set of singular pronominal forms that are optionally suffixed to the “tense maker” to co-refer to the “subject”. Examples are given in (3.47).

(3.47) West Futuna–Aniwan—Sentences with clitic pronominal forms

a. **Avau nag mentua feipe...**
   
   I tense.1Sg think like this
   
   ‘I thought it was like this...’ (Dougherty 1983:38)

b. **Kai taia akoua kai kaina.**
   
   tense.3Sg kill you all tense.3Sg eat
   
   ‘He’ll kill you all and eat you.’ (Dougherty 1983:37)

c. **Ti apolo nei falele ifo ki ta kere.**
   
   Det devil tense.3Sg descend down into Det earth
   
   ‘The devil descended into the earth.’ (Dougherty 1983:38)

According to Dougherty (1983:35), “Capell (1958:123) noted that clitic subjects could occur only with transitive verbs”, which means that the forms referred to the [AGT]. However, in modern West Futuna–Aniwan, “the clitics occur predominately but not exclusively in transitive constructions” as in (3.47c) (Dougherty 1983:35). It should be noted that, in West Futuna–Aniwan, only singular clitic pronouns occur, and “may co-occur with a full pronominal form or another nominal that also indicates the subject” (1983:35). The forms of these clitic pronouns are given in Table 3.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>-ηk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2.4 Clitic pronouns in some other Polynesian languages

In addition to the languages described above, Pawley (1970:326) lists the following languages as having some kind of clitic pronouns (what he calls “embedded subject person-markers”): East Uvean, West Uvean and Mae. The forms are cited in Table 3.7.
Table 3.7: Clitic pronoun forms in East Uvean, Fagauvea (West Uvean), and Emae (Mae) (based on Moyse-Faurie 2000 and Pawley 1970:327)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Uvean</th>
<th>Fagauvea</th>
<th>Emae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1exSg</td>
<td>u-au</td>
<td>gu</td>
<td>ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exDI</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>gimā</td>
<td>mà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPI</td>
<td>matou</td>
<td>gimādou</td>
<td>matu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inDI</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>gitā</td>
<td>tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1inPI</td>
<td>tou</td>
<td>gidou</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>gi-ge</td>
<td>(?),ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DI</td>
<td>lua</td>
<td>gola-goulua</td>
<td>kore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PI</td>
<td>koutou</td>
<td>godou</td>
<td>kote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td>i, ia</td>
<td>(?),Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DI</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>gilā</td>
<td>kire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PI</td>
<td>natou</td>
<td>giladou</td>
<td>tere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Summary of the actancy systems in Polynesian languages

The actancy system of Polynesian languages and the occurrence of the clitic pronouns (when applicable) in each language are summarised in Table 3.8. All available analyses are shown in the column headed as “the marking on full nouns”.

Table 3.8: A summary of the actancy systems of some Polynesian languages and the pattern of the occurrence of the clitic pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Marking on full nouns</th>
<th>Patterns of the occurrence of clitic pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>E, A, S</td>
<td>[acr] agreement forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[acr] for 1 and 2 persons, [AGT] for 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[AGT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan</td>
<td>E (A)*</td>
<td>[AGT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Futunan</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>both [AGT] and [PAT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Futuna–Aniwan</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[acr] (&lt;[AGT])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahitian</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = ergative, A = accusative, S = split ergative, n/a indicates that there is no clitic pronoun in the language.

* Accusatively described in Hovdhaugen et al. (1989).

---

17 See also Moyse-Faurie (1997) for a description of relevant forms in some Western Polynesian languages.
4 Reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a reconstruction of the major syntactic structures, including the actancy system, of Proto Central Pacific.

Although it has been generally assumed that Proto Central Pacific had a Fijian-type accusative system, there has been no study that specifically focuses on the reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific. As for the actancy system of Proto Polynesian, as mentioned in §1.2, there have been several attempts to reconstruct it, reaching no consensus among scholars as to whether Proto Polynesian was ergative or accusative. Whichever their claims regarding the actancy system of Proto-Polynesian, the discussions have focused primarily on the morphosyntactic interpretation of the pattern(s) of the casemarking on noun phrases. In this study, however, in order to reconstruct the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific, the pronominal forms, especially verb agreement forms and clitic pronouns in various daughter languages, will be compared. The results show that an ergative clitic pronoun system must be reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific (and also for Proto Polynesian). As for the marking on the noun phrases, it will be argued that nouns were not morphologically casemarked in Proto Central Pacific, while the ergative marking preposition was innovated in Proto Polynesian from the Proto Central Pacific personal noun marker *i.

The rest of this chapter is presented in the following order. In §4.2, a reconstruction of the possible basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific is provided. This will be based mainly on the comparison of relevant structures in daughter languages. The syntactic features that will be discussed will include word order (that is, possible branching patterns), transitivity, number of possible complements, and the verb-agreement/clitic-pronoun positions. The result of this comparison will provide a basis for the reconstruction of the skeletal structures of Proto Central Pacific, and will be established by the results of the morphological reconstruction given in §4.3 to §4.5. In §4.3, based on the comparison of the forms that occur in Fijian and those that are reconstructed for some upper level protolanguages, it will be argued that Proto Central Pacific had two sets of clitic pronouns.

1 This is understandable when we consider that the position of Rotuman was not determined until relatively recently, and thus the internal subgrouping of the Central Pacific languages was uncertain. Another factor that must have contributed to this situation is the diversity of Fijian languages, the syntactic variation of which had not been well documented.
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one Genitive set and one Nominative set, that showed an ergative pattern. Supporting internal evidence will follow. In §4.4, it will be argued that in addition to the two clitic pronoun sets, a set of independent pronouns should be also reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific. How the three pronominal sets eventually merged into two sets in some daughter languages, or only one set in some others, will be also illustrated. The morphological casemarking on noun phrases in Proto Central Pacific and its daughter languages will be considered in §4.5. Possible sources of the casemarking prepositions in Polynesian languages are discussed in this section. Section 4.6 is a summary.

4.2 Preliminary reconstructions

In this section, the basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian are reconstructed. In §4.2.1, the possible branching in Proto Central Pacific is briefly considered. In §4.2.2 and §4.2.3, two possible clitic pronoun positions are reconstructed. A post sentence-initial auxiliary verb clitic pronoun position is reconstructed based on the occurrence of the [actr] agreement forms in Fijian and various clitic pronouns in Polynesian languages. A post-transitive verb clitic position is reconstructed considering the position and morphological forms of the [PAT] agreement pronominal forms in Fijian. In order to reconstruct these, the forms in Fijian languages are first compared, and a possible protosystem from which the current Fijian languages must have developed is described. This protosystem may be referred to as “Proto Fijian” for the sake of convenience. In §4.2.4, the basic sentence patterns of Proto Central Pacific are reconstructed, based on the descriptions provided in Chapter 3. Section 4.2.5 is a summary.

4.2.1 Branching

All Fijian languages and most of the non-Outlier Polynesian languages are right-branching, in that dependents follow their head (see §2.6.2.1 for Standard Fijian examples and §2.6.3.1 for Tongan examples). It has been generally assumed that dependent noun phrases followed

2 The position of the Nominative noun phrase is reported to occur before as well as after the verb in Fijian. In example sentences in Pawley and Sayaba (n.d.), a Nominative noun phrase frequently appears in sentence-initial position, and Geraghty (1983:391) also reports no less frequent occurrence of the “SVO” pattern in Fijian languages than “S” following the “V.” This requires further study based on the following three observations. First, in the transcription of stories told by native speakers of Kadavu, I find that all noun phrases occurring in sentence-initial position, including Nominative noun phrases, are topicalised, and it is possible that this is the case also for other Fijian languages. Whenever a noun phrase is topicalised, it co-occurs with the appropriate agreement-marking form on the verb. Unfortunately, neither Pawley nor Geraghty offer a more detailed description. Second, I find that in the elicitation of single sentences in an isolated environment, a Nominative noun often occurs in the sentence-initial position, especially when translation from English to Fijian is required for the speaker. In other words, it seems that language assistants, who are somewhat familiar with English, tend to calque English sentence structure when responding to elicitation of English sentences. Third, and what I think is significant here, is that on several occasions I observed that a Nominative noun not only occurred in sentence-initial position, but replaced the verb-initial sequence that alternates depending on the person and number of the [actr]. According to Geraghty (1977), this happens among speakers of Standard Fijian and more frequently of Lau, implying that the verb-initial forms are still recognised as clitic pronouns, since they would need to be functioning as clitics rather than incorporated parts of the following verb, if they are being replaced by full words. The situation
the verb in Proto Polynesian (see, for example, Clark 1976, Chung 1978) and the same can be assumed for Proto Central Pacific as well. The Rotuman word order where the Nominative noun phrase occurs preceding the verb is explained as an innovation based on the original clitic pronoun position (see §4.2.2). How the same word order developed in some Outlier languages from an earlier topicalised position has been discussed in Clark (1976:39-40).

4.2.2 Post auxiliary clitic position

The [actr] verb-agreement system in Fijian involves a phonological sequence at the beginning of a verb that alternates according to the person and number of the [actr] of the sentence (§2.6.2.2). Geraghty (1983:205) states that these forms “appear to be an obligatory constituent of every Fijian sentence...” and that there is no Fijian language that does not have these forms. Although the verb-agreement system itself is consistently observed in most of the Fijian languages, variety is found as to the formal aspects of the phonological sequence that alternates depending on the person and number of the [actr]. These are: i) The position of this phonological sequence in relation to the verb which it is a part of may differ depending on the language; ii) The phonological sequence may have two sets in some languages differing according to the presence or to the absence of a tense feature on the verb; iii) The forms appear to reflect a source either from an earlier Genitive set of pronouns or from an earlier Nominative set. The first of the three points above is relevant to the discussion presented in the rest of §4.2. The second point will appear, and the third point will be discussed in detail in §4.3.

As has been described in §2.6.2.2, in Standard Fijian, the agreement-marking forms occur at the beginning of a sentence-initial verb. In some Fijian languages, however, equivalent forms instead occur as verb endings, depending on the initial verb. Furthermore, there are some languages where the forms appear to occur either preceding or following the sentence-initial verb.3 Example sentences are given in (4.1). The fact that the agreement-marking forms occur in different positions in Fijian languages today suggests that they must have been clitic pronouns in Proto Fijian rather than agreement-marking forms, the reflexes of which would be found occurring in one position or the other.

(4.1) Nabukelevu—Sentences with “verb-agreement forms” occurring in different positions

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad Sā & qu & qai & xilā... \\
& & =9gū & 9gai & xilā \\
\text{aspect 1Sg} & \text{ then} & \text{ know} & \\
\text{‘I’ll then learn it ...’ (my fieldnotes)}
\end{align*}
\]

observed in such languages supports the claim that verb agreement forms in Fijian languages must have developed from earlier clitic pronouns as a result of grammaticalisation, as discussed later in §4.2.2.

3 According to Geraghty, this is observed in some Eastern Fijian languages (such as SF [Standard Fijian] and LAU [the Lau island languages]). They “allow sā-aspect and past tense to precede the preverbal pronoun; Nabukelevu requires ma (past tense) to precede” (1983:205).
Reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

b. Qu sā laxo.
   ³gu= sā laxo
   1Sg aspect go
   actr +xlry -trns
   ‘I’m leaving now.’ (my fieldnotes)

c. Mā qū xacivi ixo.
   mā =³gū xaðìbi ixo
   past 1Sg call you
   +xlry actr +trns PAT
   ‘I called you.’ (my fieldnotes)

d. Qu seau laba-t-a.
   ³gu= seau laba-ta
   1Sg adversative kill.3Gn
   actr +xlry -trns
   ‘I murdered him.’ (Pawley and Sayaba 1982:50)

Further examination is necessary to be able to judge the current syntactic status of the agreement-marking forms—whether they are a part of the verb or are independent pronouns—in each language. However, I argue here that the earlier clitic pronouns occurred following the sentence-initial auxiliary verb. The reasons are as follows. First, some of the forms of certain auxiliary verbs, those which are often described as “conjunctions,” carry a fossilised clitic pronoun as their ending. Such forms do not occur at the beginning of these verbs. Examples of such forms in Standard Fijian are given in (4.2). This kind of auxiliary verb with fossilised endings is commonly found throughout Fijian languages, implying that the merged forms retain an earlier word order in which clitic pronouns always followed, rather than preceded, their regent verb.4

(4.2) Standard Fijian—Forms of some auxiliary verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>‘Should. Implies a third person singular/General [actr]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meu</td>
<td>‘Should. Implies a first person singular [actr]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo</td>
<td>‘Should. Implies a second person singular [actr]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meda</td>
<td>‘Should. Implies a first person plural [actr]’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, external evidence supports this claim. Outside Fiji, many of both external and internal members of the Central Pacific language family show a clitic pronoun occurring after the sentence-initial (usually tense marking) auxiliary verb. This suggests that the change of the position must be an innovation that took place in Fiji. The reconstructed position for the sentence-initial auxiliary verb and the clitic pronoun is shown in (4.3).

---

4 Geraghty (1983:205-209 and 1977) provides some description of these forms observed in various Fijian languages.
(4.3) **Proto Fijian—Position of clitic pronoun**

\[ V =N V... +xlry+prnn \]

The order of the clitic pronoun and the auxiliary verb changed probably as a result of the loss of the sentence-initial auxiliary verb, which had indicated tense and aspect and had been obligatory in the preceding stage.\(^5\) A possible scenario for this change is presented in (4.4).

(4.4) **Development of the PCP clitic pronouns in Fijian**\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCP structure</th>
<th>Stage I</th>
<th>Stage II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ V =N V... +xlry +prnn ]</td>
<td>a. [ V =N V... +xlry +prnn ]</td>
<td>a. [ V V... +xlry ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ N= V... +prnn ]</td>
<td>b. [ N= V... +prnn ]</td>
<td>b. [ V... (±xlry) ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \( .n/ \) and \( /n.. \) indicate the verb ending and the initial phonological sequence on a verb respectively that indicates the person and number of one of the arguments in a sentence.

In the original structure, there was a set of obligatory auxiliary verbs that occurred in the sentence-initial position, and to which a clitic pronoun was attached. These auxiliary verbs became optional in Stage I, yielding Structure b., where the clitic pronoun now occurred in sentence-initial position, being cliticised to the following verb instead of to the preceding one. A subsequent change took place where the original clitic pronouns acquired fixed position(s) to become a part of the verb, to be analysed as agreement marking forms (the so-called “grammaticalisation”). Stage II shows the sentence structures in this stage. Semantically, some of the forms began to have a more generalised meaning as well: for example, the original third person singular form came to be used also to mark third person unspecified number.

In the Fijian languages spoken today, there is no language that shows what is assumed to be the original structure here. The vast majority of Fijian languages have the two structures shown in Stage II. Structure a. is found with a set of auxiliary verbs, which are commonly described as “conjunctions”. Example forms from Standard Fijian have been given in (4.2) with the auxiliary verb \( me \). Structure b. is found in sentences without such auxiliary verbs. A Standard Fijian example sentence given in (3.10) is repeated in (4.5).

---

\(^5\) The original idea was proposed in Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1981) where phenomena of this sort were referred to as “Aux-axing”.

\(^6\) Geraghty (1977), based on a careful examination of the forms and distribution of “preverbal subject-marking pronouns” in Bauan, Waidina and Lau, proposes a hypothesis as to how the Bauan pronominal system developed. I consider that the historical changes proposed by Geraghty took place subsequent to Stage I.
Some Fijian languages, such as Nabukelevu, reflect the situation in Stage I, with some clitic pronouns following certain auxiliary verbs. Examples have been given in (4.1). Because of their unfixed position, the forms in such languages are analysed as clitic pronouns rather than as agreement-marking forms on the verb. The auxiliary verbs that can precede an [actr] clitic pronoun in Nabukelevu are limited to sā and mā, while any other auxiliary verb, such as seau in (4.1d), must follow the pronoun as the form. According to Geraghty (1983:205), this is observed also in some Eastern Fijian languages.

The situation in Stage I also allowed a new sentence structure to develop in some Fijian languages, including Standard Fijian and Lau (Geraghty 1977). An independent pronoun may now occur preceding verbs, the frequency and the flexibility differing depending on the language. Examples are shown from Standard Fijian in (4.6). This is readily explained as a reinterpretation of Structure b. in Stage I, illustrated in (4.7).

(4.5) Standard Fijian—Transitive sentence with 3DI [actr] agreement marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erau na</th>
<th>lakovi iratou</th>
<th>tiko</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>gasenivuli</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>luvequ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erauna</td>
<td>lakoʃiratou</td>
<td>tiko</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ʃgasenivuli</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>luʃeʃgu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future.3Dl</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>-prpr</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>-prpr</td>
<td>my.child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ndex</td>
<td>2ndex</td>
<td>3ndex</td>
<td>4ndex</td>
<td>5ndex</td>
<td>6ndex</td>
<td>7ndex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Det</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Det</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlry</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[[actr \] \[\text{PAT} \] \[3\text{DI} \] \[3\text{Pc} \] \[\text{actr} \]

‘My (two) children will be seeing the teachers.’

(4.6) Standard Fijian—Full noun phrase occurring in the sentence-initial position

(O) iko sā lako?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o</th>
<th>iko</th>
<th>sā</th>
<th>lako</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+prpr</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>asp</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Are you leaving?’

cf. O sā lako?

| osā | lako |
| asp | go |
| V | V |

\[1\text{Sg} \] \[\text{actr} \]

‘Are you leaving?’

---

7 Structures in which pronominal forms precede these auxiliary verbs are considered to be a result of the influence of Standard Fijian, rather than to reflect a change where the word order is reversed.
(4.7) **Reinterpretation of the original clitic position in Fijian**

(Stage I)

b. \[ \text{N} = \text{V...} + \text{pmn} \pm \text{xlry} \]

b. \[ \text{V...} (\pm \text{xlry}) / \text{n.} \]

c. \[ \text{N} \text{V...} + \text{pmn} \pm \text{xlry} \]

In Structure b. in Stage I, there is no original sentence-initial auxiliary verb, and a clitic pronoun occurs in the sentence-initial position. It is assumed that these pronouns started being cliticised to the following verb. A full (pro)noun phrase occurring in this position is likely to be the result of a reinterpretation of the clitic pronoun position as a full noun position.

This also explains the development of the current Rotuman situation from the assumed original system. Rotuman does not have any clitic pronoun forms, and Nominative noun phrases occur in sentence-initial position as has been described in §3.2. Sentence examples (3.2) and (3.3) are repeated in (4.8).

(4.8) **Rotuman—Transitive and intransitive sentences**

a. \[ \text{Ia} \quad \text{al'ak} \quad \text{iris.} \]
   i.a \quad \text{al?eak} \quad \text{iris}
   he \quad \text{kill} \quad \text{them}
   Nom \quad +\text{trms} \quad \text{Acc}
   'He killed them.' (Churchward 1940:121, my analysis)

b. \[ \text{Iris} \quad '\text{"a.} \]
   iris \quad ?\text{"a}
   they \quad \text{eat}
   Nom \quad -\text{trms}
   'They ate.'/‘They are eaten.’ (Churchward 1940:123, my analysis)

Rotuman is considered to have lost all the earlier clitic pronouns and to show only Structure c. in Stage II today.\(^8\) This change will be discussed further in §4.4.2.

Based on the discussion above, and on the reconstruction of Proto Polynesian by Clark (1976:33)\(^9\) which is presented in (4.9), a preliminary reconstruction of Proto Central Pacific based on the discussion above is shown in (4.10). The external evidence comes from many

---

\(^8\) It should be noted that, although the sentence-initial Nominative full noun phrase position is shared by Rotuman and some Polynesian Outlier languages, the ways they developed are different. In Rotuman, the sentence-initial noun phrase position is considered to be a generalisation of the earlier clitic pronoun position as discussed in this section (see also §4.4.2), while in the Polynesian Outlier languages it is considered to have developed from an earlier topicalised noun position, with clitic pronouns still co-occurring in some sentences. See Clark (1976:39-40) for details.

\(^9\) Clark (1974:590-591) discusses problems associated with the reconstruction of the morphosyntactic function of this set of clitic pronouns (referred to by Clark as “pre-verbal pronouns”). See §4.3.7.
Western Austronesian languages where clitic pronouns typically follow sentence-initial verbs (Reid pers. comm.), and Eastern Oceanic languages where the same structure is found in various languages (Clark 1974:590).

(4.9) **Proto Polynesian—Clitic pronoun position** (Clark 1976:33)

\[ V = N \quad V \ldots + x l r y = pr n n \]

(4.10) **Proto Central Pacific—Clitic pronoun position**

\[ V = N \quad V \ldots + x l r y = pr n n \]

### 4.2.3 Post-transitive verb clitic position

It is generally accepted that the Fijian verb endings «a] ~ «e] ~ «ia] reflect the transitive ending Proto Oceanic *..i] followed by the Proto Oceanic third person “object” marking ending *..a]. Detailed discussion appears in Pawley and Sayaba (1971) and Geraghty (1983:261-265). The form *a is reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific as a third person clitic pronoun indicating the [PAT] of the transitive verb. Other singular pronominal forms clearly existed, and there was possibly also a third person plural clitic pronoun. Table 4.1 shows forms that follow the transitive verb in various Fijian languages.\(^{10}\) Based on the forms in Table 4.1, the singular short forms and the third person plural form can be reconstructed as in (4.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. Standard Fijian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>..ikēdaru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>..ikedarou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>..ikeda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{10}\) The phonemes /x/ in Kadavu and /x-xw/ in Nadrau correspond to /k/ in Standard Fijian and other Fijian languages.
### b. Kadavu (my fieldnotes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>.iau]</td>
<td>.iix]</td>
<td>.ixia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin</td>
<td>lex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>.ixedaru]</td>
<td>.ixêruxa]</td>
<td>.ixemuruxa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>.ixedatou]</td>
<td>.ixeitou]</td>
<td>.ixemutou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>.ixedatou]</td>
<td>.ixeitou]</td>
<td>.ixemutou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>.xedr]</td>
<td></td>
<td>.a]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*/dr/* in Kadavu often corresponds to */h/* in Standard Fijian and other Fijian languages.

### c. Batiwai (my fieldnotes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>.au]</td>
<td>.iko]</td>
<td>.a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin</td>
<td>lex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>.kedaru]</td>
<td>.kemaru]</td>
<td>.kemuru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>.kedatou]</td>
<td>.keda]</td>
<td>.kemadou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>.kedatou]</td>
<td>.keda]</td>
<td>.kemadou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td></td>
<td>.a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. Nadrau (my fieldnotes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>.au]</td>
<td>.xexo]</td>
<td>.xwaya]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin</td>
<td>lex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>.xitaruxa]</td>
<td>.xairau]</td>
<td>.xodrau]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>.xitatou]</td>
<td>.xaitou]</td>
<td>.xodou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>.xita]</td>
<td>.xaimamu]</td>
<td>.xoniu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td></td>
<td>.e]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .e] < *ia < *i + *a (Geraghty 1983:262)

### e. Wayan (based on Pawley and Sayaba n.d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>.au]</td>
<td>.ko]</td>
<td>.v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin</td>
<td>lex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>.iruiketa]</td>
<td>.irukemam]</td>
<td>.irukem]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>.ivatiketa]</td>
<td>.ivatikemam]</td>
<td>.ivatikem]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>.ikêta]</td>
<td>.ikêmam]</td>
<td>.ikêm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.ra]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is possible that some or all of the Wayan 3Sg forms may be used as non-specific, or General third person markers, as in other Fijian languages. However this is not mentioned in the source.
Proto Fijian—Some post-transitive verb [PAT] marking forms

1Sg  *au
2Sg  *ko~iko
3Sg  *a
3Pl  *ra~ira

When we compare the reconstructed forms for Proto Fijian in (4.11) with those reconstructed for Proto Oceanic, which are given in Table 4.2, it can be seen that both the forms and their syntactic function have been retained from Proto Oceanic. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that, in Proto Central Pacific, too, there were clitic pronouns that occurred following the transitive verb, indicating the person and number of the [PAT].

Table 4.2: Proto Oceanic “object enclitic pronouns”
(based on Evans 1995:137)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=ko</td>
<td>*=a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-singular</td>
<td>non-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sequence of the transitive ending *i followed by the third person singular form *a is reflected in Polynesian languages and Rotuman as the verb ending ..Cia] or the like, although they no longer clearly reflect the form’s original morphosyntactic function as a transitive verb ending.\(^\text{11}\) Therefore, a [PAT] clitic pronoun position following the transitive verb is not reconstructable for Proto Polynesian. The endings in the daughter languages have been described as having various functions as summarised by Ota (1999:124-175). The distribution and semantic features observed in the so-called “-Cia suffixes” in Polynesian languages today reflect the nature of the earlier transitive verb ending, which underwent various changes in each language.

The reconstructed Proto Central Pacific (and Proto Fijian) and Proto Polynesian structures are shown in (4.12) and (4.13).

Proto Central Pacific—Post-transitive verb pronoun position

\[
\begin{align*}
V &= N \\
+trns &+prnn \\
   &\text{PAT} \\
\ldots &=i
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{11}\) See §4.6 for some comments on the development of the transitive ending.
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(4.13) Proto Polynesian—Transitive verb

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \\
+tms & \\
..ia] & \\
..i] & 
\end{align*}
\]

4.2.4 Basic sentence structures

4.2.4.1 Two casemarking strategies in Fijian: which is the retention?

It has been shown in §3.3 that Fijian languages show a variety of casemarking strategies. They can be summarised in two basic systems as shown in (4.14).

(4.14) Fijian—Two different casemarking strategies

System A

a. Transitive \( (V) \ V (Adv) \ NP \ NP \)

\( (+xlry) +tms \)

\( PAT \ AGT \ actr \)

b. Intransitive \( (V) \ V (Adv) \ NP \)

\( (+xlry) -tms \)

\( Nom \ PAT \ actr \)

* [actr] agreement on the sentence-initial verb.

* [PAT] agreement on transitive verbs.

System B

a. Transitive \( (V) \ V (Adv) \ NP \ NP \)

\( (+xlry) +tms \)

\( PAT \ AGT \)

\( -prpr \ actr \)

b. Transitive \( (V) \ V =NP (Adv) \ NP \)

\( (+xlry) +tms \)

\( Acc \)

\( PAT \)

\( +prpr \)

\( AGT \)

\( actr \)

* [actr] agreement on the sentence-initial verb.

* [PAT] agreement on transitive verbs.

c. Intransitive \( (V) \ V (Adv) \ NP \)

\( (+xlry) -tms \)

\( Nom \)

\( PAT \)

\( actr \)
Details of each system and its variations found in Fijian languages have already been described in §3.3. The question that needs to be answered here is what kind of system Proto Fijian had, and how the currently observed systems have developed from it.

The difference between the two systems is how a proper noun [PAT] is casemarked. In System A, there is no casemarking on noun phrases while in System B, when the [PAT] of a transitive sentence is expressed by a noun phrase, it is casemarked by being encliticised to the main verb. Geraghty (1983:230-231) suggests that the structure that requires a proper noun [PAT] (Structure b. in System B) must be an innovation in Fijian languages following the claim made by Clark (1974:562-563) that it is not found outside Fiji. This claim, that the structure with a proper noun [PAT] in Fijian is an innovation, is further supported by the following facts. While there are two structures differing according to the nature of the [PAT] noun in Fijian, Tongan (representing Proto Polynesian) and Rotuman have only one transitive structure each. Tongan and Rotuman do not require different syntactic environments to distinguish non-pronominal proper nouns from non-proper nouns. We can infer from this that the transitive structure that is required in Fijian when the [PAT] is expressed by a proper noun, is probably an innovation, rather than a retention. This innovation must have developed after Proto Polynesian and Pre Rotuman split off from their parent dialect chains.

In addition, in both Tongan and Rotuman, the casemarking system on pronouns is usually the same as that on non-pronominal nouns, while in most Fijian languages the casemarking system on pronouns differs from that on non-pronominal nouns. More specifically, in most Fijian languages, verb endings exist that often appear to be a sequence of the form $i$ and a full pronoun and there are no pronouns that are analysed as Accusative. This suggests the possibility that [PAT] agreement marking developed in Fijian as a grammaticisation of cliticised pronouns. In order to account for the Fijian [PAT] endings, we must assume that there was either a verb ending or a clitic pronoun that followed the verb in the reconstructed structure. It has already been mentioned in §4.2.3 that in some languages, such as in Wayan (see Table 4.1e), two pronominal transitive verb endings occur, with short endings usually found for third person singular and long endings for other person and numbers, reflecting a change whereby the morphosyntactic function of long endings and short endings merged.

Based on the discussion above, the sentence structures of Proto Fijian are reconstructed as shown in (4.15).
4.15 Proto Fijian—Sentence structures

a. \( V =N V \ NP \)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
+xlry \\
+prn \ -trns \\
actr \\
actr
\end{array}
\]

Nom
PAT

b. \( V =N V \ PP \ NP \)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
+xlry \\
+prn \ -trns \\
actr \\
actr
\end{array}
\]

Lcv
MNS/COR

Nom
PAT

actr

\( V =N V \ NP \ NP \)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
+xlry \\
+prn \ +trns \\
actr \\
actr
\end{array}
\]

Acc
PAT
AGT

Nom
actr

\( V +trns \)

\( \ldots iXJ \)

\* \( \ldots iXJ \) \ [PAT] agreement-marking ending on transitive verbs.

4.2.4.2 A comparison of the Proto Fijian structures with those in Rotuman

Although Rotuman is an accusative language as Fijian languages are, its casemarking strategy differs from those found in Fijian in that the Nominative and Accusative cases are determined solely by the position of nouns. The language is considered to have split off from the western end of Fiji (the western end of the Proto Western Fijian–Rotuman dialect chain in the subgrouping hypothesis proposed by Geraghty and Pawley, see §1.4.1), but there is no language having such a word order currently spoken in Fiji. The question thus arises as to how the Rotuman word order developed from the system from which the Fijian languages also developed.

The basic sentence structures of Rotuman, which were described in §3.2, are summarised in (4.16).

4.16 Rotuman—Basic sentence structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>(V)</th>
<th>V (Adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>(+xlry)</td>
<td>-trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>(V)</th>
<th>V (Adv)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>(+xlry)</td>
<td>-trns</td>
<td>Dtv</td>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

Transitive NP (V) V (Adv) NP
   Nom  (+xlry)  +trns   Acc
   AGT  PAT
   actr

It has been already mentioned in §4.2.2 that the Rotuman Nominative (pre-verbal) position is the result of the retention of the earlier [actr] clitic pronouns and of the shift in position of non-clitic [actr] nouns to pre-verbal position. Similarly, the Accusative noun phrase is considered to have developed from the [PAT] noun phrase that followed the verb in Proto Central Pacific.

In the reconstructed Proto Fijian sentence structures shown in (4.15), there are two positions in which an [actr] may occur: one is the clitic pronoun position that has been determined to be post-auxiliary verb, while the other is the position for a full [actr] NP, i.e. after the non-auxiliary verb (and Adverbs, if any). I conclude from these facts that the change of the position of the [actr] clitic pronoun from the post-auxiliary position to the pre-auxiliary position (shown in Stage I in [4.4]) took place in the west of Fijian before Rotuman split off. After Rotuman split off, the Proto Fijian [actr] clitic pronoun position was interpreted as the position of all [actr] NPs in Rotuman, and other nouns started occurring in this position to eventually become completely pre-verbal. The fact that, in Fijian languages, the languages that maintain a post-auxiliary position for [actr] agreement-marking forms are observed in the East supports the claim that this change in position first took place in the western part of the chain.

The Accusative position in Rotuman suggests that this must be a retention of the Proto Fijian position of a noun phrase that was not preceded by a preposition and that followed the Verbs (and Adverbs when there were any). This is reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific, which is shown in (4.17).

(4.17) Proto Central Pacific—Position of Nominative NP

\[
\begin{align*}
\star V & \quad V \quad (\text{Adv}) \quad \text{NP} \\
+\text{xlry} & \quad +\text{trns} & \quad \text{PAT} & \quad \text{AGT} \\
\text{Nom} & \quad \text{actr}
\end{align*}
\]

The following facts support this reconstruction. Fijian languages, Tongan, and Rotuman all have intransitive verbs with an “incorporated” noun (§2.6.1.4, §2.6.2.4.1 and §2.6.3.4). Such a structure, then, is reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific. This is illustrated in (4.18), where the verb form is indicated in the bottom line as ..\_N\_ to show that it carries an ending of which is equivalent to a Noun.

12 The word order of the [PAT] NP and [AGT] NP was probably flexible, being determined by factors such as whether the phrase was pronominal or not. In the daughter languages of Proto Central Pacific, a pronominal phrase tends to occur closer to the verb than non-pronominal phrases.
In Fijian and Tongan, the distinction between the noun-like ending on the verb and an independent noun that follows the verb is clear, because the independent noun is preceded by either a Preposition and/or Determiner, while the “incorporated” one does not have any such form preceding it.

4.2.4.3 Basic sentence patterns in Proto Polynesian

As discussed in §3.4.1.2, although there has been agreement on the reconstruction of Proto Polynesian sentence structures, there has been no agreement on the nature of the casemarking of the NPs that occur in these sentence structures. The sentence structures that are commonly agreed on in previous studies, combined with Clark’s reconstruction shown in (4.9), are presented in (4.19). The determination of the case system of this language will be discussed in §4.3, based on the forms and distributions of the reconstructed Proto Polynesian pronouns.

4.2.5 A summary: Proto Central Pacific basic sentence structures

Based on the discussion presented in this section, the skeletal structures of Proto Central Pacific can be reconstructed as in (4.20). The actancy system of Proto Central Pacific, including the morphosyntactic function of the elements that occur in each structure, will be determined in §4.3, based on a comparison of the pronominal forms in its daughter languages.
Reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

(4.20) Proto Central Pacific—Basic sentence structures (a preliminary reconstruction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCP [-trns]</th>
<th>*V =N V (NP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+xly +prnn -trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP [-trns]</td>
<td>*V =N V (NP) (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+xly +prnn -trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP [+trns]</td>
<td>*V =N V =N (NP) (NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+xly +prnn +trns +prnn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 A reconstruction of the Proto Central Pacific clitic pronoun system

Fijian and many Polynesian languages have forms that occur either preceding (or as the initial phonological sequence of), or following (or as the ending of) the sentence-initial auxiliary verb, and indicate person and number of one of the arguments that occur in the sentence. Some of these forms are analysed as verb-agreement marking forms, while some are analysed as clitic pronouns. The verb-agreement/clitic-pronoun systems in Central Pacific languages did not form a central part of discussion in previous studies where the historical changes of the actancy systems in this language family were examined. This is probably because of the similarities found in the systems in Fijian, Tongan, and Samoan, the languages that were relatively well-documented when most of these studies were conducted. The relevant forms in each of these languages were considered to show an accusative casemarking pattern, and therefore did not appear to reflect any sort of historical changes in their morphosyntactic characteristics. Pawley (1970:325-327) reconstructs a set of "embedded subject person-markers" for Proto Polynesian, which implies a clitic pronoun system with an accusative pattern. Clark (1974:590-591, referring to the "fronting" of pronouns) argues that in Proto Polynesian, a clitic pronoun must have indicated the [actr], and that it is not clear whether a form may have also indicated the [PAT] of transitive sentences or not. There is no mention of the patterning of clitic pronoun forms in Ota (1999). Although Chung (1978:31-37) discusses "clitic placement" that applies to "subjects", there is no mention of the system in Proto Polynesian from which these clitics could have developed.

Interestingly, lexical reconstruction of the verb-agreement/clitic-pronoun forms has not been very successful despite the assumption that the clitic pronoun forms were retained with little change in their morphosyntactic function. This is due to the fact that various apparently conflicting forms are found in the daughter languages, as will be seen later in this section. For example, Geraghty (1983:377) reconstructs the form *(k$q)auV (V stands for a verb to which the form is attached) for the Proto Tokalau-Fijian Polynesian13 first person singular "affixed or clitic pronoun". This is an attempt to account for various forms such as (k$q)au (Eastern Fijian), u-ku-kau-oku-ou (Tongan), ko (Tokelauan), ?ou-o?u (Samoan), etc. This reconstruction would probably need to be considered correct under the assumption that Proto Tokalau-Fijian Polynesian only had a single form for first person singular from which all the forms that are observed in the daughter languages today developed.

---

13 See §1.4.1 for the position of Proto Tokalau-Fijian Polynesian in the Central Pacific family.
In recent years, detailed descriptions of some of the other Polynesian languages have become available, providing us with the evidence needed to make a fuller examination of the development of the clitic pronouns and a reconstruction of the proto clitic-pronoun system(s). Following a discussion as to the original position of the clitic-pronoun/verb-agreement forms in §4.3.1, this study will examine the first person singular [actr] verb agreement-marking forms observed in the Fijian languages. In §4.3.2, it will be shown that Fijian [actr] agreement-marking forms appear to be the reflexes of Proto Malayo-Polynesian Genitive and Nominative clitic pronouns. Based on this fact, it will be argued that the Proto Central Pacific (and Proto Polynesian) clitic-pronoun systems had an ergative casemarking pattern, as most linguists assume that they did in Proto Malayo-Polynesian. Changes that Fijian languages must have undergone will be illustrated in §4.3.3. Various clitic pronoun forms and systems that are observed in Polynesian languages today support this hypothesis, as will be shown in §4.3.4 to §4.3.7.

4.3.1 Fijian verb-agreement forms

Pawley and Sayaba (1971) reconstruct both Proto Western Fijian and Proto Eastern Fijian verb agreement-marking forms (referred to as “preverbal pronouns”), but leave the reconstruction of Proto Fijian “tentative”. They claim, though, that “most of the evidence, internal and external, indicates that (a) the [Proto Fijian preverbal pronoun] forms closely resembled the Proto Western basic/past set [the set of the forms without following iJ in most details, but (b) tense was marked in Proto Fijian, as in Proto Eastern [Fijian], by separate particles…” (1971:420). The reconstruction by Pawley and Sayaba is shown in Table 4.3. The set of present/future forms is considered to be an innovation in Western Fijian (Pawley and Sayaba 1971:418-420, Geraghty 1983:281-286).

Table 4.3: Pawley and Sayaba’s reconstruction of the Fijian [actr] clitic pronouns (1971:419-420)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proto Eastern Fijian</th>
<th>Proto Western Fijian</th>
<th>Proto Fijian (tentative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-time/</td>
<td>present/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>past</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>*au</td>
<td>*qu</td>
<td>*qu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>*ko</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*(k)o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>*koya</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*- (zero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl [DI]</td>
<td>*keiru(ka)</td>
<td>*maru</td>
<td>*maru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPl</td>
<td>*keitou</td>
<td>*matu</td>
<td>*matou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1exPc</td>
<td>*keimami</td>
<td>*mamu</td>
<td>*mami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1nDI</td>
<td>*daru</td>
<td>*taru</td>
<td>*taru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1nPc</td>
<td>*datou, *tou</td>
<td>*tu</td>
<td>*tai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1nPc [PI]</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*ta</td>
<td>*ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DI</td>
<td>*(mu)ru(ka)</td>
<td>*muru</td>
<td>*murou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pc</td>
<td>*(mu)n(i,u)</td>
<td>*mi</td>
<td>*(mu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pl</td>
<td>*(ru(ka)</td>
<td>*aru, ru</td>
<td>*(ru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DI</td>
<td>*ratou</td>
<td>*(aru, ru)</td>
<td>*(ratou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pc</td>
<td>*ra</td>
<td>*ara, ra</td>
<td>*(erei, rei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*(ra)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among these forms, the difference between the Western Fijian non-time/past set and the corresponding Eastern Fijian set is most apparent with the first person singular forms. In Western Fijian languages, the form is *qu, occurring either as the initial or final sequence on the sentence-initial auxiliary verb or a clitic pronoun preceding or following the verb. The reconstruction for Proto Western Fijian is *qu, while the reconstruction for Proto Eastern Fijian is *au as shown in Table 4.3, and the distribution of the reflexes in Fijian languages is shown in Table 4.4.

In Table 4.4, language names are listed in the first column. In the second column, the subgrouping of each language suggested by Geraghty (1983) is indicated. The letter “E” stands for Eastern Fijian, and the letter “W” stands for Western Fijian. Symbols (-E) and (-W) indicate that the language is spoken in the area which is geographically close to those that belong to the other subgroup. The symbol “W?” indicated for Nabukelevu means that its subgrouping is not yet clear, but the language is known for sharing many characteristics with Western Fijian languages. Likewise, the symbol “E?” for Wailevu indicates that its subgrouping is not clear, but the language is known for sharing many characteristics with Eastern Fijian languages (see Pawley and Sayaba 1971, Geraghty 1983:301).

Table 4.4: First person singular verb-agreement forms in various Fijian languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>W/E</th>
<th>form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Fijian (K)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[au..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wailevu, Kadavu (K)</td>
<td>E?</td>
<td>[au..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau (G77)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[(k)au.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waidina (G83, 77)</td>
<td>E (-W)</td>
<td>qu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadrau (K)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[au..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokaimalo (G83:211)</td>
<td>W (-E)</td>
<td>[au..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabukelevu (K)</td>
<td>W?</td>
<td>=qu, qu=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayan (PS)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[qu..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiwai (K)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[qu..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubai (G83:211)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[qu..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakoroboya (G83:252)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[qu..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubaniwai (G83:284)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>[qu..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: G83 = Geraghty (1983); G77 = Geraghty (1977); PS = Pawley and Sayaba (n.d.); K = my fieldnotes.

As can be seen in the table, the distribution of each form is clear. The sequence *qu is found in Western languages while the sequence *au is found in Eastern languages and the reconstruction of the Western and Eastern Fijian forms proposed by Pawley and Sayaba is not controversial. However, it is not possible to reconstruct a single Proto Fijian form that could have regularly developed into these two forms, Proto Western Fijian *qu and Proto Eastern Fijian *au. Either one of the forms is innovative and the other is a retention, or both forms need to be reconstructed to Proto Fijian but with different functions. Based on an examination

---

14 See §4.2.2 for descriptions of the relevant forms.
of the forms found in both upper-level protolanguages and other Central Pacific languages, I claim here that:

i) Both *qu and *au should be reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific.

ii) The former is a reflex of an earlier Genitive first person singular clitic pronoun, which indicated the [AGT] of transitive sentences as well as the possessor in Proto Central Pacific, while the latter is a reflex of an earlier Nominative first person singular clitic pronoun, indicating the [PAT].

External evidence to support the reconstruction of these two forms will be presented in §4.3.2. Internal evidence reflecting the reconstructed Proto Central Pacific system, and scenarios as to how the systems observed in Fijian and some Polynesian languages developed, will be presented in §4.3.3 and §4.3.4 respectively.

4.3.2 Possible sources of the two Fijian verb-agreement forms

The correspondence between Proto Malayo-Polynesian and Pre Proto Oceanic first person singular clitic pronouns and those found in Fijian languages is rather straightforward. Reconstructed first person clitic pronoun forms in Proto Malayo-Polynesian and Pre Proto Oceanic, and the proposed forms for Proto Central Pacific are shown in Table 4.5.

| Table 4.5: Reconstructed first person singular clitic pronoun forms and their reflexes in Fijian |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Proto Malayo-Polynesian (Blust 1977) | *(n)i-ku | *aku |
| Pre Proto Oceanic (Ross in press:14) | *ku= | *au= |
| Proto Central Pacific | *=ŋku | *=au |
| Current Fijian | The reflex of either *=ŋku or *=au |

In both Proto Malayo-Polynesian and Pre Proto Oceanic, these clitic pronoun forms are considered to have shown an ergative system. The clitic pronouns that indicated Ergative are called Genitive clitic pronouns, for the forms also marked the possessor as they still do in many Philippine languages. An example from Kapampangan is provided in (4.21).

(4.21) Kapampangan—The 1Sg form ku marking possessor and the [AGT]
a. Ing estudyante ing anak ku.
the student the child my
‘My child is the student.’ (Mirikitani 1972:135)

15 The reason why these forms are reconstructed as clitic pronouns rather than verb agreement forms has already been discussed in §4.2.2.
The form *qu* in Fijian appears to be a reflex of the Genitive form reconstructed for Proto Malayo-Polynesian, while *au* appear to be a reflex of the Nominative form in Pre Proto Oceanic (with irregular loss of the medial consonant). Although it seems clear that the Fijian forms are continuation of forms that have been reconstructed for earlier protolanguages, it is necessary to determine what their morphosyntactic functions were in Proto Central Pacific. More specifically,

1) Is it possible that the two Fijian [actr] agreement forms could have developed from distinct Proto Central Pacific Genitive and Nominative forms?

2) If so, should the ergative clitic pronoun(s) be called “Genitive” in Proto Central Pacific as well?

The first point will be discussion from §4.3.3 to §4.3.5, where it is shown that the current Fijian system must have developed from the system stated above. The answer to the second question is “yes” as well, as discussed in §4.3.6.

4.3.3 Development of the Fijian system: a change from ergative to accusative

In §4.2.2 and §4.2.3, possible Proto Central Pacific clitic pronoun positions were reconstructed. In §4.3.2, it was suggested that the Fijian first person singular clitic pronouns forms may have come from the Proto Malayo-Polynesian Genitive and Nominative clitic pronouns *ni-ku and *aku, and Pre Proto Oceanic *ku= and *au, implying that the protosystem was ergative. If this is correct, Proto Central Pacific must have had the sentence structures as shown in (4.22). Sentence structures with the reconstructed first person singular clitic pronoun forms are also shown, in (4.23).

(4.22) Proto Central Pacific—Sentence structures with clitic pronouns

Intransitive

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
V & =N & V \text{ (NP)} \\
+\text{xlry} & \text{Nom} & -\text{trns} \\
+\text{prnn} & & \\
\end{array} \]

Transitive

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
V & =N & V \text{ (NP)} \\
+\text{xlry} & \text{Gen} & =N(NP) \\
+\text{prnn} & & +\text{prnn} \\
\end{array} \]

(4.23) Proto Central Pacific—Sentence structures with first person singular clitic pronouns

Intransitive

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
V & =au & V \text{ (NP)} \\
+\text{xlry} & \text{Nom} & -\text{trns} \\
1\text{Sg} & & \\
\end{array} \]

Transitive

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
V & =gku & V \text{ =au (NP)} \\
+\text{xlry} & \text{Gen} & =au \text{ (NP)} \\
1\text{Sg} & & 1\text{Sg} \\
\end{array} \]
Note that, in the Fijian languages today, the same form occurs in the post-auxiliary positions of both intransitive and transitive sentences. These positions are indicated with dotted lines in (4.22) and (4.23). I argue that in the Western Fijian languages the form *ŋku was generalised to occur in both [actr] positions, Genitive of the transitive construction and Nominative of the intransitive construction, replacing the earlier Nominative form *au, while in the Eastern Fijian languages the form *au was generalised to occur in both [actr] positions, replacing the earlier Genitive form *ŋku. The form that occurred as the first person singular [PAT] of transitive sentences, *au, was retained in all Fijian languages. These changes are shown in Figure 4.1 with, again, the reconstructed first person singular forms.

As a single pronominal form was generalised for each person and number in the post-auxiliary verb position, the original morphological contrast, that is the morphological contrast of Genitive versus Nominative (ergative pattern), was now replaced by a position contrast. In the Eastern Fijian languages the morphological casemarking of clitic pronouns was completely lost, with word order only being used to distinguish the case of clitic pronouns. This resulted in a switch to an accusative system with the post auxiliary position marking the [actr] and the post main verb position marking the [PAT] of a transitive sentence. In the Western Fijian languages where the Genitive forms were generalised, an accusative casemarking pattern also developed, but it was marked morphologically, the form *qu now indicating the [actr] (thus Nominative) and *au indicating the [PAT] of transitive sentences (thus Accusative).

![Figure 4.1: The development of an [actr] clitic pronoun (and thus an accusative system) in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain](image)

As has been proposed for both Proto Malayo-Polynesian and Pre Proto Oceanic, the casemarking of forms that are reconstructed as the [AGT] of transitive sentences in Proto
Central Pacific can be labelled as Genitive, rather than Ergative, because the reflexes in Fijian languages also occur as possessors. Examples are shown in (4.24) to (4.26).

(4.24) **Wailevu—Ending for possessed nouns**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{noqu ila} & \quad \text{‘my name’} \\
\text{mine name}
\end{align*}
\]

(4.25) **Standard Fijian—Genitive pronoun cliticised to noun**

\[
\begin{align*}
yaca=qu & \quad \text{‘my name’} \\
\text{name=my}
\end{align*}
\]

(4.26) **Batiwai—Genitive pronoun cliticised to noun**

\[
\begin{align*}
qu=yaca & \quad \text{‘my name’} \\
\text{my=name}
\end{align*}
\]

In the Western Fijian languages, the first person verb agreement-marking form and the first person possessive-marking forms are formally identical, namely ..*qu*, or /qu.., while in the Eastern Fijian languages there are two separate forms to indicate the two, namely ..*qu* /=qu and /au.. It can be claimed that, in Western Fijian languages, the form *qu* was retained both as an agreement-marking form and as a possessive-marking form, while in Eastern Fijian, the verb agreement-marking form was replaced and the possessive-marking form was retained.

As described above, the proposed hypothesis that Proto Central Pacific had two sets of clitic pronouns showing an ergative pattern is not only possible, but explains the distribution of the different clitic pronoun forms found in the daughter languages spoken in Fiji today. Table 4.6 shows a reconstruction of the Proto Central Pacific singular clitic pronominal forms based on the hypothesis proposed above that Proto Central Pacific had two clitic pronoun sets, Genitive and Nominative. The Fijian evidence for the first person singular forms has already been discussed in the previous section. The second and third person Nominative forms are reconstructed based on the forms that occur in the post transitive verb position in the Fijian languages, which also occur in the post auxiliary position. The Genitive forms are reconstructed based on the possessive pronouns used in Fijian languages. No reflexes of the reconstructed second and third person Genitive forms occurring on sentence-initial auxiliary verbs occur in Fijian languages today although reflexes of *=mu are found as initial sequences of non-singular second person [actr] clitic pronouns (see Table 4.3). The reconstructions are therefore based entirely on forms observed in Polynesian languages. These will be discussed in the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.6: Reconstruction of singular clitic pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proto Malayo-Polynesian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Sg</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(n)i-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*=ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*=ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: The PMP top line follows Blust (1977), the bottom line follows Ross (in press). Proto Oceanic pronominal forms follow Ross (in press), except that he reconstructs them as proclitics, while I consider that they were enclitics, based on the evidence from Central Pacific languages.

### 4.3.4 Reflexes of the Proto Central Pacific clitic pronouns in Polynesian languages

The various clitic pronoun systems observed in Polynesian languages today have been described in §3.4.2. It has been shown that Tongan and Samoan are considered to have an [actr] agreement-marking/clitic-pronoun system showing an accusative pattern. Languages, such as Tokelauan and Tuvaluan, have a set of Ergative clitic pronouns. According to Dougherty (1983:34-38), clitic pronouns in West Futuna–Aniwan indicate the [actr] today, but she notes that Capell (1958:123) claimed that they only occurred in transitive sentences, in which case they would have marked the [AGT] of transitive sentences (see §3.4.2.3).

Table 4.7 shows agreement-marking/clitic-pronoun forms in some Polynesian languages. Forms of each person are listed beneath their Proto Central Pacific reconstructions. For example, those that are reflexes of a Genitive clitic pronoun in Proto Central Pacific are listed in the leftmost column, while those that are not clear reflexes of either of the Proto Central Pacific reconstructions are listed in the rightmost column. A tentative reconstruction of the Proto Polynesian clitic pronouns, based on the forms appearing in this table, is given in the bottom line.

#### Table 4.7: The clitic pronoun forms occurring on the sentence-initial auxiliary verb in some Polynesian languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Central Pacific</th>
<th>1Sg Gen</th>
<th>1Sg Nom</th>
<th>2Sg Gen</th>
<th>2Sg Nom</th>
<th>3Sg Gen</th>
<th>3Sg Nom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ou-u</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>?ou</td>
<td>o?u</td>
<td>?e</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td></td>
<td>kē</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Futunan</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td></td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Uvean</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>u-au</td>
<td>kee</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Futuna–Aniwan</td>
<td>ηk-nk</td>
<td>h-ah^</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Polynesian</th>
<th>1Sg Gen</th>
<th>1Sg Nom</th>
<th>2Sg Gen</th>
<th>2Sg Nom</th>
<th>3Sg Gen</th>
<th>3Sg Nom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*=ku</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=u</td>
<td>*=kē</td>
<td>*=na</td>
<td>*=Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Previous reconstruction of the Proto Polynesian singular clitic pronouns: *kau '1Sg', *ke '2Sg', *na '3Sg' (Pawley 1970:348).
The reason why these forms are called Genitive rather than Ergative will be discussed in §4.3.6.

As will be shown in §4.3.6, the clitic pronouns indicating the [AGT] and the possessor of the same person and number are considered to have had the same form in both Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian. Although the form *mu is not reflected as a second person clitic-pronoun/verb-agreement form in Fijian languages today, second person singular possessor-marking forms in Fijian languages are reflexes of *=mu, of which the Proto Polynesian form *=u is a reflex. Therefore, *mu is reconstructed as the second person singular Genitive clitic form in Proto Central Pacific.

See footnote 16 for a possible account of the initial nasals.

4.3.5 Samoan “clitic placement”

Among Polynesian languages that have clitic pronouns occurring on the sentence-initial verb, Samoan provides evidence to support the morphosyntactic reconstruction proposed in the previous section.

In Samoan, an independent pronoun alternates with a clitic pronoun, which occurs either preceding or following the sentence-initial auxiliary verb. The occurrence of a clitic pronoun instead of an independent pronoun is often referred to as “clitic placement” (for example, Chung 1978, Cook 1991). According to Chung (1978:35), a clitic pronoun may occur when what is expressed by a pronoun is “neither emphatic nor contrastive”. Example sentences are given in (4.27) to illustrate this alternation.

(4.27) Samoan—Example of so-called “clitic placement”

a.  
Na  
opoa  
e  
ai  
le  
teine.  

| past  | hug  | Erg 3SG | the girl |
| V     | V    | P N    | Det N |
| +x1r | +trns | AGT  | PAT  |
|       |       | actr  |

‘He hugged the girl.’ (Cook 1991:82, my analysis)

b.  
Na   =ia  
opoina le teine.  

| past 3Sg | hug  | the girl |
| V N V    | Det N |
| +x1r     | AGT  | +trns  |
|          | PAT  | actr   |

‘He hugged the girl.’ (Cook 1991:82, my analysis)

c.  
?a=na fasia le teine.  

| perf 3Sg | hit  | the girl |
| V N V    | Det N |
| +x1r AGT | +trns | PAT |
|          | actr  |

‘He hit the girl.’ (Mosel 1987:461, my analysis)

In (4.27a), an ergatively marked third person singular pronoun ia occurs following the verb. This pronominal phrase alternates with a third person pronoun ia which is cliticised to the
Whenever a clitic pronoun alternates with the third person singular independent pronoun, as shown in these examples, it may be realised as either =ia or =na, while the form of the independent pronoun is always ia. An example with the clitic pronoun =na is given in (4.27c). The form of a clitic pronoun and that of the corresponding independent pronoun may or may not be identical. Table 4.8 shows the forms of Samoan clitic pronouns and independent pronouns.

Table 4.8: Samoan clitic pronouns and independent pronouns (based on Mosel and Hovdhaugen 1992:122-124, “preverbal pronouns” and “independent pronouns”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic Pronoun</th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Pronoun</td>
<td>a?u</td>
<td>?oe</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* o’ou “has been the most common form of the non-emotional first person singular in the nineteenth [sic] and early twentieth century Samoan.” O’u “was mainly used after the TAM [Tense-Aspect marking] particles ‘olo’o and ‘ole’eɑ and when there was no TAM particle...o’u is increasingly used”. Ou “is a colloquial form. =’u is a bound allomorph (always written together with the preceding morpheme) that is found in the colloquial language after the TAM particles ‘ua, ‘ole’eɑ, sɑ, and na.” (1992:123)

† “...the forms with long vowels are emphatic forms. The forms without an initial glottal stop are today more frequent than the...one with the initial glottal stop.” (1992:123)

‡ “The two variants of the third singular are...identical in function and distribution except that ia cannot be combined with the general TAM particle te.” (1992:124)

“Clitic placement” in Samoan is generally considered to show an accusative pattern (Mosel 1987, Cook 1991); that is, a clitic pronoun cannot express the [PAT] of a transitive verb. A pair of examples illustrating this is given in (4.28).

(4.28) Samoan—Restriction of “clitic placement” (Cook 1991:82-83, my analysis)

a. Na opo ?o ia e le tama.
   past hug Nom 3Sg Erg the boy
   V V P N P Det N
   +xlny +trns PAT AGT actr
   ‘She was hugged by the boy.’

b. *Na =ia opo(-ina) e le teine. (unacceptable)
   past 3Sg hug Erg the girl
   V N V P Det N
   +xlny PAT +trns AGT
   ‘I.M. She was hugged by the boy.’

According to Mosel (1987), these clitic pronouns are, in fact, restricted in their distribution. Table 4.9 is a summary of such restrictions presented by Mosel shown along with the terms...
used in this study. It should be noted that “clitic placement” may occur with all pronouns only when they are the (ergative) actor of a transitive verb. They are completely restricted from occurring when the pronoun is the (absolutive) “undergoer” of a transitive verb as shown in (4.28).

Table 4.9: The occurrence of clitic pronouns in Samoan
(based on Mosel 1987:461)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor of [-trns] inactive verbs</th>
<th>Undergoer of intransitive inactive verbs</th>
<th>Actor of transitive verb</th>
<th>Undergoer of transitive verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Abs]</td>
<td>[Abs]</td>
<td>[Erg]</td>
<td>[Abs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2Sg, DI, PI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DI, PI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms used in this study: [actr] [PAT] of -trns [AGT] [PAT] of +trns

Notes: “+” indicates that the use of clitic pronouns is permitted; “-” indicates that the use of clitic pronouns is not permitted.

The forms and the distribution of the occurrence of the clitic pronouns in Samoan are explained by assuming a Proto Polynesian system similar to that proposed for Proto Central Pacific in (4.22). The Proto Polynesian system is shown in (4.29). The same structures including the reconstructed singular clitic pronouns shown in Table 4.7 are given in (4.30). The dotted lines show the post sentence-initial auxiliary verb position where only a single set of clitic pronouns occurs in Samoan today.

(4.29) **Proto Polynesian—Sentence structures with clitic pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>=N</th>
<th>V (NP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+xlry Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+prnn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>=N</th>
<th>V (NP) (NP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+xlry Gen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+trns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+prnn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4.30) **Proto Polynesian—Sentence structures with singular clitic pronouns**

a. Intransitive | V | =au | V (NP) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+xlry Nom 1Sg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-trns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitive | V | =ku | V (NP) (NP) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+xlry Erg 1Sg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+trns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Intransitive  
\[ V =k_e \]  
\[ +x_{lry} \]  
\[ \text{Nom} \]  
\[ 2\text{Sg} \]  
\[ V \]  
\[ (NP) \]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ V =u ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ +x_{lry} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \text{Erg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ 2\text{Sg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ V ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Intransitive  
\[ V =\emptyset \]  
\[ +x_{lry} \]  
\[ \text{Nom} \]  
\[ 3\text{Sg} \]  
\[ V \]  
\[ (NP) \]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ V =n_{a} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ +x_{lry} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \text{Erg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ 3\text{Sg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ V ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Samoan, both the [PAT] of an intransitive sentence and the [AGT] of a transitive sentence can be expressed with a clitic pronoun when it is either first or second person singular, while it is only the [AGT] that a clitic pronoun can express when it is third person singular. Compare Samoan sentence structures given in (4.31) (with the form ?u representing the first person singular forms, and the form na representing the third person singular forms) with those reconstructed for Proto Polynesian in (4.30). It can be seen that for first and second persons only a single clitic pronoun occurs in the same position (boxed with a dotted line) indicating the [actr], while in an intransitive sentence with a third person singular [actr], having no overt form, the Proto Polynesian system was retained.

(4.31) Samoan—Sentence structures with singular clitic pronouns
a. Intransitive  
\[ V =?_{u} \]  
\[ +x_{lry} \]  
\[ \text{Nom} \]  
\[ 1\text{Sg} \]  
\[ V \]  
\[ (NP) \]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ V =?_{u} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ +x_{lry} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \text{Erg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ 1\text{Sg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ V ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Intransitive  
\[ V =?_{e} \]  
\[ +x_{lry} \]  
\[ \text{Nom} \]  
\[ 2\text{Sg} \]  
\[ V \]  
\[ (NP) \]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ V =?_{e} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ +x_{lry} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \text{Erg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ 2\text{Sg} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ V ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ (NP) ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Intransitive  
\[ V = \emptyset \]  
+xlry  
Nom  
3Sg  
\[ V \]  
-\text{trns}  
NP

Transitive  
\[ V = na \]  
+xlry  
Erg  
3Sg  
\[ V \]  
+\text{trns}  
NP (NP)

Most of the first person singular clitic pronouns in Samoan, namely *ou, o*u, and ou, regularly reflect any of the reconstructed pronominal forms, although they appear to have developed from the Proto Polynesian forms *ku and *au (clitic pronouns) and *aku (see §4.4.1.1), a glottal stop being a regular reflex of *k. The irregular phonological change from *a to o must have taken place after languages that belong to the lower-level subgroups split off, since both *ku, *aku and *au are regularly reflected in other Polynesian languages including those that belong to lower-level subgroups. The form ia occurring in the clitic pronoun position is considered to have developed from the third person independent pronoun that spread to this position at a later stage.

4.3.6 Genitive, or ergative?

Should the Ergative clitic pronouns be called “Genitive” as they are in Proto Malayo-Polynesian and Proto Central Pacific? There is evidence that suggests that Ergative clitic pronouns had the same forms as possessive pronouns in Proto Polynesian.

Table 4.10 shows Wilson’s reconstruction of the possessive pronouns in Proto Polynesian. The reflexes of Proto Polynesian Genitive clitic pronoun and the possessive pronouns in some Polynesian languages are shown (4.32) to (4.34).

| Table 4.10: Reconstructed singular possessive pronouns (Wilson 1982:113) |
|------------------|---------|--------|---------|
|                  | 1Sg     | 2Sg    | 3Sg     |
| Proto Eastern Oceanic | *-ŋku   | *-mu   | *-na    |
| Standard Fijian      | ŋ'gu    | mu     | na      |
| Proto Polynesian      | *-ku    | *-u    | *-na    |
(4.32) **Polynesian languages—Reflexes of 1Sg Genitive pronoun occurring as [AGT] and possessor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>(Source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>*=ku</td>
<td>*=ku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>[ku..]</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>(Pawley 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>?u</td>
<td>?u</td>
<td>(Mosel and Hovdaugan 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Futuna—Aniwan</td>
<td>(ŋk-nk)46</td>
<td>-ku</td>
<td>(Dougherty 1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4.33) **Polynesian languages—Reflexes of 2Sg Genitive pronoun occurring as [AGT] and possessor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>(Source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>*=u</td>
<td>*=u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Futuna—Aniwan</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>(Dougherty 1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4.34) **Polynesian languages—Reflexes of 3Sg Genitive pronoun occurring as [AGT] and possessor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>(Source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>*=na</td>
<td>*=na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>(Churchward 1953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(Mosel and Hovdaugan 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(Besnier 2000:387, 399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Futunan</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(Pawley 1970, Moyse-Faurie 1992)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the forms listed above, the forms that occur as the endings of certain auxiliary forms are sometimes identical to their corresponding possessive forms. For example, in Tuvaluan the forms that occur on the conjunction moo, which are considered to be fossilised earlier Ergative forms, are identical to the forms that indicate the possessor as shown in (4.35).

(4.35) **Tuvaluan—Forms of “purpose conjunction” moo with the “coalesced-pronoun” ending, and corresponding possessive expressions (based on Besnier 2000:387, 398)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>mooku</td>
<td>'so that I...'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>mooou</td>
<td>'so that you...'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>mooona</td>
<td>'so that s/he...'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>toku vaka</td>
<td>'my canoe'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>tou vaka</td>
<td>'your canoe'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>tona vaka</td>
<td>'his canoe'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 The initial nasal in the forms in West Futuna—Aniwan, along with the West Uvean agentive form ŋu, suggests that these forms must have been borrowed, because there is no other evidence for reconstructing the Proto Polynesian first person singular Genitive clitic pronoun with an initial nasal. The two languages are both Outlier languages, spoken in geographically relatively close areas, West Futuna—Aniwan in the South of Vanuatu, and West Uvean in the north of New Caledonia (see Bril 1997a and b for a discussion of pronominal forms in New Caledonian languages).
Although further research is necessary, I conclude here that there is enough evidence to assume that the clitic pronouns that indicated the [AGT] of transitive sentences were identical to those that indicated the possessor in Proto Polynesian. Thus they are referred to as Genitive, rather than Ergative.

4.3.7 An alternative hypothesis and its plausibility

Clark (1974:590-591) discusses the possibility of reconstructing an [actr] clitic pronoun system (referred to as “the Tongan–Samoan system”) for Proto Polynesian, from which the Tokelauan system developed by restricting the occurrence of the clitic pronouns to only Ergative to correspond to the occurrence of the Ergative preposition e. In this hypothesis, the East Futunan system is considered to have developed by “relaxing” the restrictions on the distribution of the forms to allow them to indicate both [PAT] and [AGT]. I argue that my proposed reconstruction, the Proto Polynesian system showing an ergative clitic pronoun pattern, is more plausible than Clark’s suggestion considering the following points.

1) The proposed reconstruction directly reflects the system reconstructed for higher-order protolanguages.

2) Some systems observed in Polynesian languages clearly reflect the Proto Polynesian ergative pattern clitic pronoun system reconstructed in this study in one way or another, as specified below.

a. The clitic pronoun forms in Tuvaluan, which show an ergative pattern as described in §3.4.2.1, reflect the Proto Polynesian Genitive forms. Thus, it is clear that Tuvaluan retained only the Genitive set along with their morphosyntactic function, while it lost the Nominative set occurring in this position along with their morphosyntactic function. It would be difficult to explain the situation in Tuvaluan if we assume that Proto Polynesian had a single set of [actr] clitic pronouns.

b. As has been mentioned in §3.4.2.3, West Futuna–Aniwan, where the forms of the first and second person clitic pronouns also reflect the original Genitive forms, their function as Genitive, marking only the [AGT] of transitive sentences, was apparently also retained until relatively recently, when the forms spread also to mark the [actr] of intransitive sentences as well.

c. Although Tokelauan also has a set of Ergative clitic pronouns, unlike Tuvaluan and West Futuna–Aniwan, the second and third person Ergative clitic pronouns are not reflexes of the reconstructed Proto Polynesian Genitive clitics (see §3.4.2.1). Tokelauan is known to have had considerable influence from Samoan17, and it is very possible that it borrowed the two forms from Samoan.

d. Samoan data reflect the proposed change as discussed in §4.3.5.

3) Languages that show the Tongan–Samoan pattern of clitic pronouns are geographically closely located and are known to have had contact among one another, while those that have ergative pattern clitic pronouns are located in peripheral areas. This supports the

17 “Tokelauan may have shared or borrowed innovations more or less continuously through its history from Samoan.” (Marck 2000:3)
claim that the clitic pronouns in Proto Polynesian showed an ergative pattern, and after languages spread, a change from an ergative pattern to an accusative pattern took place.

Considering the situation described above, I conclude that it is more plausible to reconstruct the presented clitic pronoun system for Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian and that the [actr] clitic pronoun system is a later innovation as shown in this chapter. At this stage, it is not clear whether the change from an ergative pattern to an accusative pattern took place independently in each language or whether it is an areal feature observed in the Fijian–Tongan–Samoan area in the Pacific.

4.4 The development of the pronominal systems in Central Pacific languages

In the previous section, it was shown that an ergative clitic pronoun system is reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific, with a Genitive clitic pronoun set and a Nominative clitic pronoun set. However, the reconstructed system is not reflected unchanged in any Central Pacific language spoken today. The Proto Central Pacific clitic pronoun sets were retained in Proto Polynesian. In addition to the clitic pronoun sets, there was a set of independent pronouns in Proto Central Pacific as well as in Proto Polynesian. In this section, first, a set of independent pronouns is reconstructed for Proto Polynesian. Second, the processes by which the original three sets of pronouns in Proto Polynesian have developed into the systems observed in Polynesian languages today will be discussed. Finally, Fijian and Rotuman pronominal data will be compared with the Proto Polynesian reconstructions in order to complete the reconstruction of the Proto Central Pacific pronominal systems.

4.4.1 The development of pronominal systems in Polynesian languages

4.4.1.1 Three pronominal sets

In Table 4.11, where clitic pronoun forms in some Polynesian languages are listed, there are some forms that do not reflect either of the reconstructed clitic pronouns, such as aku for first person singular and the form ia for third person singular. These forms are readily explained when we consider independent pronouns as their sources.
Table 4.11: Singular pronominal forms in five Polynesian languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tongan</th>
<th>Niuean</th>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clitic pronouns/agreement markers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>ku-o-ou</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?ou, o?u</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>ke (dl. mu)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>ne (dl. na)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ia, na</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent pronouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>a?u</td>
<td>au, a?u, owau¹</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>?oe</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>koe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia, oia¹</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: The forms owau (1Sg) and oia (3Sg) are described as "emphatic forms" (Judd 1939:7).

Table 4.11 gives pronominal forms found in five Polynesian languages representing each major sub-branch. It can be seen that the forms that are not reflexes of the reconstructed clitic pronouns in Table 4.6 are found in Polynesian languages either as clitic or as independent pronouns. The forms in the table also suggest that there has been merger between originally different sets of pronouns, the form au, for example, occurring as an independent pronoun in all the languages except Samoan, and the form aku occurring as a clitic pronoun in Tuvaluan, as has been shown in Table 4.7. In Table 4.12, the forms shown in Tables 4.7 and 4.11 are reorganised into possible cognate sets along with their probable reconstructions in Proto Polynesian (and earlier protolanguages), but without considering their syntactic functions. A sound correspondence chart of relevant sounds is provided in Table 4.13.

In Table 4.12, it can be seen that for each person and number set, the number of forms varies, with a few languages having reflexes of all three pronouns, while others have two, and others only one. The number of forms likewise differs depending on which person and number set is involved. The languages with reflexes of all three sets, namely Genitive and Nominative clitic pronoun sets and independent pronouns, only have them for first person singular. In all languages, for some person and number sets, if not all, the number of reflexes of the protoforms was reduced. The pattern of reduction differed depending on changes which were taking place in the syntax of the daughter languages. The next section discusses the relationship between the number of sets and the syntactic patterns which developed in the Polynesian languages.
Table 4.12: Pronominal forms in Central pacific languages organised according to their possible source forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1Sg Gen</th>
<th>1Sg Nom</th>
<th>1Sg Independent</th>
<th>2Sg Gen</th>
<th>2Sg Nom</th>
<th>2Sg Independent</th>
<th>3Sg Gen</th>
<th>3Sg Nom</th>
<th>3Sg Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Malayo Polynesian</td>
<td>*ni-ku</td>
<td>*aku</td>
<td>*iakən</td>
<td>*ni-mu</td>
<td>*kaSu</td>
<td>*i-kaSu</td>
<td>*ni-a</td>
<td>*si-ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Oceanic</td>
<td>*ku</td>
<td>*au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Central Pacific</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=ŋu</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=ŋu</td>
<td>*=ŋkoe</td>
<td>*=ŋkoe</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>*=ŋu</td>
<td>*=ŋu</td>
<td>*=ŋu</td>
<td>*=ŋu</td>
<td>*=ŋkoe</td>
<td>*=ŋkoe</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ou-ŋu</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>ʌŋ, ʌbu</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>o ʌŋ, a ʌŋ</td>
<td>ʌŋ, e</td>
<td>ʌbe</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelauan</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Futunan</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>u-ŋu</td>
<td></td>
<td>ke</td>
<td></td>
<td>ina</td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Uvean</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>u-ŋu</td>
<td></td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>u-ŋu</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td>kē</td>
<td>koe</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Futuna-Aniwan</td>
<td>ŋk<del>nk</del></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>koe~kko ꞑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nukuoro</td>
<td>gau</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>a ʌŋ</td>
<td>ʌbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>gau</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>a ʌŋ</td>
<td>ʌbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>*ŋk</th>
<th>*k</th>
<th>*ʔ</th>
<th>*m</th>
<th>*ŋ</th>
<th>*n</th>
<th>*ŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Central Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotuman</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Ør,</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fijian</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Fijian</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*ʔ</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Tongic</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*ʔ</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*a, *e, *o</td>
<td>*e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a, e, o</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a, e, o</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Nuclear Polynesian</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*ʔ</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Futunan</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Uvean</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Futuna A niwan</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Ellicean</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*ʔ</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Ellicean Outlier</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvaluan</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nukuoro</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Central Eastern</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>a, oo, e, o</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>a, e, o</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: A sound correspondence chart of some Central Pacific languages
(Based on Biggs 1965, Geraghty 1986, Marck 2000:23-24, 74)
4.4.1.2 Development of pronoun systems in Polynesian languages

Evidence for the existence of distinct Genitive, Nominative and independent sets of pronouns in Proto Polynesian comes from the fact that reflexes of forms from each set are found throughout the family, even though their syntactic functions have changed. It is probable that all three sets, marking the same syntactic functions that they had in Proto Polynesian, were present until relatively recently, until the relatively lower-level subgroups had begun to differentiate. This forces us to conclude that the neutralisation of syntactic function with associated merger of the pronominal forms operated independently in different languages. Table 4.14 is provided to show the number of pronoun sets found in various current systems or that must be reconstructed for one or the other of the reconstructed protolanguages. In the table, independent pronouns are referred to simply as “pronouns.”

Table 4.14: Number of pronominal sets and positions of their occurrence in Polynesian languages and their parent languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>(a) PCP ergative clitic system</th>
<th>(b) PPn ergative clitic system</th>
<th>(c) Pn system with either agreement or clitic pronouns</th>
<th>(d) Pn system with neither agreement nor clitic pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of pronoun sets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-xlyV</td>
<td>Gen. clitic</td>
<td>Gen. clitic</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>marker/clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-xlyV</td>
<td>Nom. clitic</td>
<td>Nom. clitic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-mainV</td>
<td>Nom. clitic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.14, systems (a) and (b) are the reconstructed systems of Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian respectively, and have three pronominal sets each. System (c) refers to the kind of system that is found in Samoan, Tokelauan, Tongan, Tuvaluan and some Outlier languages that have clitic pronouns indicating either the [actr] or the [AGT]. This kind of system has two sets of pronouns. System (d) is found in Niuean, Tahitian, Hawaiian and other languages that do not have clitic pronouns, where the minimally required pronoun set is one. The number of pronominal sets reduces as languages develop from the systems (a) and (b) to (c) and (d). This means that if a language changes its pronominal system from (b) to (c), or from (b) to (d), some kind of reorganisation takes place by changing the morphosyntactic function of some pronominal forms and losing some other forms.

There are two patterns observed in Polynesian languages by which pronoun sets reduced in number. One is what I call “merger”, where forms of some person and numbers from one set are retained, while forms of other person and numbers are replaced by forms from another set, with the result that a new pronoun set containing forms from two different sources is innovated. The other is what I call “selection”, where, of the two sets occurring in one position, one set is retained unchanged, while the other set is lost.

A “merger” takes place in the stage between Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian where the [PAT] clitic pronoun position was lost, while the full noun phrase [PAT] position was retained. However, as for the forms, for the first person singular, both the earlier Nominative clitic *au and the independent pronoun *aku were retained, while for the second
person and third person, independent pronoun forms *koe and *ia were retained. One possible distribution of the two forms *au and *aku in Proto Polynesian is that *au occurred indicating the [PAT] of a transitive sentence, while *aku occurred in prepositional phrases. In most of the Polynesian languages, a reflex of *au was retained as the first person independent pronoun. Reflexes of the Proto Polynesian first person independent form, *aku, are found only in a few languages, and only in prepositional phrases, such as Hawaiian e a?u ‘by me’ and i a?u ‘to me’. Likewise, Besnier (2000:395) states that in the Nukulaelae dialect of Tuvaluan, the form aku optionally occurs (instead of the form au) when preceded by the prepositions i (location, etc.), ki (direction, etc.), and mai (source, etc.).

The motivation for this change is probably the shared similar position (post main verb) and the morphological similarity (for example, *=koe versus *ikoe ‘second person singular’) of the two forms carrying the feature [PAT]. Examples (4.36) and (4.37) are given to illustrate this situation.

(4.36) Proto Central Pacific—[PAT] pronoun positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>=N</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>(NP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>+xlry Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td>−trns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>+xlry Gen</td>
<td></td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+prn PAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>actr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4.37) Proto Central Pacific—Positions for [PAT] 2Sg pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>=nā</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>(NP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>+xlry Erg</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>=koe Nom</td>
<td>(Adv) (NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actr PAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2Sg AGT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Sg actr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>+xlry Erg</td>
<td>+trns</td>
<td>iko e Nom</td>
<td>(Adv) (NP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actr PAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2Sg AGT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Sg actr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (4.36), positions where a [PAT] pronoun could occur are indicated by a dotted line. The two possible transitive structures with a second person singular [PAT] are shown in (4.37).

18 In Pukapukan, aku also occurs in prepositional phrases to indicate first person singular. In this language, the form seems to have been reanalysed as a followed by the Genitive clitic pronoun ku and then generalised to the third person singular to form ana ‘3Sg’, which also occurs in prepositional phrases today (data obtained from Beaglehole and Beaglehole n.d.).
The similarity in the second and third person forms may also have been a factor that encouraged this change.

After Proto Polynesian split off from Proto Central Pacific, another “merger” took place in some languages in the post-auxiliary clitic pronoun position as well, resulting in an [actr] clitic pronoun system such as those that are found in Tongan and Samoan today. This is illustrated in Figure 4.2. It is the same change as those that took place in Fijian and Samoan that were described in §4.3.3.

In some other languages, a “selection” took place in the post-auxiliary clitic pronoun position, and the earlier Genitive set was retained while the earlier Nominative set was lost, resulting in an ergative clitic pronoun system such as those observed in Tuvaluan and West Futuna–Aniwan. This is illustrated in Figure 4.3. Sentence structures with retained pronominal forms are shown in (4.38).

Figure 4.2: Changes in pronominal sets in Polynesian languages I
Reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) PCP ergative system</th>
<th>(b) PPn ergative system</th>
<th>(c-1) Pn system with an ergative clitic pronoun system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-xlryV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. clitic pronouns</td>
<td>Gen. clitic pronouns</td>
<td>Gen clitic pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erg clitic pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. clitic pronouns</td>
<td>Nom. clitic pronouns</td>
<td>(lost) Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-main V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. clitic pronouns</td>
<td>New Independent pronouns</td>
<td>Independent pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: Changes in pronominal sets in Polynesian languages II

(4.38) Post Proto Polynesian—Sentence structures with retained pronominal forms

a. Intransitive V V a(k)u
   +xlry -trns Nom
   PAT
   actr
   1Sg

   Transitive V =ku V (NP) (NP)
   +xlry Gen +trns
   AGT
   actr
   1Sg

b. Intransitive V koe V
   +xlry -trns Nom
   PAT
   actr
   2Sg
c. Intransitive \[ V =_{ia} (NP) (NP) \]
\[ +_{xlry} \text{Gen} +_{trns} \text{Nom} \]
\[ \text{actr} \]
\[ 3Sg \]

Transitive \[ V =_{na} (NP) (NP) \]
\[ +_{xlry} \text{Gen} +_{trns} \text{Nom} \]
\[ \text{actr} \]
\[ 3Sg \]

In Figure 4.4, the changes from the Proto Polynesian system to the languages that currently have only one pronominal set are illustrated. It is possible that these languages have undergone the change through either of the two stages (c1 and c2), described in Figures 4.2 and 4.3. However, further research is necessary to determine the details.

![Figure 4.4: Changes in pronominal sets in Polynesian languages III](image-url)
4.4.2 Pronouns in Fijian and Rotuman

With three sets of pronouns being reconstructable for Proto Polynesian, and having been reconstructed for Proto Oceanic, it is reasonable to reconstruct the same set for Proto Central Pacific, which was an intermediate protolanguage. In this section, the way Fijian languages and Rotuman reflect the protosystem is discussed.

The Fijian and Rotuman forms are repeated in Table 4.15, along with the reconstructed Proto Central Pacific forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(features of PCP forms)</th>
<th>1Sg. Gen</th>
<th>1Sg. Nom</th>
<th>1Sg.</th>
<th>2Sg. Gen</th>
<th>2Sg.</th>
<th>2Sg.</th>
<th>3Sg. Gen</th>
<th>3Sg.</th>
<th>3Sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Central Pacific</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*aku</td>
<td>*=koe</td>
<td>*koie</td>
<td>*=na</td>
<td>*=a</td>
<td>*=ia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotuman</td>
<td>(you)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?ae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto West Fijian</td>
<td>*=ŋgu</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td></td>
<td>*=iko</td>
<td></td>
<td>*=a</td>
<td>*=kia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto East Fijian</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*=koie</td>
<td></td>
<td>*=φ</td>
<td>*=koia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(features of Fijian forms)</td>
<td>1Sg [actr]</td>
<td>1Sg [actr]</td>
<td>2Sg [actr]</td>
<td>2Sg [actr]</td>
<td>3Sg [actr]</td>
<td>3Sg [actr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from the table that Fijian [actr] agreement forms developed from either one of the original clitic pronoun sets, while the first person singular independent pronouns developed from the Proto Central Pacific first person singular Nominative clitic pronoun, and the second and third person singular independent pronouns are retentions of the Proto Central Pacific independent pronouns.

In Rotuman, the second person singular (independent) pronoun developed from the original Nominative clitic pronoun, while the third person singular pronoun is a retention of the original independent pronoun. However, the source of the first person singular form is not clear. The regular reflex of Proto Central Pacific *ŋk is *k in Rotuman (as it is in Proto Polynesian). The only possible cognates are the reflexes of the first person Genitive clitic pronoun found in West Futuna–ANIWAN ŋk–nk and in Nukuoro ŋau, both of which are not regular reflexes either (see footnote 16 in this chapter). It is worth conducting further examination as to how these languages acquired the initial nasals and how they spread.

Another question regarding the development of the Rotuman pronominal system is how the intransitive verb ending (see §2.6.1.3.2), which apparently originates from the earlier Genitive clitic pronouns developed. Table 4.16 provides the Rotuman singular pronominal forms. The ending ..a] is an innovation which probably took place independently in Rotuman.

---

19 There is a possibility that Proto Eastern Fijian retained the form *koie, instead of *ko. In Kadavu dialects, the form koi is often used as the second person [actr] agreement form. An explanation for the ending ..i] is not yet apparent. Geraghty (1983) considers that this is related to the non-past tense form found in Western Fijian languages (see Table 4.3 in 4.3.1). However, the ending ..i] occurs only on a few forms in the Wailevu communalect spoken in Kadavu, and it is possible that the second person singular form had the ending ..e]-i], which was then generalised to some other forms as a result of contact with Western languages.
Table 4.16: Rotuman singular pronominal forms (based on Schmidt 1999:146-149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent long form</th>
<th>Independent short form</th>
<th>Intransitive verb ending</th>
<th>Possessive ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>youa</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>-toua</td>
<td>-tou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>?aeia</td>
<td>?æe</td>
<td>-ua</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Summary: the Proto Central Pacific pronom system

Table 4.17 summarises reconstructed singular pronoun forms in Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian.

Table 4.17: Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian singular pronominal forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. Genitive clitic pronouns</th>
<th>b. Nominative clitic pronouns</th>
<th>c. Independent pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>2Sg</td>
<td>3Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Central Pacific</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>*=ku</td>
<td>*=u</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 The reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

In the previous sections, it has been argued that clitic pronouns showed an ergative system in both Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian. In this section, the pattern of casemarking on nouns in Proto Central Pacific is reconstructed. It will be argued that there was no morphological casemarking on nouns in Proto Central Pacific, but that in Proto Polynesian ergative noun phrases were marked by a preposition *e. This form was an innovation in Proto Polynesian. I argue that it was an irregular development of the Proto Central Pacific preposition *i which preceded personal nouns, namely pronouns and proper nouns.
4.5.1 Morphosyntactic interpretation of the reconstructed basic sentence structures

The basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific reconstructed in §4.2.5 are combined with the reconstructed clitic pronoun system in (4.39). It should be noted that in transitive sentences, the verb carried an ..i/ ending, marking the verb as transitive.

(4.39) Proto Central Pacific—Basic sentence structures

PCP [-trns]  
*V =N V  (NP)  
+xlry +prnn -trns  
Nom  
PAT  
actr

PCP [-trns]  
*V =N V  (NP) P NP  
+xlry +prnn -trns  
Nom  
PAT  
actr

PCP [+trns]  
*V =N V =N (NP) (NP)  
+xlry +prnn +trns +prnn  
Gen  
Nom  
AGT  
PAT  
actr  
..i/  

The basic sentence patterns of Proto Polynesian, which were proposed in (4.18), are also combined with the reconstructed clitic pronoun system and are shown in (4.40). Pattern c. is reconstructed as the transitive sentence and the other two patterns, namely a. and b., are considered to be intransitive. This is based on the following facts. First, Pattern c. is the structure where a verb with the so-called -Cia ending occurred and therefore corresponds to the reconstructed transitive sentence structure in Proto Central Pacific where the verb form with the transitive ending ..i/ followed by the third person clitic pronoun ..a/ is reconstructed. Second, as has been described in §3.4.2.1, in Polynesian languages where the Proto Polynesian Genitive clitic pronouns are retained, the verb occurs with the so-called -Cia ending when a clitic pronoun occurs in a sentence. This is obviously a retention of the transitive sentence structure in Proto Central Pacific and implies that in Proto Polynesian as well a Genitive clitic pronoun must have co-occurred with this verb ending, which is Pattern c. These facts support a reconstruction of Pattern c. as the transitive structure.
(4.40) **Proto Polynesian—Basic sentence structures**

a. \*V =N V NP
   
   +xlry +prmn −xlry Nom
   
   Nom −trns PAT
   
   PAT actr

b. \*V =N V NP Al/ki NP
   
   +xlry +prmn −xlry Nom Lcv
   
   Nom −trns COR
   
   PAT actr

c. \*V =N V e NP NP
   
   +xlry +prmn −xlry Erg Nom
   
   Gen +trns AGT PAT
   
   AGT actr

4.5.2 **A reconstruction of the casemarking prepositions**

In this section, I will focus on the Ergative-marking preposition \*e and the Locative/Dative-marking prepositions \*?i and \*ki in Proto Polynesian, and examine i) whether they should also be reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific or not, and ii) the sources of these forms.

4.5.2.1 **Proto Polynesian casemarking prepositions**

Several Proto Polynesian prepositions have been reconstructed by previous researchers. These reconstructions are presented in (4.41). They are presented again in (4.42) but with my revised definitions. The reflexes and relevant forms in daughter languages, along with their reconstructed sources, are given in Table 4.18.

(4.41) **Proto Polynesian—Prepositions reconstructed in previous studies**

Clark (1976:41)

* e ‘what may loosely be called the agent with transitive verbs’

* i ‘location, source or cause [sic], and objects of some verbs’

* ki ‘directional, dative and instrumental case relations, and objects of some verbs’

---

20 For the morphological reconstruction of the forms of the prepositions, see §4.5.2.
Reconstruction of the actancy system of Proto Central Pacific

Harrison (1991)

*e ‘unmarked (common and proper) noun marker’
*i ‘unmarked locative noun marker’
*ki ‘goal’
*a ‘marked proper noun marker’
*se ‘marked common noun marker’

Marck (2000:34)

*?i ‘at, from’

cf. Geraghty 1986:308
Proto Central Pacific
*?i ‘at, in, on’

(4.42) Proto Polynesian—Prepositions revised

*e ‘Ergative preposition’
*i ‘Locative preposition’
*?i ‘Genitive preposition’
*ki ‘Dative preposition’

The definitions of the reconstructed forms are assigned based on the reconstruction in §4.5.1 and following the theoretical framework. The Locative form is reconstructed as *?i instead of *i (see Clark 1976, Harrison 1991), based on the fact that the glottal stop is observed in the reflexes in Tongan, Niuafou’ou, East Uvean and possibly East Futunan. The Ergative preposition is reconstructed as *e without an initial glottal stop, as the Ergative marking form does not have a glottal stop in the initial position in most of the languages where Proto Polynesian *? is regularly retained.

The absence of the expected glottal stop in the Rennellese and Rapanui locative forms, and the unexpected occurrence of a glottal stop in the Tongan Ergative form, are both explained as the result of an analogical change that apparently has taken place in the prepositional forms in each language. That is, the casemarking prepositional forms in Tongan which were vowel-initial added a glottal stop, while, in Rennellese and Rapanui, casemarking prepositional forms which were glottal stop initial became vowel-initial. East Uvean and East Futunan are considered to reflect the forms unchanged, with the form e for Ergative preposition, and ?i for

21 Ross (n.d.), based on data given in Moyse-Faurie (1993), considers that East Futunan ?i is a reflex of the Proto Oceanic non-specific inalienable possessive marker *?i, while East Futunan i is a reflex of the Proto Oceanic Locative preposition *i. Unfortunately, the distribution of the East Futunan form ?i, which appears in Marck (2000:34), is not known. The East Uvean form ?i, on the other hand, is clearly a locative preposition. According to Rensch (1984), East Uvean ?i occurs not only as a preposition introducing a semantic location, but also as a preposition introducing a complement phrase. An example is cited below.

 tense 1Sg be.pleased at Det arrival of my brother
 ‘Je suis content de l’arrivée de mon frère. (I’m pleased with my brother’s arrival.)’
 (Rensch 1984:170, my translation)
Table 4.18: The forms of some prepositions in selected Central Pacific languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCP</th>
<th>Personal noun marking</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sound correspondences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Fijian</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*ki</td>
<td>Kifn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadrau</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Kifn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayan</td>
<td>Ø*</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i$</td>
<td>PSnd</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotuman</td>
<td>Ø*</td>
<td>( ?e)††</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*ki</td>
<td>Schip</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPN</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sound correspondences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*ki</td>
<td>Ch53</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuafo‘ou</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>( ?i)***</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*ki</td>
<td>Ts88</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Uvean</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Re84</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Futunan</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Mo92, Re86</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennellese/</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>E188</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellona</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Se80</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapanui</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>( ?i)+++</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Du96, LT83</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>( ?i)+++</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>MH92</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>Se80</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Ch53 = Churchward (1953); Cl76 = Clark (1976); Du96 = Du Feu (1996); El = Elbert (1988); Kifn = my fieldnotes; LT83 = Langdon and Tryon (1983); MH92 = Mosel and Hovdhaugen (1992); Mo92 = Moyse-Faurie (1992); PSnd = Pawley and Sayaba (n.d.); Re84 = Rensch (1984); Re86 = Rensch (1986); Se80 = Seiter (1980); Schip = Schmidt (in press); Ts88 = Tsukamoto (1988).

* Blank columns indicate that information is not available.
† Fossilised in the initial position of some independent pronouns. See for example Table 4.19.
‡ Retained as the Accusative preposition. It should be noted that Wayan is a Western Fijian language, and a parallel development is observed in Lau, which is an Eastern Fijian language (see §4.5.2.3).
§ Used also to indicate “agentive” (see §4.5.2.2).
** Synonym of the form i, “but much less common” (Pawley and Sayaba n.d.: kiJ).
†† Used also to indicate “agentive” (see §4.5.2.2). There are two possible sources for this form. One is a locative preposition *i in a related language (possibly East Uvean) that was borrowed into Rotuman, and the other is the Proto Central Pacific *ki, which would have had to undergo a functional change from Dative to Locative and then have its Dative function replaced by the form se.
‡‡ The form se is used to indicate Dative in Rotuman.
§§ Reflexes occur only in fossilised or idiomatic expressions in Polynesian languages (see Ross n.d.).
*** Analysed as a “possessive suffix” by Churchward (1953:249-252).
**** Churchward notes the form i as a variation (1953:100, 109). However, he does not state any condition for the loss of the glottal stop.
††† Ko te hingoa ‘i te fine’aliki ko ‘Ifimea.
Det the name of the mother Det ‘Ifimea
‘The name of the mother—it was ‘Ifimea.’ (Tsukamoto 1988:175)
‡‡‡ Defined as ‘possessive relator’ by Moyse-Faurie (1993).
**** i in Mo92 and Re86, ?i in Marck (in press:44).
†††† Occurs in limited idiomatic expressions. Because of the initial glottal stop, it is likely that these phrases were borrowed from a closely related language(s) after PPN *? was lost in Samoan. A possible source is East Futunan.
Locative preposition. Rotuman probably borrowed the locative and agentive prepositional form *te from one of these languages.

4.5.2.2 Prepositions in Fijian and Rotuman

Of the three prepositions reconstructed for Proto Polynesian, the forms *?i and *ki appear to be also reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific. The form *?i 'at, in, on' is reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific by Geraghty (1986), and *ki 'to' for Proto Tokalau Fijian (see 1.4.1) also by Geraghty (1983). Reflexes of both of the forms are widely found in Fijian languages, although it appears that reflexes of *ki are less commonly used in some Western Fijian languages. For example, Pawley and Sayaba (n.d.:ki) note that ki in Wayan which "marks location, direction, source, instrument or cause", is a synonym of the form i "but much less common". In Nadrau (my fieldnotes), the form ki is not used unless speakers are adapting their language to Standard Fijian. However, because of the existence of external evidence for the form ki (for example, Nguna ‘object noun phrase marker’, Sesake ki ‘motion to or from’ [Pawley 1972:85]), the form *ki is also tentatively reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific.

Unlike these two forms, there are no forms observed in Fijian or Rotuman that are apparent cognates of the Proto Polynesian Ergative preposition *e. Both Fijian and Rotuman are accusative languages, and the most likely morphosyntactic function a cognate would have is an agent-marking preposition that occurs in a (semantically) passive-like sentence. A few such examples are reported in Wayan and Rotuman.

In Wayan, Pawley and Sayaba state that the locative preposition i, which carries various meanings such as location, instrument, cause, etc., may also mark a (semantic) agent. Examples are given in (4.43). However, the semantic distinction between “locative” and “agentive” is not always clear. In (4.43a), the phrase i na soqoni could also be translated as ‘at the meeting’ (Pawley pers. comm.). The form ivaru in (4.43b) is the third person Locative form.

(4.43) Wayan—Sentence with semantic agent expressed with i

```plaintext
a. Ei dodonu mera lai drali i na soqoni
  ei "do"donu mera lai "rali i na soqoni
  future correct should going.to be.punished Lev -prpr meeting
  1ndex 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex 8ndex
  V V V V V P Det N
  +xrary -trns +xrary +xrary -trns MNS
  m[actr] 10[actr]
  3Sg 3P1

  o kora na dau driva mē.
  o kora na "dau"rišamē
  +prpr they -prpr goat.thieves
  9ndex 10ndex 11ndex 12ndex
  P N Det N
  PAT COR
```
‘It is proper that the goat thieves should be punished by the meeting.’ (Pawley and Sayaba n.d. i, my analysis)

b. Sā leiāgetu vele na le'dru iāā ivuaru na dau driva.

’sā leiāgetu be.theirs stolen na le\’ru iāā iβ'aru na ʻdau\’riβa
aspect theirs belongings -prpr thieves

Tawley and Sayaba n.d. ii, my analysis)

Sa leiaqetu vele na ledru iaa ivuaru na ʻdau ʻriβa
aspect be.stolen -prpr theirs belongings Lcv.they -prpr thieves

Index 2ndex 3ndex 4ndex 5ndex 6ndex 7ndex 8ndex 9ndex
V V Adv Det N N N MNS COR
+xlrty -trns PAT
\[ actr \]

‘Their belongings had been ransacked by the thieves.’ (Pawley and Sayaba n.d. āgetu, my analysis)

There is no comment as to the frequency of the occurrence of this structure in Pawley and Sayaba (n.d). However, judging from the paucity of such example sentences occurring in Pawley and Sayaba’s dictionary (Pawley and Sayaba n.d.) and from the situation in other Fijian languages, it is probably rare.22

In Rotuman, according to Churchward (1940:119), the preposition ʻe may be used to denote the (semantic) agent, although he at the same time claims that this is “very rare”. An example is given in (4.44).

(4.44) Rotuman—Sentence with semantic agent expressed with ʻe

a. Kav hū ‘on fā ta huaʻe ʻe roʻat.
kav hū ʻon fā ta huaʻe ʻe roʻat.
kava his man definite beguarded Lcv bull-ants
PAT -trns MNS
\[ actr \]

‘The man’s kava plant was guarded by bull-ants.’ (Churchward 1940:119, my analysis)

Although there are prepositions both in Fijian and Rotuman that are used to indicate the agentive meaning as shown above, they should not be considered to be cognates of the Proto Polynesian Ergative marking preposition *e. In both languages, it appears that the forms have developed from the original Locative preposition extending its semantic characteristics from its instrumental meaning. It is also possible that the Rotuman form ʻe has been borrowed from a related language because of the existence of the glottal stop.23

---

22 Dixon (1988:223) claims that, in Boumaa, another Fijian language, the (semantic) agent of an intransitive verb with what I describe as an effect feature, can be expressed by a prepositional vei phrase. However, in other Fijian languages, such as Standard Fijian and the Wailevu communelct (spoken in Kadavu), a vei phrase only means either location or benefactor, and even in example sentences provided by Dixon (1988:223), the vei phrases are interpretable only as the benefactor. They cannot be understood as the (semantic) agent (Kikusawa 1998a).

23 Geraghty (1986:308) lists this Rotuman form as one of the cases where “P[roto] C[entral] P[acific] *? appears to be retained”. It is also possible that ʻe is a reflex of Proto Central Pacific *ki, but the semantic features do not match those reconstructable for *ki.
4.5.2.3 The source of the Proto Polynesian Ergative casemarking preposition *e

Because there is no apparent cognate of the Proto Polynesian Ergative preposition *e either in Fijian or Rotuman, it is difficult to reconstruct a form for Proto Central Pacific based on internal evidence. However, external evidence suggests that the form *e originates either i) from a personal noun marker *i, or ii) from a Genitive preposition *?i. The existence of relics of the form i that are observed in various environments in Fijian languages supports a reconstruction of either, or both *?i and *i preceding a noun phrase for Proto Central Pacific. A reconstruction of some prepositions in Proto Oceanic by Ross (n.d.) is given in (4.45).

(4.45) Proto Oceanic—Some reconstructed prepositions (Ross n.d., orthography adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>'personal article'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>'non-specific inalienable possessive marker'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>'locative preposition'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Locative preposition is retained in Proto Polynesian, and this leaves the forms *i 'personal article' and *?i 'possessive marker' as possible candidates for the source of the Proto Polynesian Ergative preposition *e. Among these, it is likely that the Proto Polynesian Ergative preposition *e has developed from the former because of the sound correspondences and its syntactic distribution. If the form *?i was the source of the Ergative preposition, an initial glottal stop would be expected in the Proto Polynesian (POc *? is reflected as *? in PPn) and therefore the loss of the glottal stop would need to be explained. As for the syntactic distribution, if POc *?i was an inalienable possessive marker, POc *?i could only have occurred between two nouns, the first of which was a possessee, and the second a possessor. The Ergative preposition however would typically have occurred following a transitive verb.

An explanation for the change from /i/ to /e/ is not clear, but one possibility is the influence of a low vowel in the following Determiner (POc *na ‘article preceding transitive subject’, Ross in press). As will be described below, there are various forms found in Fijian languages that suggest the existence of a personal noun marking form *i in Proto Central Pacific. The changes that took place in daughter languages of Proto Oceanic are described in (4.46).

---

24 See §4.5.2.1.

25 It is worth noting, however, that the Proto Malayo-Polynesian Genitive *?i(/ni) marked the [AGT] of a transitive clause (as well as the possessor), and therefore its morphosyntactic function matches that of Ergative preposition *e.
Development of Proto Oceanic *i ‘personal article’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Oceanic</th>
<th>Proto Central Pacific</th>
<th>Proto Polynesian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘personal article’</td>
<td>‘personal marker, preposition’</td>
<td>‘Ergative preposition’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ross n.d.)

The morphosyntactic change from a personal marker to an ergative marker is possible, considering that personal nouns are likely to occur as the [AGT] in a language far more frequently than non-personal nouns. The rest of this section will describe the fossilised forms observed in Fijian that are probable reflexes of the original personal-marking preposition *i.

The first example comes from the Accusative-marking forms (§3.3.3.2). In Wayan, in addition to the verb ending . .i), the form i also occurs as the initial segment of the transitive verb ending. It also precedes a proper noun [PAT]. The situation in Wayan is compared to that in other languages in (4.47).

(4.47) Verbs with an ending with one or two “i” in various Fijian languages

a. Wayan   tolavi.ikoya ‘see him’ cf. koya ‘he (3Sg pronoun)’
b. Batiwai tolavi.iau ‘see me’ cf. au ‘I (1Sg pronoun)’
c. Standard Fijian raici.iau ‘see me’ cf. au ‘I (1Sg pronoun)’
d. Nadrau  ziv.ixiratou ‘see me’ cf. iixiratou ‘they (3Pc pronoun)’

This suggests that there must have been two i forms, one being a part of the verb and one preceding a personal [PAT]. This is further supported by the situation in Lau, described in Geraghty (1983). He claims that there is an independent form i that marks a proper noun as Accusative in Lau.

Proper Noun Incorporation [cliticisation of a proper noun [PAT] of the transitive verb] has not quite conquered Lau, where a Proper Noun object may be left outside the verb phrase marked by a preposed i. (1983:383)

In addition, there are some facts that suggest that it may be more appropriate to consider that this form preceded a personal noun regardless of its case, rather than that it was an Accusative-marking form. First, I am not aware of any language where a non-pronominal non-proper noun is preceded by the form i. Second, as Geraghty (1983:203-204) points out, in many Fijian languages i is found as the initial element in some pronouns. Table 4.19 shows the forms of independent pronouns of Nadrau, where it can be seen that the form i is retained in the initial position of some pronouns.
One may conclude, based on the facts shown above, that the preposition *i was not simply an Accusative-marking form but preceded pronominal forms regardless of their case.27 In fact, Geraghty argues,

"...A few historical points might be raised here [regarding the forms of pronouns]. The first concerns the existence of possible cognates of the pronoun and proper noun marker *i which is found widely in the Eastern Oceanic language area (Pawley 1972:58). One likely candidate is LAU [Lau], VBL [Vanua Balavu] iPN [proper noun] object marker. *i is also found ... in Nadrau. In other cases, it could be argued, the *i is fossilised, either as the initial element in the pronoun, or between the original pronoun and a reflex of the article *ko, which has itself become fossilised. (1983:204)

Following Geraghty, and based on the distribution of the form *i in the daughter languages, I reconstruct Proto Central Pacific *i as a personal noun marker that preceded pronouns and proper nouns regardless of their case. It is a reflex of Proto Oceanic *i 'personal maker' and was probably the source of Proto Polynesian *e 'Ergative preposition'.

### 4.6 Summary: the Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian actancy systems

In this chapter, the basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific and Proto Polynesian have been reconstructed, along with relevant morphological forms and their syntactic functions. Example (4.48) is a summary of the casemarking patterns of clitic pronouns and full noun phrases showing the transition from Proto Malayo-Polynesian to Proto Polynesian.

---

26 Geraghty (1983:202) also presents a table of Nadrau pronouns where the first person singular form and all forms for second person are preceded by an optional *x (written as k by Geraghty).

27 This also eliminates the possibility that the form *i in Fijian languages originates from the Proto Central Pacific Locative preposition *?i. It is possible, however, that the innovation of the Accusative preposition *i resulted from the combination of the Locative preposition introducing a complement noun phrase in intransitive sentences and the personal preposition in some noun phrases.
Ross (in press) argues that the ergative pattern in the clitic pronoun system existed in the Pre Proto Oceanic stage. However, it is not clear if he considers that it was still retained in Proto Oceanic or not.

...[pronominal] Sets I and II [observed in Oceanic languages today] respectively reflect the Proto Malayo-Polynesian nominative and genitive clitics...On the basis of this reconstruction, we would expect Set I to be the intransitive subject set, Set II the transitive. However, although both sets of forms are reflected in Oceanic languages, the functional distinction between them is found nowhere, and we infer that it was being lost when POc broke up...

However, if it is correct to assume that Proto Oceanic is a parent language of Proto Central Pacific, and if the reconstruction of the Proto Central Pacific clitic pronoun system presented in this study is also correct, we need to conclude that the functional distinction between the two clitic pronoun sets was in fact retained in Proto Oceanic. Although Ross considers that the assumed functional distinction is not found in daughter languages, it is in fact reflected in various Polynesian languages as has been shown in this chapter.

The proposed development of the transitive verb form is shown in (4.49).

(4.49) Development of the transitive verb endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Oceanic</th>
<th>..i/</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Central Pacific</td>
<td>..i/</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>..i/, ..ia/</td>
<td>(lost)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transitive verb ending ..i/ developed in Proto Oceanic, probably from the Proto Malayo-Polynesian locative effect ending ..i/ (Reid pers. comm.). Nominative clitic pronouns started occurring in the post transitive-verb position in Proto Oceanic and were retained until Proto Central Pacific split off. The [PAT] marking function of Nominative clitic pronouns was taken over by the independent pronouns in Proto Polynesian, where the original third person singular Nominative clitic pronoun a occurred being fossilised on the end of some transitive verbs.

---

28 Reid (pers. comm).
29 Blust (1977).
30 Ross (in press).
5 Daughter protolanguages and their historical development

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the reconstructed sentence structures and forms of Proto Central Pacific and its daughter languages, and their historical development are illustrated. Syntactic characteristics and relics found in daughter languages observed today are provided as supporting evidence, or otherwise, cross-referenced.

In §5.2 to §5.6, the syntactic structures of each protolanguage are schematically shown. Reconstructed pronominal forms, prepositions and determiners are also presented. Then a description of the reconstructed sentence structures follows, with possible reconstructed sentence examples. How this system must have developed from the system in the upper-level protolanguage is also explained, along with the motivation for the change whenever possible. Among various morphosyntactic changes presented in these sections, there is a morphological change that independently took place in each daughter language at different stages of their development. This, referred to as “morphological differentiation” in this study, is discussed in §5.7 separately from other changes. Reconstructed pronominal forms are listed in §5.8 along with supporting evidence, showing the development of each form in the Central Pacific languages.

In the discussion, despite the hypothesis proposed by Geraghty (1983), it is assumed that Fijian languages have developed from a single proto dialect chain, namely the Proto Fijian dialect chain. This subgrouping hypothesis is based on shared syntactic innovations and is illustrated in Figure 6.2 in Chapter 6, where subgrouping hypotheses are examined in detail.

5.2 Basic sentence structures in the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain

Reconstructed basic sentence structures for (the) Proto Central Pacific (dialect chain) are shown in (5.1). Reconstructed pronominal forms, casemarking prepositions and determiners are given in Table 5.1.
(5.1) Basic sentence structures of Proto Central Pacific

(PCP-a) \[*V =Nom V NP (?i/ki NP)\]^1
+xlry PAT -trns PAT actr actr LOC

(PCP-b) \[*V =Nom V ?i NP NP (?i/ki NP)\]
+xlry PAT -trns COR PAT actr actr

(PCP-c) \[*V =Gen V =Nom NP NP (?i/ki NP)\]
+xlry AGT +trns PAT AGT PAT actr actr LOC

Table 5.1: Reconstructed forms for Proto Central Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive clitic</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative clitic</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=koe</td>
<td>*=a, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>*=aku</td>
<td>*=koë</td>
<td>*=ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive (common-noun possessor)</td>
<td>*=ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive (non-common-noun possessor)</td>
<td>*=?i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>*=?i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>*=ki^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>*=mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal^3</td>
<td>*=i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Determiner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-personal</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Transitive verb ending

*..i]

---

1 A [LOC] phrase may also have been introduced by the Dative preposition *se if this form in fact is reconstructable. See Table 5.1.

2 In Rotuman, the form of the Dative preposition is *se. Further studies are necessary to determine whether this form is also reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific.

3 The class of personal nouns probably included pronouns and personal names.
Proto Central Pacific was a right-branching, ergative language. There were two sets of clitic pronouns, one that was used to indicate the [AGT], and the other that was used to indicate the [PAT] of a sentence. One or two full NPs, the heads of which were non-pronominal, could occur in addition to the clitic pronoun(s), to make explicit or to emphasise the content of the [AGT] and/or [PAT]. A full NP, the head of which was pronominal, could either co-occur or alternate with the clitic pronoun. An auxiliary verb possibly indicating the tense was obligatory. All NPs and PPs were optional; that is, they may or may not have occurred in a sentence.

In Proto Central Pacific, there were two intransitive structures. One that had a complement Locative phrase ([COR]) (PCP-b), and one that did not (PCP-a). The occurrence of a complement Locative was lexically determined by the verb, while an adjunct Locative ([LOC]) could occur in any one of the three proposed structures. Adjunct Locative phrases are indicated in parentheses in (5.1) and examples that follow.

In an intransitive sentence, a Nominative pronoun indicating the [PAT] was cliticised to the auxiliary verb. In a transitive sentence, unlike in an intransitive sentence, it was a Genitive pronoun indicating the [AGT] that was cliticised to the auxiliary verb, and a Nominative pronoun indicating the [PAT] was cliticised to the non-auxiliary verb. A transitive verb often carried an ending that was a sequence of a consonant followed by *-i] marking the verb as transitive.

A Genitive form was cliticised not only to an auxiliary verb to indicate an [AGT], but was also cliticised to a noun to indicate the possessor. These two different syntactic distributions eventually were distinguished by two different sets of pronominal forms, one marking the Ergative case form, the other marking the Genitive in most, if not all, of the daughter languages.

The preposition *?i marked a non-common noun as the possessor of an immediately preceding noun ([COR]). The use of this preposition became less productive in daughter languages, except for Eastern Fijian languages. Likewise, the preposition *ni marked a common noun as a possessor. Reflexes of this preposition are observed throughout Fijian languages, Rotuman and in some Polynesian languages.

To illustrate the proposed sentence structures, sentence examples are given below. Examples (5.2) to (5.8) are based on the reconstructed structures PCP-a to PCP-c. The sentences consist of both reconstructed and potentially reconstructable words in addition to the forms presented in Table 5.1. The following Proto Central Pacific forms were reconstructed by Hockett (1976) and are used in this study: *vale ‘house’; *vatu ‘stone’; *tina ‘mother’; *mai ‘motion towards speaker’; *tiko (Bau ‘sit, squat; reside, be’; PPn ‘defecate’; glossed here as ‘stay’); *tiro (Bau tirov- ‘look at oneself via a reflection; peep’; PPn ‘look at,

---

4 This is mainly based on the fact that i) in Fijian, clitic pronouns were retained and co-occur with full noun phrases, while in some other languages, only either clitic pronouns or full noun phrases occur to indicate each case relation; ii) in Polynesian languages, the clitic pronouns indicating the [actr] were retained while the ones that indicated the [PAT] were lost.

5 See §4.2.2.

6 See examples (3.4) to (3.6) for the Rotuman intransitive sentence structure with a complement noun phrase and examples, and (3.35b) and (3.36b) for Polynesian examples.

7 See §4.2.3 (position reconstruction) and §4.3 (reconstruction of pronominal forms).

8 See §5.7 for discussion.
peep, spy’; glossed here as ‘look at, see’); *tama ‘child; father’; glossed here as ‘person’ and treated as a non-personal noun). Auxiliary verb *na ‘past’ is a potentially reconstructable form.

(5.2) **PCP—Intransitive sentence with single complement**

a1. *Na =au tiko (?i na vale).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{past} & \text{1Sg.Nom stay} & \text{Lcv -prsn house} \\
V & N & V & P & \text{Det N} \\
+xlry & \text{PAT -trns} & \text{LOC actr} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I stayed (in the house).’

a2. *Na =a tiko (?i na vale).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{past} & \text{3Sg.Nom stay} & \text{Lcv -prsn house} \\
V & N & V & P & \text{Det N} \\
+xlry & \text{PAT -trns} & \text{LOC actr} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He stayed (in the house).’

Sentences in (5.2) illustrate Structure PCP-a. They are intransitive sentences, and Nominative pronouns indicating the [PAT] (or, the “subject”), namely, *=au in (5.2.a1) and *=a (5.2.a2) are cliticised to the auxiliary verb *na. The Locative [LOC] phrase, *?i na vale ‘in the house’ is an adjunct and indicated in parentheses.

(5.3) **PCP—Intransitive sentence with two complements**

b1. *Na =au tiro ?i na vatu (?i na vale).

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{past} & \text{1Sg.Nom look} & \text{Lcv -prsn stone} & \text{Lcv -prsn house} \\
V & N & V & P & \text{Det N} & \text{P Det N} \\
+xlry & \text{PAT -trns} & \text{COR actr LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I looked at stones (in the house).’

b2. *Na =a tiro ?i na vatu (?i na vale).

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{past} & \text{3Sg.Nom look} & \text{Lcv -prsn stone} & \text{Lcv -prsn house} \\
V & N & V & P & \text{Det N} & \text{P Det N} \\
+xlry & \text{PAT -trns} & \text{COR actr LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He looked at stones (in the house).’
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   past 1Sg.Nom look Lcv 3Sg Lcv -prsn house
   V N V P N P Det N
   +xlry PAT -trns COR LOC
   actr

   ‘I looked at him (in the house).’

   past 3Sg.Nom look Lcv 1Sg Lcv -prsn house
   V N V P N P Det N
   +xlry PAT -trns COR LOC
   actr

   ‘He looked at me (in the house).’

Examples in (5.3) illustrate PCP-b, the intransitive sentence structure with a verb that implies a complement Locative phrase. A complement Locative phrase is marked by a Locative preposition as in *?! na vatu in (5.2.b1, b2). Examples where a pronoun follows this preposition are given in (5.2.b3, b4). It is an independent pronoun and not a clitic pronoun that occurs in a prepositional phrase. The complement Locative phrase may or may not occur in a sentence.

In both of the intransitive sentence structures, when the Nominative was overtly expressed by a full NP, this NP was simply added probably to the end of the complement noun phrases. Examples are given in (5.4) where *na tina=ŋku ‘my mother’ makes the third person singular [PAT] explicit. Compare (5.4.a3) with (5.2.a2), and (5.4.b5) with (5.3.b2). Sentence (5.5) is an example where the [PAT] is expressed by a pronominal phrase to emphasise the actor.

(5.4) PCP—Intransitive sentences with full Nom NP

a3. *Na =a tiko (?! na vale)10 na tina =ŋku.
   past 3Sg.Nom stay Lcv -prsn house prsn mother=1Sg.Gen
   V N V P Det N Det N N
   +xlry PAT11 -trns LOC (PAT) COR
   actr  (actr)

   ‘My mother stayed (in the house).’

9 The Nadrau language of Fijian has a set of Dative pronouns, and one of these forms is used as an adjunct phrase instead of a pronoun preceded by the Dative preposition. For example, ‘to/for me’, ‘to/for you’, ‘to/for him/her/it’ are expressed by the forms yaguqu, yagumu, yaguna respectively. The endings of such forms are identical with the corresponding possessive pronoun endings. Further research is necessary to determine whether such a Dative pronoun set existed in Proto Central Pacific or not.

10 The position of the Locative [LOC] phrase was probably not fixed.

11 When there are two co-referential forms in a sentence that have the same case relation, the features of the full noun phrases are glossed in parentheses.
'My mother looked at stones (in the house).'

Examples that illustrate the Proto Central Pacific transitive sentence structure (PCP-c) are given in (5.6) to (5.8). Sentences (5.6) are examples with only clitic pronoun complements. Those in (5.7) and (5.8) are examples with full NPs overtly expressing the [PAT] and [AGT], the former showing ones with non-pronominal full NPs, the latter showing ones with pronominal full NPs. The verb form which was in derivational relation with the form *tiro is assumed to have been *tirovi here, the ending *..vi being a transitive ending on verbs implying a "direct effect (+dfct)" feature.

12 In all of the example sentences, the words *tama and *tina are treated as non-personal nouns.

13 See §2.4.3 and §2.6.2.4.2 for an explanation of "effect" features of the verb.
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In example (5.6.c1) (and the following examples [5.7.c3] and [5.9.c8]), the [AGT] is ‘I’, and the first person Genitive pronoun *ŋaŋu is cliticised to the auxiliary verb. The [PAT] is ‘he/she’, and the third person Nominative pronoun *ŋa is cliticised to the non-auxiliary verb. In example (5.6.c2) (and [5.7.c4], [5.8.c5-7], and [5.9.c9-10]), the [AGT] is ‘he/she’, and the third person Genitive pronoun *ŋaŋu is cliticised to the auxiliary verb. In (5.6.c2) (and [5.9.c9]), the [PAT] ‘I’ is expressed by the first person Nominative pronoun *ŋaŋu cliticised to the non-auxiliary verb.

(5.7) PCP—Transitive sentences with non-pronominal NPs expressing [PAT]

In examples (5.7.c3, c4), the [PAT] of each sentence is expressed by a full non-pronominal NP, by *na vatu ‘stone’ in (5.7.c3), and by *na tina=ŋaŋu ‘my mother’ in (5.7.c4).

(5.8) PCP—Transitive sentences with non-pronominal NPs expressing [PAT] and [AGT]

In examples (5.7.c3, c4), the [PAT] of each sentence is expressed by a full non-pronominal NP, by *na vatu ‘stone’ in (5.7.c3), and by *na tina=ŋaŋu ‘my mother’ in (5.7.c4).
In examples (5.8.c5, c6, c7), both the [PAT] and [AGT] of each sentence are expressed by full NPs. The order of the [PAT] and the [AGT] NP was flexible, although probably there was a preference that the [AGT] preceded the [PAT].

In Proto Central Pacific, an independent pronoun could also occur as the head of a full NP to express [AGT] and/or [PAT]. Examples are given in (5.9). An independent pronoun occurring in a full noun phrase was preceded by the personal preposition *i. In actual language use, it is likely that an independent pronoun appeared in a full NP only occasionally, probably for emphasis. An [AGT] independent pronoun possibly occurred in a full NP.
addition to the Genitive clitic pronoun as shown in (5.9.c8), while the [PAT] independent pronoun alternated with the corresponding Nominative clitic pronoun, as in (5.9.c9 and c10). As can be seen in the examples, an Adverb would follow a clitic pronoun [PAT] as in (5.9.c9), while it preceded an independent pronoun [PAT] (5.9.c10).

(5.9) **PCP—Transitive sentences with independent pronouns expressing [AGT] and [PAT]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c8)</th>
<th>*Na =ŋku tirovi=a i aku (?i na vale).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V Nc</td>
<td>past 1Sg.Gen see 3Sg +prsn 1Sg Lcv -prsn house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V N P N P Det N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlrty AGT +trns PAT (AGT) LOC actr +dfct (actr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I saw him (in the house).'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c9)</th>
<th>*Na =ŋa tirovi=au mai (?i na vale).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V Nc</td>
<td>past 3Sg.Gen see 1Sg hither Lcv -prsn house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V N Adv P Det N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlrty AGT +trns PAT LOC actr +dfct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'He saw me (in the house).'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c10)</th>
<th>*Na =ŋa tirovi mai i aku (?i na vale).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V Nc</td>
<td>past 3Sg.Gen saw hither +prsn 1Sg Lcv -prsn house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Adv P N P Det N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+xlrty AGT +trns PAT LOC actr +dfct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'He saw me (in the house).'

The Proto Polynesian system split off from the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain in which the casemarking system described above occurred, with the remaining dialects forming the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain.

5.3 **Proto Polynesian basic sentence structures**

Reconstructed basic sentence structures for Proto Polynesian are shown in (5.10). Relevant forms that are reconstructed for Proto Polynesian are also shown in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2: Reconstructed forms for Proto Polynesian

a. Pronominal forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive Clitic</td>
<td>*=ku</td>
<td>*=u</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative Clitic</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=kē</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>*aku (in PPs)</td>
<td>*koe</td>
<td>*ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*au (elsewhere)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>*?i, *ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>*?i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>*ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>*mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>*e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Transitive verb endings15

*..Ci], *..Cia]

Although Proto Polynesian retained the right-branching, ergative features of Proto Central Pacific, there were two major changes that took place in Proto Polynesian. One is the loss of the [PAT] clitic pronoun position, which followed the transitive verb.16 The third person singular Nominative clitic pronoun form *=a was retained as a part of some transitive verbs, thus resulting in the so-called “-Cia ending”, while it was lost in the post-auxiliary verb position. The third person singular Nominative clitic pronoun *=a, on the other hand, is

15 This means that these endings occurred on some transitive verbs, and does not mean that all transitive verbs carried either one or the other of these endings.
16 See 4.4.1.2 for discussion.
considered to have been lost. The other is the innovation of the Ergative preposition *e probably from the Proto Central Pacific person-marking form *i.17

Examples of intransitive sentences with two complement noun phrases are given in (5.11), illustrating the reconstructed Structure PPn-b. Note that the absence of a Nominative clitic pronoun on the auxiliary verb indicates a third person singular [PAT, actr] in (5.11.b2).

(5.11) PPn—Intransitive sentences with two complement noun phrases


past 1SG.Nom look Lcv -prpr stone Lcv -prsn house
V N V P N N P Det N
+xly PAT -trns COR LOC

actr

'I looked at the stone (in the house).'


past.3SG.Nom look -prpr person at I Lcv -prsn house
V N V Det N P Det P Det N
+xly PAT -trns (PAT) COR LOC

actr (actr)

'The person looked at me (in the house).'

Examples of transitive sentences are given in (5.12), illustrating the reconstructed Structure PPn-c. Note that the verbs carry the ending ..i(a)],18 reflecting the earlier transitive ending *..i] followed by the earlier third person singular Nominative clitic pronoun *a. This ending is no longer analysed as such, and its occurrence is now lexically determined. Note also that when the [AGT] is expressed by a full noun phrase, it was marked by the form *e as in (5.12.c2 and c4). When emphatic, a full pronoun co-occurred with the post-auxiliary clitic pronoun as in (5.12.c2).

(5.12) PPn—Transitive sentence examples

c1. *Na =u tirofia (?i na fale).

past 2SG.Gen see Lcv -prsn house
V N V P Det N
+xly AGT +trns LOC

actr +dfct

'You saw him/it (in the house).'

---

17 See 4.5.2.3 for discussion.

18 The occurrence of the ending *..a] may have been optional when followed by a pronominal [PAT] as shown in (5.12.c3 and c4).
c2. \*Na =u tirofia e koe (?i na fale).

past 2Sg.Gen see Erg 2Sg Lcv -prsn house
V N V Det N P Det N
+xlry AGT +trns (AGT) LOC
actr +dfct (actr)

'You saw him/it (in the house).'

c3. \*Na =na tirofi(a) au (?i na fale).

past 3Sg.Gen see I Lcv -prsn house
V N V N P Det N
+xlry AGT +trns PAT LOC
actr +dfct (actr)

'He saw me (in the house).'

c4. \*Na =na tirofi(a) au e na tama (?i na fale).

past 3Sg.Gen see I Erg -prsn person Lcv -prsn house
V N V N P Det N P Det N
+xlry AGT +trns PAT (AGT) LOC
actr +dfct (actr)

'The person saw me (in the house).'

The form of the first person singular independent pronoun was *au when it was not preceded by a preposition, as can be seen in (5.12.c3 and c4), while it was *aku when preceded by a preposition, as in (5.11.b2).

Polynesian languages have developed from this system. For details of the development of pronominal systems in Polynesian languages, see §4.4.1.

5.4 Basic sentence structures in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain

The dialect chain that continued developing in Fiji after Proto Polynesian split off is referred to in this study as the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain, meaning that this is the stage after Proto Polynesian split off but before Rotuman diverged from it (see Figure 6.2). Fijian languages and Rotuman share some major syntactic changes, as will be shown in this section, and these changes help to define the dialect chain from which these languages developed (see §6.3 for discussion). The syntactic changes that took place in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain occurred in two stages. They are described in the next sections.

5.4.1 The first major change in Proto Rotuman–Fijian

Reconstructed basic sentence structures for the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain after they had undergone the first major change are shown in (5.13), followed by Table 5.3 where reconstructed forms are provided.
Table 5.3: Reconstructed forms for the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Pronominal forms</th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ergative Clitic (post xlryV)</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>Ø (lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive Clitic (post N)</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative Clitic</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=koe</td>
<td>*=a, Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=iko</td>
<td>*=ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Genitive ‘of’ | *?!i, *ni
| Nominative | - |
| Locative, instrumental, etc. | *?! |
| Dative ‘to’ | *ki |
| Ablative ‘from’ | *mai |

c. Determiners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto Rotuman–Fijian retained the right-branching feature of Proto Central Pacific. However, the clitic pronoun system changed to undergo a morphological differentiation (see

---

19 Fijian languages *ni ‘of'; Rotuman *ne ‘of' (Churchward 1940:141-144).
§5.7), which was the beginning of a sequence of changes that resulted in a change from an ergative to an accusative system.

The major innovation that took place in the first stage of Proto Rotuman–Fijian was the loss of the third person singular Genitive clitic pronoun *ña. The motivation and factors that were responsible for the loss of the third person Genitive clitic pronoun are not yet understood, but the change itself is supported by the fact that there is no [actr] marking form that could have developed from *=ña found in Fijian languages (§5.7). This morphological change resulted in a sentence structure PRF1-d, which could be interpreted as either transitive or intransitive (see examples in 5.17). The loss of the form for the third person singular Genitive clitic pronoun created a situation where a Nominative clitic pronoun was cliticised to the auxiliary verb instead of to the non-auxiliary verb to which it would otherwise have been cliticised. This is illustrated in sentence examples (5.14) to (5.16).

(5.14) PCP—Transitive sentence with third person [AGT] (=5.6.c2)

*Na =ña tirovi =au (ʔi na vale).

past 3Sg.Gen see 1Sg.Nom Lev-prsn house
V N V N P Det N
+xlry AGT +tms PAT LOC
 actr +dfct

‘He saw me (in the house).’

A reconstructed Proto Central Pacific example with a third person singular [AGT] is repeated in (5.14). The [AGT] is expressed by the Genitive clitic pronoun *=ña, which is cliticised to the auxiliary verb *na in this sentence. In Proto Rotuman–Fijian, the form for the third person Genitive (post-V) clitic pronoun was lost, and would have resulted in a sentence such as (5.15).

(5.15) PRF—Transitive sentence with third person [AGT] (I)

*Na =∅ tirovi=au (ʔi na vale).

past (3Sg.Erg) see 1Sg.Nom Lev-prsn house
V N V N P Det N
+xlry AGT +tms PAT LOC
actr +dfct

‘He saw me (in the house).’

However, because the (sentence-initial) auxiliary verb obligatorily required a clitic pronoun to cliticise to it, the only clitic pronoun now in the sentence, *=au, filled in this what would have been an otherwise “vacant” slot. A sentence example where the form *=au is cliticised to the auxiliary verb is shown in (5.16.d1). The same sentence but with a full pronominal NP emphasising the [AGT] is given in (5.16.d2).
(5.16) PRF—Transitive sentence with third person \([AGT]\) (II)

\[ *Na = au tirovi (\text{(?i na vale}). \]

\[
\text{Past 1SG.Nom see Lcv-prsn house V N V P Det N +xlyr PAT ?trns LOC +dfct}\
\]

‘He/(someone) saw me (in the house). I was seen (by him).’

d2. \[ *Na = au tirovi i ia (\text{(?i na vale}). \]

\[
\text{Past 1SG.Nom see +prsn 3SG Lcv-prsn house V N V P N P Det N +xlyr PAT +trns AGT LOC +dfct actr}\
\]

‘He looked at me (in the house).’

This new structure was syntactically ambiguous as to whether it was transitive or intransitive, especially when it did not have a full NP expressing the \([AGT]\). Although the verb still had a “transitive” ending \(*...vi\), it was possible for this sentence to be interpreted as syntactically intransitive, because the form of the clitic pronoun that was cliticised to the auxiliary was Nominative. The two interpretations—one transitive, the other intransitive—of the “ambiguous sentence” given in (5.16.d1) are shown in (5.17). Example (5.17.d3) shows a transitive interpretation where the absence of a Genitive clitic pronoun implies a third person General \([AGT]\), while (5.17.d4) shows an intransitive interpretation.

(5.17) PRF—Two interpretations of a structurally ambiguous sentence

\[ *Na = au tirovi (\text{(?i na vale}). \]

\[
\text{Past 1SG.Nom see Lcv-prsn house V N V P Det N +xlyr PAT +trns LOC +dfct actr}\
\]

\[ (\text{Someone) saw me.’ } \]

d4. \[ *Na = au tirovi (\text{(?i na vale}). \]

\[
\text{Past 1SG.Nom see Lcv-prsn house V N V P Det N +xlyr PAT -trns LOC +dfct actr}\
\]

‘I was seen.’

In addition, a sentence such as this must have often occurred without a full \([AGT]\) noun phrase. This is similar to the usage of a “passive” structure in accusative languages, as glossed in (5.17.d4). Sentences in (5.18) are given for the purpose of comparison. Example (5.18.a1) shows an intransitive sentence illustrating the reconstructed structure PRF1-a, and
examples (5.18.b1, b2) are intransitive sentences with two complement noun phrases, illustrating the reconstructed structure PRF1-b. Sentences (5.18.c1, c2) are examples of unambiguous transitive sentences with both [AGT] and [PAT] overtly expressed, illustrating PRF1-c. Sentence (5.18.d5) illustrates PRF1-d, a sentence ambiguous as to its transitivit y.

(5.18) PRF—Sentence examples illustrating various sentence structures

a1. *Na =au tiko (i na vale).
   past 1Sg.Nom stay Lcv -prsn house
   V N V P Det N
   +xlr PAT trns LOC
   'I stayed (in the house).'</n
b1. *Na =au tiro i na vatu.
   past 1Sg.Nom see Lcv -prsn stone
   V N V P Det N
   +xlr PAT trns COR
   'I looked at stones.'</n
b2. *Na =au tiro i ia.
   past 1Sg.Nom see Lcv 3Sg
   V N V P N
   +xlr PAT trns COR
   actr
   'I looked at him.'</n
c1. *Na =tirovi =a.
   past 1Sg.Erg see 3Sg.Nom
   V N V N
   +xlr AGT trns PAT
   actr +dfct
   'I saw him.'</n
c2. *Na =tirovi i ia.
   past 1Sg.Nom see +prsn 3Sg
   V N V P N
   +xlr PAT trns AGT
   +dfct actr
   'He saw me.'
The structure PRF1-d was eventually consistently reinterpreted as intransitive. Once this happened, the [AGT] NP could no longer occur, but the semantic feature of the earlier transitive verb ([+dfct]) was retained. Note that the meaning of a sentence remains the same in this kind of change, although the syntactic interpretation changes.

The change described above explains the following somewhat unusual characteristics found in Fijian and Rotuman.

A. The Fijian Situation
In the Fijian languages, a transitive verb always has a corresponding intransitive verb that has the same effect feature, namely, [+dfct] (plus direct effect) or [+ifct] (plus instrumental effect), and shares the same derivational ending. Examples in (5.19) illustrate this point. It can be seen in (5.19) that both transitive (5.19a, b, and c) and intransitive (5.19d) verbs share a phonological sequence ...ti(...), and a feature [+dfct] that implies the semantic nature of the [PAT]. From a cross-linguistic point of view, an intransitive verb having the same form as a transitive verb is not unusual (for example, eat '[+tms]' and eat '['-trns]' in English). However, in Fijian, where syntactic transitivity is typically reflected in the forms of the verb, it seems unusual to have an exception like this.

---

20 The syntactic status of this intransitive sentence structure has been controversial. Some people describe it as "passive" (for example, Dixon 1988), while others contest that (Schutz and Nawadra 1972). Kikusawa (1998a) examines it applying the Lexicase framework, and concludes that this is a simple intransitive structure where the form of the verb implies a semantic feature of its [PAT] complement. The main determining factor for this analysis was that the (semantic) agent usually cannot be expressed in this sentence structure.

21 See §2.4.3 for theoretical orientation, and see §2.6.2.4.2 (fuller version appears in Kikusawa 2000b) for the analysis of Fijian applying this notion.

22 It is generally accepted that the ending .a/ (5.19c) comes from a sequence of the Proto Central Pacific transitive ending *..i] followed by *..a] 'third person singular pronoun' (Pawley and Sayaba 1971, Geraghty 1983:260-264).
(5.19) Standard Fijian—Transitive and intransitive sentences with [+dfct] verb

a. A kauti au (ki valenibula).

ā kautiau ki βaleni\textsuperscript{m}bula
past take to hospital
V V P N

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{actr} \\
\text{3Sg} \\
\text{+trns} \\
\text{+dfct} \\
\text{PAT} \\
\text{1Sg} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{LOC}

‘He took me (to the hospital).’

b. Au ā kauti Mere (ki valenibula).

auā kauti =mere ki βaleni\textsuperscript{m}bula
past take M. to hospital
V V N P N

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{actr} \\
\text{1Sg} \\
\text{+trns} \\
\text{+dfct} \\
\text{PAT} \\
\text{LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I took Mere (to the hospital).’

c. Au ā kauta na gone (ki valenibula).

auā kauta na ŋone ki βaleni\textsuperscript{m}bula
past take child to hospital
V V Det N P N

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{actr} \\
\text{1Sg} \\
\text{+trns} \\
\text{+dfct} \\
\text{PAT} \\
\text{LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I took the child (to the hospital).’

d. Au ā kauti (ki valenibula) (o yau).

auā kauti ki βaleni\textsuperscript{m}bula o yau
past be.taken to hospital I
V V P N P N

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{actr} \\
\text{1Sg} \\
\text{+trns} \\
\text{+dfct} \\
\text{LOC} \\
\text{PAT} \\
\text{1Sg} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘(Someone) took/carried me (to the hospital)./I was taken/carried (to the hospital).’

The situation in Fijian described above is well explained if we assume that the currently observed Fijian sentence structures have developed from a transitive structure. Every transitive verb in Fijian comes with a corresponding intransitive verb with the same effect feature, because these intransitive verbs developed from equivalent transitive verbs. A transitive verb and the corresponding intransitive verb share what historically was a “transitive suffix”, for the same reason.

The proposed hypothesis further explains the following situation found in Fijian. An intransitive verb with an effect feature in Fijian, such as kauti in (5.19d), often has a synonym
that has a similar form but without the ending showing the effect feature. The synonym of the form \textit{kauti} is \textit{kau}, corresponding to the verbs given in (5.19). An example with the intransitive verb \textit{kau} is given in (5.20), which should be compared with (5.19d).

(5.20) Standard Fijian—Intransitive verb with no effect feature

\begin{align*}
\text{d.} & & \text{Au} \, \tilde{a} & & \text{kau} & & (ki \, \text{valenibula}) & & (o \, \text{yau}). \\
& & \text{au} & & \text{kau} & & \text{ki} \, \beta\text{aleni}'\text{bula} & & \text{yau} \\
& & \text{past} & & \text{be.taken} & & \text{to} \, \text{hospital} & & \text{I} \\
& & \text{V} & & \text{V} & & \text{P} & & \text{N} & & \text{P} & & \text{N} \\
& & +\text{xlry} & & -\text{trns} & & \text{LOC} & & \text{PAT} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{actr} \\
15g
\end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{PAT} \\
15g
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}

\text{‘(Someone) took/carried me (to the hospital)./I was taken/carried (to the hospital).’}

The kind of verb such as \textit{kau} ‘be taken, carried’ may be called an “unaccusative verb”\textsuperscript{23}, because of its correspondence with \textit{kauta} ‘to take (it), carry (it)’. The two forms, such as \textit{kau} and \textit{kauti} in the examples above, although different in form, rarely show any semantic or pragmatic difference in actual use.\textsuperscript{24} Some studies claim that these two differ semantically, but with no convincing data (for example, Dixon 1988:222).\textsuperscript{25} The fact described above can also be explained as being the result of the development of a new intransitive verb. One (without any ending) is the retention of an original intransitive form, while the other (with a “transitive suffix” ending) has developed from a transitive verb.

B. The Rotuman Situation

Rotuman also has characteristics that indicate the same syntactic development as that described in the previous section. In Rotuman, according to Churchward (1940), the meaning of the verb—whether it should be read “actively” or “passively”—is context-dependent, unless the verb is formally followed by an Accusative noun phrase.\textsuperscript{26} Examples in (5.21) illustrate this situation.

\textsuperscript{23} My research on the Wailevu communalect of Fijian shows that about half of the verbs without any endings are “unaccusative” while the other half are “unergative”. Dixon (1988:204) reports that 53 per cent of his sample of Boumaa verbs are “unergative” while 47 per cent are “unaccusative”. This suggests that it is correct to assume that the proportion may not differ too much depending on the language of Fijian.

\textsuperscript{24} See Kikusawa (1998a:127-128) for a few examples that appear to be exceptional.

\textsuperscript{25} It should be noted that a study that makes this kind of claim usually analyses the intransitive structure with an effect feature as “passive” and “implies an agent”. I suggest that that such a description may have been influenced by the knowledge of English (or some other accusative language with a passive structure).

\textsuperscript{26} The Accusative case is expressed by the post-verb position in Rotuman today. See §2.6.1.2 and §3.2 for a description of the casemarking system of Rotuman, and §5.5 for the development of the Rotuman sentence structures after Proto Fijian–Rotuman.
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(5.21) Rotuman—Sentences that could be understood either actively or passively

(Churchward 1940:22)

a. *Iris hoa*.
   ‘They took, they were taken.’

b. *Iris hoa’kia*.
   ‘They took, they were taken.’

Churchward (1940:22) describes these sentences as follows: “Many, perhaps most, trans. [transitive] verbs may be used either in an active or in a passive sense (without any change of form)”. Examples in (5.21) are restated using a Lexicase analysis in (5.22).

(5.22) Rotuman—Lexicase restatement of the structurally ambiguous sentences in (5.21)

(Churchward 1940:22, my analysis)

a1. *Iris*  
   hoa?.
   they.Nom  
   take
   AGT  
   +trns
   actr
   ‘They took (something).’

a2. *Iris*  
   hoa?.
   they.Nom  
   be.taken
   PAT  
   -trns
   actr
   ‘They were taken.’

b1. *Iris*  
   hoa?kia.
   they.Nom  
   take
   AGT  
   +trns
   actr
   ‘They took (something).’

b2. *Iris*  
   hoa?kia.
   they.Nom  
   be.taken
   PAT  
   -trns
   actr
   ‘They were taken.’

Again, these structurally ambiguous sentences are well explained as a result of the proposed development in Proto Fijian-Rotuman. Sentences (5.20.a1) and (5.20.b1) are considered to be the retentions of the transitive sentence shown as (PRF1-c), while Sentences (5.20.a2) and (5.20.b2) are considered to have developed from (PRF1-d)27, the original meaning of which must have been “(someone) took them”.

---

27 See also examples (5.18.b1, b2) and (5.18.d5).
C. Expressing Semantic Agent in Fijian and Rotuman

In both Fijian and Rotuman, the Locative preposition *?i extended its morphosyntactic function to indicate the semantic agent of intransitive sentences. This is considered to have taken place after the change described in the preceding paragraphs took place.

5.4.2 The second major change in Proto Rotuman–Fijian: a change from an ergative system to an accusative system

After the loss of the third person Genitive clitic pronoun form and the reinterpretation to produce a new intransitive sentence structure, there were two major subsequent changes in the Proto Rotuman-Fijian dialect chain.

First, from the forms that followed an auxiliary verb, a single set of clitic pronouns was innovated retaining the syntactic feature [actr] that was shared by any clitic pronoun that had occurred in this position. The motivation must have been the combination of the shared position, similarity in the forms, and the shared syntactic feature [actr]. The new clitic pronouns indicated [actr], and were thus Nominative. When we look at daughter languages spoken today, we find the original Genitive form ..qu (or [qu..) in the Western Fijian languages, and the original Nominative form ..au in the Eastern Fijian languages. This choice of the clitic-pronoun set may have been consistent through the person and numbers in a language. In the west, for example, the Genitive forms were probably chosen for all person and numbers. However, from the current forms found in daughter languages, this seems to be difficult to prove. If this assumption is correct, on the western end of the dialect chain, the original Genitive forms, including *=qu, were retained as a set of post-auxiliary clitic pronouns, and thus there was a contrast between the new Nominative (earlier Genitive) clitic pronoun forms and the new Accusative (earlier Nominative) pronoun forms. On the eastern end, the original Nominative forms, including *=au, were retained as a set of post-auxiliary clitic pronouns, and there was no contrast between the Nominative (earlier Nominative) forms and Accusative (earlier Nominative as well) forms.

Once this generalisation occurred, the clitic pronouns were interpreted as Nominative, or the "subject" of the sentence, because the feature that was commonly shared by these forms was [actr]. At this point, the language could be analysed as having an "accusative pattern" clitic pronoun system that eventually developed into the [actr] verb-agreement system found in the modern-day Fijian languages. Note that full NPs were not morphologically casemarked, and therefore were likewise interpreted as Nominative and Accusative.

The sentence structures as a result of the changes described above are shown in (5.23).

(5.23) Basic sentence structures of Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain (2)

(PRFL-a) *V =N1 V NP (?iliki NP)
+xlry PAT -trns PAT LOC
+prnn actr actr

---

28 See §4.5.2.2 for a discussion.
(PRF2-b) \[ *V = N_1 V \quad ?i \ NP \quad NP \quad (?i/ki \ NP) \]
\[ +xi\_ry \ PAT \quad -trms \quad COR \quad PAT \quad LOC \]
\[ \quad
Rotuman split off from the western end of the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain, after these changes took place. The remaining dialects subsequently developed into two dialect chains, namely the Proto Western Fijian and Proto Eastern Fijian dialect chains.

5.5 Pre Rotuman basic sentence structures

Pre Rotuman is the stage after Rotuman split off from the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain and before it became Rotuman as it is spoken today. Reconstructed basic sentence structures for Pre Rotuman are shown in (5.24).

(5.24) Basic sentence structures in Pre Rotuman

(PRot-a) *N= V V NP (?ilki NP)
   PAT +xlr-y -trns PAT actr
   actr
   +prmn Nom
   Pat

(PRot-b) *N= V V ?i NP NP (?ilki NP)
   PAT +xlr-y -trns COR PAT actr
   Lev actr
   +prmn Nom
   Pat

(PRot-c) *N= V V =N NP NP (?il/ki NP)
   AGT +xlr-y +trns PAT AGT actr
   +dflct Acc actr
   +prmn Nom

(PRot-d) *N= V V NP (?il/ki NP)
   AGT +xlr-y -trns PAT actr
   +dflct +prmn Nom
   PAT

The innovation in Pre Rotuman is the reinterpretation of the post-auxiliary clitic pronoun position as the position for an independent pronoun. This was followed by a generalisation of the new pronoun position as the position for any Nominative noun phrase pronominal or otherwise. The generalisation of the post-auxiliary position has already been discussed in §4.2.2. The generalisation of the post non-auxiliary position must have been similar to that which took place in Proto Polynesian (§5.3), probably as a result of intimate contact with some Polynesian languages.
5.6 The Proto Fijian dialect chains

The Proto Fijian sentence structures reconstructed in §4.2.4.1, shown in (5.25), developed subsequent to the stage shown in (5.23) for the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain.

(5.25) Proto Fijian—Reconstructed basic sentence structures

(PFj-a) *(V) =N₁ V (Adv) NP
         +xlry PAT actr -trns PAT actr +prnn

(PFj-b) *(V) =N₁ V (Adv) i NP NP
         +xlry PAT actr -trns COR PAT actr +prnn

(PFj-c) *(V) =N₁ V =N₂ (Adv) NP NP
         +xlry AGT actr +trns PAT AGT PAT +prnn +prnn

*N₁ and N₂ were obligatory.

From these sentence structures, there was a further innovation in Eastern Fijian languages. The Accusative clitic pronoun position was reinterpreted as the Accusative position for personal nouns, resulting in the acquisition of the two transitive sentence structures shown in (5.26). The Accusative-marking form *i observed in Wayan and some languages in Lau (§3.3.3.2) is probably a reinterpretation and retention of the original personal noun marker *i. In other areas, this form *i following the verb ending ..i/ eventually disappeared.

(5.26) Pre Eastern Fijian—Transitive sentence structures

(PEF-a) *(V) =N₁ V =N₂ (Adv) NP NP
         Nom Acc NP NP
         +xlry AGT actr +trns PAT AGT PAT +prnn +prnn

(PEF-b) *(V) =N₁ V =N₂ (Adv) NP
         Nom Acc NP
         +xlry AGT actr +trns PAT AGT +prpr actr +prnn

30 Compare with System B described in (4.14).
5.7 Morphological differentiation

The clitic pronoun forms that indicated the [AGT] in Proto Central Pacific are considered to have been identical with those that indicated the possessor, and thus are called "Genitive clitic pronouns" rather than "Ergative clitic pronouns" (see §4.3.6). However, a change took place in various daughter languages, which resulted in two separate sets of pronouns, an Ergative set expressing the [AGT] occurring on the auxiliary verb and a Genitive set expressing the possessor occurring on the noun. This kind of change, namely the innovation of two sets of pronouns each of which took over one of the two syntactic features that a single set of pronouns carried in an earlier state, is referred to as MORPHOLOGICAL DIFFERENTIATION in this study.31 It indicates that the function(s) of the original form were distributed over more than one form in the daughter language. The morphological differentiation in the clitic pronouns took place independently in various daughter languages of Proto Central Pacific, and some of these are described in this section.

I have claimed above (§5.4.1) that the third person Genitive clitic pronoun was lost in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain. This is one morphological differentiation that took place in Central Pacific languages. Table 5.5 shows the system in Proto Central Pacific and Proto Rotuman–Fijian.

### Table 5.5: Innovation of new pronoun sets in Proto Rotuman–Fijian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Central Pacific System</th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive clitic pronouns</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-N)</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Rotuman–Fijian System</th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[AGT] marking clitic pronouns</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor markers</td>
<td>*=ŋku</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=ŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Proto Central Pacific, a Genitive pronoun could be cliticised to either a verb or a noun. When it was cliticised to a verb, it indicated the [AGT] of the sentence (post-V), while when it was cliticised to a noun, it indicated the possessor (post-N). Since these two functions were carried by a single set, the forms are referred to by a single case form, namely Genitive. In Proto Rotuman–Fijian, however, these forms were not a single set any longer. The loss of the Proto Central Pacific third person Genitive form *ŋa resulted in new sets of clitic pronouns. The new Ergative set eventually "merged" with the Nominative set (§4.4) to create a new [actr] set in the language, while the new Genitive set eventually became a part of the possessed nouns.

---

31 The term is introduced in Anderson (1973:164), but with a slightly different sense from the way it is used in this study.
Morphological differentiation took place also in the clitic pronoun system in Proto Polynesian. However, the change in Proto Polynesian involves the creation of two new sets of pronouns that have different syntactic functions, rather than the creation of morphologically different forms. This is shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6: Innovation of a new pronominal system in Proto Polynesian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Central Pacific System</th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive clitic pronouns</td>
<td>*=qu</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-N)</td>
<td>*=qu</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Polynesian System</th>
<th>1Sg</th>
<th>2Sg</th>
<th>3Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[AGT] marking clitic pronouns (post-V)</td>
<td>*=ku</td>
<td>*=u</td>
<td>*=na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor markers (end of N)</td>
<td>*.ku</td>
<td>*.u</td>
<td>*.na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Proto Polynesian, the forms that indicated the [AGT] remained as clitic pronouns, while those that indicated the possessor had already become a part of the possessed nouns. The former are now called Ergative, while the latter are possessed noun endings and, since they were not independent words any more, they did not carry case. What originally were recognised as the same Genitive form were no longer recognised as such, because of their different syntactic distribution. Therefore, when some [AGT] marking forms were replaced in a later stage in each language, this did not influence the forms on the possessed nouns.

As shown in §4.3.6, a Genitive set of clitic pronouns expressing both the [AGT] and the possessor are reconstructable for Proto Central Pacific. These are considered to be retentions of the Proto Malayo-Polynesian Genitive clitic pronouns, which also expressed both the [AGT] of a transitive verb and the possessor in a possessive noun phrase. Since this system is not reflected as it is reconstructed in the present-day Oceanic languages, one must assume that there were multiple independent innovations that took place. This is a classic example of syntactic "drift", the conditions for which must have been already present in Proto Oceanic.

5.8 Reconstructed pronominal forms and their changes

In this section, reconstructed singular pronominal forms and their development are summarised.

According to the reconstruction proposed in Chapter 4 and in the previous sections in this chapter, Proto Central Pacific needs to be reconstructed as having three sets of pronominal forms. Two are sets of clitic pronouns, one a Genitive set and the other a Nominative set. The third is a set of full pronouns. Each reconstructed Proto Central Pacific form is presented in this section with a set of information presented in the following order: i) the reconstructed form and its definition as the title line; ii) a tree diagram which shows the succeeding changes; iii) a list of supporting evidence for phonological changes; iv) previously reconstructed forms
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that are relevant to the protoform proposed in this study; v) external evidence; vi) notes on changes other than those listed in iii).

It should be noted that the diagram given for each reconstructed form not only shows the succeeding phonological changes of the form, but it also indicates how its reconstructed syntactic function(s) are carried over in daughter languages. To enable this to be done, the symbols "||", ":", and "()" need to be introduced. The symbol "||" indicates a morphological replacement. The form that follows "||" is NOT a (phonological) reflex of the form in the upper level, but has taken over (all or part of) its syntactic function(s). The symbol ";" indicates a case of morphological differentiation (see §5.7). This is defined as occurring when the function(s) of the reconstructed form are distributed over more than one form in the daughter languages, at least one of which is a reflex of the reconstructed form while the other may be a reflex, or may have a completely different source. The relevant forms are listed separated by ";". Forms which retain only a part of the syntactic function of the reconstructed form are given in parentheses. Parentheses "( )" indicate that the reflex (or a replacement form) has changed its syntactic function from that which it had in the earlier protolanguage.

To illustrate the usage of these symbols, a sample diagram with made-up forms is given in Figure 5.1. The subgrouping in the diagram shows a simplified model of the hypothesis presented in Figure 6.2, and contains PCP (the Proto Central pacific dialect chain), PPN (Proto Polynesian), PRF (the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain), PEF (Proto Eastern Fijian dialect chain), PWF (Proto Western Fijian dialect chain) and Rot (Rotuman). As for the Fijian languages, where the same form can be reconstructed for both the Western and Eastern end of this chain, it is indicated as being reconstructed for PWF-PEF. Where different forms need to be reconstructed for each end of the dialect chain, they are indicated as being reconstructed as PEF and PWF. These conventions are applied both in the diagram and in the list of supporting evidence.

This diagram is read as follows. In PCP, there was a form reconstructed as *akuma. In PPN, there were two apparent reflexes of the PCP form, namely, *aku and *akuma, each of which continues part of the syntactic function that the form *akuma had in PCP. In PRF, the form *akuma was replaced by the form *auku. When a replacement occurred, the earlier form and function of the introduced one are indicated with an arrow sign. Naturally, the succeeding forms, namely PEF *yau, PWF *au, and Rot auk are all reflexes of this introduced form *auku, and not of PCP *akuma.

The abbreviations for sources are as follows: BI77 = Blust (1977); Ch40 = Churchward (1940); Ch53 = Churchward (1953); Ho76 = Hockett (1976); Hp85 = Hooper (1985); Pa66 = Pawley (1966); Pa70 = Pawley (1970); PS71 = Pawley and Sayaba (1971); LRCip = Lynch, Ross, and Crowley (in press); Wi82 = Wilson (1982). A sound correspondence chart is given in Table 5.7.
Table 5.7: Sound correspondence chart (Based on Geraghty 1986, Geraghty and Pawley 1981, Marck 2000, and Pawley 1972, orthography adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCP</th>
<th>Rot</th>
<th>PFj</th>
<th>Way</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>PPn</th>
<th>Ton</th>
<th>Niu</th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Mao</th>
<th>Haw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*v</td>
<td></td>
<td>*v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>*f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>wh/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mp</td>
<td></td>
<td>m, Ø</td>
<td>mb</td>
<td>mb</td>
<td>*m, Ø</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*w</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>*w</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*t</td>
<td></td>
<td>fl/js</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ñ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø/r, n, y</td>
<td>*ñ/*n</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*z</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>*h, *s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʒ</td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>*h, *s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø/r</td>
<td>*c</td>
<td>*c</td>
<td>*t, *s</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*j</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s</td>
<td></td>
<td>s/lj</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td></td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø/l?</td>
<td>Ø/*y</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø/l?</td>
<td>Ø/*y</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kw</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ŋkw</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋgw</td>
<td>*ŋgw</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*ŋk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ŋw</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>*ŋw</td>
<td>*ŋw</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/ŋ</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td>*ŋg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r, *l</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nr</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>*nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>*r, *l</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>*r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*l</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ø/#_a</td>
<td></td>
<td>r, y</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
<td>*Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ae</td>
<td>*ae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ao</td>
<td>*ao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.8.1 Proto Central Pacific singular genitive clitic pronouns

A. PCP *=ŋku  First person singular Genitive clitic pronoun (1Sg.Gen)

Figure 5.2: The PCP first person singular Genitive clitic pronoun and its development

PPn *=ŋku  Ton ..ku] ‘1Sg [actr] agreement marker’; Sam ..ʔu] ‘1Sg [actr] agreement marker’.
PEF *=ŋgu  ‘1Sg Genitive (possessive) clitic pronoun’. Bau =qu ‘my, 1Sg Genitive (possessive) clitic pronoun, (e.g. yaca=qu ‘my name’).
PWF *=ŋgu₁  ‘1Sg Nominative clitic pronoun. Nbl qu=, =qu ‘1Sg Nominative clitic pronoun’ (e.g. Qu=sā lako/Sā=qu lako. ‘I’m leaving now.’).
PWF *=ŋgu₂  ‘1Sg possessed noun ending’. Nbl ..qu] ‘1Sg possessed noun ending (e.g. noqu ‘mine’).
Rot ..tou] ‘1Sg possessed noun and possessive adjective ending (e.g. ‘ontou ‘my’, ‘otou ‘mine’).
Rot =ŋu  ‘1Sg (short) pronoun’. (Irr. *ŋk > ŋ, *u > ou. No explanation.)

Relevant previously reconstructed forms: PCP *ŋku³³ ‘my’ (Ho76:216); PFj (tentative) *qu ‘1Sg preverbal pronoun’ (PS71:420); PWF *qu ‘1Sg preverbal pronoun’ (PS71:419); PPn *kau ‘1Sg embedded subject person-marker’ (Pa70:348); *-ku ‘1Sg possessive pronoun’ (Wi82:113).
External evidence: PMP *ni-*ku ‘1Sg Genitive pronoun’ (Bl77:11).

³² Where no definition is provided for a reflex, the form has the same definition as that of its reconstructed source.
³³ Corresponds to *-qu in recent orthographic conventions for Proto Central Pacific (for example, Pawley 1996).
B. PCP *=mu Second person singular Genitive pronoun (2Sg.Gen)

Figure 5.3: The PCP second person singular Genitive clitic pronoun and its development

PPn *=u ‘2Sg Genitive (possessive) noun ending’. Tuv ..u/ ‘2Sg Ergative clitic pronoun, 2Sg possessive ending’.

PRF *=mu ‘2Sg Genitive clitic pronoun’.

Rot ..mu../ ‘a phonological sequence that occurs on the second person dual and plural possessed nouns (‘yours’) and pronominal adjectives (‘your’)’.

PEF-PWF *=mu ‘2Sg Genitive (possessive) clitic pronoun’.

Relevant previously reconstructed forms PPn *=u ‘2Sg possessor pronoun’ (Wi82), PPn *=u-o ‘2Sg ‘preposed possessor’ pronoun’ (Pa66, see Pa66:48 for a discussion of possible existence of possessed noun ending *mu or *mo in PPn).

External evidence PMP *ni-mu ‘2Sg ‘polite’ Genitive pronoun, 2PI Genitive pronoun’ (Bl77:11).

Notes There was a morphological differentiation in PPn. The Genitive clitic pronoun attached to the auxiliary verb was replaced by PPn *=ke (Ton ke; Sam ?e), the source of which is uncertain. The original form was retained as a 2Sg Genitive (possessive) noun ending.

C. PCP *=ña Third person singular Genitive clitic pronoun (3Sg.Gen)

Figure 5.4: The PCP third person singular Genitive clitic pronoun and its development

PPn *=ña ‘3Sg possessed noun ending, an “emphatic” variant, ..ña(...)’ ‘phonological sequence that occurs in the 3DI and 3PI [actr] agreement markers, as well as in the forms of 3DI and 3PI possessed nouns (e.g. he’ena ‘theirs’ Ch53:131), ..ne/ ‘3Sg possessed noun ending of non-“emphatic” forms (e.g.
he’ene ‘his/her/its’ Ch53:131’). Sam ..na/ ‘first person [actr] agreement marker’.

PRF *=-ña ‘3Sg Genitive clitic pronoun’.
PEF *=-na ‘3Sg Genitive (possessive) clitic pronoun’. Bau =na (e.g. yaca=na ‘his name’)
PWF *=-ña ‘3Sg possessed noun ending’.

Relevant previously reconstructed forms PCP *-na ‘his/her’ (Ho76:216).
External evidence PMP *ni-a ‘3Sg Genitive pronouns’ (Bl77:11); *ña ‘3Sg Genitive clitic pronoun’ (LRCip).

Notes There was a morphological differentiation in PRF whereby the form *ña was retained as a Genitive (possessive) clitic pronoun, while the form that functioned as a Genitive clitic pronoun was completely lost.

5.8.2 Proto Central Pacific singular nominative clitic pronouns

A. PCP *=au First person singular Nominative clitic pronoun (1Sg.Nom)

PPn *=au Ton au ‘1Sg pronoun’; ..ou/ ‘1Sg [actr] agreement marker (Irr. *au > ou. Occurs only with ?oku ‘present tense’. Suggested derivation: ?okuau > ?okuou); Niuean au ‘1Sg pronoun’; Haw ‘1Sg pronoun’.
PRF *=au ‘1Sg Nominative clitic pronoun’.
PEF-PWF *(..au]) ‘Transitive verb ending marking agreement with 1Sg [PAT]’. NbI *(..au]; Bau ..au].

Relevant previously reconstructed forms PCP *au ‘I’ (Ho76:200).

B. PCP *=koe Second person singular Nominative clitic pronoun (2Sg.Nom)

PPn *=kê PEF *(..iko] ‘2Sg’
PRF *=koe PWF *(..koe] Rot (?ae)

Figure 5.5: The PCP first person singular Nominative clitic pronoun and its development

Figure 5.6: The PCP Second person singular Nominative clitic pronoun and its development
PPn *koe  Ton koe; Sam ?oe; Haw oe; Mao koe. (Irr. Acquisition of final e. Possibly the result of an analogy with the final vowel e of the 2Sg.Gen form *ke. This took place after the form *ke was introduced.)

PRF *=ko  ‘2Sg Nominative clitic pronoun’. (*e > ae-#).

PWF *..ko]  ‘2Sg transitive verb ending’.

Rot 'ae(a)  ‘2Sg pronoun’. (Irr. *oe > ae. [Indirect inheritance? Split off from the West before *ko spread in the dialect chain?]).

Relevant previously reconstructed forms  PCP *ko- second person (Ho76:210). PPn *ke ‘2Sg “preposed subject” pronoun’ (Pa66:45 and Pa70:348)

External evidence  PMP *i-kaSu second person short Nominative pronoun (Bl77:11).

Notes  The PPn form was replaced by PPn *koe ‘2Sg pronoun’. Ton koe ‘2Sg pronoun’; the PEF form was replaced by PEF *iko ‘2Sg pronoun’.

C. PCP *=a  Third person singular Nominative clitic pronoun (3Sg.Nom)

Figure 5.7: The PCP third person singular Nominative clitic pronoun and its development

PPn *..a]  Fossilised in the so-called “-Cia” suffix and other verb endings.

PEF-PWF *..a]  ‘3Sg [PAT] transitive verb ending’.

External evidence  PEO -*a ‘3Sg object marking ending’ (Pa70:423 fn.).

5.8.3 Proto Central Pacific singular independent pronouns

A. PCP *aku  First person singular pronoun (1Sg)

Figure 5.8: The PCP first person full pronoun and its development

PPn *aku.  Sam a’u; Haw a’u (fossilised form in prepositional phrases).

PRF *au.  Merged with 1Sg.Nom clitic pronoun.

PEF-PWF *yau < *i (personal preposition) + *au. Way (y)au, Bau yau.

External evidence:  PMP *i-aku, first person Nominative pronoun (Bl77:11).
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B. PCP *iko Second person singular pronoun (2Sg)

Figure 5.9: The PCP second person full pronoun and its development

PEF-PWF *iko Bau *iko; Way *iko.
Relevant previously reconstructed forms: PPn *koe ‘2Sg “nuclear” pronoun’ (Pa66:45).
External evidence: PMP *i-kaSu, second person Nominative pronoun (Bl77:11).

C. PCP *ia Third person singular pronoun (3Sg)

Figure 5.10: The PCP third person full pronoun and its development

PPn *ia. Ton *ia; Sam *ia; Haw *ia; Mao *ia.
PWF-PEF *koya. < *ko (personal marker) + *ia. Bau *koya; Way *koya.
Rot *ia.
Relevant previously reconstructed forms PCP *ia ‘he/she’ (Ho76:207).
External evidence PMP *si-ia, third person nominative (Bl77:11).
6 Subgrouping hypotheses in the light of syntactic change

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, a subgrouping hypothesis based on syntactic change is proposed. In §6.2, previously proposed subgrouping hypotheses of the Central Pacific languages and evidence for these hypotheses are summarised. In §6.3, a different subgrouping hypothesis based on syntactic change is presented along with supporting evidence. How the evidence used to support the previous hypotheses is accounted for under the new hypothesis will be discussed in §6.4.

6.2 Subgrouping hypotheses proposed in previous studies

Geraghty (1983, 1996) proposed a subgrouping hypothesis of Proto Central Pacific applying the notion “dialect chain”, and Pawley (1996, 1999) modified it examining the position of Rotuman. These hypotheses were summarised in Figure 1.2 in §1.4.1, which is repeated here.

Geraghty’s main conclusions as to how Central Pacific languages developed are summarised by Pawley (1999:119) as follows (italics by Pawley).

(i) The language ancestral to today’s Fijian group had already differentiated into a chain of dialects before the Polynesian branch diverged from certain members of the Fijian chain.

(ii) For a time the dialects of eastern Fiji remained in closer association with the dialect that was to become the Polynesian branch than they did with the dialects of western Fiji. The closest association was between the Polynesian group and dialects of the Lau Islands and [North][East] Vanua Levu, that is ‘Tokalau Fijian’.

(iii) After Polynesian diverged from Tokalau Fijian, the various dialects in Fiji remained in contact and innovations continued to spread within the dialect chain. Most innovations spread over a limited area but others spanned virtually the whole of Fiji ...

A schematic representation of the relationships among Central Pacific languages with an emphasis on their development from a series of successive dialect chains is also presented by Pawley (1999:122).
Geraghty's hypothesis that Tokalau Fijian and Polynesian languages form a subgroup exclusive of the Western Fijian languages is based on sound correspondences and lexical innovations. The two phonological changes presented as a part of the evidence (Geraghty 1983:367) are as follows (orthography adjusted).

i) PEO *mw > PPN [Proto Polynesian] *n, EF [Eastern Fijian] n/.1

ii) PEO *n > PPN, EF n² (but WF y/∅). As a result, *n and *n merged in PPN and EF, while they remained distinct in WF.

Lexical items shared by some Eastern Fijian languages and Proto Polynesian are also presented as evidence. These include both what Geraghty calls "functors" and "nonfunctors". "Functors" are forms that are often referred to as "grammatical morphemes" and include what are referred to in this study as auxiliary verbs, Adverbs, Prepositions, clitic pronouns, and verb endings. "Nonfunctors" include what are here referred to as Nouns, (non-Auxiliary) Verbs, and Adjectives. Table 6.1 is taken from Geraghty 1983, and indicates the number of lexical

---

1 "Western Fiji shares the reflex [tjw] with parts of the New Hebrides and Southeast Solomons, but the reflex [η], with complete absence of labial constriction, is confined to PPN and EF (with the exception of SE Viti Levu, which shows [jw] and, possibly, [m])." (Geraghty 1983:367)

2 "This change, of course, is very common in Oceanic languages, and does not constitute strong evidence, since the chances are high of its occurring independently." (Geraghty 1983:367)

3 Some of the "functors" presented as supporting evidence in Geraghty (1983) are examined in the context of syntactic change in §6.4.
items that are shared exclusively by some Fijian and Polynesian languages.\(^4\) The position of each language (group) is indicated by number in Map 6.1.

Although some morphosyntactic features that distinguish Western and Eastern Fijian languages from each other are discussed in Geraghty (1983), he presents no morphosyntactic evidence to support his main subgrouping hypothesis.\(^5\)

Pawley’s (1996:109) claim that “Rotuman stems from the western part [of the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain] and probably from western Vanua Levu” is based on the examination of isoglosses that are drawn among Rotuman, Fijian and Polynesian languages. Pawley considers that this hypothesis best explains that fact that Rotuman reflects many innovations in common with the Fijian languages (especially with those spoken in the western regions) exclusive of Polynesian and that it shares very few apparent innovations with the Polynesian group. Shared innovations between Rotuman and Western Fijian languages presented by Pawley (1996:102-107) are as follows:

i) Retention of the distinction between PCP *\(\text{n}\) and PCP *\(\text{n}\).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PCP *\(\text{n}\)} & \text{ > PreRot (*\(y\)) > Rot \(r\) (word-initially), } \emptyset \text{ (word-medially).} \\
& \text{ > WF} \ y \\
& \text{ > EF, PPn *\(\text{n}\) (merged with PCP *\(\text{n}\)).}
\end{align*}
\]


Pawley considers that Rotuman diverged from the Fijian languages before the formation of the Proto Fijian dialect chain, because Rotuman did not undergo some innovations that are common to all Fijian languages, such as simplification of PCP rising diphthongs *\(ae\) and *\(ao\), which became \(a\), \(e\), or \(o\), under given phonological conditions in all the Fijian languages (Geraghty and Pawley 1981, cited by Pawley 1996:111).

\(^4\) Most of the lexical items are compared with Proto Polynesian, while some are shared by a certain Fijian group with a certain Polynesian language(s). See Geraghty (1983:367-378) for the list.

\(^5\) A simple comparison of the forms of “functors” is considered to be lexical comparison, rather than morphosyntactic comparison.
Table 6.1: Lexical items shared exclusively by the various Fijian Communalect groups with Polynesia (cited from Geraghty 1983:379)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonfunctors</th>
<th>Functors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northwest Viti Levu</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southwest Viti Levu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Namosi, Naitāsiri, Šērua</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southeast Viti Levu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northeast Viti Levu</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kadavu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Western Vanua Levu</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Central Vanua Levu</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northeast Vanua Levu</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Southeast Vanua Levu</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 6.1: Location of the Fijian communalect groups listed in Table 6.1
6.3 A subgrouping hypothesis based on syntactic innovations

The distribution of the major syntactic changes that took place in the Central Pacific languages implies a different subgrouping of the languages from what has been suggested by Geraghty. Some major innovations are exclusively shared by Rotuman and Fijian languages while some are exclusively shared only by Polynesian languages, implying a clear cut split between Proto Polynesian and the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain. A modified subgrouping hypothesis is presented in §6.3.1, followed by explanations. Supporting evidence is provided in §6.3.2. The order required by some of the changes is discussed in §6.3.3. There is one morphosyntactic feature that is found both in Fijian as well as in some Polynesian languages. The distribution of this particular feature is explained as a result of contact rather than as an exclusively shared innovation.

6.3.1 A subgrouping hypothesis based on syntactic changes

Figure 6.2 shows a subgrouping hypothesis based on syntactic changes.

![Diagram of the subgrouping hypothesis based on syntactic changes]

Figure 6.2: Revised hypothesis of the development of the Central Pacific languages

Following Geraghty (1983), I assume that Proto Central Pacific developed into a dialect chain in Fiji, and that Proto Polynesian diverged from its eastern end. Although Geraghty considers
that contact was maintained between the speakers of Eastern Fijian dialects and those who had migrated east forming his "Tokalau Proto Polynesian dialect chain", syntactic evidence suggests that there must have been a period of isolation long enough for the dialects to have diverged to develop different morphosyntactic features such as those discussed in detail in §6.3.2 and §6.3.3. It was during this period that there took place two major syntactic changes (Changes i and ii in §6.3.2) which are shared by all Polynesian languages but are not found in any of the Fijian group nor in Rotuman. The dialect chain in Fiji at this period is labelled "the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain”.

In the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain, several syntactic changes (iii, viii and iv) took place which ultimately spread across Fiji and resulted in the change from an ergative system (which Proto Polynesian inherited) to the accusative system which is shared by Rotuman and the Fijian languages today. It is for this reason that Rotuman is considered to have split off from Proto Polynesian did. At this stage or later, intimate contact developed between the western part of the Polynesian group and some eastern Fijian dialects, evidenced by the extension of a pan-Fijian syntactic change (viii) into Tongan and ultimately Samoan.

After Rotuman diverged from the western end of the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain (see Pawley 1996), two further syntactic changes (v and vi) shared by Fijian languages but not by Rotuman occurred. This change helped to define what is here labelled the Proto Fijian dialect chain. Ultimately, one further syntactic change (vii) occurred, the distribution of which is restricted to languages in the eastern part of Fiji, and helped to define the Eastern Fijian dialect chain. Finally, Rotuman exhibits some morphosyntactic features that appear to have been introduced into Rotuman from Polynesian languages. This is explained as a result of extremely intensive contact between Pre Rotuman and the Tongan and East Uvean languages, and later with the Samoan and East Futunan languages, as demonstrated by Biggs (1965).

6.3.2 Evidence for the proposed subgrouping hypothesis

The proposed subgrouping hypothesis is based on the distribution of several uniquely shared morphosyntactic features in the Central Pacific languages. Figure 6.3 shows this distribution, followed by an explanation of each syntactic change. The numbers in Figure 6.3 refer to the number given to each change in the following text.
Innovations in Proto Polynesian

i) Loss of the post main verb [PAT] clitic pronoun position. This resulted in a new set of independent pronouns combining some of the earlier Nominative clitic pronoun forms and the earlier Independent pronoun forms (see §4.4.1.2, §5.3).

ii) Innovation of the Ergative preposition *e (see §4.5.2.3, §5.3).

These two changes took place in Proto Polynesian, for both are shared by most of the Polynesian languages and are found neither in Fijian nor in Rotuman.6

Innovations in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain

iii) Loss of the Proto Central Pacific third person singular Genitive clitic pronoun *=ŋa. This resulted in a new transitive structure which was subsequently reinterpreted as intransitive (see §5.4.1).

iv) Acquisition of the new pre-Verb position for the [actr] clitic pronouns in addition to (and eventually to replace) the post-auxiliary position (see §4.2.2, §5.4).

These two changes both took place after Proto Polynesian split off from the dialect chain, because the Proto Central Pacific Genitive clitic pronoun *ŋa is reflected in some Polynesian languages, and the position change is not reflected in the Polynesian languages.7

---

6 Rotuman today does not have clitic pronouns indicating the [PAT] of a transitive verb either. However, because of the existence of the intransitive verb endings indicating the person and number of the [PAT] (see Change iii), I consider that this was a separate development from the one that took place in Proto Polynesian.

7 In Samoan, the “unspecified tense-aspect-mood” marking auxiliary verb e takes the form te and occurs following the clitic pronoun; that is, the clitic pronoun precedes the auxiliary verb instead of following it (Chung 1978:35). However, the distribution of the occurrence of the sequence of an auxiliary verb followed by a clitic pronoun in Polynesian languages and that of possible cognates of the auxiliary verb te suggest that this is a later innovation that took place independently in this language.
Innovations in the Proto Fijian dialect chain

v) Loss of the extensive use of intransitive sentence structures with two complement noun phrases with non-movement verbs (see §5.6).

vi) Grammaticalisation of the [PAT] clitic pronouns as agreement markers on transitive verbs (see §4.2.3).

Innovation in the Eastern Fijian dialect chain

vii) Cliticisation of proper nouns to the transitive verb (see §4.2.4.1, §5.6).

This is considered to have taken place independently in Eastern Fijian languages.\(^8\)

As can be seen in Figure 6.3, the distribution of the major morphosyntactic innovations observed in the Central Pacific languages clearly shows the split between Polynesian languages and the Rotuman and Fijian languages.

There is one morphosyntactic feature that is observed in Rotuman, Fijian and in at least two Polynesian languages, namely Tongan and Samoan. This is shown in Figure 6.4.

---

**Figure 6.4:** Syntactic innovation in Rotuman and Fijian borrowed into Western Polynesian languages

viii) Merger of forms from two sets of clitic pronouns (Genitive and Nominative) into a single set of Nominative [actr] clitic pronouns immediately following the auxiliary verb. This resulted in a change from an ergative pattern clitic pronoun system to an accusative one (see §4.3.3, §4.3.5).

This change took place in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain, probably motivated by the loss of *ňa. On the western end of the dialect chain, the earlier Genitive form *ŋku was retained to indicate the new [actr], while on the eastern end, the earlier Nominative form *au was retained. Rotuman does not directly reflect this change, but the innovation of the [actr] clitic pronoun set is considered to be a precondition for Rotuman to have developed its Nominative position (see example [4.7] and the following discussion in §4.2.2). Therefore, Rotuman is considered to have split off from the western end of the dialect chain after this change took place.

This feature is considered to have spread to Tongan and Samoan as a result of contact. The evidence for this claim (that Tongan and Samoan reflect an [actr] clitic pronoun system as a result of contact rather than of shared innovation) comes from the required order of the

syntactic changes and the geographical distribution of the languages that have [actr] clitic pronouns, and will be discussed in detail in §6.3.3.

6.3.3 The required order of the proposed morphosyntactic changes

Among the proposed morphosyntactic changes, some could only have taken place in a given chronological order to be described in this section.

6.3.3.1 Order of the changes that involve clitic pronouns expressing the [actr]

Changes iii, iv, and viii are morphosyntactic changes that involved the clitic pronouns which occurred on certain auxiliary verbs and which indicated the [actr]. Figure 6.5 shows the order of the changes and the resulting distribution of morphosyntactic features.

The horizontal axis shows approximate geographical distribution, while the vertical axis shows chronological order. The changes are indicated by numbers (iii, viii, and iv) on the left side.

The two clitic pronoun sets reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific, namely Genitive and Nominative sets (indicated in the figure by slanted lines), are reflected in various Polynesian languages. Forms found in the daughter languages today include reflexes of the Proto Central Pacific third person singular form *ña (see §4.4.1.2). Therefore, the loss of the form *ña (iii), an innovation shared by all the Fijian languages and a precondition of certain changes in Pre Rotuman, had to have taken place after Proto Polynesian split off from the Central Pacific dialect chain.

The loss of the [actr] marking feature of the Genitive clitic pronoun form *=ña resulted in the Proto Rotuman–Fijian dialect chain having only one third person singular clitic pronoun, namely the Nominative form *=a. It is plausible to assume that this set the stage for the innovation of the single [actr] clitic pronoun set replacing the two clitic pronoun sets that had earlier indicated the [actr] (viii, indicated with course dots in the figure).

A single set of clitic pronouns (or agreement markers) indicating the [actr] appears in Tongan and Samoan. However, this has to be a feature acquired after Polynesian languages diverged, because the earlier two sets of pronouns are reflected in other Polynesian languages in one way or another (see the distribution of slanted lines in the figure). This implies that the two clitic pronoun sets still existed at the time when the languages that are considered to belong to lower subgroups than Tongan and Samoan diverged. Some languages in the east of Fiji, especially those spoken in the Lau islands, are known to have had intimate contact with Tongan. It was probably as a result of this contact that Tongan developed a single set of [actr] clitic pronouns (which eventually developed into agreement markers), rather than as a result of an independent innovation. This subsequently spread to Samoan, which retains some earlier ergative characteristics in its clitic pronoun system (discussed in §4.3.5).

Because clitic pronouns occur in the post-sentence initial auxiliary position in Tongan and Samoan, which are considered to have acquired the [actr] clitic pronoun system by contact with Fijian, the innovation of the pre-sentence initial verb clitic position (iv) must have taken place after the [actr] clitic pronoun system was borrowed into Tongan. Both changes viii and

\[ See the description of Change iv) in §6.3.2 for an exceptional case in Samoan.\]
Figure 6.5: Changes involving clitic pronouns indicating the [actr] in the Central Pacific languages
Figure 6.6: Changes involving the form indicating the [PAT] of transitive verbs in the Central Pacific languages
iv are preconditions for Rotuman to have undergone generalisation of the clitic pronoun position as the position for all [actr] noun phrases, and for this reason, Rotuman is considered to have split off after change iv took place.

6.3.3.2 Order of the changes that involve the transitive [PAT]

Changes vi and vii involve the occurrence of the [PAT] of transitive sentences and are considered to have taken place in the order shown in Figure 6.6.

As in Figure 6.5, the horizontal axis shows approximate geographical distribution, while the vertical axis shows chronological order. The changes are indicated by numbers (vi and vii) on the left side.

In the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain, the [PAT] of a transitive sentence was expressed by a clitic pronoun that was cliticised to the transitive verb. This was lost in Proto Polynesian (i) while being maintained in the remaining dialect chain in Fiji. Pre Rotuman must have split off before the clitic pronouns were grammaticalised as agreement endings, because there is no evidence in Rotuman for [PAT] agreement marking on transitive verbs. Change vi is observed only in the Eastern Fijian dialect chain and could have developed before, or after, Pre Rotuman separated from the west end of Fiji.

6.4 Discussion

The subgrouping hypotheses proposed by Geraghty and Pawley (presented in Figure 6.1, hereafter Hypothesis A) and the one based on morphosyntactic innovations (presented in Figure 6.2, hereafter Hypothesis B) differ in some aspects. In this section, I will argue that the evidence used to determine Hypothesis B is NOT accounted for in Hypothesis A, while the evidence used to support Hypothesis A is implied in Hypothesis B.

It has been argued in §6.3 that shared syntactic innovations imply that Proto Polynesian split off from the rest of the Central Pacific family, and that then, after the change from ergative to accusative took place, Rotuman diverged from the Fijian branch. The distribution of the shared innovations cannot be accounted for in Hypothesis A. The following are two possible explanations trying to account for the distribution of the uniquely shared innovations within Hypothesis A, neither of which is very plausible.

The first explanation would be to assume that no syntactic change took place in the dialect chain in Fiji until the Proto Fijian dialect chain was formed. This would assume that all the changes except for (i) and (ii) would have had to have taken place in this dialect chain, after the Proto Fijian dialect chain was formed. However, this is unrealistic, because many lexical innovations are considered to have taken place in this period. What is more, this alternative still would not account for the fact that Rotuman shares the major syntactic changes with the Fijian languages.

10 The fact that some of the so-called “ingressive” intransitive verbs (which possibly developed from transitive verbs) do carry [PAT] agreement endings may seem to contradict this statement. However, the Rotuman agreement forms appear to have developed from earlier genitive clitic pronouns, rather than from the earlier nominative pronouns which are reflected in the Fijian languages, and are therefore assumed to reflect an independent innovation.
Another possible explanation is to assume that all the changes except for (i) and (ii) took place in the Proto Western and Central Fijian and Rotuman dialect chain, and spread to Tokalau Fijian after Proto Polynesian developed from the Proto Tokalau Fijian Polynesian dialect chain. However, this is not very realistic either, for again it needs to be assumed that no morphosyntactic change took place in the Proto Tokalau Fijian Polynesian dialect chain.

On the other hand, the evidence for Hypothesis A is readily accounted for in Hypothesis B. It is assumed in Hypothesis B that Proto Central Pacific already formed a dialect chain by the time Proto Polynesian split off. This by its nature implies that Proto Polynesian shared a set of innovations with certain of the dialects in Fiji exclusive of the remaining dialects, while sharing another set of innovations with some other dialect group in Fiji, etc. This is illustrated in Figure 6.7.

![Figure 6.7: A parent dialect chain and the distribution of linguistic features as a result of shared innovations](image)

If Changes a to f were taking place in the Proto A-B dialect chain when Proto B split off from the point indicated in the figure, languages in the eastern end of Proto A dialect chain and Proto B would reflect Changes b, c and d, but not Changes a, e and f (which would be reflected in the western end of the Proto A dialect chain).

Figure 6.7 illustrates a situation where a language called Proto B splits off from a Proto A-B dialect chain. Each of the changes (a) to (f) illustrates the distribution of each set of changes that was taking place in this dialect chain when Proto B split off from somewhere in its east. Regardless of the relationship between Proto B and the remaining dialect chain after Proto B split off from the East as indicated in the figure, Proto B and some languages in the east of Dialect Chain A would exclusively reflect changes (b), (c), and (d), while changes (a), (e), and (f) would be reflected only in the languages spoken in the west of this dialect chain. Likewise, the fact that Proto Polynesian is assumed to have split off from somewhere in the east of the Proto Central Pacific dialect chain implies that Proto Polynesian shared some linguistic features with some eastern Fijian dialects exclusive of those in the western part of the islands. I do not see any reason to assume a period of common development between Tokalau Fijian and Proto Polynesian in addition to this hypothesis to account for Geraghty’s evidence.

The claim in Hypothesis B that Rotuman split off from somewhere in the west of Fiji follows Pawley (1996). However, the time when Pre Rotuman split off in relation to the linguistic situation in Fiji in Hypothesis B differs from that in Hypothesis A. In Hypothesis B,
it is assumed that there was a dialect chain in Fiji and that some innovations had taken place in this dialect chain before Rotuman split off. Rotuman directly or indirectly reflects these changes. On the other hand, in Hypothesis A, Rotuman is considered to have diverged before the proto Fijian dialect chain was formed in Fiji. The reason for Pawley (1996:110-111) to claim this is because the separation of Rotuman “must have happened before the spread across Fiji of those particular innovations that are not found in Rotuman”. This statement would be true if Proto Central Pacific was assumed to have been a single homogeneous language. However, because Rotuman is considered to have diverged from a dialect chain, this condition is unnecessary. Even if the languages spoken in Fiji already constituted a dialect chain by the time Pre Rotuman separated, it is possible that the particular innovations Pawley talks about had not reached the area from which Pre Rotuman split off. In fact, the claim that Proto Central Pacific was a dialect chain implies that there were innovations that were taking place in parts of the chain (such as in Figure 6.7) which are not reflected in Rotuman today.

Converting the dialect-chain model to a standard tree diagram displays somewhat more succinctly the differences between the two hypotheses in regard to the sequencing of the initial splits. This is shown in Figure 6.8.

![Figure 6.8: Development of the Central Pacific languages implied in the two subgrouping hypotheses](image-url)
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