

Non-referential actor indexing in Nehan

John Olsstad

University of Newcastle

jtolstad@gmail.com

Abstract. Non-referential actor indexing is found in many languages in the form of 3PL impersonal constructions. In the sentence, “They don’t drink root beer in Australia.”, the actor *they* does not refer to any specific entity. In addition to 3PL impersonals, the Nehan language of northern Bougainville uses non-referential actor indexing for middle voice-like constructions, undergoer promotion, and—perhaps uniquely—expands impersonal constructions using 3SG agreement to indicate that the actor of the verb either lacks sentience or has accidentally carried out an action. This paper describes the semantics of non-referential actor indexing constructions and their role in argument structure.

Keywords. impersonals, non-referential indexing, argument structure, Oceanic, semantics

1. Introduction

The Nehan [nehan] language (Oceanic; Northwest Solomonian) of northern Bougainville is spoken by approximately 6,500 speakers on Nissan island, an atoll 50km north of the mainland. There are two main dialects on the atoll, called Hape [hape] and Hapa [hapa] after their respective varying pronunciations of “how?”. Another dialect of the language is spoken on the island immediately north-northwest of Nissan called Pinapir. Like virtually all languages of Bougainville, Nehan speakers can also be found living in Buka, the erstwhile provincial capital, and they also make up a transient community there.

Nehan is essentially a verb initial language, but it has been characterized as having TVX word order (Ross 1988) [Topic Verb X – verb dependents]. This non-canonical characterization is necessary in the first place because Nehan is a language for which, structurally speaking, the terms subject and object are not useful¹. That is to say, the order of constituents is in some cases determined only by pragmatic principles, and roles of constituents are understood via real world plausibility (further discussion in the next section). Actors and undergoers occur in NPs after the verb, but actors are coreferenced by number/exclusivity on a preverbal clitic, and undergoers are attached post-verbally in certain sentence types (discussed below). It is head-marking in the noun phrase for genitives and possessives (see Palmer & Brown 2007), but marks dependents of the verb.

In this paper I will describe non-referential actor indexing (henceforth NRAI) in Nehan as a rhetorical device used to derive various non-compositional meanings. In doing so, I will briefly describe Nehan argument structure and discourse as they relate to NRAI.

¹ This makes passivization difficult to talk about as well. I will refer to passives assuming that backgrounding of the logical verbal actor is akin to passivization. Traditional definitions of passive of course make use of transitivity, a notion which may not be useful in Nehan. In this sense, I use passive as a term of convenience throughout, but I also consider to what extent a passive-like construction might be in use in Nehan.

2. Argument structure

2.1 Nehan argument structure preliminaries

In order to understand NRAI, it is first necessary to introduce Nehan argument structure and syntax. Setting aside verbless clauses, virtually all clauses in Nehan contain a grammaticalized topic clause initially², and a verbal complex including a portmanteau verbal proclitic housing: a TAM morpheme and a person/number agreement morpheme. The verbal participants are expressed verb finally. The marking of grammatical roles on the verbal participants, and whether or not the verb contains an agreement enclitic, is dependent on clause type, discussed further in the next section. The structure of a basic clause is as follows:

(TOP) TAM-PERS/NUM.Agr=V X

The ‘X’ from the schema above can be any number of configurations including sentences with omitted logical objects and various combinations of verbal participants. In the next section, I will discuss two clause types that are differentiated by the form of post-verbal participants.

- (1) (*ing-o*) *k-u=* *bilin* *ta-r* *tinib*
 (TOP-1SG) PST-1SG= discard CM-R canoe
 ‘I left the canoe.’

It is possible to repeat the topic after the verb or to omit it entirely (indicated by parentheses in (2a)), but it is more common to find a topic either clause initial or verb final and not in both positions. Repeats of full NPs are likely to be pronouns as in (2b). In any case, pronominal topics have two forms corresponding to the two positions and NPs are marked differently as well.

² Although topic is a grammatical category in Nehan, clause initial pronouns and NPs may be and often are omitted.

- (2) a. *(ing-o) k-u= bilin (i-o) ta-r tinih*
 (TOP-1SG) PST-1SG= discard (LCL-1SG) CM-R canoe
 ‘I left the canoe.’
- b. *a kuah k-e= bilin (i-on) ta-r tinih*
 the woman PST-3SG= discard (LCL-3SG) CM-R canoe
 ‘The woman left the canoe.’
- c. *k-e= bilin i-r kuah ta-r tinih*
 PST-3SG= discard LCL-R woman CM-R canoe
 ‘The woman left the canoe.’

Grammatical roles are marked for what I refer to as local (LCL) and common (CM) argumenthood. This distinction has been identified by Ross (2007:232-233) for the lexicon of Proto-Oceanic, and I suspect it has been largely grammaticalized in Nehan items as primary and secondary in importance respectively in the spirit of POc. In Nehan, the markers *i-* (LCL) and *ta-* (CM) are used in marking the grammatical roles of verbal participants and in locative classes to denote this primary/secondary distinction. Nehan classifies locative nouns into culturally significant local entities and common entities.

- (3) a. *t-i= la i du!*
 IRR-1PLI= go LCL.PREP lagoon
 ‘Let’s go to the lagoon!’
- b. *t-i= la tar kuri!*
 IRR-1PLI= go CM.PREP PN
 ‘Let’s go to Kuri (restaurant/guesthouse in Buka)!’

- c. *k-u=* *wa-ate* *i=o* *tay John* *i* *du*
 PST-1SG= CS-know LCL=1SG CM PN LCL.PREP lagoon
 ‘I was the one who showed John to the lagoon.’

In (3a-b) above, *i* is the locative marker for motion towards a local entity, and *ta* is the marker for motion towards a common entity. (3c) demonstrates that it is possible to have *i* appear both as a verbal participant marker and a locative marker. It is possible that Nehan retained the LCL/CM categorical distinction in locative nouns, and that this was later extended to marking grammatical roles.

- (4) a. *k-e=* *tapolaka-to* *i-r* *bot* *ta-r* *palau*
 PST-3SG= break-on LCL boat CM-R rocks
 ‘The boat broke on the rocks.’
- b. *ing-o* *k-a=* *haluhu* *i-o*
 TOP-1SG PST-3PL= hit LCL=1SG
 ‘I was hit.’
- c. *ing-o* *k-u=* *haluh* *i-o* *ta=non*
 TOP-1SG PST-1SG= hit LCL=1SG CM=3SG
 ‘I hit him.’

The examples (4a-c) demonstrate that *i-* can mark either an actor or undergoer of a verb and *ta-* can mark either an undergoer or an oblique argument. It is for this reason that we cannot consider LCL/CM to be marking subjects and objects.

Ta-marking has been discussed previously in Ross (1988) as marking a topic/non-topic distinction. The following examples support this analysis³.

³ I am maintaining Ross’s terminology in these examples: TOP=topic; NT=non-topic

- (5) a. *ing-o* *ke-u=* *en* *i-o* *ta-r* *lo*
 TOP-1SG PST-1SG= eat TOP-1SG NT-R dog
 ‘I bit the dog.’
- b. *ing-o* *ke-e=* *en* *i-o* *ta-r* *lo*
 TOP-1SG pst-3SG= eat TOP-1SG NT-R dog
 ‘The dog bit me.’
- c. *a* *lo* *ke-e=* *en* *to~toguo*
 the dog PST-3SG= eat NT.1SG
 ‘The dog bit me.’
- d. **a* *lo* *ke-e=* *en* *i-o*
 the dog PST-3SG= eat TOP-1SG
 (intended: ‘The dog bit me.’)

My own analysis after collecting further field data differs from Ross only in that I have found *i-* to mark arguments in the same fashion as *ta-*, as opposed to marking the verb as transitive or a verbal argument as object, as *i* does so frequently in the Oceanic languages (Lynch *et al.*, 2002). And crucially, sentences may sometimes contain more than one *i*-marked argument:

- (6) (*ing-o*) *ke-e=* *haluh-in* *i-o* *i-r* *palau*
 (TOP-1SG) PST-3SG= hit-OBJ.SG LCL-1SG LCL-R stone
 ‘I got hit by a stone.’

In addition, as I discuss in the next section, the status of arguments marked by *ta-* is differentiated by the type of clause they appear in. For these reasons, I consider *i-/ta-* to be a distinction of primary and secondary arguments and call them local/common to reflect their hypothesized roots in POc.

2.2 Clause types

For clauses with at least two participants, the form that argument structure takes on is dependent on the choice of clause type. Clauses in Nehan can take on two types, the choice of which is determined by discourse appropriateness, which I call Type A and Type B. Type A clauses are used for referring to an event immediately after witnessing it. Morphological marking does not distinguish between logical objects and oblique phrases in Type A clauses. In Type B clauses, the main distinguishing structural characteristic is undergoer number agreement marking on the verb. This number agreement also distinguishes animacy in plurals. Type B clauses are used more restrictively than Type A clauses being reserved for situations that require more propositional specificity. (7a-b) below are examples of Type A clauses and (7c-d) are examples of Type B clauses.

- (7) a. *k-u= ban totomua tar Kute*
 PST-1SG= see CM.2SG PREP PN
 ‘I saw you at Kute.’
- b. *gisin k-a= longor totoguo*
 TOP.3PL PST-1SG= hear CM.1SG
 ‘They heard me.’
- c. *k-u= bana ia tar Kute*
 PST-1SG= see LCL.2SG PREP PN
 ‘I saw you at Kute.’
- d. *ing-o k-a= longoro=in*
 TOP-1SG PST-1SG= see=SG.Agr
 ‘I was heard.’

In (7a, c), only the form of the undergoer changes. In (7b, d), the alternation is between a sentence with a *ta*-marked undergoer, and one where the undergoer is

indexed on the verb but otherwise omitted, which is characteristic of Type B clauses.

Type A

Type A clauses take the following basic structure:

(TOPIC) TAM-ACT.Agr=V (TOPIC)

Verbal participants in Type A clauses are divided between *i* and *ta* as indicated below:

LCL	CM
<i>i</i> = [TOP]	<i>ta</i> = [Obj, Obl]

Table 1. LCL/CM alignment in Type A clauses.

In addition to use in depicting the immediate past, Type A clauses are found in hypothetical descriptions and descriptions of ongoing and future events. As mentioned above, there is no morphological differentiation between logical objects and obliques.

- (8) a. *k-e= haluh i-r kuah ta-r lo ta-r walih*
 PST-3SG= hit LCL-R woman CM-R dog CM-R paddle
 ‘The woman hit the dog with the paddle.’
- b. *k-ij= her ta-r buk tasir keketik*
 PST-1PLE= give CM-R book CM.PLANIM child
 ‘We gave the kids a book.’

In (8b), what could be expressed as a three-place predicate in some languages is not in Nehan. Taking the illustration one step further, the *ta*-marked participants in (9) can be rearranged while retaining the same propositional truth conditions. Plausibility determines the propositional content and intonational prosody is used where further clarification is necessary.

- (9) *k-e= haluh i-r kuah ta-r ball ta-r box ta-r walih*
 PST-3SG= hit LCL-R woman CM-R ball CM-R box CM-R paddle
 ‘The woman hit the ball into the box with the paddle.’

Type B clauses differentiate undergoers and obliques by indexing the undergoer by number agreement on a verbal enclitic. In (10a), ‘a bot’ is the topic and undergoer but not the actor, which is, in this case, an anonymous 3PL. (10b) shows that the boat can appear post-verbally as well. The actor of the verb *break* is not expressed apart from 3PL actor agreement on the proclitic.

- (10) a. *a bot k-a= tapolak=in ta=non*
 the boat PST-3PL= break=3SG CM.3SG
 ‘The boat was broken because of him.’
- b. *k-a= tapolak=in a bot ta=non*
 PST-3PL= break=3SG the boat CM.3SG
 ‘The boat was broken because of him.’

A further dimension of animacy is indicated by two forms for plurals. Obliques are *ta*-marked. This information is displayed again in the tables below:

Type B

Type B clauses take on the following structure:

(TOPIC) TAM-ACT.Agr=V=UND.Agr LCL

LCL	CM
$i = [\text{ACT}, \text{UND}]$	$ta = [\text{Obl}]$

Table 2. LCL/CM alignment in Type B clauses.

sg	=in
pl.anim	=is
pl.inam	=ig

Table 3. Undergoer agreement forms.

Type B clauses are only found in reporting the specifics of past events, particularly where establishing actor and undergoer is important or where there is an unexpected or vague relationship between referents⁴. As such, middle voice expressions employ Type B clauses as well.

- (11) $k-e=$ $bele=is$ $i-em$
PST-3SG= float=PL.ANIM LCL-1PLE
‘We went adrift.’

Middle voice constructions represent a situation where semantic roles and transitivity become less than straightforward. In the English sentence, “I failed.”, it is unclear as to the semantic role of the subject; the actor of the verb *fail* is in fact not specified. In Nehan, the solution to this sort of vagueness is to demote the actor to an unspecified 3rd person. The range of meanings produced via this strategy is the topic of the next section.

⁴ Politeness may also be a factor, but that is not clear to me yet.

It is perhaps useful to refer to Type A clauses as unmarked, whereas Type B clauses are marked in that Type A clauses are used under default pragmatic circumstances.

3. Semantics of NRAI constructions

Number/person indexing on the proclitic is used rhetorically to derive various meanings by indexing non-referential 3SG and 3PL actors. I call these non-referrers (N-Rs). Person/number marking usually agrees with the LCL verbal argument and always with the logical actor. In the case of N-Rs, there is no agreement with LCL and this is used to derive a number of meanings. In (12a), the topic and undergoer of hitting is expressed as a preverbal topic pronoun *ingon*, ‘he/she/it’, and indexed postverbally as a 3SG enclitic. The 3PL on the proclitic is non-referring, which would usually express undergoer promotion. Additionally, a 3PL N-R indicates that the actor is a sentient being capable of purposefully committing the action.

- (12) a. *ing-on* *ke-a=* *haluh-in*
 TOP-3SG PST-3PL= hit-3SG
 ‘He/she/it was hit.’ (volitional, by animate assailant)
- b. *ing-on* *ke-e=* *haluh-in*
 TOP-3SG PST-3SG= hit-3SG
 ‘He/she/it was hit.’ (arbitrarily, by inanimate object)

In (12b), the sentence is the same except for the N-R being indexed with 3SG to denote that the action was not carried out on purpose, and that there may be no actor, implied or otherwise, because the undergoer may, for example, have been struck by a fresh falling coconut. As shown in (12a-b) N-Rs are always would-be

3rd person indexes, 3SG and 3PL are used to derive different specific meanings as discussed further below for 3PL and 3SG N-Rs.

3.1 3SG N-Rs

3SG N-Rs always convey that an action was committed unintentionally. This could either be because there is no logical actor to refer to other than the forces of gravity as implied by (13a), or because the actor accidentally committed the action as in (13b).

- (13) a. *ing-o* *k-e=* *baluh=in* *io* *ir* *palau*
TOP-1SG PST-3SG= hit=OBJ.SG 1SG LCL stone
‘I got hit by a stone.’
- b. *a!*, *k-e=* *baya* *ia!*
Ah!, PST-3SG= see 2SG
‘Ah, I saw you (by accident, I’m sorry!)’

Sentences that contain volitionless verbs whose actors and undergoers are one in the same are always expressed using 3SG N-Rs, which fits the analysis that 3SG N-Rs are used to express unintentionality. Verbs of non-transitive sinking, losing one’s way, going adrift and others are thus expressed this way.

- (14) a. *k-e=* *bele=is* *iem*
PST-3SG= float=UND.PLANIM 1PLE
‘We went adrift.’
- b. *k-e=* *bele=in* *ia*
PST-3SG= float=UND.SG 2SG
‘You went adrift (you idiot)!’

In English, verbs like *shave* and *wash* usually appear without the undergoer of the action when the action is performed by the speaker on the speaker him/herself. In sentences like “I shaved” or “I bathed”, the logical is object is recovered by pragmatic convention. So unlike examples in 14 above, verbs of shaving one’s self contain a clear actor. Nehan uses a reflexive marker to express this:

- (15) *k-u= wel-pukub (katongo i-o)*
 PST-1SG= RCP-shave (self LCL-1SG)
 ‘I shave (myself).’

A common connotation here is that the action taken place was caused by carelessness of the LCL argument as in (14b) above. It is also possible to find coordinating clauses with the same topic having different types of N-Rs as in (16).

- (16) *ing-o k-ε= wa-labir katongo io, kar a tupara io*
 TOP-1SG PST-3SG= CS-be.careless myself 1SG, CNJ RL.3PL catch1SG
 ‘I got careless on myself and was caught.’

In this example, the speaker expresses a sort of get-passive using 3SG index and then an impersonal passive using 3PL in the conjunct clause. 3PL N-Rs will be discussed in the next section.

3.2 3PL N-Rs

NRAI constructions using 3PL N-Rs appear much more frequently cross-linguistically compared to 3SG N-Rs as impersonal constructions, which may only occur in Nehan. In Nehan, 3PL N-Rs usually refer to a vaguely defined 3rd person entity, the actual referent of which could easily be singular or plural. The reading is usually impersonal passive (17a-b) but impersonals (17c) and passives of a sort (17d) are also possible.

- (17) a. *ing-on* *k-a=* *lonoro=in*
TOP-3SG PST-3PL= hear=3SG
‘He was heard.’ (Lit. He, They heard him.)
- b. *ing-o* *k-a=* *pobas* *nar* 1982
TOP-1SG PST-3PL= born/birth PREP 1982
‘I was born in 1982.’ (Lit. Me, they birthed in 1982.)
- c. *abik* *mat-a=* *la* *kep* *tar* *bot* *manas*
not NEG-3PL= go with CM-R boat now
‘They don’t go by boat now (these days).’
- d. *ing-o* *k-e=* *haluh=in* *i-o* *i-r* *palau*
TOP-1SG PST-3SG= hit=UND.SG LCL-1SG LCL-R stone
‘I got hit by a stone.’

4. Non-referential actor indexing and similar constructions in other languages

Non-referential indexing is perhaps most common in other languages in impersonal constructions. The anonymous 3PL index is quite common in impersonals as in the English and Polish sentences below.

- (18) English
‘They don’t know who shot him.’
‘They don’t let you do that anymore.’
‘They don’t make ‘em like they used to.’

- (19) Polish (Siewierska, 2010:74):
W *niedzięle* *nie przynoszą* *POcztę*
on Sunday not bring:3PL mail
‘(There is) no mail on Sundays.’ (‘They don’t bring mail on Sundays.’)

Kaqchikel is a Meso-American language that uses NRAI in much the same way as Nehan but can be shown to be in the process of developing a new passive from 3PL N-Rs.

(20) Kaqchikel (Broadwell, 2011)

- a. *x-u-pax-ij* *ri achin* *ri b'ojoy*
 COM-3SGE-break-TR the man the pot
 'The man broke the pot.'
- b. *ri b'ojoy* *x-**ki**-pax-ij* *r-oma'* *rija'*
 the pot COM-**3PLE**-break-TR 3SGE-by him
 'The pot was broken by him.'

Broadwell glosses *-ki-* as PASS as per his analysis, but I want to focus on the fact that *-ki-* is derived from a 3PL morpheme.

Givón (1976) gives a diachronic reanalysis scenario from 3PL to passive from Kimbundu:

(21) Kimbundu (Givón, 1976)

- a. *a- mono Nzua*
 3PL- saw Nzua
 'They saw Nzua.'
- b. *Nzua, a- mu- mono*
 Nzua 3PL- 3SG- saw
 'Nzua, they saw him.'
- c. *Nzua a- mu- mono kwa mem*
 Nzua pass- 3SG saw by me
 'Nzua, was seen by me.'

The pattern above suggests that in Kimbundu, 3PL became simply a passive marker when an oblique phrase containing the actor was allowed. Minus the reanalysis, the same pattern can be shown in Nehan:

(22) Nehan

- a. *gisin* *k-a=* *tapolak* *ta-r* *bot*
 TOP.3PL PST-3PL= break CM-R boat
 ‘They broke the boat.’
- b. *a bot* *k-a=* *tapolak=in*
 the boat PST-3PL= break=3SG
 ‘The boat was broken.’
- c. *a bot* *k-a=* *tapolak=in* *ta=non*
 the boat PST-3PL= break=3SG CM=3SG
 ‘The boat was broken **because** of him.’

In (22) the pattern suggested by Givón is not borne out. *k-a=* in (22c) cannot be considered a passive marker, because a passive is not formed here in the canonical sense. In canonical passives (e.g. Dixon & Aikhenvald, 2000), the actor is demoted to oblique, and the undergoer is promoted to subject. Here, a sentence containing a would-be demoted actor as an oblique must be interpreted as oblique to the action, and therefore not the actor of the verb. If obliques like *ta=non* began to be understood as the actor, a 3PL-to-passive situation could potentially arise.

However, considering a pair of active/passive sentences such as (23a-b), the potential for Givón’s reanalysis scenario is complicated.

- (23) a. *a kuah* *e=* *hikutal* *ta-r* *su*
 the woman 3SG= wear CM-R shoe
 ‘The woman wears the shoe.’

- b. *a su* *e=* *bikatal=in* *i-r* *kuah*
 the shoe 3SG= wear=3SG LCL-R woman
 ‘The shoe, the woman wears it.’

- c. *ing-o* *k-a=* *en* *i=o-r* *bakue*
 TOP-1SG PST-3PL= eat LCL=1SG-R shark
 ‘I was bitten by the shark.’ [Glennon & Glennon, 1994:77]

(23a) is a Type A active sentence. (23b) may seem to be a straightforward active sentence with *a su* topicalized perhaps, but it is significant that a Type B structure is required and the LCL-marked argument *kuah* is not co-referential with the topic. The unnatural relationship (e.g. Silverstein, 1976)—the shoe is made more prominent than the human—is what draws out the Type B clause. Examples like (23b) are not easy to find, but what is crucial for the 3PL-to-passive discussion is that a 3PL is not used, instead 3SG is used to refer to the woman. So if a proper passive is emerging in Nehan it does not appear to be following the path of 3PL-to-passive.

Such is not the case with (23c), where 3PL does in fact refer to the singular actor. However, I find this example to involve noun incorporation of the actor.

5. Discussion

Non-referential actor-indexing is a process used to express propositions where the actor role is, in some way, less than fully defined. In Nehan, a special clause type—which I have called Type B—with an alternation in the VP is preferred in such scenarios. Generally speaking in language, it is the situation with impersonals, middles, and passives that some kind of special clause or valency changing operation is employed. Many languages use non-referring 3PLs to form impersonals, but Nehan may be unique in its use of 3SG to denote non-sentience of the anonymous 3rd person actor. The other functions of 3SG N-Rs in expressing unintentionality and middles may be unique as well.

Like many other Oceanic languages, Nehan has no canonical passive construction. Nehan achieves the functional equivalence of passivization in undergoer foregrounding via the use of non-referring 3PLs. Givón (1976) has argued that impersonals using 3PLs are a source of passives. Givón's reanalysis scenario seems possible in Nehan, however in Nehan 3SG plays another role not considered and 3PLs are not used in the limited passive examples. As to the question of whether 3PL impersonals will ever reanalyze to passives, Siewierzka (2010:104) suggests:

3PL IMPs which are essentially used in generic contexts and/or are restricted to speech act verbs are not promising inputs to reanalysis. Reanalysis requires that 3PL IMPs be used in episodic contexts and with different types of agents, among them individual and specific ones. In other words, reanalysis is predicated on high grammaticalization of the 3PL IMP construction itself.

The facts of Nehan fit this description, 3PL NRAI constructions are not restricted to certain verbs or generic contexts, but reanalysis to passive has not occurred.

Nehan is a language for which transitivity is an elusive notion. It has a grammatical role alignment that changes based on discourse considerations. Verbal participants are frequently omitted and recovered via agreement sometimes, but mainly through pragmatic principles. In order to express more specific scenarios in the distant past when talking to the police or telling a story for which accurate portrayal of the relationship between participants is especially important, Nehan alters argument structure. Explicitness in grammatical relations is not always necessary to achieve communicative adequacy. Nehan is a language that shifts to accommodate such situations. It is interesting that it uses (non-) agreement—a necessarily redundant process—in its existing clause structure to derive more meanings and voice constructions.

References

Broadwell A 2011 'A new passive in Kaqchikel' Paper read at Meso-American parasession to International Conference on Historical Linguistics 2011 Osaka, Japan.

- Dixon RM & AY Aikhenvald 2000 'Introduction' in RM Dixon, MW Riebert & AY Aikhenvald (eds) *Changing Valency* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 1-29.
- Givón T 1976 'Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement' in C Li (ed) *Subject and Topic* New York: Academic Press. Pp. 151-188.
- Lynch J, M Ross & T Crowley 2002 *The Oceanic Languages* Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Palmer B & Dunstan B 2007 'Heads in Oceanic indirect possession' *Oceanic Linguistics* 46(1):200-209.
- Ross M 1982 'The development of the verb phrase in the Oceanic languages of- the Bougainville region' in A Halim, L Carrington & S.A. Wurm (eds) *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. 1: Currents in Oceanic* Canberra Pacific Linguistics, C74:1-57.
- 1988 Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia Canberra Pacific Linguistics, C98: Pacific Linguistics.
- 2007 'Talking about space: terms of location and direction' in M Ross, Pawley & Osmond (eds) *The Lexicon of Proto Oceanic: The culture and environment of ancestral Oceanic society 2: The physical world* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. Pp 221-284.
- Siewierska A 2008 'Ways of impersonalizing: pronominal vs verbal strategies' in MA Gómez-González, L Mackenzie & EM Gonzáles Álvarez (eds) *Current Trends in Contrastive Linguistics* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 3-26.
- 2010 'From 3pl-to passive: incipient, emergent and established passives' *Diachronica* 27(3):73-109.
- Silverstein M 1976 'Hierarchy of features and ergativity' in R.M.W. Dixon (ed) *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages* Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Pp. 112-171.

Abbreviations

1SG	1st person singular	PASS	Passive
1PLE	1st person plural exclusive	PERS	Person
2SG	2nd person singular	PLANIM	Plural animate
3SG	3rd person singular	PLINAM	Plural inanimate
3PL	3rd person plural	PREP	Preposition
ACT	Actor	PST	Past tense
AGR	Agreement	R	Ligature
COM	Comitative	RCP	Reciprocal
CM	Common	SG	Singular
CS	Causative	TAM	Tense/aspect/mood
LCL	Local	TOP	Topic
NUM	Number	TR	Transitive
		UND	Undergoer