

PERSON MARKING IN THREE OCEANIC LANGUAGES*

Elizabeth Pearce
Victoria University of Wellington
elizabeth.pearce@vuw.ac.nz

The paper proposes that the contrasting morphosyntax of CNPs versus pronoun/Proper name objects in Fijian, Iaaí and Drehu, is accounted for as an effect of a [+person] feature. Objects lacking this feature can only be externally A'-bound *pros*.

1. Introduction

In this paper I present an analysis of three transitive constructions that are found in three Oceanic languages: Fijian, Iaaí and Drehu (the latter two being languages of the Loyalty Islands, New Caledonia). All three languages have unmarked VOS constituent ordering. In Drehu the unmarked VOS ordering has ergative case marking and there is also an alternative aspectually conditioned SVO ordering lacking the ergative case marking on the Agent argument (Moyse-Faurie 1997: 228). Iaaí and Drehu are considered to belong to a Southern Oceanic linkage, independent of the Fijian subgrouping membership in a Central Pacific linkage (e.g., Lynch et al 2002: 884-890).

The three constructions, which I label as Classes I-III, are distinguished broadly in accordance with the category membership of the direct object:

(1) *Direct objects in Fijian, Iaaí and Drehu*

- Class I: Common noun phrase DPs
- Class II: Proper names and pronouns
- Class III: Bare Ns

As illustrated for Fijian in (2), Class I objects can be separated from the verb by an (aspectual) adverbial marker, but, with Class II and III objects, the adverbial marker follows the object.¹

* My thanks to members of the AFLA 23 audience for helpful suggestions. I also wish to thank Claire Moyse-Faurie for input on Drehu that she gave me at a presentation of material included in this paper at the Lacito centre, Villejuif in October 2015, as well as other participants for their comments. My thanks again to Samuel Wadjeno for his Iaaí contributions.

¹ All data is presented in the orthography of the respective languages. Glosses have been adapted for uniformity and they conform to the Leipzig Glossing Rules (<http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>), except for: AG 'Agent', ASP 'Aspect', CNT 'Continuous', HAB 'Habitual', INCH 'Inchoative', LIM 'Limitative', P 'Preposition', PAUC 'Paucal', PERS 'Personal', PROC 'Process' and PTCL 'Particle'.

- (2) a. E **vuke-a** **tiko** na gone o Waisale. Class I
 3SG help-TR CNT the boy DET Waisale
 ‘Waisale is helping the boy.’ [Aranovich 2013: 473]
- b. A **kaci-vi** Kele **tiko** o koya. Class II
 PST call-TR Kele CNT DET he
 ‘He was calling Kele.’ [Aranovich 2013: 473]
- c. Au a **taga** ura **tiko** e na bogi. Class III
 1SG PST catch prawn CNT in DET night
 ‘I was catching prawns last night.’ [Aranovich 2013: 470]

As can also be observed in (2), the forms of the verb are distinct across the three classes: with a bare verb in Class III, and distinct transitivity suffixes in Classes I and II. The constructions in the three languages are alike in that they all have morphological distinctions in the verb forms of the three Classes and in that their Class II and III objects must immediately follow the verb. As we will see also, with non-overt objects, the construction is Class I in all three languages.²

Previous studies of the syntax of these three constructions have focused on the analysis of the forms in one particular language (e.g., for Fijian: Alderete 1998, Aranovich 2013; for Drehu: Moyse-Faurie 1997; for Iaaï: Pearce 2001). There are, however, differences between the languages in the details as to how the three constructions are manifested. This paper attempts to answer the question: How can the microparametric manifestations across the three languages contribute to an understanding of the central characteristics of the constructions?

The analysis that is undertaken in this paper of the sentence forms across the three languages brings out differences in the realizations that are linked the availability or not of *pro* objects in accordance with extraction type, in interaction with a [+/-personal] categorization of pronouns and proper names. In essence, I propose in this paper that the Class I objects are A'-bound *pros* that are distinguished from post-verbal objects in lacking a [+personal] feature.

Section 2 reviews the main points brought out in previous analyses of the syntax of the constructions as they have been applied to the languages individually. Section 3 provides an account of the differences between the three languages in terms of the class membership characteristics of overt and non-overt objects. Section 4 develops an analysis of the role of A'-binding in the use of Class I *pro* objects. The conclusions in section 5 attempt to situate the discussion in the paper with respect to further research on the issues that are raised.

² As is the case with complement clauses, the discussion of which I leave aside here for reasons of space.

2. Previous syntactic analyses

2.1. Fijian

The Fijian direct object constructions have been studied in a number of works, including: Arms (1974), Pawley (1986), Alderete (1998), Kikusawa (2000, 2001) and Aranovich (2013). In the most recent analysis of the syntax of the constructions, Aranovich (2013) distinguishes the locations of the objects as follows:

(3) *Direct object syntax in Fijian (Aranovich 2013)*

	<i>Suffix</i>	<i>Syntax</i>
Class I:	- <i>Ca</i> [AGRO]	IP-adjoined
Class II:	- <i>Ci</i> [TR]	VP-internal
Class III:	-	N-incorporation

For Aranovich the Class II suffix, -*Ci* (in which ‘C’ is some consonant) is a transitivity marker and the Class I suffix -*Ca* is an object agreement marker indexing the VP-internal *pro* object argument.³ In contrast to the Class I and II construction, the Class III construction is intransitive: it can be transitivized with the addition of causative or applicative morphology (Aranovich 2013: 482-487).

Given that there are West Fijian dialects that only include pronouns in Class II, Aranovich proposes that the basis for the distinction in the Class I and Class II objects is to be viewed as resulting from a choice that the languages make with respect to the treatment of the object in terms of an animacy hierarchy in which there are different cut off points for different dialects:

(4) *Person/Animacy hierarchy (Aranovich 2013: 493)*

Ø > Pronoun > Proper > Human > Animate > Inanimate			
CLASS II	_____	CLASS I	E Fijian
			W Fijian

For East Fijian dialects, including Standard Fijian, both proper names and pronouns are included in Class II, whereas for Rotuman and West Fijian dialects only pronouns are included in Class II (Kikusawa 2000, 2001, Kissonck 2003).

Alderete (1998) also argues for Class I dislocation for Fijian and proposes a type-theoretic approach to the Class I versus Class II patterns in accordance with which the Class I objects are canonically of type <e,t>, whereas Class II objects are of type <e>:

³ This analysis of the suffixal forms is in agreement with the analyses adopted in Pawley (1973), Arms (1974) and Schütz (1985).

(5) *Type-shifting categories (Alderete 1998)*

Objects

Class I: <<e,t> t>

Class II: <e>

Class III: <e,t>

Fijian then lacks the type-lifting mechanism allowing direct composition of the transitive verb with the full DP argument being of type , <<e,t>,t>. However, as Aranovich (2013: 494) points out, whilst these type-theoretic distinctions can account for the Standard/East Fijian class membership, they fail to account for the differing Class memberships in Rotuman and East Fijian.

2.2. Drehu

Moyse-Faurie (1997) brings out a distinction in the valency effects with the Class III construction in Drehu. Classes I and II are transitive with ergative subjects, whereas in the Class III construction, as with intransitives, the subject lacks the ergative case marking.

- | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|
| (6) a. | xen jë hi itre koko hnei angatr. | Class I |
| | eat DIR INCHOAT PL yam AG 3PL | |
| | ‘They start eating the yams.’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 234] | |
| b. | Kola nangëë angatr hnei Wajoxumë. | Class II |
| | PROG accept 3PL AG Wajoxumë | |
| | ‘Wajoxumë accepts them.’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 236] | |
| c. | Xeni itra jë hi angatr. | Class III |
| | eat bounia DIR INCH 3PL | |
| | ‘They start eating bounia.’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 234] | |

For Moyse-Faurie (1997) both the Class II and Class III constructions have incorporated objects, but the Class II construction lacks the detransitivization effects observed in Class III. As shown also by Aranovich (2013) for Fijian, the intransitivity of the Drehu Class III construction is manifested also in the possibility of the inclusion of a transitivity suffix on the V-N sequence, along with an additional argument, in this construction.

2.3. Iaa

Pearce (2001) proposes an account for the transitive constructions in Iaa that locates the syntactic distinctions in the structure of the object. According to this analysis, Class III objects are bare NPs, and Class I and II objects are both DPs. The Class I/Class II divide is then attributed to a difference in the content of the D head: with Class II objects the D is filled by the raised pronoun or proper name N.

(7) *Direct object syntax in IaaI (Pearce 2001)*

Class I:	$[_{DP} D [_{NP} N ..]]$	No incorporation of DP
Class II:	$[_{DP} [_D N_i [_{NP} t_i]]]$	N-incorporation from head of DP
Class III:	$[_{NP} N]$	N-incorporation from head of NP

Under this account, when the head of the object is filled by N in both Class II and Class III, it raises and incorporates to the verb. Aranovich (2013) objects to this analysis on the basis that the two kinds of incorporation do not provide the required distinctions in the Class II/Class III valency effects. Whilst one could counter this objection by treating the valency distinction in terms of the DP versus NP constituency of the object, the incorporation account that is assumed in Pearce (2001) is also, however, problematic in that, on a left-adjunction view of N-raising, the N should be to the left of the V, rather than on its right. In my reconsideration of the data here, I will take on board the view that the Class I overt object is vP-external and that the V-Object adjacency in Classes II and III reflect outcomes involving phrasal movement, giving rise to the post-object positioning of the aspectual/adverbial particles.

3. Cross-linguistic Class membership distinctions

3.1. Pronouns and Proper Names

In Standard Fijian the Class I/II object divide corresponds to a contrast in articles borne by DPs in other contexts in sentences. The article with common noun phrases (CNPs) is *na* and with pronouns and proper names it is *(k)o*, both of which I gloss as ‘DET’:

- (8) a. Era sã tiko **na** gone.
 3PL ASP CNT DET child
 ‘The (many) children are present.’ [Churchward 1941: 15]
- b. Ena lako **ko** koya.
 3SG.FUT go DET 3SG
 ‘He will go.’ [Churchward 1941: 14]
- c. E vuke-a tiko **na** gone **o** Waisale. (=2a)
 3SG help-TR CNT DET boy DET Waisale
 ‘Waisale is helping the boy.’ [Aranovich 2013: 473]

In (8a) the CNP subject bears the article *na* (as does the object in (8c)). The pronoun subject in (8b) and the proper name subject in (8c) appear with the article *(k)o*.⁴

⁴ For discussion of the forms of the pronoun and proper name article in Fijian dialects, see Kikusawa (2000, 2001).

Polynesian languages, which belong to the same Central Pacific subgrouping as Fijian, also exhibit a robust distinction between articles/case marking forms with pronouns and proper names versus CNPs. In Māori, for example, the Personal article is *a* and the (definite) article has the form *te*:

- (9) a. Kei runga **te** pukapuka i **te** tēpu.
 at on.top the book P the table
 ‘The book is on the table.’ [Harlow 2007: 157]
- b. Kua tae mai **a** Hēmi hei āwhina i **a**
 T/A arrive PROX PERS Hēmi T/A help ACC PERS
 koe.
 2SG
 ‘Hēmi has come to help you.’ [Harlow 2007: 158]

It appears that the Fijian and Polynesian languages have maintained a Personal category distinction from Proto-Oceanic but with but with distinct morphological reflexes. A variety of categorially distinct article forms have been reconstructed for the larger Proto-Oceanic grouping (Lynch 2001, Lynch et al 2002: 70-72), shown in Lynch (2001) as:

- (10) *Proto Oceanic articles* (Lynch 2001: 224)
- | | |
|---------|------------------|
| *e, *i | personal |
| *qa | personal |
| *dri | feminine |
| *na, *a | common non-human |
| *ta | common non-human |

Whereas **ta* is the source for Māori *te*, Fijian *na* is a reflex of **na*. Geraghty (1983: 356) mentions the possibility of Fijian *(k)o* as a reflex of the Proto-Eastern Oceanic proper article **qa*, but he observes that Fijian *(k)o* “shows formal disparity, but functional similarity” with PEO[Proto-Eastern Oceanic] **qa*.⁵

Whilst languages of the Central Pacific subgroup have these distinct article forms, which in the case of Fijian languages matches with the Class I/II divide in the syntax of objects, neither Iaaï nor Drehu have such distinct article forms with independent (subject) DPs. In other contexts, however, the two Loyalty Islands languages have contrasting constructions with Class I/II nominals.

In Drehu a particle *i* (a likely reflex of the **i* personal article shown in (10)) occurs before pronouns and proper names in possessive/partitive constructions:

⁵ The analysis is complicated by the fact that Polynesian languages have a variety of uses of a particle *ko* < **ko* Proto-Polynesian, as discussed in Clark (1976: 44-47). In particular, in Polynesian languages *ko* is a marker of initial Topic/Focus constituents.

- (11) a. la uma ne la qatreföe
 DET house PTCL DET old.woman
 ‘the old woman’s house’
 b. la uma i angeic
 DET house PTCL 3SG
 ‘his house’
 c. la uma i Hagee
 DET house PTCL Hagee
 ‘Hagee’s house’ [Moyse-Faurie 1983: 59]

In Iaaï, presentative constructions are distinct for CNPs, proper names and pronouns:

- (12) a. ûnya wanakat
 PRESENTATIVE child
 ‘It is the child.’
 b. jia Poou
 PRESENTATIVE Poou
 ‘It is Poou.’
 c. inya
 1SG
 ‘There is me.’ [Ozanne-Rivierre 1976: 154-155]

On the supposition that DPs include functional structure in addition to D and N projections (e.g., Giusti 2002, Pearce 2012), we could suppose that the Fijian forms suggest the presence of a Classifier projection to which the features [+/-personal] are assigned. Such an interpretation could then imply that Iaaï and Drehu have a corresponding Classifier head, but with \emptyset or other realizations for the [+/-personal] content. The issue then for the analysis of the Class I/II divide is that of the mechanisms by which the distinct Class I/II surface forms are derived in the constructions in the three languages in terms of the features and the role of such a Classifier head.

3.2. Null objects

The three languages differ in terms of what can be a null object in the Class I construction.

3.2.1. Class I/Class II suffixes with non-overt objects

The common characteristic of the Class I construction in all three languages is that they have a *pro* object that is linked to a DP in some vP external position. Data from Fijian suggests that the Class I *pro* is A'-bound, whereas the Class II

construction can have an A-bound non-overt object. In Fijian the verb occurs in the Class II form in the passive and reciprocal constructions. In these constructions the merge position of the object argument is non-overt:

- (13) a. sa tobo-**ki** na vuaka
ASP catch-TR DET pig
'The pig was caught.'
b. eratou vei-loma-**ni**.
3PL RECP-love-TR
'They love each other.' [Aranovich 2013: 471]

In these constructions the object role is identified as linked to the syntactic subject of the clause. In all other Class II constructions the object is an overt pronoun or proper name.

In cases of A'-binding with a preposed object, the construction is either Class I with a non-overt object or Class II with an overt pronoun object. The Standard Fijian examples following in (14) have an initial Topic with the Class I verb form:

- (14) a. O koya, au a kaci-**va** tiko.
DET 3SG 1SG PST call-TR CNT
'I was calling her.'
b. O Ema, au a kaci-**va**.
DET Ema 1SG PST call-TR
'I called Ema.'
c. *O koya, e keve-**ti** tiko na marama.
DET 3SG 3SG carry-TR CNT DET woman
'The woman was carrying her,' [Aranovich 2013: 476]

The Drehu example in (15) has the verb in the Class I form with an initial Topic and the Iaaï example in (16) has a Class I verb with a relativized object Topic:

- (15) *Drehu*
Ame la nu celë tre hna traan hnei kak.
TOP DET coconut.tree PROX then PST plant AG dad
'As for this coconut tree, dad planted it.' [Moyse-Faurie 1983: 199]

- (16) *Iaaï*
Haba daa eang oge-e hadruâ me e gaan.
TOP boy PROX 1SG-COMPL help COMP 3SG big
'As for this boy that I helped, he was big.' [Samuel Wadjeno]

In all of these cases, the use of the Class I forms in A'-binding constructions supports the analysis that the CNP Class I object in the VOS ordering is in an A'-position. That is, as illustrated with the Fijian suffixal forms in (17), the distributions are summarized as follows:

- (17) *Binding and suffixes with non-overt object*
 A-binding **-Ci** Class II
 A'-binding **-Ca** Class I

3.2.2. Resumptive pronouns with CNP objects

The three languages differ in terms of where the Class I *pro* object is obligatory and where the vP-internal object position may be realized by a (resumptive) pronoun in the Class II construction. Both Fijian and Drehu are more liberal than is Iaaï in allowing the use of resumptive pronouns.

In Fijian a third person object may either be non-overt in the Class I construction, or overt in the Class II construction:

- (18) a. Au-na kau-**ta** ki koronuvuli. Class I
 1SG-FUT bring-TR P school
 'I will take him to school,'
 b. Au-na kau-**ti** **koya** ki koronuvuli. Class II
 1SG-FUT bring-TR 3SG P school
 'I will take him to school.' [Kikusawa 2000: 184]

Even when the CNP object is overt, the inclusion of the overt pronoun object can have a disambiguating function:⁶

⁶ Although the use of apparent composite sequences including a pronoun followed by a CNP, as in (i), is possible, the positioning of the aspectual markers in (iia,b) indicates that, at least in these examples, the pronoun is separate from the following CNP:

- (i) Era la'o [o ira a gone].
 3PL go DET 3PL DET child
 'The children are going.' [Dixon 1988: 33]
 (ii) a. Erau na lako-**vi** iratou **tiko** na qasenivuli na luve-qu.
 3DU FUT go-TR 3PL CONT DET teacher DET child-my
 'My (two) children will be going to see the teachers.' [Kikusawa 2001: 93]
 b. Seti, seti, o iko sa dau nanu-**mi** ira **tu** **ga**
 no no DET 2SG ASP HAB remember-TR 3PL INDF LIM
 na yalewa.
 DET women
 'No, no, you generally just remember the women.' [Aranovich 2013: 477]

- (19) Eratou rai-**ca** na gone o iratou.
 3PL see-TR DET child DET 3PL
 ‘They saw a child/children.’ [Kikusawa 2000: 176]

- (20)a. au rai-**ca** a gone.
 1SG see-TR DET child
 ‘I see the child.’
 b. au rai-**ci** ‘**ea** a gone
 1SG see-TR 3SG DET child
 ‘I see the child.’
 c. au rai-**ci** **ira** a gone
 1SG see-TR 3SG DET child
 ‘I see the children.’ [Dixon 1988: 34]

Drehu also allows for the inclusion or not of an overt third person pronoun. Here also, without the pronoun, the construction is Class I, but when the pronoun is included the construction is Class II:

- (21) a. Angeic a dreuth la uma. Class I
 3SG PRS set.fire.to DET house
 ‘He sets fire to the house.’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 230]
 b. Angeic a dreuth. Class I
 ‘He sets fire (to something).’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 230]
 c. Eni a lep la nekōnatr. Class I
 1SG PRS hit DET child
 ‘I hit the child.’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 231]
 d. Eni a lep-i angeic. Class II
 1SG PRS hit-TR 3SG
 ‘I hit him.’ [Moyse-Faurie 1997: 232]

In Iaai, except for the interrogative pronouns, there is no overt 3SG object pronoun. Personal pronouns with Dual, Paucal and Plural number are overt in the Class II construction.

In summary, the possible realizations for 3SG (non-interrogative) objects across the three languages are as follows (in which ‘-’ indicates the unavailability of the construction):

- (22) *3SG Direct object exponence*
- | | Class I | Class II |
|--------|---------|---------------|
| Iaai | pro | - |
| Fijian | pro | <i>koya</i> |
| Drehu | pro | <i>angeic</i> |

3.2.3. *Wh* pronoun objects

In all three languages, as with other overt pronoun objects, the Class II construction is used with an overt post-verbal ‘who’ object.

The examples in (23) below show the contrasting constructions with ‘what’ and ‘who’ objects in Iaa. The ‘who’ object is not subject to *wh*-movement and it occurs in the post-verbal position in the Class II construction. The ‘what’ object is subject to *wh*-movement, resulting in the Class I form with a *pro* object.

- (23) a. **Ieû** u-mwe **wâ?** Class I
 what 2SG-PROC see
 ‘What do you see?’ [Ozanne-Rivierre 1976: 145]
 b. U-mwe **oo** **iaa?** Class II
 2SG-PROC see who
 ‘Who do you see?’ [Ozanne-Rivierre 1976: 145]

In a multiple *wh*-question the ‘what’ object can be post-verbal, but in the Class I construction:

- (24) a. Iaa a-me **an** **ieû?** Class I
 who 3SG-PROC eat what
 ‘Who is eating what?’
 b. Iaa a-me **ön** **iaa?** Class II
 who 3SG-PROC eat who
 ‘Who is eating who?’ [Samuel Wadjeno]

The use of the Class I verb form with *ieû* ‘what’ in post-verbal position in (24a) suggests that the construction conforms to the syntax of CNPs in which *ieû* is here vP-external and there is a post-verbal *pro* object.⁷

For ‘what’ questions in Boumaa Fijian, Dixon shows two Class I options, with and without preposing of *a cava* ‘what’:

- (25) a. **A** **cava** o aa rai-ca i waa’olo levu?
 DET what 2SG PST see-TR P road big
 ‘What did you see on the main road?’
 b. O aa rai-ca **a** **cava** i waa’olo levu?
 2SG PAST see-TR DET what P road big
 ‘What did you see on the main road?’ [Dixon 1988: 171]

Although *a cava* ‘what’ immediately follows the verb in (25b), from the presence of the common article *a* it can be inferred that *a cava* has both the form

⁷ This conclusion for Iaa could be tested on data including post-verbal aspectual markers. The prediction is that aspectual markers would precede the *ieû* object in the (24a) construction.

and the syntax of a vP-external CNP. (On the contrast between the Class I presence versus the Class II absence of the determiner, see also the contrast between independent *o koya* in (14a) versus Class II post-verbal *koya* in (18b)).

Also in Boumaa Fijian, there are three options for ‘who’: post-verbal in the Class II construction (26a), preposed in the Class I construction (26b), or preposed and with a resumptive pronoun in Class II (26c):

- (26) a. O aa rai-**ci** **cei**? Class II
 2SG PST see-TR who
 ‘Who did you see?’ [Dixon 1988: 170]
- b. **O** **cei** o aa rai-**ca**? Class I
 DET who 2SG PST see-TR
 ‘Who did you see?’ [Dixon 1988: 170]
- c. **O** **cei** o aa rai-**ci** **‘ea**? Class II
 DET who 2SG PST see-TR 3SG
 ‘Who did you see?’ [Dixon 1988: 170; (26c) possible, but less preferred]

In allowing the optional resumptive pronoun in the Class II construction, these Boumaa Fijian constructions are in parallel with the possible constructions with overt and non-overt non-*wh*-pronouns, as seen in (18) - (20).⁸

The Drehu examples in (26) show the use of the Class I construction with preposed *nemen* ‘what’ and the Class II construction with post-verbal *drei* ‘who’:

- (27) a. **Nemen** la hnei eö hna qaj-**a**? Class I
 what PROX AG 2SG PST say-TR
 ‘What did you say?’
- b. Hna humu-**thi** **drei** hnen la joxu? Class II
 PST kill-TR who AG DET chief
 ‘Who did the chief kill?’ [Moyse-Faurie 1983: 190-1]

Moyse-Faurie (1983) also gives the following examples with post-verbal *nemen* ‘what’ in what she glosses as the Class III construction:

- (28) a. Eö a hnyimaa-**nemen**?
 2SG PRS laugh.at-what
 ‘What are you laughing at?’

⁸ With however the difference that, whereas the resumptive pronoun is optional with a preposed non-*wh* object in Standard Fijian, in Bouma Fijian it is obligatory:

- (i) a. O Mere o aa rai-**ci** **‘ea**.
 DET Mere 2SG PST see-TR 3SG
 ‘As for Mere, you saw her.’
- b. *O Mere o aa rai-**ci**. [Dixon 1988: 170]

- b. Angeic a kuci-**nemen**?
 3SG PRS do-what
 ‘What is he doing?’ [Moyse-Faurie 1983: 190]

Because the verb form *kuci* is non-distinct for Class II and Class III (it has the form *kuca* in Class I) and because I have not seen data on distinct forms for the verb ‘laugh at’ in (28a), the basis for the Class III attributions is underdetermined from the data that is given.⁹

3.3. Summary

Summarized in (29) below are the possible occurrences in the Class I/II constructions of overt and non-overt pronouns in constructions with non-*wh*- and *wh*-pronouns.

	3SG		‘who’		‘what’	
	I	II	I	II	I	II
Iaai	pro	-	-	<i>iaa</i>	pro	-
Fijian	pro	<i>koya</i>	pro	<i>cei</i>	pro	‘ <i>ea</i> (BFij)
Drehu	pro	<i>angeic</i>	pro	<i>drei</i>	pro	(<i>nemen</i> ?)

Iaai differs from both Fijian and Drehu in the unavailability of *wh*-movement with a ‘who’ object. Both Fijian and Drehu also allow the use of 3SG resumptive pronouns, which Iaai does not. As discussed with respect to the examples in (28a,b), there is some unclarity around the Class membership of Drehu post-verbal *nemen* ‘what’, either Class II or III. We may note, however, that, given that in other respects the Drehu data matches up with the Fijian data, it is possible that these two languages could have parallel syntax also with ‘what’ objects.¹⁰ But, in the absence of relevant data this possibility must be left for further research.

4. Movement and A’-binding

The analysis of the data in section 3 has shown that, although there are differences between the languages in terms of what may be a *pro* object and in what constructions a resumptive pronoun may occur, the common characteristics are: (i) that overt post-verbal personal pronouns systematically occur in the Class II construction and (ii) that *pro* objects systematically occur in the Class I construction. For the shared characteristics there are two key aspects of the object syntax that we would like to understand: (i) the role of object ϕ -features with

⁹ An additional factor with respect to the form *kuci-nemen* ‘do-what’ is that it may be a lexicalized compound and thus, for this reason, in line with the Class III attribution.

¹⁰ In that case, the prediction would be that post-verbal *nemen* in Drehu would be Class I.

respect to the licensing of *pro* and with respect to the verb morphology realizations and (ii) the syntactic mechanisms that are at play in the contrasting placement possibilities for the different classes of objects.

Rizzi (1997) gives evidence for the presence versus the absence of pronouns in initial Topic versus initial Focus constructions, as illustrated in the contrasting forms in Italian (as also in the corresponding English forms):

- (30) a. Il tuo libro, **lo** ho letto. Topic
the your book it have.1SG read
‘Your book, I have read it.’
b. IL TUO LIBRO, ho letto (, non il suo). Focus
the your book have.1SG read NEG the his
‘Your book, I read (, not his).’ [Rizzi 1997: 286]

Supposing that Topics are merged in the CP domain, but that Focused constituents (including *wh*-constituents) can be in derived CP positions, the contrast in (30a)/(30b) could suggest that the pronoun occurrences could be distinguished in terms of use versus non-use of movement. However, for Cinque (1990: 151-152) an A'-bound empty category may be present in a structure either by direct merge or as the outcome of A'-movement. Across the data that we have seen in the three Oceanic languages, we have taken it that empty objects and resumptives are A'-bound in some way.

Aside from the differences between the languages in the use of resumptive pronouns, there is just one aspect of the available data that is suggestive of a Topic/Focus differentiation. Whereas, as in the Boumaa Fijian example (26c) a resumptive 3SG pronoun may cooccur with *wh*-moved ‘who’, the resumptive is obligatory with an initial Proper name or non-third person pronoun Topic (see also fn. 8):

- (31) a. O Roopate saa mai rai-**ci** Nato.
DET Roopate ASP PROX see-TR Nato
‘As for Roopate, he came to see Nato.’
b. O Nato saa mai rai-**ci** ‘ea o Roopate.
DET Nato ASP PROX see-TR 3SG DET Roopate
‘As for Nato, Roopate came to see him.’
c. *O Nato saa mai rai-**ca** o Roopate.
DET Nato ASP PROX see-TR DET Roopate
‘As for Nato, Roopate came to see him.’ [Dixon 1988: 247]
- (32) O ‘emudrau au aa rogo-**ci** ‘emudrau.
DET 2DU 1SG PST hear-TR 2DU
‘As for you two, I heard you two.’ [Dixon 1988: 247]

There is also evidence from IaaI that the non-availability of *pro* with a non-singular human referent gives rise to a resumptive pronoun with a Topic as antecedent. The example below in (33a) is in contrast with (33b) (repeated from (16)), in which the Topic is 3SG:

- (33) a. Haba jee wanakat oge-e **hadruöö** **ödrin** me
 TOP PAUC child 1SG-COMPL help 3PAUC COMP
 ödrin gaan.
 3PAUC big
 ‘As for the children that I helped, they were big.’
- b. Haba daa eang oge-e **hadruâ** me e gaan.
 TOP boy PROX 1SG-COMPL help COMP 3SG big
 ‘As for this boy that I helped, he was big.’ [Samuel Wadjeno]

In both these examples the initial topic is the antecedent for a relative clause-internal object. Not unexpectedly for IaaI, there cannot be a non-3SG *pro* object.

The Fijian data brings out differing effects in the use or not of resumptive pronouns under A'-binding, but we have also seen at least three distinctions in the antecedent functions/locations, with antecedents in a post-verbal position and with antecedents as initial Topics or *wh*-constituents. Given that data from other languages attests to a range of Topic and Focus positions in the CP domain (as in Benincà and Poletto 2004 and references therein), we can envisage a syntax in which phrasal movement into the CP domain results in the post-verbal placement of CNP objects, themselves merged/located in the CP domain. Because overt objects precede subjects in the unmarked VOS constituent ordering, assuming the Antisymmetry view of Kayne (1994), post-verbal objects must at least be vP-external. If the subjects are in Spec,TP, then such objects should be in the CP domain.

What is it then that disallows the appearance of CNPs vP-internally? There is either a requirement for the extraction of such DPs or there is a failure of feature matching between a transitive verb and a CNP object. Under both these interpretations the crucial factor is in the contrasting feature composition of the different classes of DPs. The approach of Pearce (2001), shown in (7), exploited the N-to-D raising possibility of Longobardi (1994) for pronouns and Proper names as the essential factor distinguishing Class II from Class I. However, as shown in the discussion in section 2, such an analysis does not of itself account for the differing argument status of Class II and Class III objects. Furthermore, we have seen evidence that DPs in non-object roles exhibit a Personal/Common contrast (articles in Fijian and syntactic distinctions in other constructions in IaaI and Drehu). In terms of their behaviour, pronouns and Proper names are [+personal] and all other kinds of DPs, including *pros*, are [-personal]. This means that, whatever the precise internal composition of object constituents, there is an agreement requirement between the verb and a [personal] feature on the object.

On the view that both Class I and Class II objects are DPs, whereas Class III objects are NPs, we remain with an open question as to mechanisms inducing the absence of articles with Class II objects in Fijian, contrasting with use of articles with personal DPs in other positions.¹¹

5. Conclusions and prospects

The investigation that has been undertaken in this paper of object positions in three Oceanic languages with VOS constituent ordering has come to a view that material preceding overt CNP subjects is located in the CP domain as the result of phrasal movement(s). Given that as part of this analysis CNP objects are assumed to be always located in the CP domain (but in different possible locations within that domain), one is also led to consider whether CNP subjects should also be viewed as occupants of positions in the CP domain. The Topic status of the CNP objects that has been proposed here is akin to the treatment of VOS subjects in Malagasy in Pearson (2005). However, for Pearson, such Topics are right-adjoined in CP and there is thus no movement requirement to account for the pre-subject location of objects. This style of account would be applicable to the derivations of the surface sequencings observed in the Oceanic languages studied here, but at the expense of a rejection of the Antisymmetry view. If both CNP subjects and objects are located in left-branching Topic positions then the raised constituent on their left must be TP.

Although I believe that I have shown that Fijian, Iaaí and Drehu have A'-bound *pro* objects and that such objects are distinguished across the three languages in their lacking a [+personal] feature, there remain many questions around the details of licensing mechanisms distinguishing overt and non-overt objects and around the nature of the features applicable to the composition of the CP domain. These questions are also of interest for possible future work on the understanding of VOS syntax in languages belonging in Oceanic subgroupings in which there are many other languages with SVO or VSO constituent orderings.

References

- Alderete, J. 1998. Canonical types and noun phrase configurations in Fijian. In *Recent Papers in Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings of the Third and Fourth Meetings of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)*, ed. M. Pearson, 19-44. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics.
- Aranovich, R. 2013. Transitivity and polysynthesis in Fijian. *Language* 89: 465-500.

¹¹ But not in all other positions, as complements of prepositions align with complements of verbs (as in the paradigms shown in Aranovich 2013: 474).

- Arms, David G. 1974. *Transitivity in Standard Fijian*. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, Focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of syntactic structures, Volume 2*, ed. Luigi Rizzi, 52-75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Churchward, C. Maxwell. 1941. *A New Fijian grammar*. Suva: Government Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Clark, Ross. 1976. *Aspects of Proto-Polynesian syntax*. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1988. *A Grammar of Boumaa Fijian*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Geraghty, Paul A. 1983. *The History of the Fijian languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2002. The functional structure of noun phrases: A bare phrase structure approach. In *Functional structure in DP and IP*, ed. Guglielmo Cinque, 95-123. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press.
- Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2000. Historical implications of a syntactically ambiguous structure in Standard Fijian. In *Leo Pasifika: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics*, eds. Steven Roger Fischer and Wolfgang Sperlich, 173-199. Auckland: The Institute of Polynesian Languages and Literatures.
- Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2001. Rotuman and Fijian case-marking strategies and their historical development. *Oceanic Linguistics* 40: 85-111.
- Kissock, Madelyn J. 2003. Transitivity and objecthood in Rotuman. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42: 144-160.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-665.
- Lynch, John. 2001. Article accretion and article creation in Southern Oceanic. *Oceanic Linguistics* 40: 224-246.
- Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross and Terry Crowley, eds. 2002. *The Oceanic languages*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.
- Massam, Diane. 2010. V1 or V2? On the left in Niuean. *Lingua* 120: 284-302.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire. 1983. *Le drehu: Langue de Lifou (Iles Loyauté)*. Paris: SELAF.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire. 1997. Phénomènes d'incorporation dans quelques langues océaniques. *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica e applicata* 26: 227-246.
- Ozanne-Rivierre, Françoise. 1976. *Le iaai: Langue mélanésienne d'Ouvéa (Nouvelle Calédonie)*. Paris: SELAF.
- Pawley, Andrew. 1973. Some problems in Proto-Oceanic grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12: 103-188.

- Pawley, Andrew. 1986. A reanalysis of Fijian transitive constructions. *Te Reo* 29: 81-112.
- Pearce, Elizabeth. 2001. Lexical feature-driven incorporation in two Oceanic languages: Iaa and Fijian. *The Linguistic Review* 18: 265-288.
- Pearce, Elizabeth. 2012. Number within the DP: A View from Oceanic. In *Functional heads*, ed. Laura Brugè, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro, and Cecilia Poletto, 81-91. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pearson, Matthew. 2005. The Malagasy Subject/Topic as an A'-element. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 381-457.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman. 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Schütz, Albert. 1985. *The Fijian language*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Pearce, E

Title:

Person marking in three Oceanic languages

Date:

2016

Citation:

Pearce, E. (2016). Person marking in three Oceanic languages

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/221116>

File Description:

Published version