



HAL
open science

Noun-phrase conjunction in Austronesian languages

Isabelle Bril

► **To cite this version:**

Isabelle Bril. Noun-phrase conjunction in Austronesian languages. C. Moyse-Faurie & J. Sabel. Topics in Oceanic morphosyntax, De Gruyter Mouton, pp.235-286, 2011, Trends in Linguistics 239. halshs-00641389v1

HAL Id: halshs-00641389

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00641389v1>

Submitted on 15 Nov 2011 (v1), last revised 10 Jun 2013 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Noun-phrase conjunction in Austronesian languages: additive, inclusory and comitative strategies.

Isabelle Brill
(LACITO-CNRS, Paris)

Abstract

This is an investigation of various types of NP conjunctive strategies in Austronesian languages, additive, inclusory and comitative strategies. The focus is on asymmetrical conjunction involved in the inclusory and comitative types; the aim is to delineate the syntactic constraints and semantic parameters on the use of these conjunctive constructions, as well as their pragmatic effects, including an analysis of the etymology of some of these conjunctive morphemes (comitative marker, noun ‘fellow’, verb ‘accompany, be with’).

Introduction¹

In the past two decades, cross-linguistic evidence of asymmetrical coordination at all levels (clauses, VPs or NPs), have led to revision of its definitions as a symmetrical type of conjunction, and to propose that the conjuncts are actually syntactically asymmetrical, with the conjunctive marker (if any) heading one of the conjuncts (Van Valin 1997, Johannessen 1998). Cross-linguistically, additive, but also comitative and inclusory conjunction² display cases of asymmetrical coordination. The first extensive analysis of inclusory constructions in Oceanic languages was authored by Lichtenberk (2000), who outlined a typology of such constructions, more specifically in Toqabaqita (Solomon Islands), elaborating on their phrasal and split subtypes. The present analysis will centre on noun-phrase conjunction in Austronesian languages and the Oceanic subgroup of this family, focusing on asymmetrical conjunction of the inclusory and comitative types, and delineating the syntactic and semantic parameters on the use of these conjunctive constructions, as well as their pragmatic effects.

¹ I wish to thank two anonymous reviewers, as well as Claire Moyse-Faurie and Joachim Sabel for comments and suggestions which have helped improve this paper.

² For comitative coordination, see Stassen 2000, 2001, 2003. Inclusory coordination is found in Mayan (Tzotzil), Australian, Tchadic (Hausa), Bantu (Nkore-Kiga), Finno-Ugrian (Hungarian, Finnish), Germanic (Old Norse, Old English), Slavic (Russian, Polish, Czech, etc.) languages (see Schwartz 1988, Aissen 1989, Singer 2001, Evans 2003, Moravcsik 2003, Faarlund 2004).

Section 1 is an overview of various conjunctive strategies and their distinctive features. Section 2 analyses the syntactic and semantic features of inclusory constructions and the constraints on their use. Section 3 is an analysis of the conjunctive morphemes, their functions and etymology. Section 4 sketches a typology of the strategies used in a sample of Austronesian languages for standard coordination, inclusory constructions, or comitative coordination, and the semantics of these conjunctive strategies.

1. Additive, comitative and inclusory conjunction: some distinctive features

Let us briefly define the three conjunctive types under consideration: the additive, inclusory and comitative types. In additive NP coordination, the conjuncts are in a semantic relation of addition, and the conjunctive morphemes may also be used in counting ('and/plus'). Comitative coordination, on the other hand, makes use of a comitative morpheme, which also behaves as a coordinator ('with/and') and triggers agreement in number with the conjuncts. The conjuncts of inclusory constructions stand in a relation of inclusion, typically between a superset pronoun which includes a subset NP in its reference.

These three types are illustrated by examples (1) in Nêlêmwa: (1a) is a case of additive coordination with *xa* 'and, plus'³, (1b) is the standard NP coordination for animate conjuncts marked by the comitative coordinator *ma*, and (1c-d) are cases of inclusory conjunction. When syndetic (i.e. marked by a conjunctive marker), inclusory constructions often use a comitative coordinator ('with/and') (1c-d).

(1) Nêlêmwa (VOS, Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia)

- Additive coordination

- a. **Hla** u oda mwa [hlileny thaamwa **xa** ye].
3PL PFV go.up ACT these.DU woman CONJ 3SG.FR⁴
'These two women and/plus him go up.' (Bril 2002: 428)

³ Compare with *tujic xa bwaat pwagiik* 'eleven' (lit. ten and/plus top one) (Bril 2002: 428).

⁴ Abbreviations: ACT actualiser; AF actor focus; ANAPH anaphoric; AOR aorist; ASS assertive; ASSOC associative; BF buffer; COLL collective; CONJ conjunctive mkr; CONN connector; COORD coordinator; DIR directional; DO direct object; DX1 proximal deictic; DX2 medial deictic; EMPH emphatic mkr; FR free (pronoun); GENR general TAM marker; ID identification mkr; IDX indexer; N.FUT non-future; N.VIS non visual; PART particle; PC paucal; P.CLF possessive classifier; PERS.MKR personal marker; PROSP prospective; REV reverse; RL realis; RED reduplication; SPEC specifying preposition; SR same reference; TAM tense-aspect-mood mkr; TRANSL translative aspect mkr; TRI trial; UNC uncertain mood; VENT ventive.

- Standard NP coordination (with a comitative coordinator)

- b. *Hli ulep [dagiiny ma axaleny Teâ Paak].*
3DU go.out messenger CONJ this.M T. P.
'The messenger and Teâ Paak go out.' (Bril fieldnotes)

- Non-phrasal inclusory construction

- c. *Ma pe-vhaa ma axomoo-n.*
1DU.EXCL RECP-speak CONJ mother-POSS.3SG
'We and his mother speak to each other.' (Bril fieldnotes)

- Phrasal inclusory construction

- d. *Yaman ma Polie.*
1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ Polie
'Polie and I.' (Bril fieldnotes)

The inclusory construction in (1c) is non-phrasal since the dual subject index *ma* (indicating the superset) is part of the VP⁵ and does not make up a conjunctive phrase of the [NP and NP] type with the subset *axomoo-n*. In (1d) on the other hand, the inclusory construction is phrasal, the superset free⁶ pronoun *yaman* and the subset NP are a conjunctive phrase [NP and NP]. In both cases, the reference to the subset is included in the superset (an index pronoun in (1c) or a free pronoun in (1d)), it is not added up to it (see ex. (26) below for further analysis).

In Nêlêmwa, conjunction is syndetic; in other Austronesian languages, these three conjunctive types (additive, inclusory, comitative) may be syndetic or asyndetic; some languages may even use both strategies, varying with syntactic constraints or semantic properties (detailed in sections 1.1 & 1.2 below). Example (2a) in Ajië illustrates asyndetic inclusory construction and (2b) syndetic standard (additive) coordination.

(2) Ajië (Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia, A. Boehe, p.c.)

- a. *Gövu Paul.*
1DU.EXCL.FR Paul
'Paul and I.' (asyndetic inclusory construction, lit. we2 Paul)
- b. *Gènyâ ma⁷ Paul.*
1SG.FR CONJ Paul
'Paul and I.' (syndetic additive coordination)

⁵ This is often referred to as "verb-marking strategy" in the literature on this question.

⁶ Free pronouns are full pronominal forms, with NP status, as opposed to personal indexes which belong to the VP.

⁷ *Ma* in Ajië is an additive coordinator which never has the inclusory function that similar coordinators have in northern New Caledonian languages (such as Nêlêmwa or Zuanga).

The semantics of additive and comitative coordination is slightly different: additive coordination has a distributive ('each') or a collective reading, while comitative coordination tends to have a collective reading only.

1.1. NP additive coordination

Various types of additive coordination and their semantic properties will now be analysed, including the summation pronoun strategy.

1.1.1. Asyndetic vs. syndetic coordination

In some languages, syndetic and asyndetic coordination are two possible options, with syntactic and semantic correlates. For instance, asyndetic coordination may be specific to NPs with human reference or expressing greater semantic proximity between nominals.

In Nakanai, the asyndetic strategy is commonly (but not obligatorily) used when the NP conjuncts are in the discourse topic position of the sentence, as in (3a-b). But when the NP conjuncts are in the subject position (3c-d), the coordinator *me* is then obligatory.

(3) Nakanai (Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)

- a. [E Marisa e latu-la], *egira goata e Malalia*.
ART Marisa ART child-3POSS 2DU go.up ART Malalia
'Marisa and her child, they've gone up to Malalia.' (Johnston 1980: 185)
- b. [E Marisa (*me*)⁸ latu-la], *egira goata e Malalia*.
ART Marisa CONJ child-3POSS 2DU go.up ART Malalia
'Marisa and her child, they've gone up to Malalia.' (Johnston 1980: 185)
- c. *La bolo me la paia ogala-le*.
ART pig CONJ ART dog at.outside-there
'The/a pig and the/a dog are outside there.' (Johnston 1980: 185)
- d. *E tau me rutu ilua*.
ART man CONJ wife two
'A man and his wife.' (Johnston 1980: 186)

The syndetic strategy may be reinforced by a dual numeral, as in (3d).

1.1.2. Summation free pronoun strategy vs. coordinator

Another frequent conjunctive strategy in Austronesian languages is to use a summation free pronoun referring to all conjuncts as in (4, 5). In most

⁸ The coordinator *me* assimilates the noun marker *e*.

languages, this is restricted to higher animates, or to humans with close relationship, as in Tetun or Kaulong. Other types of NPs are conjoined by coordinators.⁹

(4) Tetun-Fehan (SVO, Central Malayo-Polynesian, West Timor)

Fu ʼa [*a ina-n sia ruas a ama-n*] *bá*.
 waken 2SG mother-GEN 3PL.FR two 2SG father-GEN IMP
 ‘Wake up the two of them, your mother and father.’ (van Klinken 1999: 157)

(5) Kaulong (SVO, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, Southwest New Britain)

Hiang ngong titie-n.
 3SG.M 3SR.DU wife-3SG
 ‘He and his wife.’ (Throop & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 396)

In Manam or Kairiru, the summation pronoun strategy is also restricted to higher animates with close relationship. Other nouns are either juxtaposed or conjoined by a standard coordinator, *-be* ‘and’ in Manam (6b), *bo* in Kairiru (7c) (inanimates are juxtaposed in Kairiru). In Manam, the coordinator *-be* is optional with nouns referring to humans and with tight relationship. Note that the position of the summation free pronoun is not always medial; in Manam, it comes after the conjuncts (6a):

(6) Manam (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, Manam and Boesa Islands, PNG)

- a. [*Tamóata róa-ø dí-a-ru*] *di-lá?o-ru*.
 man spouse-3SG 3PL-BF-DU.FR 3PL.RL-go-DU
 ‘The man went with his wife.’ [lit. man spouse they2 they went] (Lichtenberk 1983: 430)
- b. *moán-(be) áine di-púra*.
 man-and woman 3PL.RL-arrive
 ‘The men and the women arrived.’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 365)

The summation pronoun is medial in Kairiru (7a); but when more than two conjuncts are involved, it appears only once, between the first two conjuncts, the other NP conjuncts are juxtaposed (7b):

⁹ See examples (60) in Tetun. In Kaulong, the medial coordinator *u* ‘and’ conjoins NPs or VPs; the comitative coordinator *to* conjoins animate NPs, see examples (52). The coordinator *ma* conjoins VPs, *si* ‘and, but, and then, and so’ is used for clause coordination (Throop & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 399, 408).

(7) Kairiru (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, East Sepik, PNG)

- a. *Cuok* [Smowai **řu** Cawor].
boundary Smowai **3DU.FR** Cawor
'Smowai and Cawor's boundary.' (Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 209)
- b. *Wocul ři awo-ñ natu-ñ.*
Wocul **3PL.FR** spouse-3SG child-3SG
'Wocul, his wife and children.' (Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 208)
- c. *moin bo nat*
'woman and children' (Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 208)

The summation free pronoun is also medial in Mangap-Mbula (8) or Teanu (9):

(8) Mangap-Mbula (SVO, Western Oceanic, North New Guinea cluster)

[*Nio niam-*] **a-n** *zin pikin*] **am-sa** *yom*
1SG **1PL.EXCL-NMLZ-POSS.3PL** PL child **1PL.EXCL-wait** 2PL
ma som.
And do.in.vain
'I together with the children waited for you in vain.' (Bugenhagen 1995: 212)

(9) Teanu (SVO, Central Eastern Oceanic, Vanikoro, Solomon Islands)

Emele da mwalik[~] iape.
woman **3DU** man 3SG.POSS
'a woman and her husband.' (François p.c.)

In Māori or Tahitian, the summation pronoun strategy is restricted to conjoining NPs referring to humans (represented by personal names or common nouns). The inclusory construction is required to conjoin a pronoun and a noun (see also (24, 25) below).

(10) Māori (Eastern Polynesian, New Zealand)

Ka noho nei [a Ponga rua ko tana mkai].
 TAM sit near ART Ponga 3DU SPEC his slave
 ‘Ponga and his servant went on sitting.’ (Bauer 1997: 548)

(11) Tahitian (Eastern Polynesian)

Ua mno e [ō Tama rua ō Terii].
 PFV disappear(PL.) ID T. 3DU.EXCL ID T.
 ‘Tama and Terii disappeared.’ (Lazard & Peltzer 2000: 179)

In Tahitian, common nouns may also be conjoined by the standard coordinator *ē* ‘and’, or by the comitative coordinator *mua* ‘and, with’.

Summation pronouns are often reanalysed as coordinators or comitative markers (Bril 2004: 526-527). This mostly (but not exclusively) occurs with 3rd person pronouns. In Mwotlap, only *kōyō*, the 3rd person dual inclusory pronoun, is reanalysed as a coordinator of NPs referring to humans with a tight semantic link (François, 2000: 389-390). Compare the inclusory construction (12a) and the reanalysed coordinator *kōyō* (12b).

(12) Mwotlap (SVO, Eastern Oceanic, Banks Is., North Vanuatu)

- a. *Imam ku itōk ?*
 father 3DU be.good
 ‘Are father (and him) well ?’ [*lit.* father they_{DUAL} well] (François 2000: 386)
- b. *Mayanag ku ēgnō-n.*
 chief 3DU spouse-3SG
 ‘The chief and his wife.’ (François 2000: 389)

In Ajië, the occurrence of a non-inclusory subject pronoun (*na* ‘he’ in (13)), in what was formerly an inclusory construction (*wakè curu yèvù* [lit. work they₂ chief]) has triggered the reanalysis of the dual pronoun as a comitative marker (Bril 2004: 526-528).

(13) Ajië (SVO, Eastern Oceanic, South New Caledonia, A. Boehe, p.c.)

Na wakè curu yèvù.
 3SG work 3DU chief
 ‘He works with the chief.’

1.1.3. Summation free pronoun strategy plus a conjunctive marker

The summation pronoun strategy may be reinforced by a comitative coordinator, as in Atayal (Formosan) or Samoan (15). In Atayal,

conjunction with the comitative coordinator *ci?* or with *laha? ci?* (the summation pronoun and the comitative coordinator respectively) is restricted to animate entities (14a-b). Otherwise, the standard coordinator *lu?* ‘and’, which is compatible with all types of NPs (\pm animates, see (14c)), is required. Inclusory constructions, which are used to conjoin a pronoun and a noun, are presented in examples (50) below.

(14) Atayal (Formosan)

- a. *M-pa-siliy-cu* [*ci? huril laha? ci?* |*yaw*].
 AF-IRR-beat-1SG.NOM ACC dog 3PL.FR COM cat
 ‘I will beat the dog and the cat.’ (Huang 2006: 228)
- b. *Nyel-ø¹⁰ m-awas* [*ka? naβkis laha? ci? ule?*].
 PROG.PROX AF-sing NOM old.man 3PL.FR COM child
 ‘The old man is singing here with the child.’ (Huang 2006: 224) [AF = actor focus]
- c. *Cyel ma-sa-siliy* [*ka? Watan lu? Temu*].
 PROG.DIST RECP-RED-beat NOM Watan and Temu
 ‘Watan and Temu are beating each other (with sticks).’ (Huang 2006: 226)

(15) Samoan (Polynesian)

Fai le mafaufau tele faiva o [Peni laua ma Ruta].
 do not think much fishing.trip POSS Peni 3DU and Ruta
 ‘Peni and Ruta did the fishing trip rather thoughtlessly.’ (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 680)

1.1.4. Associative plural constructions

A slightly different strategy, sometimes called “associative plural constructions”, is instantiated by a plural pronoun referring to an indefinite group of humans and meaning ‘and the rest, and followers, and companions’.

In Papuan Malay, this construction is mostly used with subject and object arguments and is less acceptable with obliques; thus, *(b) is ungrammatical.

¹⁰ The 3rd person (sg. or pl.) bound nominative pronoun on the VP is zero-marked.

(16) Papuan Malay (SVO, Eastern Province of Papua¹¹)

- a. *Kitong pi lia Yohannes dong.*
1PL go see Yohannes 3PL
'We went to see Yohannes and his mates.' [*lit.* Yohannes them]
(Donohue forthc.)
- *b. *Sa-su-masa banyak untu sa-pu-ana dong.*
1SG-PFV-cook much for 1SG-POSS-child 3PL
[Intended meaning: 'I've already cooked a lot for my daughter
and her friends.']

(17) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic, Malaita, Solomon Islands)

- Tha Gerea kera.*
ART.PERS Gerea 3PL.FR
'Gerea and them.' (Lichtenberk 2000: 29)

In Nakanai, the associative plural pronoun fuses the coordinator *me* and a non-singular pronoun, yielding the plural *mite* (*me+ite* 3PL), or the dual *mira* (*me+ira* 3DU).

(18) Nakanai (Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)

- a. *E Tubu, mite.*
ART Tubu and.3PL
'Tubu and the rest.' (Johnston 1980: 186)
- b. *E Tubu, mira.*
ART Tubu and.3DU
'Tubu and the other fellow.' (Johnston 1980: 186)
- c. *E Tubu, mira me e rutu-la.*
ART Tubu and.3DU and ART wife-3POSS
'Tubu together with his wife.' (or:) 'Tubu and his wife.'
(Johnston 1980: 186)

Note that while (18a) might be interpreted as a standard additive coordination, (18b) is clearly inclusory, since the dual pronoun *mira* includes 'Tubu' in its reference. Compare with standard coordination in Nakanai (3). In (18c), the presence of the coordinator *me* suggests that *mira* has been reanalysed as a collective-associative marker.

¹¹ Formerly Irian Jaya.

In Nêlêmwa, the suffix *-ma* is an associative plural marker referring to members of a group or fellows.

(19) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia)

Cawi-ma ma Dahoot-ma.
Cawi-ASSOC.PL and Dahoot-ASSOC.PL
'The Cawi clan and the Dahoot clan.' (Bril fieldnotes)

1.2. Inclusory constructions

In contrast with additive coordination, inclusory constructions comprise a superset NP (generally marked by a dual or plural pronoun), which includes the reference to the subset NP. These constructions may be \pm syndetic, \pm phrasal. They are always restricted to higher animates with tight relationship. The syntactic constraints and semantic properties of inclusory constructions, in comparison with additive or standard coordination, will be analysed in section 2.

1.2.1. Asyndetic inclusory constructions

1) Phrasal construction with free pronoun strategy

In the phrasal construction involving a superset free pronoun and an included subset NP, the superset free pronoun is the head of the construction and the included subset stands as its specifier. In Ajië (20), the first person dual pronoun *curu* 'we2' is the verb's subject index, while the second occurrence of *curu* belongs to the inclusory construction, it is the superset pronoun which includes the subset 'maternal uncle' in its reference.

(20) Ajië (Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia, Leenhardt 1932: 190)

Curu b̄ori we vi-t おお [*curu kaŋa* ㄥ ㄆ]
3DU SEQ PVF RECP-speak 3DU maternal.uncle POSS-3SG
'Then they talked, him and his maternal uncle.' (or:) 'Then he talked with his maternal uncle.' [*lit.* they_{DUAL} talked they_{DUAL} maternal uncle].

2) Non-phrasal or verb-marking strategy

Asyndetic, non-phrasal inclusory constructions (labelled 'split inclusory' by Lichtenberk, 2000) are illustrated by (21a-b) in Toqabaqita. The dual subject indexes *meki* or *mere* 'we' also mark tense-aspect on the verb and do not make up a conjunctive phrase with the subset NPs *mature woman* in

(a), or *brother* in (b). In some approaches, this is sometimes called verb-marking strategy. Yet, though the subject index is part of the VP, it includes the other NP conjunct in its reference and thus behaves referentially as the superset.

(21) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic, Malaita, Solomon Islands)

- a. [\emptyset *kukeqe-nau*] *meki* *lae uri Honiara qana*
 mature.woman-1SG 1DU.EXCL.FUT go to H. at

wiki loo.

week that.up

‘My wife and I will go to Honiara next week.’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 21)

- b. [\emptyset *doqora-mu*] *mere* *ngata.*
 brother-2SG 1DU.EXCL.NONFUT speak
 ‘Your brother and I spoke (to each other).’ [*lit.* your brother we_{DUAL} spoke] (2000: 21)

The examples (21a-b) stand in contrast with the phrasal construction in (21c), in which the superset free pronoun *kamareqa* ‘we2’ makes up a conjunctive phrase with the subset ‘brother’ included in its reference. The dual subject index *meki* marks future and number agreement on the verb.

- (21c) [*Kamareqa doqora-ku*] *meki* *lae ma-i.*
 1DU.EXCL.FR brother-1SG 1DU.EXCL.FUT go DIR-at
 ‘I and my brother will come tomorrow.’ [*lit.* we_{DUAL} my brother we_{DUAL} spoke] (Lichtenberk 2000: 3)

When comparing the non-phrasal (21a-b) and phrasal constructions in Toqabaqita (21c), the non-phrasal construction contains a potential position whose gap is symbolised by \emptyset , and which is filled by an inclusory free pronoun (such as *kamareqa* ‘we2’ in (21c)) in the phrasal construction, not by a 1st person singular pronoun ‘I’.

The same two constructions, non-phrasal (21d) and phrasal (21e) are also found with object arguments.

- (21d) *Kera thaitoqoma-mareqa wela-nau.*
 3PL know-1DU.EXCL child-1SG
 ‘They know me and my child.’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 22)

- (21e) *Wane e laba-taqi [kamareqa maka-nau].*
 man 3SG.N.FUT harm-TR 1DU.EXCL.FR father-1SG
 ‘The man harmed me and my father.’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 14)

Many languages display the non-phrasal pattern, Papuan Malay for instance.

(22) Papuan Malay (SVO, Eastern Province of Papua)

Maria *kitong-dua su-tara-bisa lae.*
Maria 1PL-two PFV-NEG-able again
'Maria and I can't do it anymore.' [*lit.* Maria we_{DUAL} ...] (Donohue
forthc.)

On the other hand, Tetun displays the phrasal pattern.

(23) Tetun-Fehan (SVO, Central Malayo-Polynesian, West Timor)

Ami ruas Pák Tóm bá Laran.
1PL.EXCL two Mr Tom go Laran
'We two Mr Tom (and I) went to Laran.' (van Klinken 1999: 157)

In Tahitian (24) and Māori (25), inclusory constructions are only used to conjoin pronouns and nouns referring to humans; see (ex. 10-11) for other conjoining strategies.

(24) Tahitian (Eastern Polynesian)

ʻUa reva ʻtu m ʻua ʻo Peu.
PFV leave away 1DU.EXCL ID Peu
'Peu and I left.' (Tryon, 1970: 67, in Payne 1985: 35)

(25) Māori (Eastern Polynesian)

Kei te aha k ʻua ko Tame?
TAM what 2DU SPEC Tame
'What are you and Tame doing ?' (Bauer 1997: 548)

1.2.2. Syndetic inclusory constructions

In other languages, such as Nêlêmwa and many northern languages of New Caledonia (Nyelâyu, Nemi, Bwattoo, Cèmûhî, etc.), inclusory constructions are syndetic¹² and involve a conjunctive morpheme, often a comitative conjunction.

- Phrasal vs. non-phrasal constructions

In Nêlêmwa, the phrasal construction (26a) with a superset free pronoun (*yaman* 'we2') and an included subset is emphatic, while the non-phrasal construction (26b) is neutral. In (26b), the subject index *ma* 'we2' includes *Polie* in its reference. The potential position symbolised by \emptyset in (26b) cannot license a pronoun standing for only one of the subset conjuncts (a 1st

¹² While inclusory constructions or their traces tend to be asyndetic in southern languages (Ajië, Tîrî (Osumi 1995), etc.)

person singular pronoun would thus be ungrammatical), it only allows an inclusory free pronoun as in (26a). Inclusory constructions are thus syntactically obligatory to conjoin a pronoun with a noun; no other construction is available in Nêlêmwa. The NP headed by the conjunctive *ma* in (26b) is a conjunct, not an adjunct, nor an afterthought. The notion of collective action may be stressed by an adverb *wuung* ‘together’, as in (26c).

(26) Nêlêmwa (VOS, Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia)

- a. *Io ma tu haga [yaman ma Polie].* (emphatic)
 FUT 1DU.EXCL go.down fish 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ Polie
 ‘We’ll go fishing, Polie and I.’ (Bril 2000)
- b. *Io ma tu haga Ø ma Polie.* (neutral)
 FUT 1DU.EXCL go.down fish CONJ Polie
 ‘Polie and I will go fishing.’ [*lit.* we_{DUAL} will go fishing including Polie]
 (Bril fieldnotes)
- c. *Hâ shaya wuung ma co.*
 1PL.INCL work together CONJ 2SG.FR
 ‘We and you work together.’ (Or:) We work together with you.’
 (Bril fieldnotes)

Non-contiguity results from the fact that subject indexes with superset reference (*ma* ‘we2’, or *hâ* ‘we’ in (26b-c)) must be in pre-verbal position, while nominal arguments and free pronouns are post-verbal. Compare with standard coordination (26d), in which *ma* conjoins two animate NPs.

- (26d) *I tu mwa uya shi [hlileny kââma-n ma axomoo-n].*
 3SG go.down ACT arrive at these.2 father-his CONJ mother-his
 ‘He arrives at his father and mother’s place.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

1.2.3. Inclusory interrogative constructions

The subset may be an interrogative pronoun with argument function; the same ± syndetic and ± phrasal constructions are found.

1) Asyndetic phrasal

- (27) Manam (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, PNG)
Náita ?án-ru ?
 who? 2PL.FR-DU
 ‘Who are you with ?’ (*lit.* who you2 ?) (Lichtenberk 1983: 431)
- (28) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic, Malaita, Solomon Islands)
Tei keeroqa ?
 who? 3DU.FR
 ‘Who (is) he with ?’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 28)
- (29) Mwotlap (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Is., North Vanuatu)
K↑ny↑↓y← ma-van me ? ‘ Kamy↑↓ Wilson
 2DU who? PFV-go VENT 1DU.EXCL W.
 ‘Who did you come with ?’ — ‘With Wilson.’ (François 2000: 391)

2) Phrasal vs. non-phrasal syndetic constructions

The phrasal conjunctive construction in sentence-initial position in (30a) is a cleft, emphatic construction; the superset free pronoun *yamon* ‘you2’ includes the interrogative pronoun in its reference. On the other hand, the non-phrasal construction (30b) is pragmatically neutral, the 2nd person dual subject index *mo* (30b) also includes the interrogative pronoun in its reference.

- (30) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)
- a. *Yamon ma ti me mo tu yhalap?*
 2DU.FR COORD who? CONJ 2DU go.down gather.food
 ‘Who is it that you went food-gathering with ?’ [*lit.* (it’s) you and/with whom that you went food-gathering?] (Bril 2002: 265)
- b. *Mo perui ma ti?*
 2DU.EXCL meet CONJ who?
 ‘Who have you met?’ [*lit.* you_{DUAL} met including whom?] (Bril, fieldnotes)

Tolai also displays a syndetic phrasal inclusory construction.

- (31) Tolai (SVO, Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)
Amur ma ia ?
 2DU.FR CONJ who?
 ‘Who is with you?’ [*lit.* you_{DUAL} including whom?] (Mosel 1984: 41)

1.2.4. Inclusory possessive constructions

Superset pronouns may be expressed by possessive pronouns in asyndetic (32-33) or syndetic (34-35) constructions. The possessive pronoun includes the reference to the other conjoined possessor.

- (32) Mwotlap (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Is., North Vanuatu)

Inti-mamyō Wilson.

son-1DU.EXCL Wilson

‘It’s our son (with) Wilson.’ (or:) ‘It’s the son of Wilson and me.’
(François 2000: 479)

- (33) M \leftarrow ori (Eastern Polynesian, New Zealand)

Kei whea t \leftarrow k \uparrow rua moenga ko t \uparrow t \leftarrow ne ?

at where your.DU bed SPEC your husband

‘Where is your and your husband’s bed ?’ (Bauer 1997: 549)

- (34) Zuanga/Yuanga (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

Mwō-[bi ma ābaa-nu].

house-POSS.1DU.EXCL CONJ brother-POSS.1SG

‘It’s my and my brother’s house.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

- (35) Samoan (Polynesian)

ĩ te fa’atoaga a [l \leftarrow ua ma l-o-na tin \leftarrow].

LOC ART plantation POSS 3DU CONJ ART-POSS-3SG mother

‘... to the plantation belonging to her mother and herself.’ (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 680)

2. Syntactic and semantic constraints on inclusory constructions

Several questions crop up at this point. Do inclusory constructions result from some elliptical pronoun or referent ? Are such constructions optional ? What are the constraints on inclusory constructions ?

2.1. Obligatory inclusory strategy: syntactic constraints on the type of conjuncts

In Oceanic languages, inclusory constructions usually obey a number of syntactic constraints, and have specific semantic properties and pragmatic effects related to topicality. Inclusory constructions, when obligatory, do not result from constituent ellipsis, but rather, from a syntactically obligatory null instantiation, as discussed in §2.1.1. about Nêlêmwa.

2.1.1. Constraint on pronominal conjuncts and person hierarchy

In Nêlêmwa, only nouns may be phrasally conjoined as in (36a), pronouns may not (**you and me*), nor may nouns be conjoined with pronouns (**she and her girl*), such conjuncts trigger obligatory inclusory constructions as in (36b), which is the neutral inclusory construction. In (36b), the conjunct position marked by \emptyset must remain empty if represented by a pronominal conjunct, hence the notion of ‘obligatory null instantiation’. Only an inclusory free pronoun is admitted in this position, as in (36c), yet the reference to the non-instantiated pronoun is included in the verb’s subject index (the verb-marking strategy) acting as the superset pronoun. The emphatic construction would involve an inclusory free pronoun, as in (36c).

(36) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

- a. *Hli u peeve [Teâ Pwayili ma horaamwaleny Kaavo].*
3DU PFV argue T. Pwayili CONJ this.woman Kaavo
 ‘Teâ Pwayili and this woman Kaavo argue.’ (Bril fieldnotes)
- b. *Hli u peeve \emptyset ma horaamwaleny Kaavo.*
3DU PFV argue CONJ this.woman Kaavo
 ‘He and this woman Kaavo argue.’ [*lit.* they_{DUAL} argue including this woman Kaavo]
- c. *Hli u peeve hli ma horaamwaleny Kaavo.*
3DU PFV argue 3DU.FR CONJ this.woman Kaavo
 ‘They argue, he and this woman Kaavo.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

The superset pronoun abides by person and referential hierarchy: 1st includes 2nd person, which includes 3rd person. According to such hierarchy, :I and you₂ yields a :we2 incl. you₂ form; :I and him₃ yields :we2 excl. him₃ and :you and him₃ yields a :you2 him₃ form. No difference of inclusory pattern was observed for 1st, 2nd or 3rd persons. In contrast with languages which restrict inclusory constructions to 1st and 2nd person

pronouns, 3rd person inclusory pronouns are also allowed, possibly because pronouns have distinct forms for dual, sometimes trial, and plural forms, thus preventing any referential ambiguity.

As already pointed out, in some Northern New Caledonian languages such as Nêlêmwa or Nemi (37), inclusory constructions are obligatory for conjuncts involving a noun and a pronoun (there is no available alternative):

(37) Nemi (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

- a. *Yelu li am me ti-nga-me ma Hixe.*
 3DU VIRT ASS together go.down-REV-PROX and/with Hixe
 ‘She’ll go back with Hixe.’ (Ozanne-Rivierre 1979: 124)
- b. *Yelu li me hen ma-m¹³ daama.*
 3DU VIRT together go and/with-DEF chief
 ‘He’ll go with the chief.’ (Ozanne-Rivierre 1979: 124)

On the other hand, Southern languages such as Ajië, have an alternative construction: a noun and pronoun may be conjoined by an inclusory construction or by a standard additive coordinator (as in (1a-b)), though the latter construction might be a more recent development.

The constraints bearing on pronominal conjuncts is a widespread feature of languages with inclusory constructions: conjunction of pronouns ranges from dispreferred (in Russian for instance, McNally 1993) to ungrammatical (Nêlêmwa). Though widespread, the ban on pronominal conjuncts is not universally criterial for inclusory constructions; various Oceanic languages (among which Mangap-Mbula (8), southern New Caledonian languages (38), Samoan (39), Manam (43a), Toqabaqita (44a), Fijian (45), also allow pronominal conjuncts.

(38) Xârâcùù (Eastern Oceanic, South New Caledonia)

- Mwââ=gè mê dèèri Mîâ.*
 house=2SG.FR COORD people Mîâ
 ‘Your (sg.) and the people of Mîâ’s house.’ (Moyses-Faurie 1995: 30)

(39) Samoan (Polynesian)

- ...ou te le alofa ia te [‘oe ma tamaiti].*
 1SG GENR NEG love LOC 2SG.FR COORD children
 ‘...[that] I do not care for you and the children.’ (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 680)

¹³ The clitic *-m* is a singular definite nominal determiner.

2.1.2. Higher animacy hierarchy

Inclusory constructions are most generally restricted to humans or higher animates with close relationship as in Mwotlap for instance, while inanimates require other types of coordination or comitative adjunct strategies. No exceptions have been found in the sample.

(40) Mwotlap (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Is., North Vanuatu)

- a. \downarrow *ntɛk* *yɛ* ← *so van voñopñon ?* \downarrow *ntɛk* *Wilson.*
 1TRI.INCL.FR who? PROSP go fishing 1TRI.INCL.FR Wilson
 ‘Who are **we2** going to fish with?’ ‘With Wilson.’ (or:)
 ‘Wilson and us.’
 [*lit.* we3 who go fishing] [*lit.* we3 Wilson]
 (François 2000: 392)

There are subtle semantic features relating to the position of the inclusory pronoun, before or after the subset NP (40b), signalling differences in topicality, anaphoricity and empathy, the first conjunct is more topical¹⁴.

- (40b) *kōyō Wilson* *Wilson kōyō*
 3DU Wilson Wilson 3DU
 ‘(S)he and Wilson.’ ‘Wilson and the other.’
 (François 2000: 390)

Other NPs are conjoined by the coordinators *ba* ‘and, but’ (40c), *wa* (40d), but also by the instrumental preposition *mi* (+ inanimates) or the comitative preposition *tiwag mi* ‘together with’ (± animates) which also has conjunctive function (40e), even for pronouns (40f).

- (40c) *Nata* | *mi/ba* *naxasel ?*
 basket with/COORD knife
 ‘basket and knife’ (Crowley, in Lynch et al. 2002: 592)

- (40d) *ige imam wa ige tita.*
 ART.PL father and ART.PL mother
 ‘the fathers and mothers (François 2002: 263)

- (40e) *ige susu tiwag mi ige lililwo.*
 ART.PL small.one together with ART.PL big.one
 ‘the children and the adults (François 2002: 263)

¹⁴ A similar phenomenon is described in Toqabaqita by Lichtenberk (2000: 9-10, 27).

- (40f) *Ino, tiwag mi nək.*
1SG together with 2SG
'me and/with you' (François 2002: 263)

Compare coordination in (40g) with a comitative adjunct in (40h), without number agreement:

- (40g) *Na-māngo tiwag mi nō-wōh, kōyō vėlēs neneh vėlēs.*
ART-mango together with ART-coconut 3DU only sweet only
'The mango and the coconut are as sweet.' (François 2002: 262)
- (40h) *Nēk tog vanvan tiwag mi ige hōw en!*
2SG PROH go together with PL down DX
'Do not go with the people down there (to the north)! (François 2002: 262)

2.2. Properties of inclusory constructions: sameness of syntactic function, semantic role and topicality

In most languages, inclusory constructions appear with most syntactic functions (analysed in §2.2.2. below).

2.2.1. Sameness of syntactic function, semantic role and topicality

Like other types of conjuncts (additive or comitative), conjuncts in inclusory constructions must have the same syntactic function, independently from their morphological marking which may sometimes be different due to their asymmetrical head-specifier relation. They must also have similar semantic roles.

A] New Caledonian languages

For instance, the conjunct NPs are co-agents or co-patients, collective or reciprocal participants, or they display similar properties (41) (same age, size, etc.); they are joint possessors or participants with kinship and part-whole relationship, and they are included in the agreement pattern. Semantic asymmetry triggers syntactic hierarchy, which is marked by associative or comitative adjuncts, without number agreement.

- (41) Zuanga/Yuanga (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

Pe-kau-li ma Hiixe.

RECP-year-3DU CONJ Hiixe

‘She and Hiixe are the same age.’ (Bril fieldwork 2007)

A tentative construction such as **pe-kau-n ma Hiixe* [RECP-year-3sg], with a 3rd singular pronoun and an adjunct *ma Hiixe*, with the intended meaning ‘she’s the same age as/with Hiixe’ would be ungrammatical.

Various other New Caledonian languages, among them Bwato, Cèmuhî¹⁵ and Ajië (Bril 2004: 509-511), show similar contrasts. Oceanic languages generally distinguish comitative conjuncts restricted to higher animate NPs and marked by an :and/with~ coordinator (with number agreement), from associative adjuncts marked by a preposition :with~, without number agreement. They usually express differences in agency, animacy, and topicality.

B] Nakanai

In Nakanai, (± syndetic) inclusory coordination is obligatory with pronominal conjuncts (42a-b) and stands in contrast with a comitative adjunct marked by the preposition *le*, without agreement (42c):

- (42) Nakanai (Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)

a. *Eia ge voku la luma [tamutou me la valalua taume].*

3SG IRR work ART house your.PL and ART men your.SG

‘He will build a house for you (sg.) and your men.’ (Johnston 1980: 269)

b. *La baa taku sesele, [amite me tabara-bara-gu], [egite la*

ART area my true 1PL.EXCL and brother-RED-my 3PL ART

valua isahari] la baa tamite isasa.

men some ART area our.PL.EXCL one

‘My section, belonging to me and my brothers and some others, that’s one section.’ (Johnston 1980: 273)

¹⁵ In Cèmuhî (Rivierre, 1980: 194-95) the inclusory construction with the coordinator *me* triggers number agreement and is distinct from the non-co-agentive preposition *imi* ‘with, carrying’, derived from *imwi* ‘seize, hold’, without number agreement (see Ozanne-Rivierre 2004).

- c. *Amite umala ge pou vikapopo le-gite Siapanipani.*
 1PL.EXCL PROH IRR sit be.together with-3PL Japanese
 ‘We were not to stay with the Japanese.’ (Johnston 1980: 35)

C] Manam

In Manam, conjunction of nouns with pronouns is allowed and may be ± syndetic. Asyndetic noun-pronoun conjunction (43a) expresses different empathy and discourse prominence from an inclusory construction (43b), which puts more stress on the subset/ specifier NP standing in sentence initial position.

- (43) Manam (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster)

- a. [*ɲáú toʔá-gu* *ʔé-ru*] *ʔi-réba-ru.*
 1SG.FR older.brother-1SG.POSS 1EXCL.FR-DU 1EXCL-sail-DU
 ‘I and my older brother sailed.’ (Or:) ‘I sailed with my older brother.’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 430)
- b. [*Toʔá-gu* *ʔé-ru*] *ʔi-reba-réba-ru.*
 older.brother-1SG 1EXCL.FR-DU 1EXCL.RL-sail-RED-DU
 ‘My older brother and I were sailing.’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 275)

D] Toqabaqita

In Toqabaqita, nouns and free pronouns may be conjoined with *ma* if equally topical (44a), while inclusory constructions such as (44b) express different empathy and discourse prominence between entities.

- (44) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic; Malaita, Solomon Islands)

- a. [*Nau ma wela-nau ki*] *mili* *too siafaqa.*
 1SG.FR and child-1SG PL 1PL.EXCL(N.FUT) stay be.not.well.off
 ‘I and my children, we are not well off.’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 8)
- b. [*Kamaroqa tha Bita*] *moki lae bii kamiliqa ?*
 2DU.FR ART Bita 2DU.FUT go with 1PL.EXCL.FR
 ‘Will you (sg.) and Bita come with us ?’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 9)

E] Fijian

In Fijian, the construction with or without the first person singular (*yau*) in (45) profiles arguments differently and carries different stress and different pragmatic effects. A phrasal coordination between a pronoun and a noun stresses the pronoun (*yau*). The unmarked construction excludes the pronoun (*yau*), yielding a non-phrasal inclusory construction.

(45) Boumaa Fijian (Central Pacific)

'Eirau aa sota vata (o yau) 'ei Jone mai Viidawa.
1DU.EXCL PAST meet together ART 1SG and John at Viidawa
'John and I met at Viidawa.' (Dixon 1988: 157)

Nêlêmwa displays similar constructions (26a-b) with similar stress on the inclusory free pronoun (26a), but there is one major difference, the free pronoun must be inclusory in Nêlêmwa.

2.2.2. Syntactic function: subject vs object function

In most languages, inclusory constructions appear with most syntactic functions, as in Mangap-Mbula, Toqabaqita, Nakanai or Nêlêmwa. Some languages tend to prefer or to restrict them to subjects and co-agents and to use comitative adjunction for other syntactic functions.

(46) Mangap-Mbula (Western Oceanic, North New Guinea cluster)

*Nio ko a]-pit pa [niamru Bob uraata tiam].*¹⁶
1SG UNC 1SG-recount about 1DU.EXCL Bob work LOC.1PL.EXCL
'I will tell a story about my work together with Bob.' (Bugenhagen
1995: 114)

¹⁶ Dual forms only exist for nominative pronouns, otherwise only SG vs PL pronouns.

- (47) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic, Malaita, Solomon Islands)

Toqa loo kera ngata taqaa suli [kamareqa
people that.up 3PL.N.FUT speak be.bad about 1DU.EXCL.FR

wela nau].

child 1SG

‘The people up there speak badly about me and my child.’
(Lichtenberk 2000: 15)

In Nakanai and Nêlêmwa, the inclusory construction is obligatory for direct objects.

- (48) Nakanai (Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)

Eau alalavi hilo [egira (me)¹⁷ e harua-la].
1SG yesterday see 3DU CONJ ART husband-3POSS

‘I saw her and her husband yesterday.’ (Johnston 1983: 185)

A tentative construction of (48) with a 3rd singular pronoun would be ungrammatical:

*Eau alalavi hilo eia (3sg) **me** e harua-la.

In Nêlêmwa, inclusory constructions are also used with prepositional conjuncts.

- (49) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

- a. *Kiya-a pe-mwang ni pe-wooxa[-va ma*
there.is.not-at.all RECP-bad in RECP-middle-POSS.1PL.EXCL CONJ

Teâ Belep].

T. Belep

‘There is not the least conflict between us and Teâ Belep.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

- b. *Kiya-a pe-pwa-wo shi[-vaak¹⁸ ma axamaleena*
there.is.not-at.all RECP-break-COLL side-POSS.1PL.EXCL CONJ these.M.DX2

Polo].

Polo

‘There is not the least reason of discord between us and the Polo clan.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

¹⁷ The coordinator *me* is optionally deleted when the NP is not in subject/topic function and position.

¹⁸ The possessive form *-va* is neutral, *-vaak* is emphatic.

3. Syndetic constructions: the status of the conjunctive morphemes

Let us now turn to the syntactic status of the conjunctive morphemes used in syndetic constructions.

3.1. Etymology of the conjunctive morpheme

There are two frequent etymological sources for the conjunctive morpheme used in the various types of NP conjunction: a coordinator or a comitative adposition, often (but not exclusively) expressing co-agentivity¹⁹, and less frequently nouns meaning ‘friend, companion’, and verbs meaning ‘accompany, follow’.

3.1.1. Source: a comitative adposition

The use of comitative conjunctions is frequent in Austronesian languages and is often restricted to animate NPs. In Atayal (Formosan) for instance, inclusory constructions use a comitative morpheme *ci?* heading the subset noun. Constructions may be non-phrasal (50a) or phrasal (50b) with an inclusory free pronoun (*camí*). For other NP conjoining strategies using *ci?* or *laha? ci?* (the summation pronoun + *ci?*), see (14).

(50) Atayal (Formosan)

- a. *Nyel-min m-awas ci? Temu.*
 PROG.PROX-1PL.EXCL.NOM AF-sing COM Temu
 ‘I’m singing with Temu.’ (Huang 2006: 223) [AF = actor affix]

¹⁹ In French, *nous irons avec Michel* (lit. we’ll go with Michel) is ambiguous: it generally refers to more than two participants with the standard adjunctive function and reading of *avec*, but if the context is clear, it may also refer to two participants (*Michel and I*, understood as a couple) with the inclusory reading.

In Chilean Spanish (Schwartz 1988), the comitative preposition *con* ‘with’ may be used with an inclusory reading, but only for co-agentive animates with close relationship (as in a-b below). With inanimates (as in c), the inclusory reading is impossible, *con* only has the instrumental adjunct reading; with distantly related animates (d), the reading cannot be inclusory either and must be that of a comitative adjunct:

a. *fuimos a casa con mi madre* ‘I went home with my mother’ [lit. we went home with my mother];

b. *fuimos al mercado con mi perro* [inclusory, 2 participants] ‘I went to the market with my dog’;

c. *fuimos al mercado con mi auto* [instrumental reading]: ‘we went to the market with my car’ [impossible inclusory reading: *I went to the market with my car];

d. *fuimos al mercado con el Mayor de la ciudad* [comitative] ‘We went to the market with the Mayor of the city’.

- b. *Nyel-min* *m-awas* [*cami* *ci?* *Temu*].
 PROG.PROX-1PL.EXCL.NOM AF-sing 1PL.EXCL.FR COM Temu
 ‘I’m singing with Temu.’ (Huang 2006: 228)

In Takia (Oceanic), NPs with human reference are conjoined with the comitative conjunction *da* ‘and/with’ triggering plural agreement on the verb, whereas non-human NPs are simply juxtaposed.

- (51) Takia (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, Madang province (PNG))

Ab a o| w-abi ya-n [*|ai Meit da*] *lo*
 house DX2 2SG build RL-DEF 1SG.FR Meit COM 3.LOC.in
mu-mado da.
 1PL.EXCL-stay IPFV
 ‘The house that you built, Meit and I are living in it.’ (Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 230)

In Kaulong, the comitative conjunct headed by *to* and triggering number agreement is restricted to animates. Other (\pm inanimate) NPs may also be conjoined by the standard coordinator *u* ‘and’ (see footnote 6).

- (52) Kaulong (Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, Southwest New Britain)

Hiang me tik [*po vio-n to elaio-n*].
 3SG.M come call.name 3PL father-in-law-3SG COM mother-in-law-3SG
 ‘He came and uttered the names of his father-in-law and mother-in-law.’ (Throop & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 405)

3.1.2. Source: a comitative coordinator with *mV* form

Comitative coordinators exist cross-linguistically; they are found in many Slavic languages (Polish (*z*), Russian (*s*), Bulgarian), in Old Norse, in Hungarian, etc.

In many Oceanic languages, comitative coordinators with a *mV* form are common; they may originate from former comitative verbs, reconstructed as Proto-Oceanic **ma-i* or **ma-ni* ‘be with’. They may head comitative conjuncts with agreement, and, in some languages, they also head comitative adjuncts without agreement, as in Tolai (Mosel 1984: 94), M̄ori, Niuean, East Futunan (Moyses-Faurie & Lynch 2004).

In many Northern Vanuatu languages, *mV* comitative coordinators have conjunctive and inclusory functions.

- (53) Hiw (Eastern Oceanic, Torres, North Vanuatu)

Kemāre mi Edga peon tō.
 1DU.EXCL and/with E. FUT go.INDIV
 :Edgar and I will go. ~ (François p.c.)

- (54) Lo-Toga (Eastern Oceanic, Torres, North Vanuatu)

Kemor mi²⁰ Edga tē ↑↓-v↔ ?
 1DU.EXCL and/with E. PROSP AOR.DU.go
 :Edgar and I will go. ~ (François p.c.)

In M̄ori, the conjoining function of the comitative/associative preposition *me* :with~ appears in older texts and is thus not an innovation, but the conjoining function has increased in modern speech (Bauer 1997: 550). *Me* conjoins humans (with group or generic reference) and inanimates, in all syntactic functions (subjects, direct or oblique objects). The choice between the comitative coordinator *me* (55a-b) or a summation dual pronoun (55c) does not carry any semantic difference.

- (55) M̄ori (Eastern Polynesian)

- a. *E kore [te tangata teina me te tūtūā] e tae atu*
 TAM NEG the man younger COM the low.born TAM arrive away
ki reira noho ai.
 to there sit PART
 ‘People of junior rank and low-born people could never go and sit there.’ (Bauer 1997: 547)
- b. *I haere atu [a Hone me Piri] ki te tangihanga.*
 TAM move away PERS John COM Bill to the tangi
 ‘John and Bill went to the tangi.’ (Bauer 1997: 552)

²⁰ In Lo-Toga, *mi* has extended its conjunctive function to clause conjunction (François, p.c.).

- c. *I haere atu [a Hone rāua ko Piri] ki te tangihanga.*
 TAM move away ART John 3DU SPEC Bill to the
 tangi
 ‘John and Bill went to the tangi.’ (Bauer 1997: 552)

The comitative preposition *me* also expresses set inclusion in Māori:

- d. *Ngā tāngata katoa i kata me te rangatira atu.*
 the.PL people all TAM laugh COM the chief away
 ‘All the people, including the chief, laughed.’ (Bauer 1997: 219)
- e. *Kua tika [katoa ngā kai me ngā mīti atu].*
 TAM right all the.PL food COM the.PL meat away
 ‘All the food, including the meat, should be ready now.’ (Bauer 1997: 219)

3.1.3. Source: a noun :companion, fellow[~]

Another source may be nouns meaning ‘companion, fellow[~]’ grammaticalised into a comitative marker. This is found for instance in many languages of North Vanuatu (Bank Islands); the marker is a reflex of a Proto-North Vanuatu etymon *tua ‘fellow’ (François p.c.).

- (56) Mwerlap (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Islands, North Vanuatu)

To-k i Edga s-van.
 COM-1SG ART E. AOR-go
 :Edgar and I will go.~ (François p.c.)

In Dorig, *ta-* appears in an inclusory construction (57a), or functions as a comitative coordinator (57b).

- (57) Dorig (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Islands, Gaua Island, North Vanuatu)

- a. *Kmur ta-ñ i sē s-van ?*
 2DU COM-2SG ART who PROSP-go
 :Who will you (sg) go with ?~ [lit. you2 your companion who will go?]
 (François p.c.)
- b. *I vve kmur ta-ñ i tma kmur.*
 ART mother 2DU COM-3SG ART father 2DU
 :your father and your mother~ (François p.c.)

In Vurës, the comitative marker (58a) has been further grammaticalised as an instrumental preposition *tek* with inanimate nouns (58b).

(58) Vurës (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Islands, North Vanuatu)

- a. (K↑m↑k) *te-k i Womtelo ma-van me.*
 1DU.EXCL COM-1SG ART W. PFV-go hither
 :I came with Womtelo. [lit. (we2) my-fellow Womtelo came here]
 (François p.c.)
- b. *Nē mō-bōl no tek o vin mōtō.*
 3SG PFV-hit 1SG INS ART skin palm-tree
 :He hit me with the bark of a palm-tree. (François p.c.)

3.1.4. Source: a verb :accompany, be with

In various Austronesian languages, these comitative markers are verbs or deverbal morphemes, reanalysed as coordinators triggering number agreement, such as *òra* ‘be with’ in Leti.

(59) Leti (Central Malayo-Polynesian, Timor, Southwest Maluku)

- a. [*Aii-òra piata=didi*] *ma-saava=mèka=e.*
 1SG-be.with woman=DX1 1PL.EXCL-marry=only=IDX
 ‘I just marry this woman here.’ (van Engelenhoven 2004: 254)
- b. [*Aii-òra=o*] *tata-ltìeri-nena=o.*
 1SG-be.with=2SG NEG.1PL.INCL-speak-RL=IND
 ‘We cannot speak with each other.’ (van Engelenhoven 2004: 255)
- c. [*Tutküèi n-òra Vatimíaa*] *ra-ara=e.*
 T. 3SG-be.with B. 3PL-war=IDX
 ‘Tutukei and Batumiau were at war (with each other or someone else)’ (van Engelenhoven 2004: 254)

In Tetun (Timor), the verb²¹ *hoo* ‘accompany, be with (person)’ has been reanalysed as a coordinator of co-actor NPs under the form *no* ‘and’ (from *n-o* [lit. 3sg-be with], a reduced third person singular form of *hoo*).

²¹ Another verb, *hodi* ‘bring, take, use’ has been reanalysed as a prepositional verb introducing instrument noun phrases, and as a coordinator of clauses (van Klinken 2000).

(60) Tetun-Fehan (SVO, Central Malayo-Polynesian, West Timor)

- a. *Ha'u k-oo emi.*
 1SG 1SG-be.with 2PL
 'I am with you.' (van Klinken 2000: 358)
- b. *Maromak la n-abusik lerek [emi no ha'u].*
 God NEG 3SG-leave.free forsake 2PL CONJ 1SG
 'God does not just abandon you and me.' (van Klinken 2000: 360)

Several other conjoining strategies have previously been mentioned in Tetun: two of them (the summation pronoun (4) and inclusory constructions (23)) are restricted to NPs with human reference; the comitative coordinator *hoo* is also more frequent than the coordinator *no* 'and' for human NP conjunction.

3.2. The status of *ma* in Nêlêmwa: a case study

This section will focus on the syntactic status of the connector *ma* in Nêlêmwa, based on my own data. *Ma* is one of several coordinators, among which two others (*me* and *xa*) have NP conjoining functions and will briefly be mentioned for comparison (see Brill 2002, 2004 for further details). *Ma* may mark standard coordination (62a) or inclusory coordination (61a), while *xa* is only additive (and also used in counting).

˘ Additive *xa* vs. inclusory *ma*

(61) Nêlêmwa

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>a. <i>Yaman ma axaleny.</i>
 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ this.one
 'Me and that man.' (<u>inclusion</u>)
 man.' (<u>addition</u>)</p> | <p>b. <i>Yaman xa axaleny.</i>
 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ this.one
 'The two of us and/plus that</p> |
|---|---|

˘ *Me* and *ma*

The comitative coordinator *ma* conjoins nouns referring to animates with close relationship (62), and triggers obligatory number agreement. Only *ma* may be used in inclusory constructions (61a) (never *me*, nor *xa*); *ma* never has any adjunctive function.

(62) Nêlêmwa (Bril fieldnotes)

Coxaada-me [*Aloe ma Mudae*] *me hli u fhe* [*waja*
go.up-VENT Aloe CONJ Mudae CONJ 3DU PFV take boat

[*Kaavo ma Teâ Pwayili*]].

Kaavo CONJ T. P.

‘Aloe and Mudae (two waves) rise up and take Kaavo and Teâ Pwayili’s boat.’

By contrast, the general coordinator *me* ‘and’ conjoins ± human NPs (as well as VPs and clauses, as in (62)). When conjoining NPs, it never has any inclusory function, and it may head a comitative adjunct without number agreement as in (63a) (*me* might be the reflex of POC **mai* ‘be with’). Compare the NPs conjoined with *ma* which trigger number agreement in the dual (63a), and the comitative adjunct (*pwaxi* ‘child’) headed by *me*, which is excluded from agreement. Similarly, in (63b), *me hlaaleny shâlaga* is an adjunct.

(63) Nêlêmwa (Bril fieldnotes)

- a. *Na [hli u muuvi mwâ [Kaavo Dela ma Teâ Pwayili]] me*
CONJ 3DU PFV stay then K. D. CONJ T. P. CONJ

aaxiik pwaxi-hli.

one child-POSS.3DU

‘And Kaavo Dela and Teâ Pwayili lived there and/with their child.’

- b. *Hli u oda-me hli me hlaaleny shâlaga i hli.*

3DU PFV go.up-VENT 3DU.FR CONJ these.DX1 crab CONN 3DU

‘They(2) come back, they(2) with their crabs.’

Several tests will be used to assess the conjunctive functions of *ma* in Nêlêmwa.

A] Extraction

Extraction (e.g. topicalization, focus or wh-movement) is commonly used to distinguish a coordinator from an adposition. An adposition may be stranded, not a coordinator: *who did you go with*?, but **who did you go and*? is ungrammatical. An NP may be extracted together with its adposition *with whom did you go*?, not with a coordinator **and who did you go*? The following test will bear on the properties of the comitative coordinator *ma* in comparison with the deverbal associative preposition *ve~vi* ‘with’ (from *fhe* ‘take, carry’). As far as focus movement goes, the preposition *ve~vi* and the comitative coordinator *ma* behave similarly, with

a resumptive anaphoric pronoun *in situ*, the main distinctive feature between them is number agreement (see Bril 2004: 512-513, for details). But in topicalization (64b), only *ma* behaves as a phrasal coordinator, *ve~vi* may not, as shown in (64c).

(64) Nêlêmwa (Bril fieldnotes)

- a. *Mo pîlla wuung yamon ma âlô-raamwa eli.*
 2DU stroll together 2DU.FR CONJ young-woman that.ANAPH
 ‘You took a walk together, you and that girl.’ (emphatic)
- b. [*Yamon ma âlô-raamwa eli*] *xe mo pwe wuung.*
 2DU.FR CONJ young-woman that.ANAPH TOP 2DU fish together
 ‘You and that girl, you took a walk together went fishing together.’
- c. *I fuk vi Kaavo* :he flew with Kaavo ˇ;
 but **ye vi Kaavo xe hli fuk* (intended meaning: :he with Kaavo, they flew ˇ) would be ungrammatical.

Agreement and extraction thus show that *ma* is a comitative coordinator, behaving differently from the comitative preposition *ve~vi*. Phrasal inclusory constructions such as (64a-b) are structurally asymmetrical, with an inclusory free pronoun including the reference to the *ma*-headed subset NP, yet number agreement highlights their semantic symmetry (they are co-agents with close relationship). Non-phrasal (split) inclusory constructions (such as (64d) or (26b)), without a superset free pronoun (contiguous to the *ma*-headed NP, as in (64a)) are structurally even more asymmetrical, yet the reference to the *ma*-headed NP (64d) is included in the number of the subject pronoun, as a conjunct not an adjunct.

- (64d) *O hî tu haga ma na xe yo haga co,*
 if 1DU.INCL go.down fish CONJ 1SG TOP 2SG fish 2SG.FR
bu fo idaama-m...
 as there.is eye-POSS.2SG
 ‘When we go fishing, (you) and/with me, you will be able to fish since you have your eyes ...’ (but what about me who have lost mine ?)

Example (64d) displays the strange occurrence of a 1st person subset pronoun (*na*), instead of the expected 2nd person (*co*, *yo*) in constructions with standard person hierarchy (see (64e):

- (64e) *O hî tu haga ma co*
 ‘when we go fishing, you (and me)’

This is contextual and has some pragmatic effect: in (64d) the speaker is blind and helpless, thus not in a leading position, but in the position of a subservient co-agent, which accounts for the occurrence of the *ma*-headed 1st person pronoun *na*. Otherwise, example (64d) is not structurally different from the standard inclusory construction in (64e) (see a similar construction in (26b-c) above), it just reverses the standard person hierarchy for semantic and pragmatic-argumentative (possibly contrastive) effect. In any case, the *ma*-headed subset NP is not an adjunct.

B] Iteration

Comitative adpositions are usually not iterable in listing, while coordinators may be. *Ma* in Nêlêmwa can be iterated (65a), exactly like the standard coordinator *me* (65b).

- (65) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

- a. ***Hla*** *oda-me hlaaleny aavak thaxamo i ye:*
 3PL go.up-VENT these.DX1 four wife CONN 3SG
horaamwaleny Naan ebai ma Naabuc ma Deedan
 this.woman.DX1 fly ANAPH CONJ mosquito CONJ horsefly
ma *Naalôp.*
 CONJ small.fly

‘His four wives come up here: this woman Fly, and Mosquito, and Horsefly, and small Fly.’ (Bril 2004: 506)

- b. *I xau mwêmwêlî roven hleena yada-va me yada*
 3SG ASS know all these.DX2 customs CONJ customs
fwamwa-va me kedoxa-va me.
 country-POSS.1PL.INCL CONJ medicine-POSS.1PL.INCL CONJ

‘She knows all our customs, and all the customs of our country, and our medicine and so on.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

By contrast, the comitative coordinator *me* in M̄ori cannot be iterated more than twice and seems to preserve more of its prepositional properties. Listing usually starts with juxtaposition and ends with one or two final *me*:

(66) M̄ori (Eastern Polynesian, Bauer 1997: 552)

...e whiu ana i te taonga nei, i te h̄puku [...],
 TAM collect TAM DO ART treasure near DO ART groper [ũ]

i te huahua kuku me te huahua k̄k̄
 DO ART preserved.game pigeon CONJ ART preserved.game kaka

me te huahua k̄aka.
 CONJ ART preserved.game godwit

‘they collected these treasures, groper [...] and preserved pigeon, kaka and godwit.’

3.3. Other tests of the syntactic status of the conjunctive morphemes

Some other distinctive properties will be considered. The first one concerns conjunct position and phrasal vs. non-phrasal properties.

3.3.1. Position: Contiguous vs. non-contiguous conjuncts

Are conjuncts obligatorily phrasal and contiguous, by contrast with adjuncts? NP conjuncts are often contiguous, but cross-linguistic data show that there is no universal constraint on the contiguity of conjuncts, and that non-contiguity is not an *a priori* argument against coordination. On the other hand, non-contiguous conjuncts may be banned by some language specific rules. In many Oceanic languages (among them Nêlêmwa), conjuncts in split inclusory constructions are non-phrasal and non-contiguous; and in Tolai, even standard coordinate NPs may be non-contiguous (67).

(67) Tolai (Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)

Telengai dir rovoi ma ra pap.
 Telengai 3DU hunt CONJ ART dog

‘Telengai and the dog hunted.’ (Mosel 1984:176)

In Nakanai, contiguous subject conjuncts indicate the concomitant involvement of the participants in an action or state, while non-contiguous subject conjuncts as in (68b) seem to indicate a slight shift of emphasis and

topicality²², the men being slightly less topical in (b);

- (68) Nakanai (Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)
- a. *E hatavile, la valalua, egite o-io po-pou.*
 ART women ART men 3PL at-there RED-sit
 ‘The women and the men are there waiting.’ (Johnston 1980: 243)
- b. *E hatavile o-io po-pou, la valalua.*
 ART women at-there RED-sit ART men
 ‘The women are there waiting, and the men.’ (Johnston 1980: 243)

Rather than position, the most reliable criterion for conjunction in Austronesian languages is number agreement with the conjuncts; though number agreement is known not to be a universal constraint either, since various language types choose single conjunct agreement with the nearest or furthest conjunct (in Slavic languages, for instance Russian or Polish (Corbett 2006), in Welsh (Sadler 2003)).

- Comitative conjunctions and the positional criterion

If contiguity is not fully criterial for standard conjunction, on the other hand, in Oceanic languages, contiguity and agreement are important factors for comitative adpositions to acquire conjoining functions and thus be disambiguated from their adjunctive function. In Mwotlap, for instance, the NP conjuncts must be contiguous for the comitative preposition *tiwag mi*²³ ‘together with’ to function as a coordinator (see (40e-f-g)). In Manam, the comitative postposition *záiza* has conjoining functions with number agreement if NPs are contiguous (69a), in contrast with (69b) where it is adjunctive.

- (69) Manam (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, PNG)
- a. [*?ái?o náita záiza*] *?a-pile-pile ?*
 2SG who COM 2PL.RL-speak-RED
 ‘Who are you speaking with?’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 432)
- b. *Anúa ne-∅ i-lá?o [nátu-∅ záiza].*
 village POSS-3SG 3SG-go child-3SG COM
 ‘She went to her village with her child.’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 376)
- c. [[*róa-∅-be nátu-∅*] *záiza*] *di-sin-sín-∅-to.*
 spouse-3SG.POSS-and child-3SG.POSS COM 3PL-drink-RED-3PL-PC
 ‘He used to drink them (coconuts) with his wife and child.’
 (Lichtenberk 1983: 376)

²² Johnston is not more specific in his description.

²³ *Tiwag* originally meant ‘one’ (François p.c.).

In (69c), *záiza* is also conjunctive as shown by the plural subject index referring to the three participants (including an unexpressed 3rd person singular participant), instead of the expected singular subject index if *záiza* were an adjunctive comitative postposition. *Záiza* functions as a set inclusion morpheme, while the standard coordinator *-be* conjoins the two members of the subset (spouse and child).

- Negative comitative constructions

The negative comitative construction (‘without’) expressing lack of accompaniment follows the same principle. Conjuncts are contiguous and the negation marker *tágo* has scope over the comitative conjunct headed by *záiza* (69d); note again the plural subject pronoun on the verb. Negative comitative may also be expressed by a negated coordinate construction marked by a summation pronoun (*dí-a-ru* in (69e)). The scope of the negation marker *tágo* is over the second conjunct.

(69d) [| *ái* [*tágo* *toʔá-ø* *záiza*] *dí-púra-to*.
 3SG.FR NEG older.brother-3SG COM 3PL.RL-arrive-PC
 ‘He came without his older brothers.’ (lit. he did not arrive with his older brothers)
 (Lichtenberk 1983: 432)

(69e) [| *ái* *tágo* *toʔá-ø* *dí-a-ru*] *dí-púra-ru*.
 3SG.FR NEG older.brother-3SG 3PL.FR-BF-DU 3PL.RL-arrive-DU
 ‘He arrived without his older brother.’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 275)

Both constructions trigger number agreement with the conjuncts in spite of the lack of co-agency or collective action. This is an additional argument to suggest that syntactic coordination overrides semantics. Similarly in French or in English, the actor NPs conjoined by *et* trigger plural number agreement even though the predicate is negated, *son frère et lui ne sont pas venus (ensemble/séparément)* :his brother and him have not come (together/separately)~, whereas the comitative adjunct of a negated predicate is not included in number agreement *il n’est pas venu avec son frère* :he has not come with his brother²⁴.

²⁴ Similarly, in Chilean Spanish, inclusory construction with *con* ‘with’ may be discontinuous (as in (a)), while in its conjoining function, the conjuncts are contiguous (b):
 (a) *fuiamos al mercado con mi amiga* ‘I went to the market with my friend’ [lit. went.we to the market with my friend];
 (b) [*yo con mi amiga*] *fuiamos al Mercado* ‘I with my friend we went to the market’ (Schwartz 1988).

3.3.2. Semantic tests: collective or distributive readings

Additive and comitative coordination tend to have slightly different semantics: additive coordination has a distributive ('each') or a collective reading, while comitative coordination tends to have a collective reading only, unless the comitative morpheme has undergone reanalysis as a full-fledged coordinator.

A] Collective and distributive readings of the conjunctive construction

Coordinators are compatible with a collective or a distributive reading and with adverbs such as 'together' or 'separately', whereas comitative/associative morphemes only have the collective reading. In Zuanga (neighbour of Nêlêmwa), the inclusory construction with the comitative coordinator *ma* is compatible with predicates with a collective or a distributive reading (70a-b). Compare with standard coordination in (70c).

(70) Zuanga/Yuanga (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

- a. *Bi a pe-haze ma ābaa-nu.*
1DU.EXCL go RECP-separate CONJ brother-POSS.1SG
'My brother and I went separately.' (Bril fieldnotes 2006)
- b. *Bi vara kibaò a-kò bwò ma ābaa-nu.*
1DU.EXCL each kill CLF-three bat CONJ brother-POSS.1SG
'My brother and I killed three bats each.' (Bril fieldnotes 2006)
- c. *Li a kaze [Kaavo ma Hiixe].*
3DU go fish Kaavo CONJ Hiixe
'Kaavo and Hiixe go fishing.' (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

The use of inclusory constructions for NP conjunction involving a pronoun and a noun is receding among younger Zuanga speakers, who tend to use standard coordination with a non-inclusory free pronoun in sentence topic position as in (70d); this type of construction is ungrammatical in neighbouring Nêlêmwa. Thus inclusory constructions with comitative conjunctions tend to evolve towards standard coordination in some northern New Caledonian languages.

(70d) [*Ije ma moo-je*] *li uda no mwa.*
3SG.FR CONJ wife-3SG 3DU enter in house
'He and his wife, they went into the house.' (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

In Fijian, the comitative conjunction *kei* 'and, with' is also compatible with the collective or distributive readings:

(71) Fijian (Central Pacific)

- a. *Keirau lako kei Samu.*
IDU.EXCL go CONJ Samu
'Samu and I are going.' (Milner 1967: 67)
- b. *Erau sã dui kania na kona ika [ko Jone kei Filipe].*
3DU EMPH each eat ART his fish ART Jone CONJ Filipe
'Jone and Filipe are each eating their own fish.' (Milner 1967, in Payne 1985: 22)

B] Predicate semantics

Predicate semantics is another possible discriminating factor: motion and action verbs favour the collective reading of a coordinate expression such as *John and I ran away*, interpreted by default as 'ran together', and which is also expressible as a comitative construction *I ran away with John* in English. On the other hand, property predicates tend to favour the distributive reading of a coordinate expression such as *my brother and I are tall*, and exclude the collective reading or a comitative construction (such as **I am tall with my brother*). The comitative construction becomes slightly more acceptable with inclusory pronouns (?*we are tall with my brother*) provided that the property is conceived as a shared or symmetrical property; 'with' then signals set inclusion, not standard comitative adjunction. English existential-possessive predicates allow both the distributive and the collective reading of a coordinate expression, as in *my brother and I have a house* (each or in common); the collective reading is also expressible as a comitative construction *I/we have a house with my brother*. In Zuanga (72) and Nêlêmwa (73), inclusory constructions with the comitative conjunction *ma*, are compatible with property predicates²⁵ and accept a distributive or a collective reading when they refer to some shared or similar property. The important point is that *ma* expresses set inclusion, not comitative adjunction.

²⁵ Schwartz (1988: 69-70) also notes that in Chilean Spanish property predicates may appear in inclusory constructions with *con* 'with' expressing set inclusion: *somos altos con mi hermano* 'my brother and I are tall' [lit. we are tall with my brother], *nos gusta el jazz con mi hermano* 'my brother and I like jazz' [lit. we like jazz with my brother].

(72) Zuanga/Yuanga (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

- a. *Bi enō ma ābaa-nu.*
1DU.EXCL young CONJ brother-POSS-1SG
'My brother and I are young.' (Bril fieldnotes 2006)
- b. *Kixa mwani-bi ma ābaa-nu.*
there.is.no money-POSS.1DU.EXCL CONJ brother-POSS-1SG
'My brother and I are poor [lit. there is no money of ours including my brother].'

(73) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

Pe-kau-ma ma Polie.
RECP-year-1DU.EXCL CONJ Polie
'Polie and I are the same age.' [lit. (it is) our_{DUAL} reciprocal age including Polie] (Bril 2002)

4. Competing strategies in Austronesian languages: standard coordination, inclusory constructions, comitative coordination

Many Austronesian languages display various competing strategies for (i) standard coordination, (ii) inclusory constructions, (iii) comitative conjunction, and (iv) comitative adjunction. All four types may be marked by different morphemes and different constructions; other Austronesian languages make use of one single morpheme whose various functions are distinguished by agreement or position.

4.1. Languages with multiple morphemes and constructions

In Austronesian languages, the chosen strategy is sensitive to the category of the conjuncts (pronouns or nouns), to semantic properties (\pm animate, tight vs. loose relationship) and to pragmatic properties (\pm even saliency).

In Kairiru, the summation pronoun strategy (see ex. (7)) is restricted to humans with close relationship; NPs referring to humans, like other NPs, may also conjoined by the standard coordinator *bo* 'and'. If unequal control is involved, a comitative adjunct is then used (74).

(74) Kairiru (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New Guinea cluster, East Sepik, PNG)

Nat a-fwat nau qeq-au kyau.
child 3SG-bathe sea COM-1SG 1SG
'The child bathed in the sea with me.' (Implied meaning: I hold him)
(Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 213)

Here are further examples of competing strategies in a sample of (mostly Western) Oceanic languages.

4.1.1. Maleu

In Maleu, free pronouns and nouns may be conjoined by *me* 'and' (75a), or expressed as inclusory constructions (75b-c) marking close relationship between persons or kin.

(75) Maleu (Western Oceanic, North New Guinea cluster)

- a. *Iou me Vulum.*
1SG.FR and Vulum
'Vulum and I.' (Haywood 1996: 168)
- b. *Iami-lua Vulum.*
2PL.FR-two Vulum
'You and Vulum.' (Haywood 1996: 169)
- c. *Ire-lua tivu-a.*
3PL.FR-two grand-father-POSS.3SG
'He and his grand-father.' (Haywood 1996: 169)

Inclusory construction or coordination with *me* require conjuncts with identical properties, otherwise triggering the use of comitative verbs (in complex verb constructions, (75d)) and instrumental strategies (75e). These strategies express differences of rank, topicality or other semantic differences.

(75d) *Ku-moi ta-re|e ta-ualiu.*
2SG-come 1PL.INCL-be.with 1PL.INCL-wash
'Come and bathe with us.' (lit. come be with us we bathe) (Haywood 1996: 180)

This comitative verb is reanalysed as a deverbal preposition, sometimes involving metathesis, from *ti-re|e* (3sg be.with) to *ti|ere* 'with'.

(75e) *na-melamela ti|ere tna-re*
NM-children COM mother-POSS.3PL
'the children with their mother' (Haywood 1996: 180)

4.1.2. Mangap-Mbula

In Mangap-Mbula, pronouns and nouns may be conjoined by a summation pronoun (76a) when the participants are co-agents or co-experiencers of the event, though with a slight topical asymmetry and a slightly less topical conjunct to the right of the conjunctive summation pronoun.

(76) Mangap-Mbula (SVO, Western Oceanic, North New Guinea cluster)

- a. [*Nio niamru wae-*] *am-la*.
 1SG.FR 1DU.EXCL associate-POSS.1SG 1PL.EXCL-go
 ‘I, together with my wife, went.’ (Bugenhagen 1995: 114)

Nouns and pronouns may be conjoined by the NP coordinator *ma* or *mi* ‘and’²⁶ (76b), expressing equal prominence and topicality.

- (76b) [*Nio ma abu mi Matias*] *am-la*
 1SG.FR CONJ grand-mother CONJ M. 1PL.EXCL-go
mokleene tiama.
 taro.place LOC.1PL.EXCL.N.VIS.PROX.
 ‘I and my grandmother and Matias went to our garden.’ (Bugenhagen 1995: 395)

- (76c) *Ata ma Namoj*o *ti-mar ti-re yam*.
 Ata CONJ Namojo 3PL-come 3PL-see 1PL.EXCL
 ‘Ata and Namojo came to see us.’ (Bugenhagen 1995: 213)

Unequal syntactic and semantic status triggers a comitative adjunct, marked by *raama* ‘together, with’, without number agreement (76d-e).

- (76d) *Ni i-mbot raama zin buzur sa|sa|-|a-n*.
 3SG.FR 3SG-stay COM PL animal wild-NMLZ-GEN.3PL
 ‘(S)he stayed with the wild animals.’ (Bugenhagen 1995: 213)

- (76e) *Ni ko i-mbot raama yom totomen*.
 3SG.FR UNC 3SG-stay COM 2PL always
 ‘He will always be with you.’ (Bugenhagen 1995: 114)

²⁶ *Ma* is used for formulaic conjuncts of equal topicality, or for commonly or naturally associated entities; *mi* is used for more arbitrary conjuncts or lists, and for clauses (Bugenhagen, 1995: 214).

4.1.3. Tawala

In Tawala, there are three main coordinating strategies, using two standard coordinators, *po* and *ma* 'and' (77a), or a comitative conjunction *mite-* 'with' (77b-c). *Po* is more commonly used for NP conjuncts with tight relationship, while *ma* conjoins NPs with looser relationship, and clauses (Ezard 1997: 155, 199). *Ma* has additive and distributive meanings. Compare (i) and (ii):

- (i) *amau po hinau* 'my father and mother, my parents' (there is no other term for 'parents')
- (ii) *amau ma hinau* 'my father and/plus my mother'.

Nouns and pronouns are also conjoined by these coordinators, without requiring an inclusory construction.

(77) Tawala (SO sVo, Western Oceanic, Papuan Tip cluster, Milne Bay, New Guinea)

- a. *Tau ma Mika.*
1SG.FR CONJ Mika
'Mika and I.' (Ezard 1997: 157)
- b. *Taumi mite-u ta-kaoha.*
2PL.FR with-1SG 1PL.INCL-happy
'Let's be happy together.' (Ezard 1997: 159)
- c. *Tau mite-mi ta-memae.*
1SG.FR with-2PL 1PL.INCL-stay
'I and you are staying together.' (Ezard 1997: 160)

The comitative conjunction *mitehi* (from *mite-hi* 'with-3PL') functions as a postpositional conjunction and as a set inclusion morpheme indicating co-agentive conjuncts. It may be combined with *po* and *ma* (77e).

(77d) *Bada natu-na mitehi hi-nei.*
man child-3SG together 3PL-came
'The man came with his child.' (Ezard 1997: 158)

(77e) *Tau ma Bryan a manago mitehi to-gelu.*
1SG.FR CONJ B. POSS.3SG family together 1PL.EXCL-embark
'I and Bryan and his family got on board.' (Ezard 1997: 159)

There are further differences: *po* and *ma* are medial coordinators [NP *po* ~ *ma* NP], while *mitehi* is postposed to the second conjunct [NP NP *mitehi*]. The negative comitative 'without' is expressed by the negation marker *ega* which has scope on the comitative conjunct [NP [*ega* NP *mitehi*]] (lit. [NP [not NP together]]), as in Manam (69d). Comitative conjunction and set inclusion with *mitehi* is further distinguished from comitative adjunction which is marked by a preposition *a* 'with', without number agreement and referring to subservient actors (1997: 158).

4.1.4. Numèè (New Caledonia)

New Caledonian languages generally distinguish a comitative conjunction 'and/with' triggering number agreement with the conjuncts and expressing co-agentivity, from an associative preposition 'with' marking associative adjuncts. Comitative conjuncts and adjuncts express not only differences in agency, but also in topicality and animacy (see *vi* vs. *ma* in Nêlêmwa (64b-c)). Numèè has several coordinators, the focus here will be on two of them, *mê* and *mô*. *Mê* is the standard coordinator which conjoins (\pm animate) NPs, possibly with listing effect (78a-b), as well as clauses. *Mô* 'and, with' is both conjunctive and adjunctive²⁷, its functions are distinguished by number agreement, as shown by (78c vs. 78e-f). As a comitative conjunction, it conjoins all types of nouns, proper or common, \pm animate.

(78) Numèè (Far South New Caledonia)

- a. *N^o ngê wè m^oê kà m^oê yàre m^o.*
 3PL TRANSL do VENT food and fishing and
 'They bring food and fish.' (Rivierre p.c.)
- b. *N^o mw | tùu vâ niikwêrê m^o vië m^o wawèré kô.*
 3PL then board group child and woman and everyone on.top
 'They board the children women and everyone on them (boats).'
- c. [*Kwaraa mô Kwâjoro*] *wéé ngâ | xîro ng^o triié ?*
 K. and K. INTERJ 2DU pole(boat) with who?
 'Kwaraa and Kwâjoro wééé ! who are you(2) travelling with ?'
 (Rivierre p.c.)

²⁷ Also marking complement of comparative :

Yaagu mên vé-tété mô nê. 'You won't be similar to them.'
 NEG 2SG FUT be.similar with 3PL

- d. ... *pàkanô-é* *wè-karéé* *mô* *kumwà* *mô dé*.
 corn-this full.maturity and sweet.potato and sugar-cane
 ‘... full of fully mature corn-cobs and sweet potatoes and sugar-cane..’ (Rivierre p.c.)
- e. *Ékwêré* *nyaarè* *m*^o *gu* *v*^o *mô* *ékwêré* *bwè* *vî*^o *wé*
ékwêré.
 1DU.EXCL want COMP 2SG come with 1DU.EXCL to be.wife of
 1DU.EXCL
 ‘We(2) would like you to come with us to become our wife.’
 (Rivierre p.c.)
- f. *mw* | *nyî* *ba* *trə* *mô* *nyô*^o...
 then 3SG ASS stay with woman-this
 ‘.. then he stays with this woman ...’ (Rivierre p.c.)

Comitative~associative (78c) (and instrumental) adjuncts (78g) are also marked by the preposition *ngê* ‘with’, the adjunct has subservient or patientive features.

- (78g) *à* *nyî* *ngê* *tùù* *mwêé* *m*^o *ng*^o *ŋu* *ngê*
 and 3SG TRANSL go.down again VENT with knife this
mô *w* *butrii* *ngê* *mwêé*.
 and basket this again
 ‘and she runs down again towards the shore with her knife and basket.’ (Rivierre p.c.)

4.2. Languages with a unique morpheme distinguished by number agreement

On the other hand, many other Oceanic languages display a single morpheme for this range of functions: (i) standard coordination, (ii) comitative conjunction, (iii) comitative ~ associative, and sometimes instrumental adjunction. Number agreement, position or a lexical device (such as collective adverbs ‘together’) may disambiguate the conjunctive from the adjunctive functions. Among such languages are Samoan (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 148), Fijian, Drehu and Iaii (Loyalty Islands, New Caledonia), Xârâcùù²⁸ (South New Caledonia), most Polynesian languages (Lynch & Moyse-Faurie 2004). The functions of this polyfunctional morpheme sometimes extends to inclusory constructions, then expressing

²⁸ The coordinator coexists with co-agentive comitative prepositions or associative non-co-agentive, *wérè* (+animate), *kèrè* (+/-animate) without agreement (Moyse-Faurie, 1995: 140).

set inclusion (Tolai, North New Caledonian languages), and possibly to VP or clausal coordination²⁹ as an :and̃ coordinator.

In Tolai, *ma* displays this full range of functions, which are distinguished by agreement (Mosel, 1984: 94, 175-76): coordinator (of NPs, VPs and clauses), inclusory conjunction, adjunctive marker with comitative, instrumental or associative meaning, also expressing part-whole relationship (he ate the banana with the skin), or causal relationship (they suffered with/from hunger, full of/with fish).

In Fijian, *kei*~*̃ei* :with, and̃ also has a wide range of functions: standard NP coordination (79a), inclusory conjunction (set inclusion) (79b), comitative adjunction without agreement (79c). Inclusory conjunction (79b) is used for noun-pronoun conjunction, but Dixon (1988: 157-160) notes that it seems to be receding among younger speakers who increasingly use the comitative adjunct construction as in (79c).

(79) Standard Fijian (Central Pacific)

- a. *Erau lako mai [na turaga kei na watina].*
3DU move here ART chief CONJ ART wife
 'The chief and his wife are coming.' (Payne 1985: 29)
- b. *Keirau a vei-vosa-ki kaya*³⁰.
1DU.EXCL PAST DISTR-talk-TR KEI.3SG
 'I talked with him.' (Churchward, 1941: 42, in Schütz 1995: 354)
- c. *Au aa vei-vosa-ki kaya.*
1SG PAST DISTR-talk-TR KEI.3SG
 'I talked with him.' (Milner, 1972: 68, in Schütz 1995: 354)

Dixon (1988: 157-160) also notes a growing tendency to use *vata* ~*̃ei* instead of ~*̃ei* alone:

Boumaa Fijian (Central Pacific)

- (79d) *Au aa sota vata ̃ei Jone mai Viidawa.*
1SG PAST meet together with John at Viidawa
 'I met up with John at Viidawa.' (Dixon 1988: 159)

²⁹ Like *me* in Iaii (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976) and *ma* in Nemi (Ozanne-Rivierre 1979).

³⁰ The form *kaya* is analysable as *kei* + 3sg pronoun.

Because of these two coexisting patterns (inclusory and adjunctive), Dixon (1988) and Schütz (1995:354) point out that sentences such as (79e) become ambiguous as to the number of people involved, two (in the inclusory reading) or three (in the adjunctive reading) ?

Standard Fijian (Central Pacific)

- (79e) *Drau aa lako kei Samu.*
2DU PAST go CONJ S.
'You and Samu went.' (Milner 1972: 68; in Schütz 1995: 354) (or: you.2 and Samu went)

Inclusory constructions are unstable and often undergo reanalysis. I have outlined some of these changes in a previous article (Bril 2004: 528-529) and shown either the reanalysis of the inclusory pronoun as a comitative marker, or the decay of the construction once the inclusory pronoun has been replaced by a non-inclusory free pronoun in a standard phrasal coordinate construction, as in Fijian (79c).

Similarly, in Zuanga, younger speakers increasingly use a comitative adjunct with the singular pronoun *e* '(s)he' (80a), instead of the expected inclusory dual pronoun *li* 'they2' found in the inclusory construction still in use among older speakers (80b):

(80) Yuanga/Zuanga (North New Caledonia)

- a. *E uda nō mwa mǎ ti ?*
3SG enter in house COM who?
'Who did he enter the house with ?' (Bril Fieldnotes 2007)
- b. *Li uda nō mwa mǎ ti ?*
3SG enter in house COM who?
'Who did he enter the house with ?' (Bril Fieldnotes 2007)

A similar evolution was noted in Nyelâyu where the inclusory construction (81a) is increasingly replaced by standard coordination (81b):

(81) Nyelâyu (North New Caledonia)

- a. *Hor ma ri ?*
2DU and/with who?
'You (sg.) and/with whom?' (Ozanne-Rivierre 1998: 119)
- b. *Yo ma ri ?*
2SG and/with who?
'You (sg.) and/with whom?' (Ozanne-Rivierre 1998: 119)

5. Final discussion

All the discussed Austronesian languages show coordination and display various conjoining strategies, often within the same language (as shown in table 2 below), varying with (i) topicality or pragmatic effects, (ii) syntactic constraints, or (iii) semantic properties (higher animacy, close relationship, co-agency). Coordination may be \pm syndetic, according to the type of conjuncts (\pm animate, nouns or pronouns). When syndetic, the markers may be standard additive coordinators, comitative coordinators or summation pronouns.

If contiguity of the conjuncts is not an absolute prerequisite for standard (\pm syndetic) coordination “provided that discontinuity is compensated on by some other device like number agreement”, on the other hand, contiguous conjuncts are a prerequisite for a comitative adposition to be reanalysed and to function as a full coordinator (like *záiza* in Manam). Inclusory constructions with their set inclusion pattern stand in some medial position on the cline between prototypical NP coordination and prototypical comitative constructions, and are compatible with \pm contiguous conjuncts.

Contiguity and number agreement generally express close relationship and similar roles or properties, such as co-agency, otherwise adjunctive constructions are used. Inclusory constructions display specific properties and may be subject to various semantic and syntactic constraints. Among the semantic constraints is their universal restriction to NPs referring to higher animates: some languages restrict their use to co-agentive animates (though sometimes with a slight topical asymmetry), other languages extend their use to other semantic roles and syntactic functions. Among the syntactic constraints is the frequent (but non-universal) ban on noun-pronoun conjunction, as in Nêlêmwa and other northern New Caledonian languages. In languages without any such ban, the choice between inclusory constructions and standard coordination mostly correlates with discourse or pragmatic effects: coordination is chosen to express equal topicality, saliency or emphasis, otherwise inclusory constructions are used, expressing set inclusion.

Coordinate constructions may be \pm symmetrical, as evidenced cross-linguistically by various types and degrees of conjunct asymmetry. Inclusory constructions display one type of asymmetry between the superset and its specifying subset which is often headed by a comitative coordinator.

Cline of asymmetry between conjuncts

Lesser asymmetry		"		Higher asymmetry
Standard NP	"	phrasal	"	non-phrasal
coordination		±syndetic		inclusionary

The comitative conjunction used in syndetic inclusionary constructions stand in a medial position on the cline between prototypical coordination and prototypical comitative adjunction. Its conjoining function is clearly marked by set inclusion agreement. Compatibility with distributive or collective adverbs, or with verbs with similar semantics, help disambiguate the function and meaning of these comitative conjunctive markers.

Table 1 below sums up the conjunctive or adjunctive functions of the morphemes used in the Oceanic languages of the sample, concentrating on morphemes with the form *pV*, *bV*, *mV* and *kV*³¹.

Table 1. Functions of the *pV*, *bV*, *mV* or *kV* morphemes in some Oceanic languages

	Inclusionary	Coordinating	Comitative adjunct	Associative	Instrumental
Nakanai	<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>			
Maleu		<i>me</i>		<i>me</i>	
Mangap-mbula		<i>ma, mi</i>			
Manam		<i>-be</i>			
Tawala		<i>po, ma</i>			
Tolai	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>
Toqabaqita		<i>ma</i>			
Mwotlap		<i>ba</i>			<i>mi</i>
		<i>tiwag mi</i>	<i>tiwag mi</i>	<i>tiwag mi</i>	
Nêlêmwa	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma, me</i>	<i>me</i>		
Zuanga/Yuanga	<i>mā</i>	<i>mā, mani</i>	<i>mani</i>	<i>mani</i>	<i>mani</i>
Nyêlâyû	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>
Nemi	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>		
Bwato	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>			
Cêmûhî	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>			
Ajië		<i>ma</i>			
Xârâcùù	<i>mê</i>	<i>mê</i>	<i>mää</i>		
Numèè		<i>mô, mê</i>	<i>mô</i>	<i>mô</i>	
Drehu, Iaa	<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>		
Fijian	<i>kei</i>	<i>kei</i>	<i>kei</i>		
Samoan	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>		
Tahitian		<i>mā</i>	<i>mā</i>		
Māori		<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>		

³¹ These morphemes are often cognates (see Lynch *et al.* 2002, Moyse-Faurie & Lynch 2004).

Table 2 sums up the various conjunctive or adjunctive constructions used in some Austronesian languages of the sample.

Table 2. Construction Types

	Inclusive asyndetic	Inclusive syndetic	Coordination asyndetic	Coordination syndetic	Summation pronoun
Atayal		+		+	+
Leti				+	
Tetun	+			+	+
Papuan Malay	+				+
Kairiru			+	+	+
Kaulong				+	+
Nakanai	+	+	+	+	
		(+pronouns)			
Maleu	+			+	
Mangap-Mbula	+			+	+
Manam	+		+	+	+
Tawala				+	
Toqabaqita	+		+	+	
Mwotlap	+			+	+
Nêlêmwa, Zuanga/Yuanga		+		+	
Nyêlâyü		+		+	
Nemi		+			
Bwattoo		+		+	
Ajië	+			+	
Numèè				+	
Tolai		+		+	
Fijian		+		+	
Samoan		+		+	+
Tahitian	+			+	+
Māori	+			+	+

References

- Aissen, Judith. 1989. Agreement controllers and Tzotzil comitatives. *Language* 65:518-36.
- Bauer, Winifred. 1997. *The Reed Reference Grammar of M̄ori*. Auckland: Reed Publishing.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2002. *Le n̄l̄mwa (Nouvelle-Cal̄donie) : Analyse syntaxique et s̄mantique*. Paris: Peeters (Collection 'Langues et Cultures du Pacifique', n° 16).
- ´ 2004. Coordination strategies and inclusory constructions in New Caledonian and other Oceanic languages. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating constructions*. 499-534.
- Bugenhagen, Robert D. 1995. *A Grammar of Mangap-Mbula: An Austronesian Language of Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: The Australian National University (Pacific Linguistics A-82).
- Corbett, Greville G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Churchward, C. Maxwell. 1941. *A new Fijian Grammar*. Suva: Government Printer.
- Dixon, Robert M.W. 1988. *A grammar of Boumaa Fijian*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Donohue, Mark. Forthcoming. Papuan Malay. In Orin Gensler, ed., *Malay/Indonesian linguistics*. London: Curzon Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2003. *Bininj Gun-Wok: a pan-dialectal grammar of Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune* (2 vol.). Pacific Linguistics, 541. Canberra: Australian National University. 419-20.
- Ezard, Bryan. 1997. *A Grammar of Tawala, An Austronesian language of the Milne Bay area, Papua New Guinea*. Pacific Linguistics C-137, Canberra : Australian National University.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2004. *The Syntax of Old Norse*. Oxford University Press. 89-90.
- François, Alexandre. 2001. *Contraintes de structures et libert̄ dans l'organisation du discours: Une description du mwotlap, langue oc̄eanienne du Vanuatu*. Doctoral dissertation, Universit̄ Paris-IV Sorbonne. 3 vol.
- Haspelmath, Martin (ed.). 2004. *Coordinating constructions*. (Typological studies in Language 58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haywood, Graham. 1996. A Maleu grammar outline and text. In M. Ross (ed.). *Studies in Languages of New Britain and New Ireland. Vol. 1: Austronesian languages of the North New Guinea Cluster in Northwestern New Britain*. Pacific Linguistics, C-135. Canberra: Australian National University. 145-196.
- Huang, Lilian. 2006. 'Case-marking system in Pngawan Atayal', in Hon. of Prof. Li, *Streams converging into an ocean*. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series, N° W-5, 205-238. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, Raymond L. 1980. *Nakanai of New Britain. The Grammar of an Oceanic language*. Pacific Linguistics B-70. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Lazard, Gilbert & Louise Peltzer, 2000. *Structure de la langue tahitienne*. Paris, Louvain: Peeters, LCP 15, SELAF 391.
- Leenhardt, Maurice. 1932. *Documents n̄o-cal̄doniens*. Travaux et m̄moires de l'Institut d'Ethnologie, IX. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1983. *A grammar of Manam*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications 18. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- ´ 2000. Inclusory pronominals. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39, 1: 1-32.
- Lynch, John, Malcolm D. Ross and Terry Crowley. 2002. *The Oceanic Languages*.

- Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- McNally, Louise. 1993. Comitative Coordination: A Case Study in Group Formation. *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory*, 11: 347-379.
- Milner, George B. 1967. *Fijian grammar*. Suva, Fiji: Government Press. [3rd edition 1972].
- Mithun, Marianne. 1986. Disagreement: the case of pronominal affixes and nouns. *Proceedings of the Georgetown University Round Table Conference on Languages and Linguistics* 1985. Deborah Tannen & James E. Alatis (eds), 50-66. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
1988. The grammaticization of coordination. In Haiman, J. & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.). *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. 331-359.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 2003. A semantic analysis of associative plurals. *Studies in Language* 27:469-503.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 1984. *Tolai syntax and its historical development*. Pacific Linguistics, Series B 92. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Mosel, Ulrike and Even Hovdhaugen. 1992. *Samoan reference grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire. 1983. *Le drehu, langue de Lifou (Iles Loyauté)*. LCP 3. Paris: SELAF.
1995. *Le xârâcùù, langue de Thio-Canala (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*. LCP 10. Paris: SELAF.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire and John Lynch. 2004. Coordination in Oceanic languages and Proto Oceanic. In: Haspelmath, Martin (ed.), *Coordinating Constructions*. 445-497.
- Osumi, Midori. 1995. *Tinrin grammar (New Caledonia)*. Oceanic Linguistics Special publication 25. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Ozanne-Rivierre, Françoise. 1976. *Le iaai. Langue mélanésienne d'Ouvéa (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*. Paris: SELAF 30.
1979. *Textes nemi, Nouvelle-Calédonie (Vol.1)*. Paris: SELAF 31.
1998. *Le nyelâyu de Balade (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*. LCP 12. Paris: Peeters.
2004. "The Evolution of the Verb :take~ in New Caledonian Languages". In: Brill, Isabelle and Ozanne-Rivierre, Françoise (eds.). *Complex predicates in Oceanic languages: Studies in the dynamics of binding and boundness*. EALT 29, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Payne, John R. 1985. Complex phrases and complex sentences. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description II: Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-41.
- Rivierre, Jean-Claude. 1980. *La langue de Touho. Phonologie et grammaire du cèmuhi*. TO 30. Paris: SELAF.
- Rivierre, Jean-Claude, Ehrhart Sabine, Diéla R. 2006. *Le bwatoo et les dialectes de la région de Koné (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*. LCP 17, SELAF 435.
- Sadler, Louisa. 2003. Coordination and Asymmetric Agreement in Welsh. In Miram Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds), *Nominals: Inside and Out*. CSLI Publications, 85-118.
- Schütz, Albert J. 1985. *The Fijian Language*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schwartz, Linda. 1988a. Conditions on verb-coded coordinations. In Michael Hammond, Edith Moravcsik & Jessica Wirth (eds), *Studies in syntactic typology*, 53-73. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1988b. Asymmetric feature distributions in pronominal 'coordinations'. In Michael Barlow & Charles A. Ferguson (eds), *Agreement in Natural Language*, 237-49.

- Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Singer, Ruth. 2001. *Inclusory constructions in Australian Languages*. Honours thesis, Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Stassen, Leon. 2000. "AND-languages and WITH-languages". *Linguistic Typology* 4. Walter de Gruyter. 1-54.
- ' 2001. Noun phrase coordination. In: *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Vol. 2. Mouton de Gruyter.
- ' 2003. Noun phrase conjunction. In F. Plank (ed.) *Noun Phrase Structure in the languages of Europe*. 761-817.
- Tryon, Darrell. 1970. *Conversational Tahitian*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Van Engelenhoven, Aone. 2004. *Leti, a Language of Southwest Maluku*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Van Klinken, Catharina L. 1999. *A grammar of the Fehan dialect of Tetun, An Austronesian language of West Timor*. Pacific Linguistics C-155, Canberra: Australian National University.
- ' 2000. From verb to coordinator in Tetun. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39, 2 : 350-363.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.