Programme for *Continuity and Change: Grammars of the Pacific*

The whole workshop will take place in the Coombs Extension Building Room 1.04

Saturday 27 October 2012		
Time	**Presenter**	**Title**
9:30-9:45	Bethwyn Evans	welcome
9:45-10:30	Rachel Hendery	Change in verb agreement patterns in Palmerston Island English
10:30-11:00		*morning tea*
11:00-11:45	Åshild Næss	From Austronesian voice to Oceanic transitivity: Äiwoo as the "missing link"
11:45-12:30	Jason Brown and Karsten Koch	FOCUS and Polynesian *ko
12:30-1:30		*lunch*
1:30-2:30	**Jeff Siegel**	**Keynote Talk** **Language transfer and grammatical change: Evidence from Pacific contact varieties**
2:30-3:00		*afternoon tea*
3:00-4:00	Discussion 1	Regional research priorities

Sunday 28 October 2012		
Time	**Presenter**	**Title**
9:30-10:00	Bethwyn Evans	Change in object marking: possible motivations
10:00-10:30	Deborah Hill	Overt Subject NPs in Longgu: clause structure and discourse patterns over time
10:30-11:00		*morning tea*
11:00-11:45	Ellen Smith	Southern Bougainville versus Northern Bougainville: similarities in contact-induced grammatical change phenomena in four Northwest Solomonic languages
11:45-12:15	Rachel Hendery	Discussion: a database for Pacific grammatical change?

12:15-1:15	*lunch*	
1:15-2:15	**Frank Lichtenberk**	**Keynote Talk** **Complementation in Oceanic: Focus on complementisers**
2:15-3:15	Discussion 2	Transregional themes and wrap-up
3:15-3:45	*afternoon tea*	

Abstracts (alphabetical)

FOCUS and Polynesian *ko

Jason Brown, University of Auckland
Karsten Koch, University of Calgary

In Polynesian, we find a structure in which a nominal preceded by *ko may precede the verb under certain pragmatic conditions. The majority of Polynesian languages are predicate-initial, and *ko structures are striking in that they allow for a nominal to precede the lexical predicate. While there have been many (often language specific) morpho-syntactic accounts of these structures, we offer a novel account of *ko that is grounded in formal semantics. This predicts that the various syntactic structures that *ko surfaces in across the Polynesian languages will nevertheless share a common semantics: *ko marks FOCUS.

We make the strong claim that *ko has a uniform semantics in that it marks a morphosyntactic FOCUS feature. FOCUS identifies the nominal following it as the relevant nominal to be contrasted with a set of discourse alternatives (e.g. Rooth 1992). This formal semantic approach predicts certain patterns of behaviour in *ko structures: (i) they should focus the constituent following them (which we expect to be described as adding "emphasis," "contrast," etc., in the existing literature, e.g. (1)); (ii) they should display parallels to wh-questions, which are inherently FOCUS marked (2); (iii) they should display question-answer congruence (e.g. in a question-answer sequence, wh-questions and *ko structures should FOCUS mark the same nominal (3)); (iv) they should interact with FOCUS sensitive operators like *only*, in that *only* must be interpreted semantically with *ko-marked nominals (and not nominals that are in situ in VSO structures (4)); and (v) they can mark topics (5), which are inherently FOCUS marked (e.g. Büring 1997).

(1) ko   ta-ku   tamaiti tee kaa   hano. *Rarotongan (E. Polynesian)*
    ko   dominant.possession-1SG child   DEF INCEPTIVE   go
    'It is my child who will go.' (Yasuda 1968:84)
(2) 'O le ā   le   mea   'ua   tupu?   *Samoan (Samoic-Outlier)*
    ko   ART what ART thing PERF happen
    'What is the thing that happened?' (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992:489, ex. 10.203)
(3) Q: 'O wai ke kumu? A: 'O Kimo ke kumu   *Hawaiian (E. Polynesian)*
    ko   who the teacher ko   Jim   the teacher
    'Who's the teacher?' 'Jim is the teacher.' (Elbert & Pukui 1979:120)

(4) Ò ia anaiho à taù   *North Marquesan (E. Polynesian)*
ko he only INT mine.PAST.know
'He is the only one indeed that I know.' (Mutu & Teikitutoua 2002: 87 – Ùa Pou dialect)
(5) Ko Mele na'a ne kaiha'asi 'a e ika *Tongan (Tongic)*
ko_{TOPIC} Mele PAST 3PERS steal ABS DET fish
'Mele_{TOPIC}, she stole the fish.' (Custis 2004:124-125)

We offer a comprehensive view across the language family, looking at *ko behaviour in 3 major branches: Tongic, Eastern Polynesian, and Samoic-Outlier groups. Our contribution is to offer a unified account of the phenomena in (i-v). We show that the predictions hold to a remarkable degree across the family, suggesting that while the phonology of *ko and the syntactic structures that it appears in may be subject to considerable variation, its FOCUS semantics are historically surprisingly stable. This implies many Polynesian languages are both FOCUS-initial and predicate-initial. In fact, a prominent initial FOCUS position may be a more general typological feature of verb-initial systems. This predicts that, once the basic word order of a verb-initial language undergoes change, the role of *ko and the initial FOCUS position will also undergo change. Our investigation provides support for this idea: in those languages where SVO word order has developed, the role of *ko may be considerably eroded. For example, in West Futunan, which is SVO, *ko appears to have disappeared, and nominals may appear before predicates without special marking.

References
Büring, D. 1997. The Meaning of Topic and Focus. London: Routledge.
Custis, T. 2004. Word order variation in Tongan: A syntactic analysis. Ph.D., U Minnesota.
Elbert, S.H., & M. K. Pukui. 1979. Hawaiian grammar. Honolulu: University Hawaii Press.
Mosel, U., & E. Hovdhaugen. 1992. Samoan reference grammar. Oslo: Scandinavian UP.
Mutu, M., & B. Teìkitutoua. 2002. Ùa Pou: Aspects of a Marquesan dialect. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
Rooth, M. 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. Natural Language Semantics 1: 75-116.
Yasuda, A. 1968. The structure of the Penrhyn phrase. M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii.

Change in object marking: possible motivations

Bethwyn Evans, The Australian National University

In Oceanic languages verbal clauses are often overtly marked for transitivity, as illustrated in (1) from Longgu where the verb *loto* 'to bathe' occurs with the transitive suffix *-vi* and the 3SG object marker *-a*.

(1) Geni e loto-**vi-a** mwela-i.
woman 3SGS bathe-TRS-3SGO child-SG
The woman washed the child.   (Hill 2011:69)

Similar patterns of marking transitivity, and cognate markers, are found in many Oceanic languages across the Pacific region, and have long been reconstructed for Proto Oceanic (Pawley 1973). Subsequent research has supported this early reconstruction of Proto Oceanic (Evans 2003), and a number of descriptions of Oceanic languages describe transitivity marking as reflections of this reconstructed system.

This paper takes a slightly different perspective and looks at change within this apparently conservative aspect of Oceanic grammar. Marovo of the Solomon Islands and Torau of Bougainville (PNG) both display systems of transitive and object marking that clearly reflect the reconstructed Proto Oceanic system. However, they also show changes away from this earlier system, including the development of unmarked 3PL objects. This

paper describes such changes as a way of exploring the likely motivations that underpin them.

References
Evans, Bethwyn. 2003. *A study of valency-changing devices in Proto Oceanic*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
Hill, Deborah. 2011. *Longgu Grammar*. Münich: Lincom Europa.
Pawley, Andrew. 1973. Some problems of Proto-Oceanic grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12(1&2):103-188.

Change in verb agreement patterns in Palmerston Island English
Rachel Hendery, The Australian National University

Palmerston Island is a small isolated 54-person community in the Pacific. It was settled in the 1860s by a small group of Polynesian settlers and the English sailor William Marsters. The islanders are monolingual in a unique dialect of English, and have been so for over 100 years. A variety of historical records exist, including letters and court transcripts from 1888 onwards, a one-hour interview from 1959, and fieldwork recordings from the early 1990s and from 2009-2011.

From these sources it is possible to trace various changes in the dialect. One of the most striking is the change in present tense verb agreement patterns. The agreement system found in the speech of Ned Marsters, from an interview with John Burland in 1959, is quite different from any system found among speakers today. The pattern described by Sabine Ehrhart (1996, based on fieldwork in 1991 and 1992) is different again. My own fieldwork data shows that some Palmerston Island English speakers today do not use present tense verb inflection at all, while others have varying patterns that are difficult to account for with simple rules.

In this talk I will describe the differences between the verb agreement patterns in 1959 and today, and will show how these give clues as to the original Palmerston Island English verb agreement system. I will briefly discuss evidence from the early written documents. I will show that an explanation for the data is easier to come by if we assume that William Marsters' English had the 'Northern Subject Rule', whereby the distribution of -s and -ø is determined by whether the subject is pronominal or a full NP (De Haas 2011). I will conclude by discussing the consequences of this change for diachrony typology.

References
Burland, John. 1959. Unpublished transcript of an interview between John Burland, Ned Marsters and Peka Marsters. Wellington, New Zealand. Alexander Turnbull Library. MSX-8809
De Haas, Nynke Karola. 2011. Morphosyntactic variation in Northern English: The Northern Subject Rule, its origins and early history. Dissertation, Radboud University.
Ehrhart-Kneher, Sabine. 1996. 'Palmerston English.' In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler and Darrell T. Tryon (eds) *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas, Vol II*. The Hague: Walter de Gruyter. *523-532*.
Hendery, Rachel and Sabine Ehrhart. In Press. 'Palmerston Island English.' In Bernd Kortmann and Kerstin Lunkenheimer (eds) *The World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Overt Subject NPs in Longgu: clause structure and discourse patterns over time

Deborah Hill, University of Canberra

This paper explores overt Subject arguments in verbal clauses in Longgu (Southeast Solomonic) over time. Lynch, Ross and Crowley note for verbal clauses in Oceanic languages that a wide variety of basic constituent orders are encountered (2002: 49). According to Lynch et al., most Southeast Solomonic languages are SVO. In Longgu, like other languages in the subgroup, a verb complex can constitute a clause; no overt noun phrase arguments are required. However, where overt NPs are present, overt S noun phrases may occur before or after the verb complex. Overt O noun phrase arguments most typically follow the verb complex but can be fronted. Example (1) illustrates a verb complex with no overt Noun Phrase argument; example (2) illustrates a verb complex with an overt Subject Noun Phrase preceding it and an overt Object Noun Phrase following it.

(1) e   ani-a
     3sgS   eat-3sgO
     He/she eats it.

(2) mwela-i-na   e   ani-a   uli
     child-SG-DEIC   3sgS   eat-3sgO   pawpaw
     That child eats pawpaw.

The Subject Noun Phrase may occur after the verb complex in both intransitive and transitive clauses.

(3) e   mauru   mwela-i-na
     3sgS   sleep   child-SG-DEIC
     That child sleeps.

(4) e   ani-a   uli   mwela-i-na
     3sgS   eat-3sgO pawpaw   child-SG-DEIC
     That child eats pawpaw.

While overt noun phrases within the clause are grammatically 'optional', their inclusion is determined by discourse. Core argument NPs occurring before the verbal complex are associated with topicalization. However, as Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002:50) argue for Oceanic languages such as Longgu, that allow movement of constituents to clause-initial position, this may be an inadequate explanation.

Drawing on procedural and narrative texts recorded in 1989 and 2012, as well as written texts from 1994 and 2012, this paper discusses evidence of more frequent use of Subject NPs before rather than after the verb complex in verbal clauses in Longgu and canvasses possible explanations for this tendency.

Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross and Terry Crowley, 2002. *The Oceanic Languages*, Richmond, Surry: Curzon.

KEYNOTE

Complementation in Oceanic: Focus on complementisers

Frank Lichtenberk, University of Auckland

While quite a lot of comparative, historical and typological work has been done on the Oceanic languages at the clausal and subclausal levels, relatively little work has been done on complex sentences. The present paper is a small step in the direction of remedying this.

The focus of the paper is on complementisers: their uses and, in particular, their polyfunctionalities. In some languages, complementisers are not just morphosyntactic means of marking clausal complementation. They may express speaker stance and more generally modality.

The term "complementiser polyfunctionality" designates the use of one of the same etymon with a complementiser function and one or more other functions as a result of grammaticalisation processes. After presenting a number of types of complementiser polyfunctionalities, I will discuss two of them in some detail. In one, the complementiser function is linked with the demonstrative and the relativiser functions. In the other, the complementiser function is linked with the function of marking the protases of conditional sentences. The diachronic aspects of the polyfunctionalities will be discussed. Even though there are no historical records of any significant depth for the Oceanic languages, it is possible to formulate some hypotheses about the course of the developments.

From Austronesian voice to Oceanic transitivity: Äiwoo as the "missing link"

Åshild Næss, University of Newcastle

The Äiwoo language of the Reef Islands shows a number of unusual structural features for an Oceanic language, including OVS word order in transitive clauses, a distinction between prefixed subject markers on intransitive verbs and suffixed subject markers on transitive verbs, and a verb phrase structure which appears to be ergative in that it includes the V and the A, but not O or S. In this paper I will argue that the basic properties of Äiwoo clause structure and person marking can be accounted for by the assumption that it transparently reflects an earlier symmetrical voice system, where the voice alternation has been reinterpreted as a transitivity alternation, in line with the established understanding of how the Oceanic system of transitivity marking arose out of an earlier Austronesian voice system.

In Äiwoo, the OVS structure represents the pattern of the original undergoer voice; the two sets of subject affixes represent the position of the agent in the actor voice and the undergoer voice, respectively; and the ergative verb-phrase structure in formally transitive clauses reflects the VA verb phrase found in the undergoer voice. The former undergoer-voice marker, which by this stage would have been *-i (resulting from a merger between the earlier locative voice and goal voice (Pawley and Reid 2011 [1979])), is reflected in the alternation between final vowel –e and –i in some pairs of formally intransitive vs transitive verbs; it is possible that certain other pairs show a relic of an original actor-voice marker in the formally intransitive variant.

This analysis further explains the odd but characteristically Oceanic feature of having objects which appear at the same time to be incorporated and arguments of their verb – what Margetts (2008) calls transitivity discord, often known in the literature as "semi-transitive" constructions. I will argue that in Äiwoo, this pattern represents an earlier transitive actor-voice pattern where the object NP retained its argument status after the voice alternation was lost, leaving a syntactically transitive clause with intransitive morphology.
On this account, Äiwoo illustrates a transitional pattern between a western Austronesian-type actor voice/undergoer voice system and an Oceanic-style transitivity-based system. As such, it can provide further insight into the mechanisms of change that produced the latter from the

former. Furthermore, such an analysis clearly suggests that a voice system may have been present later in the development of Proto Oceanic than has previously been assumed.

References

Margetts, Anna. 2008. Transitivity discord in some Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47:1, 30-44.

Pawley, Andrew, and Lawrence Reid. 2011 [1979]. The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian. Online version accessed July 2012: http://www2.hawaii.edu/~reid/Combined%20Files/A21.%201979.%20Pawley-Reid--AN%20transitivity--rev%2011-06-09.pdf

KEYNOTE
Language transfer and grammatical change: Evidence from Pacific contact varieties
Jeff Siegel, University of New England

Language contact varieties provide extreme but clear-cut examples of contact-induced grammatical change. Most common is the expression of source language grammatical processes, categories or functions with recipient language morphemes. A particular psycholinguistic process that can lead to such a phenomenon in individuals and potentially to this kind of grammatical change in the wider community is language transfer. This occurs when a person subconsciously uses a linguistic feature of a language they already know in learning or speaking another language.

The paper starts by describing various conceptions of language transfer with regard to contact-induced language change. Then it presents examples (mainly from the Pacific) of grammatical features of new languages (pidgins and creoles) and new dialects (indigenised varieties) that can be attributed to transfer from the substrate language(s) (here the source language(s), SL) to the lexifier language (the recipient language, RL). These examples include change of word order, the introduction of new grammatical processes, such as reduplication, and the adoption by the RL of SL grammatical categories.

The focus then shifts to two types of "functional transfer", defined as applying the grammatical functions of a SL morpheme to an RL morpheme that does not normally have these functions. The first type (labelled "functionalisation") has been widely reported with regard to the creation of new grammatical morphemes in expanded pidgins and creoles. It results from the use of a lexical morpheme of the lexifier (RL) with the semantic and syntactic properties of a grammatical morpheme of the substrate language(s) (SL). Like the other types of contact-induced grammatical change just described, that resulting from functionalisation can occur with only rudimental knowledge of the RL by SL speakers, and thus without widespread bilingualism.

In the second type of functional transfer (labelled "refunctionalisation"), an already existing grammatical morpheme in the RL is used with semantic properties, but not syntactic properties, of a grammatical morpheme in the SL that speakers perceive as equivalent. For this type of transfer to occur, SL speakers must have more extensive knowledge of the RL, at least with regard to its grammatical morphology.

The paper concludes with a discussion of the possibility that the various kinds language

transfer described here may have been responsible for some of the grammatical change reported in Melanesia as the result of contact between Austronesian and Papuan languages.

Southern Bougainville versus Northern Bougainville: similarities in contact-induced grammatical change phenomena in four Northwest Solomonic languages

Ellen Smith, University of Newcastle

In Melanesia, the social contact between speakers of Austronesian and Papuan languages has led to contact-induced linguistic change whereby some languages demonstrate grammatical structures that are atypical of the other languages in their subgroup, such as Lusi (Thurston, 1994) and Takia (Ross, 1996) in Papua New Guinea. However, until Evans and Palmer's (2011) investigation of contact-induced change in the Mono-Uruavan languages of Southern Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, little research had been carried out into contact-induced change in the Northwest Solomonic (NWS) subgroup within the Oceanic branch of the Austronesian family, spoken in Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, and in the western Solomon Islands. Evans and Palmer (2011) showed that Mono-Uruavan languages (Mono, Uruava and Torau) display right-headed structures, including SOV clauses, postpositions, and preposed possessors. Such structures are not typical of NWS and Evans and Palmer (2011) argued that this grammatical change arose through Mono-Uruavan speakers' social contact with speakers of neighbouring Papuan languages (Nasioi, Nagovisi, Buin and Motuna) thus reflecting contact-induced linguistic change.

In this paper, I compare Evans and Palmer's research with data from recent fieldwork (June 2011-March 2012) in Northern Bougainville which reveals that Mono-Uruavan languages are not the only NWS languages to demonstrate such atypical structures. Papapana, which is part of the Nehan/North Bougainville (NNB) group of NWS, also exhibits SOV clauses, a postposition and preposed possessors. The Papapana speech community is spread across six villages which are slightly further north than Uruava and Torau on the east coast of Bougainville and with less than one hundred speakers, Papapana is Bougainville's most endangered language. Like the speakers of Mono-Uruavan languages, Papapana speakers are in contact through intermarriage with speakers of Papuan languages, namely Rotokas, Buin and Nagovisi. By comparing Papapana structures with typical NWS structures and with structures in these three Papuan languages, it is possible to suggest that the atypical grammatical structures are evidence of contact-induced change.

A comparison of the grammatical change in each of the Mono-Uruavan languages with that in Papapana leads to the question of why these languages have undergone such a degree of contact-induced grammatical change, when other NWS languages have not. Could we suggest that Papapana has more of a shared history with Mono-Uruavan languages than previously thought? Or if not, then given the low speaker numbers, could we propose that language endangerment is a factor? If so, is it the cause of contact-induced grammatical change, or a symptom?

This study not only increases our knowledge of an issue which has not yet been sufficiently researched in NWS languages, but the comparison also gives an insight into the motivations for language change and the processes involved in grammatical change.

References

Evans, B. & B. Palmer (2011). Contact-induced change in South Bougainville. *Oceanic Linguistics* **50:** 489-529.

Ross, M. (1996). Contact-induced change and the comparative method: Cases from Papua New Guinea. In Durie, M. & M. Ross (eds.) *The comparative method reviewed: Regularity and irregularity in language change.* New York: Oxford University Press. 180-217.

Thurston, W. R. (1994). Renovation and innovation in the languages of north-western New Britain. In Dutton, T. & D. T. Tryon (eds.) *Language contact and change in the Austronesian world.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 573-609.