A Relational Account of Samoan Quantifier Float, Case Marking, and Word Order

Author(s): Kenneth William Cook

Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1987), pp. 53-64

A NEW RELATIONAL ACCOUNT OF SAMOAN QUANTIFIER FLOAT, CASE MARKING AND WORD ORDER [1]

Kenneth William Cook
University of California San Diego

1.0 Introduction

This paper presents a new way of looking at Samoan syntax in which case marking is determined by initial grammatical relations (GRs) and word order by final GRs. This new account clears up certain problems with Chung's (1976) characterization of Quantifier Float (QF) and also allows us to explain why there is a deviation from basic VSO word order whenever a nominal that would be expected to trigger QF fails to do so, or whenever one that would not be expected to trigger QF does.

Descriptively speaking, Samoan exhibits ergative case marking, i.e. the subjects of intransitive clauses and the direct objects of transitive clauses are in the (unmarked) absolutive case and the subjects of transitive clauses are in the ergative case (marked *e*). The basic word order is VSO but subject and object are permutable: [2]

(1) a. 'Ua alu le tama 'i Sāmoa. (intransitive)
PERF go the boy DIR Samoa
'The boy has gone to Samoa.'
b. Na opo e le tama le teine. (transitive)
PAST hug ERG the boy the girl
'The boy hugged the girl.'
c. Na opo le teine e le tama.
PAST hug the girl ERG the boy

QF in Samoan optionally floats the quantifier *'uma* 'all' from its postnominal adjectival position and cliticizes it to the verb (Chung 1976:194). QF produces (2b) from (2a):

(2) a. 'Ua ō tamaiti 'uma 'i Sāmoa.
PERF go children all DIR Samoa
'All the children have gone to Samoa.'
b. 'Ua ō 'uma tamaiti 'i Sāmoa.
PERF go all children DIR Samoa
'The children have all gone to Samoa.'

According to Chung (1976:198), the following trigger QF:

(3) a. subjects and direct objects regardless of animacy or linear order.
b. animate obliques in immediate postverbal position.

There are problems with this account. With respect to (3a), what Chung would analyze as the subject of a transitive clause does not trigger QF in clauses with verb-erg-abs (VEA) word order

(cf.(4a&b)). Direct objects are not restricted in this manner (v.(4c&d)):

(4) a. E uli 'uma e a'u uō la'u ta'avale.[3]
IMP drive all ERG my friend my car
'My friends all drive my car.'
b. E uli (*'uma) la'u ta'avale e a'u uō.
IMP drive all my car ERG my friend
c. Na 'ave 'uma e le tama tusi.
PAST take all ERG the boy book
'The boy took all the books.'
d. Na 'ave 'uma tusi e le tama.
PAST take all book ERG the boy

(3b) was designed to handle clauses like (5a&b). However, (5c) shows that some animate obliques in immediate postverbal position do not trigger QF. (5d&e) also show that QF affects some inanimate obliques in immediate postverbal position and some animate obliques that are not in immediate postverbal position:

(5) a. 'Ua galo 'uma i tamaiti le tali.
PERF forget all LOC children the answer
'The children have all forgotten the answer.'[4]
b. Na 'ou ta'u-a 'uma 'i tamaiti le tali.
PAST I tell-TRANS all DIR children the answer
'I told all the children the answer.
c. 'Ua 'ou lavea (*'uma) i tamaiti.
perf I hurt all loc children
(I have been hurt by all of the children.)
d. 'Ua galo 'uma i o mātou mafaufau le mea lea.
PERF forget all LOC of we mind the thing that
'Our minds have all forgotten that.'
e. Na ta'u 'uma e Sina 'i tamaiti le tali.
PAST tell all ERG Sina DIR children the answer
'Sina told all the children the answer.'

Assuming that it is basically correct that in Samoan, subjects and objects trigger QF, one general observation that can be made is that there is a deviation from VSO(oblique) word order whenever a nominal that would be expected to trigger QF fails to do so, or whenever one that would not be expected to trigger QF does. More specifically, it is when a transitive subject is not in immediate postverbal position that it fails to trigger QF, and it is when certain obliques appear to the left of an object-like nominal that they do trigger QF. In (6) I propose a new analysis (NA) of Samoan QF, case marking and word order which can account for this correlation. This analysis assumes that the basic word order of Samoan is that given in (6c), that this word order is determined by final GRs, and that initial GRs determine case marking.[5] Below I will show that given this analysis, it is

possible to reduce the list of nominals that trigger QF to simply "2s and final 1s" (v.(6d)).

(6) a. Initial GRs determine case marking.
b. Final GRs determine word order.
c. Order of (final) GRs: Verb 1 2 3 Nonterms[6]
(where "nonterms" refers to chomeurs and obliques)
d. 2s and final 1s trigger QF.[7]

2.0 Quantifier Float in Initially Transitive Clauses

As mentioned above and illustrated in (4b), the problem with (3a) is that what Chung would analyze as transitive subjects do not trigger QF in VAE clauses. In the TA, this fact would have to be considered an exception to the generalization that subjects and objects trigger QF regardless of their linear position. In the NA, I will appeal to the fact that VAE clauses do not conform to the basic VSO word order of final GRs to say that the ergative in a VAE clause is not a final 1 but rather an initial 1 that is put en chomage by an initial 2 advancing to 1. That is to say that VAE clauses are actually passive as opposed to VEA clauses, which are monostratal transitive.[8] Under this analysis, (4a&b) have the structures given in (7a&b), respectively:[9]

(4) a. E uli 'uma e a'u uō la'u ta'avale.
IMP drive all ERG my friend my car
'My friends all drive my car.'
b. E uli (*'uma) la'u ta'avale e a'u uō.
IMP drive all my car ERG my friend

(7) a.

P	1	2
uli	uō	ta'avale

b.

P	1	2
	P	1
uli	cho	
	uō	ta'avale

In the NA outlined in (6), ergatives in VAE clauses fail to trigger QF because they are neither 2s nor final 1s. Ergatives in both VEA and VAE clauses are in the ergative case because they are both initial transitive subjects. An ergative in a VEA clause precedes an absolutive because it is a final 1 and the absolutive is a final 2. Similarly, an absolutive in a VAE clause precedes an ergative because it is a final 1 and the ergative is a chomeur. Absolutives in both clause types trigger QF by virtue of the fact that they are 2s in VEA clauses and both 2s and final 1s in VAE clauses.

3.0 Equi, Raising and Clitic Placement

Facts concerning the Samoan versions of Equi, Raising and Clitic Placement provide independent motivation for treating VAE clauses as passive. According to Chung (1976, 1978), these rules refer to subjects only. All of these rules affect the ergative and not the absolutive of clauses containing an ergative and an absolutive:

(8) a. E mana'o le tama e opo le teine. (Equi)
IMP want the boy INF hug the girl
'The boy wants to hug the girl.'
b. E mana'o le teine e opo *('oia) e le tama.
IMP want the girl INF hug her ERG the boy
'The girl wants to be hugged by the boy.'
c. E mafai e le tama ona opo le teine. (Raising)
IMP can ERG the boy COMP hug the girl
'The boy can hug the girl.'
d.*E mafai (e) le teine ona opo e le tama.
IMP can ERG the girl COMP hug ERG the boy
(The girl can be hugged by the boy.)
e. Na ia opo(-ina) le teine.[10] (Clitic Placement)
PAST he hug-TRANS the girl
'He hugged the girl.'
f.*Na ia opo(-ina) e le tama.
PAST she hug-TRANS ERG the boy
(She was hugged by the boy.)

On the basis of these facts, Chung concludes that the ergative (and not the absolutive) is the subject of clauses containing an ergative and an absolutive. Notice, however, that when these rules take effect, they leave only the absolutive to the right of the verb. This makes it impossible, given the sentences that we have considered so far, to tell whether these rules affect the ergative in VEA clauses, the ergative in VAE clauses, or both.

There is a means, however, by which we can infer in which clause type these rules affect the nominal in the ergative case. This strategy involves the *-Cia* suffix which appears in passive clauses in some other Polynesian languages (e.g. Maori). The prevailing view is that this suffix does not mark passive in Samoan. However, if the present analysis of VAE clauses as passive is correct, we must recognize that there are indeed passive clauses in Samoan in which the suffix occurs.[11] (9a), I would claim, is such a clause. In VEA clause (9b), which would be the corresponding active clause, the suffix is not permitted.

(9) a. Na velo-sia le i'a e le tama.
PAST spear-*Cia* the fish ERG the boy
'The fish was speared by the boy.'[12]
b. Na velo(*-sia) e le tama le i'a.
PAST spear-*Cia* ERG the boy the fish
'The boy speared the fish.'

Given a pair of clauses such as those in (9), it is possible to tell which clause can serve as the "input clause" for Equi, Raising, and Clitic Placement since the *-Cia* suffix occurs in the first (and not in the second) of these clauses. Significantly, the

ergative responds to Equi, etc. in the clause without *-Cia* but not in the clause with *-Cia:*

(10) a. E mana'o le tama e velo(*-sia) le i'a.
IMP want the boy INF spear-Cia the fish
'The boy wants to spear the fish.'
b. E mafai e le tama ona velo(*-sia) le i'a.
IMP can ERG the boy COMP spear-Cia the fish
'The boy can spear the fish.'
c. Na ia velo(*-sia) le i'a.[13]
PAST he spear-Cia the fish
'He speared the fish.'

This indicates that Equi, Raising and Clitic Placement affect ergatives in VEA clauses, but not those in VAE clauses. This fact is problematic for the TA since nominals in the ergative case are supposed to be subjects and subjects are supposed to trigger these rules. In contrast, since the NA distinguishes active from passive clauses, it can easily handle this fact by limiting the nominals affected by these rules to the subjects of active clauses, i.e. to 1s that are both initial and final 1s. This constraint is given in (11):

(11) Only 1s that are both initial and final 1s are affected by Equi, Raising, and Clitic Placement.[14]

Also, since I have found no reason to believe that VAE clauses with *-Cia* differ syntactically from those without *-Cia*, I will assume that VAE clauses are passive whether or not the verb is suffixed with *-Cia*. As illustrated in (12), the suffix in (9a) is optional:

(12) Na velo(-sia) le i'a e le tama.
PAST spear-Cia the fish ERG the boy
'The fish was speared by the boy.'

Since the ergative in a VAE clause is not affected by Equi, Raising, or Clitic Placement, there is motivation independent of the facts of QF for treating the ergative in a VAE clause as something other than a (monostratal) transitive subject. This supports the passive analysis of VAE clauses in which such an ergative is a 1 in the initial stratum but a chomeur in the final stratum.

4.0 Quantifier Float in *Galo* Clauses

Statement (3b) (that animate obliques in immediate postverbal position trigger QF) was designed in part, to handle clauses like (5a); however, as noted above, there are problems with (3b).

(5) a. 'Ua galo 'uma i tamaiti le tali.
PERF forget all LOC children the answer
'The children have all forgotten the answer.'

Clauses like (5a) contain "*galo* verbs", i.e. verbs of understanding and forgetting (e.g. *mālamalama* and *manino* 'be clear/understand', *galo* and *nimo* 'forget/be forgotten', *lilo* 'be lost to view/be beyond one's understanding' and *masino* 'know/be known exactly'). In *galo* clauses (i.e. clauses containing *galo* verbs) the object of understanding or forgetting is in the absolutive and the "locus of cognition" is in the locative case.[15]

Galo clauses exhibit both verb-abs-loc (VAL)and verb-loc-abs (VLA) word order:

(13) a. 'Ua galo le tusi i le tama.
PERF forget the book LOC the boy
'The book has been forgotten by the boy.'
b. 'Ua galo i le tama le tusi.
PERF forget LOC the boy the book
'The boy has forgotten the book.'

Neither the absolutive nor the locative of *galo* clauses is affected by Equi, Raising or Clitic Placement:

(14) a. E le mana'o le teine e galo *('oia) i lona 'āiga.
IMP NEG want the girl INF forget her LOC her family
The girl doesn't want to be forgotten by her family.
b.*E mana'o le tama e galo le teine.
IMP want the boy INF forget the girl
(The boy wants to forget the girl.)[16]
c.*E mafai i/e lou 'āiga ona galo 'oe.
IMP can LOC/ERG your family COMP forget you
(Your family can forget you.)
d.*E mafai (e) 'oe ona galo i lou 'āiga.
IMP can ERG you COMP forget LOC your family
(You can be forgotten by your family.)
e.*'Ua 'ou galo i lo'u 'āiga.
PERF I forget LOC my family
(I have been forgotten by my family.)
f.*'Ua 'e galo a'u.
PERF you forget me
(You have forgotten me.)

Absolutives of both VAL and VLA clauses trigger QF, as do the locatives of VLA (but not VAL) clauses.

(15) a. 'Ua galo 'uma tali i le tama.
PERF forget all answer LOC the boy
'The answers have all been forgotten by the boy.'

b. 'Ua galo 'uma i le tama tali.
PERF forget all LOC the boy answer
'The boy has forgotten all the answers.'
c. 'Ua galo 'uma i tamaiti le tali. (=5a)
PERF forget all LOC children the answer
'The children have all forgotten the answer.'
d.*'Ua galo 'uma le tali i tamaiti.
PERF forget all the answer LOC children
(The answer has been forgotten by all the children.)

To account for this array of data, I propose the following: *galo* clauses contain a 2 and an oblique locus of cognition in the initial stratum. In VAL clauses such as (13a), the 2 advances to 1:

(16)

P	2	loc
P	1	loc
galo	tusi	tama
'forget'	'book'	'boy'

In VLA clauses like (13b), the locus of cognition advances to 1:

(17)

P	2	loc
P	2	1
galo	tusi	tama
'forget'	'book'	'boy'

Equi, Raising and Clitic Placement do not affect either nominal in either clause type because neither nominal satisfies constraint (11) that limits these rules to nominals that are both initial and final 1s. The word order facts of both clause types follow from the structures in (16) and (17) given the word order template in (6c) that requires V-1-2-3-nonterm word order of final GRs. All nominals that trigger QF in these clauses are either 2s or final 1s in agreement with (6d). In the NA, a locative in immediate postverbal position in a *galo* clause triggers QF because it is a final 1. In both clause types its locative case marking is due to the fact that it is an initial "locus of cognition".

This analysis eliminates any need for statement (3b) (that animate obliques in immediate postverbal position trigger QF) to the extent that (3b) concerns *galo* clauses.

5.0 Quantifier Float in 3-to-2 Advancement Clauses

Statement (3b) was also designed to account for clauses like (5b) in which a recipient precedes a patient and the recipient triggers QF. Not all speakers accept these clauses, and so I will mark them with %.

(5) b.%Na 'ou ta'u-a 'uma 'i tamaiti le tali.
PAST I tell-TRANS all DIR children the answer
'I told all the children the answer.

For some speakers, only the patient triggers QF, and it does so whether it precedes or follows the recipient:

(18) a.%Na ta'u 'uma e Sina tali 'i tamaiti.
PAST tell all ERG Sina answer DIR children
'Sina told all the answers to the children.'
(*Sina told the answers to all the children.)
b.%Na ta'u 'uma e Sina 'i tamaiti tali.
PAST tell all ERG Sina DIR children answer
'Sina told the children all the answers.'
(*Sina told all the children the answers.)

Other speakers also extend QF to recipients that precede patients but not to those that follow patients:

(19) a.%Na ta'u 'uma e Sina 'i tamaiti le tali.(=5e)
PAST tell all ERG Sina DIR children the answer
'Sina told all the children the answer.'
b.*Na ta'u 'uma e Sina le tali 'i tamaiti.
PAST tell all ERG Sina the answer DIR children
(Sina told the answer to all the children.)

In order to account for this array of facts, I propose the following. Clauses in which a patient precedes a recipient are monostratal clauses containing a P, 1, 2 and 3. Clauses in which a recipient precedes a patient have the 3-to-2 advancement structure in (20) in which the recipient is an initial 3 (in the directional case) and the patient is an initial 2 (in the absolutive case). The 3 advances to 2, putting the initial 2 en chomage. (20) is the structure of (19a):

(20)

P	1	2	3
P	1	cho	2
ta'u	Sina	tali	tamaiti
'tell'	'Sina'	'answer'	'children'

As can be easily verified, the case marking and word order of these clauses conform to the statements in (6).[17] For the speakers who allow only the patient to trigger QF, QF is limited to initial 2s (and final 1s). For those who also allow a recipient that precedes a patient to trigger QF, this rule is extended to 2s at any level.[18] The rule in (6d) (that 2s and final 1s trigger QF) is in the more general form.

The analyses proposed for *galo* clauses in the last section and for 3-to-2 advancement clauses in this section eliminate any need in the statement of QF for (3b) (that animate obliques in immediate postverbal position trigger QF). These analyses together

with those for initially transitive clauses in section 2.0 make it possible to reduce the list of nominal types that trigger QF to simply "2s and final 1s" (as in (6d)).[19]

6.0 Conclusion

In this paper I have presented a new way of looking at Samoan case marking and word order. By assuming that case marking is determined by initial GRs and that V-1-2-3-nonterm word order is required of final GRs, we have been able to reduce the list of nominals that trigger QF to simply "2s and final 1s". This clears up certain problems with Chung's (1976) characterization of QF. This analysis also allows us to explain why there is an apparent deviation from basic VSO(oblique) word order whenever a nominal that would be expected to trigger QF fails to do so, or whenever one that would not be expected to trigger QF does. In the first case, that of ergatives in VAE clauses, an initial 1 fails to trigger QF and appears late in the clause because it it is a chomeur and not a final 1. In the second case, that of locatives in *galo* clauses and recipients in 3-to-2 advancement clauses, a nominal unexpectedly triggers QF and appears early in the clause because it has advanced to 1 or 2.

Where this new analysis departs from usual assumptions is in its treatment of case marking as an indicator of initial rather than final GRs. The fact that this assumption makes the present analysis of QF possible raises two questions: (1) Are there other languages which could felicitously be analyzed in a similar manner? and (2) What other assumptions about how languages are organized might we needlessly be maintaining?

FOOTNOTES

1. Fieldwork for this paper was funded by grants from the Academic Senate of UC San Diego, for which I am grateful. I would also like to thank my consultants Falana'i Ala, Susitina Kinuta, Kereti Misailegalu, Sulufa'iga Pa'ala, Lētau Seumālō, Tauelia Togāfau, and Willie Uili for their patience and assistance. Any errors in this paper are my own.

2. Chung (1978:12-15) claims that in Samoan and other Polynesian languages, the basic word order is VSO. She also points out that there are departures from the basic word order, e.g. pronouns tend to be attracted to the verb regardless of their syntactic function and agents tend to precede nonagents. In the analysis I am proposing here, at least some of these departures from basic VSO word order would involve nominals bearing different grammatical relations at different levels. For Chung, these departures would not involve such "changes" in grammatical relations.

Also, see Ochs (1982) for interesting sociolinguistic observations concerning Samoan word order patterns. If the analysis proposed in this paper is correct, her observations, which are stated in terms of SOV vs. VOS word order, will be statable in terms of voice (active vs. passive).

3. The absence of a determiner is an indication of plurality.

4. Examples are glossed in either active or passive, whichever maintains the left to right word order of the Samoan sentence.
5. Chung (1978), in analyzing "affected locatives" that undergo rules that refer to direct objects, assumes that they are "the derived direct objects of their associated, underlying intransitive verbs". Since generally there is no "change" in case marking of such "derived direct objects", it is only fair to say that the analysis of case marking as an indication of initial GRs is not my invention but was already present in at least part of Chung's analyses. However, the extension of this approach to the entirety of the Samoan language is new.
6. The symbols 1, 2, and 3 stand for subject, direct object, and indirect object, respectively. See Perlmutter (1983) and Perlmutter and Rosen (1984) for more on the terminology and concepts of relational grammar.
7. It will become clear below why 2s in (6d) are not restricted to any particular stratum.
8. This is a somewhat revolutionary stance to take, considering that the majority of linguists who have recently studied Samoan in depth (e.g. Chung (1976, 1978) and Milner (1962, 1966, 1973)) have concluded that Samoan does not have a passive construction. I took the same position as Milner and Chung in Cook (1978).
9. The diagrams I am employing here are abbreviated stratal diagrams in which the top line represents the initial stratum and the bottom represents the final. P stands for predicate, and cho for chomeur.

The passive structure in (7b) is not the only one in which an initial 1 is not a final 1. It would also be theoretically possible, given the present data, to assume, for example, that a silent dummy puts an initial 1 en chomage in some kind of impersonal construction. I will not entertain this possibility in this paper because such an approach introduces an added element (a dummy) whose presence is not required in order to account for the Samoan data dealt with here.
10. The transitive suffix *-a/-ina* which appears in (5) is related to the suffix *-Cia* which will be discussed below. In Cook (1978) I treated *-a/-ina* and *-Cia* as if they were the same suffix, but I now believe that they should be treated as two separate suffixes which have overlapping functions. In Cook (1978) I followed Chung (1976) in analyzing the suffix in clauses like (5a) as a "flag" for a fronted subject. That analysis, I believe, is still viable, but see footnote 17.
11. This is not to say that this is the only context in which *-Cia* occurs. See Chung (1976, 1978) and Cook (1978) for more on *-Cia*.
12. This sentence is from Milner (1966:316) where it is glossed 'The boy has speared the fish.' Milner's gloss here reflects his (1962, 1966, 1973) opinion that *-Cia* indicates perfective aspect.
13. (10c) is possible with *-a/-ina* rather than *-Cia* (see footnotes 10 and 17).
14. I have not stated this constraint in terms of monostratal 1s because the 1 of a 3-to-2 advancement clause (see below) is

afected by these rules and such clauses are not monostratal.
15. *Mālamalama* and *manino* also appear in middle clauses (described in footnote 19 below) and *galo*, for some speakers, occurs in (initially) transitive clauses (Chung 1978:205). *Galo* is probably cognate with *gālo* 'disappear/fade away'. The verbs *pa'u* 'fall (in the sense of a resposibility falling on someone)' and *pogai* 'to be caused (by someone)' occur in structures like those proposed here for *galo* verbs. Verbs like *lavea* and *manu'a* 'be hurt' that express adverse events are often treated as belonging to the same ("stative")class as *galo* verbs, but there are syntactic, as well as semantic reasons for treating them as belonging to a different class. For example, (5c) shows that these verbs, unlike *galo* verbs, occur in clauses with clitics.
16. (14b) is grammatical on the reading 'The boy wants the girl to be forgotten'.
17. (5b), the clause with which we began this section, might very well involve passive as well as 3-to-2 advancement. I make this suggestion based on the fact that clitics in initially transitive clauses fail to trigger QF (which suggests that they are not final 1s) and on the tendency for the *-a/-ina* suffix to occur in such clauses (*-a/-ina* is related to the *-Cia* suffix which I have claimed occurs in some passive clauses without clitics (e.g. (9a)). See also footnote 10.
18. These clauses are reminiscent of Niuean sentences described by Seiter (1979) in which instrumentals in initially transitive clauses undergo all the rules that affect 2s. Seiter, working in a derivational version of relational grammar reaches the conclusion (interpreted into the present framework) that in Niuean, instrumentals and initial 2s are 2s at the same level in violation of the Stratal Uniqueness Law. (The SUL prohibits more than one nominal bearing the same term relation (1, 2, or 3) at a given level.) My analysis of the Niuean data would be that instrumentals in initially transitive clauses obligatorily advance to 2 putting initial 2s en chomage. Furthermore, the rules that refer to 2s would not be restricted to 2s at any particular level. This analysis would not entail a violation of the SUL.
19. Chung (1976:196) also states that "locatives directly affected by the action of an intransitive verb" and objects of middle clauses trigger QF. In my own fieldwork, I have found that very few speakers allow QF with locatives (other than those in *galo* clauses), and whether or not they are directly affected by the action of an intransitive verb does not seem to matter. Also, if they allow QF with locatives, they also allow it with goals. My analysis of locatives and goals that trigger QF would be that they are initial locatives/goals that advance to 2; (i), then, for those speakers who allow it, would have the structure in (ii):

(i) %'Ua nofo 'uma 'oia i nofoa i le potu lenei.
PERF sit all he LOC chair LOC the room this
'He's sat in all the chairs in this room.'

(ii)

P	1	loc
P	1	2
nofo	'oia	nofoa
'sit'	'he'	'chair'

I have also found that very few speakers allow QF with objects of middle clauses (i.e. clauses that contain verbs of emotion, perception, etc. that take a subject in the absolutive and a complement in an oblique case). I would analyze middle objects as initial 3s, and for those speakers who allow clauses like (iii), in which a middle object triggers QF, the middle object advances from 3 to 2 (as illustrated in (iv)).

(iii) %E mana'o 'uma 'oia 'i teine o le nu'u.
IMP want all he DIR girl of the village
'He wants all the girls of the village.'

(iv)

P	1	3
P	1	2
mana'o	tama	teine
'want'	'boy'	'girl'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chung, Sandra. 1976. *Case Marking and Grammatical Relations in Polynesian.* PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

Chung, Sandra. 1978. *Case Marking and Grammatical Relations in Polynesian.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cook, Kenneth W. 1978. "The Mysterious Samoan Transitive Suffix". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4.53-66.

Milner, George B. 1962. "Active, Passive, or Perfective in Samoan: A Fresh Appraisal of the Problem". *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 71.151-61.

Milner, George, B. 1966. *Samoan Dictionary.* London: Oxford University Press.

Milner, George, B. 1973. "It is Aspect (not Voice) which is Marked in Samoan.". *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:621-39.

Ochs, Elinor. 1982. "Ergativity and Word Order in Samoan Child Language". *Language* 58:646-671.

Perlmutter, David (ed.). 1983. *Studies in Relational Grammar 1.* Chicago: University of Chigago Press.

Perlmutter, David and Carol G. Rosen (eds.). 1984. *Studies in Relational Grammar 2.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Seiter, William J. 1979. "Instrumental Advancement in Niuean". *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:595-621.