

Subject/Direct Object Raising in Niuean

Author(s): William J. Seiter

Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1978), pp. 211-222

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

SUBJECT/DIRECT OBJECT RAISING IN NIUEAN

William J. Seiter
University of California, San Diego

In this paper, I argue for the existence of a rule of Raising in Niuean, a Polynesian language.¹ The rule operates on the subject or direct object of complements of a small class of higher governing verbs. A raised NP becomes the subject of the governing verb.² Since Niuean Raising applies freely to complement direct objects as well as subjects, it violates Postal's (1974) suggestion that Raising should be restricted universally to complement subjects. It is therefore of theoretical interest to demonstrate that the Niuean rule should in fact be regarded as an instance of a universal rule of Raising. I will do so in sections 1-3 by presenting syntactic arguments which establish that (i) a raised NP in Niuean originates as a complement subject or direct object; (ii) it also acts as the subject of the higher, governing verb; and (iii) it cannot have originated in the higher clause and triggered deletion of a coreferential NP in the complement clause.³

Niuean is a strict VSO language with an ergative system of case marking. Case is indicated by two series of prepositional particles, one for common nouns, the other for pronouns and proper nouns.⁴

(1) <u>Case Particles:</u>	Abs	Erg	Loc	Goal/IO
Common N	e	he	he	ke he
Proper/Pro	a	e	i	ki

By way of illustration, compare (2a) and (2b):

- 2a. Nofo e tagata ia i Tuapa.
live Abs man that in Tuapa
'That man lives in Tuapa (village).'
- b. Ne lagomatai he ekekafo e tama.
Past help Erg doctor Abs child
'The doctor helped the child.'

The discussion here is limited to two of the verbs which I claim govern Raising in Niuean, the epistemic modal maeke 'can, be possible' and the aspectual kamata 'begin'.⁵ Raising operates on sentential complements introduced by the subjunctive marker ke and embedded to one of these verbs. For example, Raising relates (3a) to (3b):

- 3a. Maeke ke nofo a Pita i Tuapa.
possible Sbj stay Abs Pita at Tuapa
'Pita can stay at Tuapa (village).'

- b. Maeke a Pita ke nofo i Tuapa.
 possible Abs Pita Sbj stay at Tuapa
 'Pita can stay at Tuapa (village).'

Raising may apply to subjects of intransitive complements, as in (3b), and to subjects of transitive complements. Thus, Raising relates (4a) to (4b). Furthermore, Raising may apply to complement direct objects, relating, for example, (4a) to (4c):⁶

- 4a. To maeke ke lagomatai he ekekafo e tama ē.
 Fut possible Sbj help Erg doctor Abs child this
 'The doctor could help this child.'
- b. To maeke e ekekafo ke lagomatai e tama ē.
 Fut possible Abs doctor Sbj help Abs child this
 'The doctor could help this child.'
- c. To maeke e tama ē ke lagomatai he ekekafo.
 Fut possible Abs child this Sbj help Erg doctor
 'This child could be helped by the doctor.'

The next three sections will defend the position that (3b), (4b), and (4c) actually involve a Raising rule.

1. Downstairs Subjecthood or Direct Objecthood

Verb Agreement provides one of the arguments that raised NPs originate as complement subjects or direct objects. Certain verbs in Niuean agree in number with their subjects, the plural form being obligatorily triggered by a dual or plural subject. For example, compare the singular verb in (5a) to the plural in (5b):

- 5a. To fano a au apogipogi ki Queen Street.
 Fut go Abs I tomorrow to Queen Street
 'I'm going to Queen Street tomorrow.'
- b. To ō a tautolu apogipogi ki Queen Street.
 Fut go, Pl Abs we, Pl, Inc tomorrow to Queen Street
 'We're going to Queen Street tomorrow.'

For our discussion, the important generalization is that agreement may be triggered only by the subject in the same clause as the agreeing verb.

Now, in sentences like those in (6), it is the raised NP which triggers agreement on the complement verb:

- 6a. Ai maeke a au ke fano ki Queen Street.
 not possible Abs I Sbj go to Queen Street
 'I can't go to Queen Street.'
- b. Ai maeke a tautolu ke ō ki Queen Street.
 not possible Abs we, Pl, Inc Sbj go, Pl to Queen Street
 'We can't go to Queen Street.'

In order to maintain the generalization that Verb Agreement is a

clause-internal rule, we must adopt an analysis in which the raised NPs in (6) originate as complement subjects.

There are also several transitive verbs in Niuean, such as hala 'cut', which obligatorily agree in number with their direct objects. It turns out that in sentences like those in (7), where such a verb is embedded in a Raising complement, agreement is triggered on it by the raised NP:

- 7a. Kua kamata e akau ke hala e Pita.
 Perf begin Abs tree Sbj cut Erg Pita
 'The tree had begun to be cut down by Pita.'
- b. Kua kamata e tau akau ke hahala e Pita.
 Perf begin Abs Pl tree Sbj cut,Pl Erg Pita
 'The trees had begun to be cut down by Pita.'

Assuming Verb Agreement to be clause-internal, it must be that the raised NPs in (7) originate as complement direct objects.

A second argument that raised NPs originate as complement subjects or direct objects involves the Niuean version of Quantifier Float. The quantifier oti 'all' immediately follows the noun it modifies. Through Quantifier Float, oti is optionally removed from an NP and cliticized to the verb in the same clause. Thus, the rule relates (8a) to (8b):

- 8a. Kua fia-momohe tuai e tau tagata oti nā.
 Perf want-sleep,Pl Perf Abs Pl person all that
 'All of those people have gotten sleepy.'
- b. Kua fia-momohe oti tuai e tau tagata nā.
 Perf want-sleep,Pl all Perf Abs Pl person that
 'Those people have all gotten sleepy.'

Quantifier Float may apply to intransitive subjects, as in (8b), and to transitive subjects and direct objects:

9. Kua tele oti tuai e lautolu a au.
 Perf kick all Perf Erg they Abs me
 'They've all kicked me.'
10. Moua oti e maua mo Sione e tau mata afi.
 get all Erg we,Du,Ex with Sione Abs Pl match
 'Sione and I already got all the matches.'

But oblique NPs cannot undergo Quantifier Float. For instance, oti may not be removed from an indirect object:

- 11a. Ne tutala a au ke he tau momotua oti.
 Past talk Abs I to Pl elders all
 'I talked to all the elders.'
- b. *Ne tutala oti a au ke he tau momotua.
 Past talk all Abs I to Pl elders
 ('I talked to all the elders.')

In addition to being limited to subjects and direct objects, Quantifier Float is clause-internal, i.e. an NP always launches oti to the verb in the same clause, never to a verb in a higher or lower clause.

Significantly, oti may optionally be launched in a Raising sentence from the raised NP to the complement verb:

12. Kua kamata tuai e tau tagata nā ke fia-momohe oti.
Perf begin Perf Abs Pl person that Sbj want-sleep, Pl all
'Those people have all begun to get sleepy.'
13. Maeke e tau talo nā ke kai oti he faiaoga.
possible Abs Pl taro that Sbj eat all Erg teacher
'Those taros can all be eaten by the teacher.'

Since Quantifier Float is clause-internal, the NPs affected by it in (12) and (13) cannot simply have originated in the higher clause. Instead, the facts are explained only if those NPs originate as complement subject and complement direct object in (12) and (13), respectively, and launch oti before undergoing Raising.

2. Upstairs Subjecthood

Quantifier Float also provides an argument that a raised NP acts as subject of the higher, governing verb. The sentences below show that a raised NP may launch oti to maeke or kamata:

14. Maeke oti a tautolu ke vagahau fakapālagi mo e fakaniuē.
all Abs we, Pl, Inc Sbj speak English and Niuean
'We can all speak English and Niuean.'
15. Kua kamata oti tuai e tau fuakau ke fakagoagoa e ia.
Perf begin all Perf Abs Pl old=man Sbj fool Erg he
'The old men have all begun to be fooled by him.'

Since Quantifier Float is clause-internal, we can account for (14) and (15) only by assuming that Raising promotes a raised NP to the higher clause.

Strictly speaking, (14) and (15) only argue that raised NPs are either derived subjects or derived direct objects of maeke and kamata. It turns out, though, that raised NPs undergo those rules in upstairs clauses which apply exclusively to subjects. One such rule is Possessive Preposing in sentence nominalizations.

Nominalizations in Niuean are introduced by a case marker from the common noun series. For example, (16b) is a nominalization related to the simple sentence (16a). One NP in the nominalization may optionally become a possessive modifier of the nominalized verb through a rule of Possessive Marking, which relates (16b) to (16c):

- 16a. Kua pākia tuai a au he pilu nā.
 Perf injured Perf Abs I on knife that
 'I've been injured on that bush knife.'
- b. e pākia a au he pilu nā
 Abs injured Abs I on knife that
 'my being injured on that bush knife'
- c. e pākia haaku he pilu nā
 Abs injured my on knife that
 'my being injured on that bush knife'

Possessive Marking may apply to the direct object in a nominalization, instead of the subject, as in:

17. e kotofa haaku (e lautolu) ke fakamatala
 Abs choose my Erg they Sbj speak
 'my being chosen (by them) to make a speech'

A rule of Possessive Preposing shifts a pronominal or proper possessive NP in front of the noun it modifies. The preposed possessive is separated from the noun by a particle a, the rearticulated aa in singular possessive pronouns becomes long ā, and the absolutive marker e may fail to appear when this rule has applied. Consider (18) and (19), related to (16c) and (17), respectively:

18. hāku a pākia he pilu nā
 my injured on knife that
 'my being injured on that bush knife'
19. *hāku a kotofa (e lautolu) ke fakamatala
 my choose Erg they Sbj speak
 ('my being chosen (by them) to speak')

Notice that stating Possessive Preposing solely in terms of linear order cannot produce the right results, since the possessivized NP in a nominalization, whether a subject or a direct object, always immediately follows the nominalized verb. This argues that Possessive Preposing must be limited to the subject of the nominalized verb.

In light of these facts, it is interesting that when a Raising sentence is nominalized, the raised NP may become a possessive modifier of the nominalized Raising verb, and may also undergo Possessive Preposing:

- 20a. e maeke haaku ke āhi he kapitiga haaku
 Abs possible my Sbj visit Erg friend my
 'the possibility of me being visited by my friend'
- b. hāku a maeke ke āhi he kapitiga haaku
 my possible Sbj visit Erg friend my
 'the possibility of me being visited by my friend'

Since Possessive Preposing applies exclusively to subjects of nominalized verbs, (20b) argues that a raised NP is the subject

of the governing verb.

3. Movement

It has been established that a raised NP in Niuean originates as a complement subject or direct object, but is also an upstairs subject at some level of structure. A Raising analysis predicts both of these facts. But so does an analysis which would treat raised NPs as underlying higher subjects which trigger deletion of a coreferential NP in the complement clause, after such rules as Verb Agreement and Quantifier Float have had an opportunity to apply there. I will refer to the latter as the two-NP analysis. The deletion would have to be obligatory, since raised NPs can never be resumed by a downstairs pronoun copy:

- 21a. To maeke e ekekafo ke lagomatai (*e ia) e tama ē.
 Fut Abs doctor Sbj help Erg he Abs child this
 'The doctor could help this child.'
- b. To maeke e tama ē ke lagomatai he ekekafo (*a ia).
 Fut Abs child this Sbj help Erg doctor Abs he
 'This child could be helped by the doctor.'

Since it would also need to be bounded and lexically governed, the appropriate deletion rule would be some obligatory version of Equi, call it R-equi. I will now go on to show that the two-NP analysis is untenable.

There is a genuine rule of Equi in Niuean governed by verbs of intention, volition, desire, and command which take sentential complements introduced by the subjunctive marker ke. The rule obligatorily deletes the subject of a ke-complement under coreference with an upstairs controlling NP:

22. Kua lali a au ke tā (*e au) e fāloku.
 Perf try Abs I Sbj play Erg I Abs flute
 'I tried to play the flute.'

Significantly, Niuean Equi never deletes coreferential complement nonsubjects. Instead, complement nonsubjects in Equi configurations which are coreferential with an Equi controller must undergo personal pronominalization:

23. Kua lali lahi e kapitiga haau ke sake e au a ia.
 Perf try really Abs friend your Sbj sack Erg I Abs him
 'Your friend is really trying to get me to sack him.'
24. Lali e tama tāne ke age e au taha tupe ma-ana.
 try Abs child male Sbj give Erg I Nsp money for-him
 'The boy is trying to get me to give him some money.'

Under the two-NP analysis, the deletion rule involved in Raising sentences, R-equi, would have to delete complement subjects to derive sentences like (21a), and complement direct objects to derive ones like (21b). This means that Niuean would

have two distinct versions of Equi. The first, governed by verbs such as lali 'try', deletes only complement subjects; the second, R-equi, governed by verbs such as maeke and kamata, would delete complement subjects and direct objects. This situation would be quite unusual from a cross-linguistic point of view, but one might argue that it is only as unusual as the alternative proposal that Niuean has a version of Raising which operates on direct objects as well as subjects.

Nothing about the two-NP analysis as it stands would prevent underlying structures in which the complement NP coreferential with a higher subject of maeke or kamata is an oblique NP. Such structures would simply fail to undergo R-equi, resulting in sentences featuring a lexical subject of maeke or kamata coreferential with an oblique complement NP. The fact is, however, that no such sentences exist. Instead, raised NPs must be underlying complement subjects or direct objects. For instance, the result of raising the oblique object of a verb of emotion, such as ke he tehina haau 'to your little brother' in (25a), is ungrammatical, with or without a downstairs pronoun copy, as (25b) attests:⁷

- 25a. Maeke nakai ke falanaki a mautolu ke he tehina haau?
 Q Sbj trust Abs we,Pl,Ex to brother your
 'Can we trust your little brother?'
- b. *Maeke nakai e tehina haau ke falanaki a mautolu (ki ai)?
 Q Abs brother your Sbj trust Abs we,Pl,Ex to him
 ('Can your little brother be trusted by us?')

To rule out sentences like (25b), the two-NP analysis would have to impose a constraint, somewhat reminiscent of Perlmutter's (1970) like-subject constraint, on the underlying structure of R-equi configurations:

- (26) Like-subject-or-direct-object constraint:
 An R-equi controller (i.e. lexical subject of maeke or kamata.) must be coreferential in underlying structure with the complement subject or direct object.

In contrast to R-equi, notice that genuine Niuean Equi configurations are not subject to any like-NP constraint. With genuine Equi verbs, the controlling NP may be coreferential with a complement subject, direct object, or oblique NP, as shown by (22), (23), and (24), respectively. For that matter, an Equi controller need not be coreferential with any complement NP:

27. Kua lali a mautolu ke tokologa e tau tagata ka o mai
 Perf try Abs we,Pl,Ex Sbj many Abs Pl person Fut come,Pl
 ke he fonoga apogipogi.
 to meeting tomorrow
 'We are trying to have plenty of people come to the meeting
 tomorrow.'

We can now see a second significant way in which genuine Niuean Equi and R-equi would be distinct. Although there is no coreference constraint on underlying configurations involving Equi governors, those involving R-equi governors would be subject to the constraint in (26). Note that the constraint does not follow from any intrinsic feature of the two-NP analysis, but rather is motivated exclusively to account for the ungrammaticality of sentences like (25b). Here the Raising analysis becomes more interesting than the two-NP analysis, since the ungrammaticality of such sentences follows as a necessary consequence of positing a Raising rule limited to subjects and direct objects.

Furthermore, it is highly improbable that syntactic theory should allow a constraint like (26). Perlmutter's like-subject constraint is apparently a constraint on agency or controlability: the would-be target for deletion must be able to control the event described by the embedded verb. But semantically, direct objects are the least likely NPs to control acts. So it is implausible that a controlability constraint would identify subjects and direct objects, to the exclusion of all other types of NPs. Since the two-NP analysis would impose such a constraint on R-equi configurations, it is quite suspect as a possible analysis. Therefore, we are led to prefer the Raising analysis, which calls for no coreference constraint.

So far, this section has argued that R-equi would have to be an extremely bizarre version of Equi. The final argument against the two-NP analysis, which involves reflexive and reciprocal clauses, is stronger, because it shows that Raising sentences simply must not be derived through an obligatory deletion rule.

What is of interest here is the way reflexive and reciprocal clauses are treated by obligatory deletion rules in Niuean. Although Niuean Equi is in general obligatory, complement subjects related reflexively or reciprocally to a clausemate are only optionally deleted when the conditions for Equi are met. Thus, the reflexive complement subject *e koe* 'you' may or may not be deleted under coreference with the Equi controller below:

28. Fia manako nakai a koe ke kitia (e koe) a koe i loto
 want want Q Abs you Sbj see Erg you Abs you in middle
 he vai?
 of water 'Would you like to see yourself in the water?'

When subjects or direct objects are relativized in Niuean, they undergo a rule of Relative Deletion, which obligatorily deletes the relative noun under coreference with the head. Thus, the relative clause in (29) is ungrammatical if it includes a pronoun copy of the relativized subject:

29. e tagata ne hoka (*e ia) a Maka
 Abs man [Nonfut stab Erg he Abs Maka]
 'the man who stabbed Maka'

However, if a reflexive or reciprocal subject is relativized, Relative Deletion applies optionally. For example, the reflexive relative clause in (30) may include the subject pronoun e ia 'he':

30. e tagata ne hoka (e ia) a ia
 Abs man [Nonfut stab Erg he Abs him]
 'the man who stabbed himself'

Though I cannot offer a satisfying explanation for the resistance of Niuean reflexive and reciprocal clauses to deletion, the generalization to be made based on (28) and (30) seems clear enough. Reflexive and reciprocal subjects in Niuean optionally undergo deletion rules which are otherwise obligatory.

Now the rule required under the two-NP analysis to derive Raising sentences, R-equi, would be an obligatory deletion rule. So the generalization which I have just motivated would predict that reflexive and reciprocal subjects should undergo R-equi only optionally. The prediction is wrong, though, because (31a) is grammatical, but (31b) is not:⁸

- 31a. Liga ai maeke e fifine ke logona a ia (nī).
 likely not Abs woman Sbj hear Abs her Rfl
 'The woman couldn't hear herself.'
- b. *Liga ai maeke e fifine ke logona e ia a ia (nī).
 likely not Abs woman Sbj hear Erg she Abs her Rfl
 ('The woman couldn't hear herself.')

Since it has previously been established that R-equi would have to be an obligatory deletion rule, but the facts about reflexive and reciprocal clauses argue that R-equi could not be an obligatory deletion rule, the two-NP analysis arrives at a contradiction. What (31) suggests is that Niuean Raising sentences simply do not involve deletion.

The ungrammaticality of (31b) follows immediately from the Raising analysis, since Raising is a movement rule. A reflexive or reciprocal subject which undergoes Raising is removed from the complement clause in which it originates, so it automatically cannot surface there as a pronoun copy.

4. Conclusion

I have shown that Niuean has a version of Raising which operates on complement direct objects as well as subjects. This result is theoretically significant because Niuean Raising violates Postal's (1974) suggestion that Raising should be restricted universally to complement subjects, a view which has been implicit in most work on Raising both in transformational and relational frameworks. Specifically, Postal proposed that Raising might be represented in universal grammar simply as:

- (32) 'Promote the subject of a complement.' (Postal 1974:288)

There are two alternative ways universal grammar might be made flexible enough to recognize the Niuean rule as an instance of universal Raising. Perhaps the representation of Raising in universal grammar should explicitly mention direct objecthood, i.e. should state that it operates on complement subjects and may operate on complement direct objects. On the other hand, it may be desirable to view universal rules as representations of preferred rule types, rather than as absolute constraints on permissible versions of rules. Thus, universal Raising could simply refer to complement subjecthood, and extending the rule to complement direct objects, as in Niuean, would be taken as a permissible language-particular deviation from the universally preferred statement. This second approach gains support from Chung and Seiter's (1977) discussion of the history of Raising in Polynesian languages.

Niuean Raising also poses a more particular problem for Postal's representation of Raising (32). Relational Grammar (cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1974) recognizes several types of promotion rule, including ascensions, rules which assign an NP a grammatical relation in a higher clause, and advancements, rules which assign an NP a higher rank clause-internally along the relational hierarchy: Subject < Direct Object < Indirect Object < nonterms. What (32) claims is that the fact that Raising is an ascension follows automatically from its being a promotion. That is, if a complement subject is promoted, it must ascend to a higher clause, since it cannot advance within the complement clause. However, stating Niuean Raising along the lines of (32) will not work:

(33) Promote the subject or direct object of a complement.

The trouble is that through (33), subjects would ascend to the higher clause, but direct objects might, incorrectly, only advance to subject in the complement clause. So Postal's representation of Raising, even when extended to direct objects, is incorrect, because it is too general. Apparently, the statement of Raising in universal grammar must explicitly mention that it is an ascension rule, i.e. that the complement NP it operates on is promoted to a higher clause.

Footnotes

1. This paper is based on my field research in New Zealand and Niue Island in 1976, which was supported by NSF grant SOC-76-02030. I wish to thank Ligipati Wea, Marion McQuoid, Sione Otia, Tale and Nogi Pulevaka of Auckland, Leslie Rex of Avatele, Pitasoni Tanaki of Hakupu, Tale Pita, and Lemani, Lefu, and Ieni Tafatu of Alofi, for providing their judgements on the Niuean sentences. I am grateful to Sandra Chung, Pamela Munro, David Perlmutter, and Alan Timberlake for many helpful comments on other versions of this paper. The usual disclaimers apply.

2. Niuean also has several verbs which govern Raising to Object. Chapter 3 of Seiter (forthcoming) presents a unified

treatment of Raising to Subject and Raising to Object in Niuean, both of which operate on complement subjects and direct objects.

3. To my knowledge, the only theory of grammar which has attempted a cross-linguistic characterization of Raising is Perlmutter and Postal's Relational Grammar, in which a significant class of syntactic rules are represented in universal grammar in terms of grammatical relations (cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1974, 1977). For this reason, my discussion of Niuean Raising will likewise be in terms of grammatical relations.

4. In the Niuean orthography, g = [ŋ], and before front vowels t = [s]. The orthography distinguishes long vowels (e.g. ā) from rearticulated like vowels (e.g. aa). Word stress is penultimate.

The glosses include the following abbreviations: Abs absolute; DU dual; Erg ergative; Ex exclusive; Fut future; Inc inclusive; IO indirect object; Loc locative; Nonfut nonfuture; Perf perfect; Pl plural; Q question particle; Rfl reflexive; Sbj subjunctive.

5. Other verbs which govern Niuean Raising include an emphatic negative verb fakaai 'not', and aspectual mahani 'usual, customary' and teitei 'almost'. The arguments involving maeke and kamata may be made in essentially the same form for these Raising governors as well.

6. Sentences with a raised DO differ subtly from their non-raising counterparts in topicality, emphasis, and so forth. This semantic difference is approximated by the English translations, which involve raised passive subjects.

7. See Seiter (forthcoming) for independent arguments that objects like ke he tehina haau in (25a) are syntactically oblique.

8. In general, nonsubjects in Niuean may be marked with the post-nominal particle nī optionally under coreference with a clausemate subject.

Several verbs, including maeke and kamata, govern Equi controlled by an oblique case-marked NP. In Equi sentences with such a controller, the governing verb conveys a root sense, i.e. predicates ability, volition, or obligation on the part of the controller. This construction allows for a near-minimal syntactic contrast between Raising and Equi. Compare the ungrammatical (31b) with the analogous Equi sentence below:

- (i) Liga ai maeke he fifine ke logona e ia a ia (nī).
likely not at woman Sbj hear Erg she Abs her Rfl
'The woman was probably unable to hear herself.'

The complement reflexive subject e ia 'she' may appear in (i), since it only optionally undergoes Equi controlled by he fifine 'at the woman'.

References

- Chung, S. and W. Seiter (1977) "On the Passive-to-Ergative Re-analysis and the History of Relativization and Raising in Polynesian," UC San Diego mimeo.
- Perlmutter, D. M. (1971) Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.
- Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal (1974) Lectures at LSA Summer Institute, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal (1977) "Toward a Universal Characterization of Passivization," in Whistler, et. al. (1977).
- Postal, P. M. (1974) On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and its Theoretical Implications, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Seiter, W. J. (forthcoming) Studies in Niuean Syntax, Doctoral dissertation, UC San Diego.
- Whistler, K. et. al., eds. (1977) Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley, California.