

what in other frameworks is referred to as “applicatives.” The different NAF constructions are, in effect, different semantic subclasses of transitive verbs, each imposing a characteristic semantic interpretation on its Patient (the required perceptual, not situational, role), expressed as a Nominative noun phrase in these languages.

LAWRENCE A. REID  
University of Hawai‘i

### REFERENCES

- Comrie, Bernard, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1985. Lexical nominalization. In *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol.3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 349–398. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2002. The interpretation of *tu* and Kavalan ergativity. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41:140–158.

Joel Bradshaw and Kenneth L. Rehg, ed. 2001. *Issues in Austronesian Morphology: A focusschrift for Byron W. Bender*. Pacific Linguistics 519. Canberra: Australian National University. vii + 287 pp. A\$59, paper. ISBN 0-85883-485-5.

This volume contains a dozen papers dealing with morphological topics in Austronesian, preceded by three chapters that summarize Byron W. Bender’s research interests and professional activities. The volume opens with a short reminiscence by Alfred Capelle that recounts his experience working with Bender on the Marshallese-English dictionary project, and details Bender’s extensive administrative work in the Marshall Islands. George W. Grace provides a brief biographical-sketch that emphasizes Bender’s long and distinguished record of professional service. The third chapter lists Bender’s publications up to 2000.

The twelve papers that follow are organized alphabetically rather than thematically, though a number of papers address common issues, and some general themes run through many of the papers in the volume. One intriguing group of papers reconsiders alternations in Oceanic between reflexes of transitive forms in \*-i or \*-aki(ni) and their intransitive counterparts. In the first of these papers, “The Gilbertese -i intransitives, high-vowel erasure, and related phenomena,” Harrison articulates the descriptive issue raised by the thematic consonants that precede transitive markers. He notes that “if the verb root was one that was consonant-final in Proto Oceanic, then the transitive form will typically reflect the historical root-final consonant as a so-called thematic consonant, which is lost in the unsuffixed intransitives” (106). Yet the loss of thematic consonants in intransitives entails that the transitive

form is not in general predictable from the intransitive form (though the intransitive is generally predictable from the transitive).

A second general issue concerns the origin and interpretation of the forms in *-a* or *-aka* that alternate with transitives in *-i* or *aki*. Harrison rejects the view that the *-a* that marks transitive forms in Fijian is the reflex of *\*-ia*, derived from transitive *\*-i* and a 3SG pronominal suffix *\*-a* (Clark 1973), and suggests an alternative source for transitives in *-a*. Harrison goes on to suggest that transitives in *-a* may alternate with intransitives in *-i* in Micronesian.

In "Proto Polynesian *\*-CIA*," Pawley also disputes the claim that forms in *-a* are reflexes of *\*-ia*. He considers a number of possible sources and surveys a wide variety of patterns in Oceanic before concluding that "Proto Eastern Oceanic had a fairly productive suffix *\*-a*, which derived stative verbs from transitive verbs and which expressed a state resulting from a prior event" (212). This proposal offers an interesting perspective on the range of interpretations associated with forms in *-a*, and is consistent with Pawley's earlier treatment of the "passive" in Fijian as "an agentless active transitive construction" (Pawley 1973:138).

In "On the morphological status of thematic consonants in two Oceanic languages," Lichtenberk returns to the synchronic status of thematic consonants. Following a detailed discussion of the morphotactic status of thematic consonants in Toqabaqita and Manam, he concludes that "there is evidence both in Toqabaqita and Manam against analysing the thematic consonants as part of the inner base, and there is also evidence against analysing them as part of the transitive or object suffixes" (145). On the "morpholexemic" account that Lichtenberk proposes, "thematic consonants are separate morphs, but they are semantically empty morphs," so that it is "the transitive verbs as wholes that are signs" (141). This treatment accords with the "word and paradigm" (WP) approach adopted in Bender 1998, 2000, in which words, not morphs, are minimal signs. A word-based account also suggests a solution to the problem posed by the loss of thematic consonants in intransitives. Given that the intransitive is generally predictable from the longer transitive form, the transitive can be regarded as basic and the intransitive as derived. Harrison hints at a similar proposal for the analysis of intransitives in *-i* when he remarks that "if the transitive morphology for *-i* intransitive verbs is not agglutinative ... then an intransitive form in *-i* can be identified with the verb root and the transitive stem" (114).

The patterns that Bradshaw describes in "The elusive shape of the realis/irrealis distinction in Jabêm" also resist a morpheme-based description. As Bradshaw shows, the *-n-* prefix that historically marked irrealis has been reanalyzed as prenasalization, but only in a minority of stems. The irrealis marking on subject prefixes compensates in part for the loss of *-n-*. Yet these complementary mood-marking strategies raise complementary difficulties. On the one hand, forms may exhibit what Matthews (1991:180) terms "extended exponence," in which a single property is realized multiple times in a form. For example, irrealis is marked twice in the form *jâ-nsòm*: once by the subject prefix *jâ*, which contrasts with the realis prefix *ga*, and again by the prenasalized stem *nsòm*, which contrasts with the realis stem *sòm*. It is not possible to designate one marking strategy as primary and the other as a type of agreement, given that singular irrealis

forms are often marked solely by a prefixal alternation, as in the contrast between realis *ga-lôb* and irrealis *ja-lôp* 'I fly', whereas plural forms can only be marked by stem alternations, as in the contrast between realis *da-sòm* and irrealis *da-nsòm* 'we search'. As Bradshaw notes, "existing grammatical descriptions of Jabêm" are fully aware of the challenge that mood marking poses for a morpheme-based account and "thus wisely adopted a word-and-paradigm approach that assigns the polymorphic realis/irrealis feature to the indivisible inflected verb, not just to the stem or prefix' (80).

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the Jabêm system is that only a minority of irrealis forms show any formal marker, given the restricted domains of the marking strategies. One might be inclined to regard the widespread neutralization of realis/irrealis contrasts as evidence that the system is being lost. Yet, as Bradshaw shows, realis/irrealis contrasts are marked more robustly within clauses, due to widespread verb serialization. Whereas Bradshaw notes "the absence of any irrealis marking at all on over 70 per cent of verb stems" (78), he also reports that in two narrative texts that he examined "70 per cent of the clauses contain at least one verb unambiguously inflected for either realis or irrealis" (80). Interestingly, the locus of mood marking remains elusive even within larger verb sequences, insofar as "one can never be sure how, where or even if it will manifest itself" (83).

The reduplicative patterns outlined by Sperlich in "Semantic and syntactic functions of reduplication in Niuean" provide a more compelling case of a moribund process. Sperlich gives a preliminary classification of the interpretations associated with reduplicated forms, and notes variation in the size of reduplicated units. Yet in acknowledging that "the verbs (and some nouns) that undergo reduplication processes cannot be predicted" (286), Sperlich casts doubt on the idea that reduplication remains an active process in Niuean. If reduplication is not productive in Niuean, it would seem that "the question of what syntactic/semantic environments trigger reduplication" (279) amounts to "what do the environments that 'call for' reduplicated forms reveal about the properties of these forms?"

A group of complementary papers discuss synchronic and diachronic aspects of possessive constructions in Oceanic. In "Proto Oceanic \*i, \*qi, and \*-ki," Ross reconstructs four Proto-Oceanic nominal exponents in \*-i: a personal article \*i, a homophonous locative preposition \*i, a nonspecific inalienable possessive marker \*qi, and a derivational suffix \*-ki. Ross concurs with Hooper (1985) that the distribution of the reflexes of \*qi and the article \*i militate against reconstructing "a general possessive preposition \*(q)" (263). However, Ross suggests that the free form suffix function that Hooper attributes to \*qi in fact reflects a separate exponent \*-ki, whose reflexes are clearest in North Vanuatu languages.

Lynch traces the origins of some innovative possessive strategies in South Vanuatu in "The development of morphologically complex possessive markers in the Southern Vanuatu languages." Inalienable possession is marked by a possessive suffix on the possessed noun, reflecting the "direct" Proto-Oceanic head-marking strategy. The "indirect" possessive constructions, which express alienable possession and a range of classier-type functions, show far greater variation. Lynch remarks that "passive" possessive constructions, which pattern with inalienably possessed kinship terms and

body parts in Proto-Oceanic, are realized by reflexes of “the general oblique preposition ... \*ra, which marks, among other things, time, location, direction, instrument, cause, and reference” (152). The incorporation of the Proto-Oceanic common article \*na into the stem of common nouns has led to a contrary development toward a direct strategy, as “the effect of this nominalisation has been to convert the possessive markers into directly possessed common nouns” (155). Furthermore, as Lynch notes, Kwamera appears to have “taken the nominalisation process one step further, by prefixing a possessive marker to the nominalised forms” (160).

The peculiar developments within Erromangan are examined by Crowley in “What happened to Erromangan possessive morphology?” He notes the loss of distinct indirect possessive markers for edible and drinkable possession and the development of various innovative strategies. Crowley concedes that contact—with speakers of northern languages as well as with European missionaries—may have played a role in the evolution of these possessive constructions. However, he suggests that Proto-Erromangan had already lost the contrast between general alienable possession, on the one hand, and edible and drinkable possession on the other, and that distinctive indirect strategies were also present in the protolanguage.

The issue that Rehg addresses in “Pohnpeian possessive paradigms: the smart solution, the dumb solution, and the Pohnpeian solution” is reminiscent of the problem posed by thematic consonants. Rehg outlines three accounts of the alternation between [a] and [ɛ] in possessive paradigms in Pohnpeian. The first solution, which Rehg follows Hale (1973) in designating the “smart” solution, identifies a single underlying representation for each possessive ending, and attributes a~ɛ alternations to the application of intrinsically ordered phonological rules. This solution is smart in the parochial sense that it conforms to the generative prejudice that favors derivation strategies—irrespective of their complexity and abstractness—over alternatives that countenance multiple entries for a stem or affix. Rehg briefly mentions an opposing “dumb” position, in which noun paradigms are either listed, or organized into declension classes, defined by characteristic stem forms and distinctive patterns of exponence. He then advocates a compromise “Pohnpeian” solution that retains unique underlying representations for nouns, but introduces two allomorphs of each possessive exponent: one following vowel-final stems, and another following consonant-final stems. Rehg presents some patterns that resist description on a smart account, notes other patterns that support the Pohnpeian solution, and concludes that there cannot “be a single underlying representation for each morpheme” (232). Yet the case against a dumb solution is not entirely conclusive, as Rehg concedes in remarking that one could “postulate a limited number of exemplary paradigms that serve as models for other paradigms” (226).

The three remaining papers in the volume focus on issues within Western Austronesian, or within all of Austronesian, thus complementing the Oceanic emphasis of the papers summarized above. In “On the development of agreement markers in some Northern Philippine languages” Reid offers an account of the distribution of some reduced agreement markers in Central Cordilleran languages. In these languages, the 1SG marker *k* and the 2SG marker *m* originally followed a vowel-final noun stem, but

have also come to occur with transitive verbs in \*-en or \*-an, where they induce the loss of the final *-n*. Reid suggests that this pattern arose by analogy to forms ending in an *-n* or *-ni* that reflect the incorporation of a genitive-governing preposition. After reviewing the prosodic status of *k* and *m*, Reid concludes that “they are now part of the noun or the verb that formerly hosted them” and that these former clitics “have become simply forms that mark agreement” (245). He then outlines analogical word formation strategies that define agreeing forms of the Central Cordilleran language Bontok. Although framed in terms of Lexicase, these strategies are readily translatable into the word-based models of Anderson (1992), Stump (2001), or especially Matthews (1991, chap. 10). Reid concludes by noting that *k* and *m* also show an extended distribution in Ilokano, and considers some explanations for the fact that this pattern appears to occur outside the Central Cordilleran subgroup.

In “Personal nominal words in Austronesian: An anomaly in morphological classification,” Mahdi argues for a primary opposition between personal and nonpersonal nominals in Indonesian. He identifies ergative marking as a highly distinctive property of personal nominals, and describes a number of other phenomena, including alternations between long and short forms that are characteristic of personal pronouns and proper names.

In the first and longest paper in the volume, “Historical morphology and the spirit world: The \*qali/kali-prefixes in Austronesian languages,” Blust draws a bold conclusion from a striking pattern of “hyperallomorphy” that he traces throughout Austronesian. His point of departure is the observation that the names for a class of “creepy crawly” creatures are noteworthy in two respects. Not only are the bases of these nouns longer than the canonical Proto-Austronesian disyllabic base, but they also tend to occur with a variant of a prefix that Blust identifies as \*qali/kali-. This pattern raises a pair of issues. There are, first of all, remarkably many “variants” of \*qali/kali-. Alone the “words for ‘butterfly’ appear to contain at least eighteen inferrably different forms of the prefix, which are partially but not completely shared with the words for ‘leech” (33). Why should these items exhibit such rampant allomorphy? Moreover, as Blust demonstrates, creepy crawly nouns are merely a semantically transparent subclass of a larger group of items, all of which preserve long bases and variants of \*qali/kali-. This group includes words for ‘rainbow’, ‘whirlpool’, and other natural processes, ‘collar-bone’, ‘palate’, and other body parts, along with various bird, fish, and plant names. What natural class subsumes this diverse collection of items?

Blust suggests that animistic belief systems hold the key to understanding this pattern, and proposes that “what defines many \*qali/kali-words, and distinguishes them from unmarked lexical categories of similar semantic content, is a dangerous connection with the world of spirits” (55). He substantiates this claim in some detail in an appendix to the paper. This characterization of the class of \*qali/kali-words also offers an account of hyperallomorphy. Blust proposes that “what hyperallomorphy suggests is a pattern of partially shared history in which the regularity of sound change has been distorted by some factor not normally present in historical development” (33). Elsewhere, he identifies a plausible factor, namely, that “the referents of nominal \*qali/kali-forms are of a type likely to be associated with taboo” (58). A system in which the

names of taboo items were avoided, or subject to replacement or modification might well produce the patterns of allomorphy that \*qali/kali-forms exhibit.

Overall, the volume is a fitting tribute to Byron Bender. Individually, the papers are of considerable descriptive and typological interest; taken together, they confirm the importance of Austronesian languages for general theories of morphology and grammar. The empirical coverage of the papers also gives some indication of the progress that has been achieved in the 50 years since Bender's arrival in the Marshall Islands. Moreover, the spirit of genuine collegiality that infuses the volume clearly testifies to the influence that Bender has exerted on the tenor—as well as the content—of research within Austronesian.

J. P. BLEVINS  
University of Cambridge

### REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bender, Byron W. 1998. The sign gravitates to the word. In *Productivity and creativity: studies in general and descriptive linguistics in honor of E. M. Uhlenbeck*, ed. by Mark Janse, 15–26. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 116. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2000. Paradigms as rules. In *Grammatical analysis: Morphology, syntax, and semantics: Studies in honor of Stanley Starosta*, ed. by Videa De Guzman and Byron W. Bender, 14–29. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 29, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Clark, Ross. 1973. Transitivity and case in Eastern Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:559–605.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1973. Deep-surface canonical disparities in relation to analysis and change: An Australian example. In *Current trends in linguistics: Diachronic, areal and typological linguistics*, vol. 11, ed. by Thomas A Sebeok, 401–458. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hooper, Robin. 1985. Proto-Oceanic /\*qi/. In *Austronesian linguistics at the 15th Pacific Science Congress*, ed. by Andrew Pawley and Lois Carrington, 141–167. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Matthews, Peter H. 1991. *Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pawley, Andrew. 1973. Some problems in Proto-Oceanic grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:103–188.
- Stump, Gregory T. 2001. *Inflectional morphology: A theory of paradigm structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.