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

Introduction

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

1 I wish to thank two anonymous reviewers, as well as Claire Moyse-Faurie and Joachim Sabel for comments and suggestions which have helped improve this paper.
Section 1 is an overview of various conjunctive strategies and their distinctive features. Section 2 analyses the syntactic and semantic features of inclusory constructions and the constraints on their use. Section 3 is an analysis of the conjunctive morphemes, their functions and etymology. Section 4 sketches a typology of the strategies used in a sample of Austronesian languages for standard coordination, inclusory constructions, or comitative coordination, and the semantics of these conjunctive strategies.

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

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

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

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

- Additive coordination
  a. \textsc{Hla} u oda mwa [hlileny thamwa xa ye].

\begin{verbatim}
3PL PFV go.up ACT these.DU woman CONJ 3SG.FR\(^4\)
\end{verbatim}

These two women and/plus him go up. (Bril 2002: 428)

\(^3\) Compare with \textsc{nijic} \textsc{xa bwaat pwagiik} eleven (lit. ten and/plus top one) (Bril 2002: 428).

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

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

- Non-phrasal inclusory construction

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

- Phrasal inclusory construction

d. Yaman ma Polie.
   1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ Polie
   ‘Polie and I.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

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

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

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

a. Gövu Paul.
   1DU.EXCL.FR Paul
   ‘Paul and I.’ (asyndetic inclusory construction, lit. we2 Paul)

b. Gényâ ma Paul.
   1SG.FR CONJ Paul
   ‘Paul and I.’ (syndetic additive coordination)

---

5 This is often referred to as “verb-marking strategy” in the literature on this question.
6 Free pronouns are full pronominal forms, with NP status, as opposed to personal indexes which belong to the VP.
7 Ma in Ajië is an additive coordinator which never has the inclusory function that similar coordinators have in northern New Caledonian languages (such as Nêlêmwa or Zuanga).
The semantics of additive and comitative coordination is slightly different: additive coordination has a distributive (‘each’) or a collective reading, while comitative coordination tends to have a collective reading only.

1.1. NP additive coordination

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

1.1.1. Asyndetic vs. syndetic coordination

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

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

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

a. [E Marisa e latu-la], egira goata e Malalia.
   ART Marisa ART child-3POSS 2DU go.up ART Malalia
   ‘Marisa and her child, they’ve gone up to Malalia.’ (Johnston 1980: 185)

b. [E Marisa (me)8 latu-la], egira goata e Malalia.
   ART Marisa CONJ child-3POSS 2DU go.up ART Malalia
   ‘Marisa and her child, they’ve gone up to Malalia.’ (Johnston 1980: 185)

c. La bolo me la paia ogala-le.
   ART pig CONJ ART dog at.outside-there
   ‘The/a pig and the/a dog are outside there.’ (Johnston 1980: 185)

d. E tau me rutu ilua.
   ART man CONJ wife two
   ‘A man and his wife.’ (Johnston 1980: 186)

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

1.1.2. Summation free pronoun strategy vs. coordinator

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

8 The coordinator me assimilates the noun marker e.
In most languages, this is restricted to higher animates, or to humans with close relationship, as in Tetun or Kaulong. Other types of NPs are conjoined by coordinators.9

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

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hiang ngong titie-n.} \\
\text{3SG.M 3SR.DU wife-3SG} \\
'He and his wife.' (Throop & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 396)
\end{align*}
\]

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \text{[Tamōata rōa-ø dī-ø-ru] di-lā?o-ru.} \\
m\text{man spouse-3SG 3PL.BF-DU.FR 3PL.RL-go-DU} \\
'The man went with his wife.' [lit. man spouse they2 they went] \\
(Lichtenberk 1983: 430)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. \text{moān-(be) áine di-pūra.} \\
m\text{man-and woman 3PL.RL-arrive} \\
'The men and the women arrived.' (Lichtenberk 1983: 365)
\end{align*}
\]

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

---

9 See examples (60) in Tetun. In Kaulong, the medial coordinator u and conjoins NPs or VPs; the comitative coordinator to conjoins animate NPs, see examples (52). The coordinator ma conjoins VPs, si and, but, and then, and so is used for clause coordination (Throop & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 399, 408).
(7) Kairiru (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, East Sepik, PNG)

a. Cuok [Smowai ʔru Cawor].
   boundary Smowai 3DU.FR Cawor
   ‘Smowai and Cawor’s boundary.’ (Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 209)

b. Wocul ʔi awo-ŋ natu-ŋ.
   Wocul 3PL.FR spouse-3SG child-3SG
   ‘Wocul, his wife and children.’ (Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 208)

c. moin bo nat
   ‘woman and children’ (Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 208)

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

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

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

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

Emele da mwalik’ iape.
woman 3DU man 3SG.POSS
‘a woman and her husband.’ (François p.c.)

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

Ka noho nei [a Ponga rāua ko tana mōkai].

TAM sit near ART Ponga 3DU SPEC his slave

‘Ponga and his servant went on sitting.’ (Bauer 1997: 548)

(11) Tahitian (Eastern Polynesian)

Ua mōmoe ’ō Tama rāua ’ō Terii.

PFV disappear(PL) ID T. 3DU.EXCL ID T.

‘Tama and Terii disappeared.’ (Lazard & Peltzer 2000: 179)

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

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

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

a. Imam kōyō itōk?
father 3DU be.good

‘Are father (and him) well? ’ [lit. father theyDUAL well] (François 2000: 386)

b. Mayanag kōyō ēgnō-n.
chief 3DU spouse-3SG

‘The chief and his wife.’ (François 2000: 389)

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

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

Na wakē curu yēvū.
3SG work 3DU chief

‘He works with the chief.’

1.1.3. Summation free pronoun strategy plus a conjunctive marker

The summation pronoun strategy may be reinforced by a comitative coordinator, as in Atayal (Formosan) or Samoan (15). In Atayal, conjunction with the comitative coordinator ci? or with laha? ci? (the summation
pronoun and the comitative coordinator respectively) is restricted to animate entities (14a-b). Otherwise, the standard coordinator \( lu? \) and, which is compatible with all types of NPs (± animates, see (14c)), is required. Inclusory constructions, which are used to conjoin a pronoun and a noun, are presented in examples (50) below.

(14) Atayal (Formosan)

\begin{align*}
&\text{AF-IRR-beat-1SG.NOM} \\
&\text{ACC} \quad \text{dog} \quad 3\text{PL.FR} \quad \text{COM} \quad \text{cat}
\end{align*}
'I will beat the dog and the cat.' (Huang 2006: 228)

b. \[ Nyel-\overset{10}{m}-awas [ka? naßkis laha? ci? ule?]. \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{PROG.PROX} \quad \text{AF-sing} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{old.man} \quad 3\text{PL.FR} \quad \text{COM} \quad \text{child}
\end{align*}
'The old man is singing here with the child.' (Huang 2006: 224) \[ \text{[AF = actor focus]} \]

c. \[ Cyel \text{ ma-sa-siliy} [ka? Watan lu? Temu]. \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{PROG.DIST} \quad \text{RECP-RED-beat} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{Watan} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Temu}
\end{align*}
'Watan and Temu are beating each other (with sticks).' (Huang 2006: 226)

(15) Samoan (Polynesian)

\[ Fai \text{ le mafaufau tele faiva o [Peni laua ma Ruta].} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{do not think much fishing.trip POSS Peni} \quad 3\text{DU} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ruta}
\end{align*}
'Peni and Ruta did the fishing trip rather thoughtlessly.' (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 680)

1.1.4. Associative plural constructions

A slightly different strategy, sometimes called « associative plural constructions », is instanciated by a plural pronoun referring to an indefinite group of humans and meaning 'and the rest, and followers, and companions'. In Papuan Malay, this construction is mostly used with subject and object arguments and is less acceptable with obliques; thus, *(b) is ungrammatical.

10 The 3rd person (sg. or pl.) bound nominative pronoun on the VP is zero-marked.
(16) Papuan Malay (SVO, Eastern Province of Papua\textsuperscript{11})

a. Kitong pi lia Yohannes\textsuperscript{dong.} \\
    1PL go see Yohannes 3PL \\
    'We went to see Yohannes and his mates.' [lit. Yohannes them] 
    (Donohue forthc.)

b. * Sa-su-masa banyak\textsuperscript{untu sa-pu-ana}\textsuperscript{dong.} \\
    1SG-PFV-cook much 3PL-POSS-child \\
    [Intended meaning: I've already cooked a lot for my daughter 
    and her friends.]

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

    Tha\textsuperscript{Gerea kera.} \\
    ART.PERS Gerea 3PL.FR \\
    'Gerea and them.' (Lichtenberk 2000: 29)

In Nakanai, the associative plural pronoun fuses the coordinator \textit{me} and 

a non-singular pronoun, yielding the plural \textit{mite} (me\textsubscript{+ite} 3PL), or the dual 

\textit{mira} (me\textsubscript{+ira} 3DU).

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

a. E\textsuperscript{Tubu, mite.} \\
    ART Tubu and.3PL \\
    'Tubu and the rest.' (Johnston 1980: 186)

b. E\textsuperscript{Tubu, mira.} \\
    ART Tubu and.3DU \\
    'Tubu and the other fellow.' (Johnston 1980: 186)

c. E\textsuperscript{Tubu, mira me e rutu-la.} \\
    ART Tubu and.3DU and ART wife-3POSS \\
    'Tubu together with his wife.' (or:) 'Tubu and his wife.' 
    (Johnston 1980: 186)

Note that while (18a) might be interpreted as a standard additive 

coordination, (18b) is clearly inclusory, since the dual pronoun \textit{mira} 

includes 'Tubu' in its reference. Compare with standard coordination in 

Nakanai (3). In (18c), the presence of the coordinator \textit{me} suggests that \textit{mira} 

has been reanalysed as a collective-associative marker.

\textsuperscript{11}Formerly Irian Jaya.
In Nêlêmwa, the suffix -ma is an associative plural marker referring to members of a group or fellows.

(19) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia)

\[
\text{Cawi-ma ma Dahoot-ma.}
\]

\[
\text{Cawi-ASSOC.PL and Dahoot-ASSOC.PL}
\]

'The Cawi clan and the Dahoot clan.' (Bril fieldnotes)

1.2. Inclusory constructions

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

1.2.1. Asyndetic inclusory constructions

1) Phrasal construction with free pronoun strategy

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Curu bori we vi-təvə} & \quad \text{[curu kapa χi-ə].} \\
3DU & \quad \text{SEQ PVF RECP-speak} & \quad 3DU & \quad \text{maternal uncle POSS-3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

'Then they talked, him and his maternal uncle.' (or:) 'Then he talked with his maternal uncle. [lit. they\textsubscript{DUAL} talked they\textsubscript{DUAL} maternal uncle].

2) Non-phrasal or verb-marking strategy

Asyndetic, non-phrasal inclusory constructions (labelled 'split inclusory' by Lichtenberk, 2000) are illustrated by (21a-b) in Toqabaqita. The dual subject indexes meki or mere 'we' also mark tense-aspect on the verb and do not make up a conjunctive phrase with the subset NPs mature woman in
(a), or brother in (b). In some approaches, this is sometimes called verb-marking strategy. Yet, though the subject index is part of the VP, it includes the other NP conjunct in its reference and thus behaves referentially as the superset.

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

a. [Ø kukeqe-nau] meki lae uri Honiara qana
   mature.woman-1SG  IDU.EXCL.FUT go to H. at
   wiki loo.
   week that.up
   ‘My wife and I will go to Honiara next week.’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 21)

b. [Ø doqora-mu] mere ngata.
   brother-2SG  IDU.EXCL.NONFUT speak
   ‘Your brother and I spoke (to each other).’ [lit. your brother weDUAL spoke] (2000: 21)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Many languages display the non-phrasal pattern, Papuan Malay for instance.
(22) Papuan Malay (SVO, Eastern Province of Papua)

Maria kitong-dua su-tara-bisa lae.
Maria 1Pl-two PFV-NEG-able again

‘Maria and I can’t do it anymore.’ [lit. Maria we$_{DU}$al$^{ths}$] (Donohue forthcoming)

On the other hand, Tetun displays the phrasal pattern.

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

Ami ruas Pák Tóm bá Laran.
1Pl.EXCL two Mr Tom go Laran

‘We two Mr Tom (and I) went to Laran.’ (van Klinken 1999: 157)

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

(24) Tahitian (Eastern Polynesian)

‘Ua reva ātu māua ’o Peu.
Piev leave away 1DU.EXCL 1D Peu


(25) Māori (Eastern Polynesian)

Kei te aha kōrua ko Tame?
TAM what 2DU SPEC Tame

‘What are you and Tame doing?’ (Bauer 1997: 548)

1.2.2. Syndetic inclusory constructions

In other languages, such as Nêlêmwa and many northern languages of New Caledonia (Nyelâyu, Nemi, Bwatoo, Cêmûhî, etc.), inclusory constructions are syndetic$^{12}$ and involve a conjunctive morpheme, often a comitative conjunction.

- Phrasal vs. non-phrasal constructions

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

---

$^{12}$ While inclusory constructions or their traces tend to be asyndetic in southern languages (Ajië, Tirî (Osumi 1995), etc.)
person singular pronoun would thus be ungrammatical), it only allows an
inclusory free pronoun as in (26a). Inclusory constructions are thus
syntactically obligatory to conjoin a pronoun with a noun; no other
construction is available in Nêlêmwa. The NP headed by the conjunctive
ma in (26b) is a conjunct, not an adjunct, nor an afterthought. The notion
of collective action may be stressed by an adverb wuung ‘together’, as in
(26c).

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

a. Io ma tu haga [yaman ma Polie]. (emphatic)
   FUT 1DU.EXCL go.down fish 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ Polie
   ‘We’ll go fishing, Polie and I.’ (Bril 2000)

b. Io ma tu haga Ø ma Polie. (neutral)
   FUT 1DU.EXCL go.down fish CONJ Polie
   ‘Polie and I will go fishing.’ [lit. weDUAL will go fishing including Polie]
   (Bril fieldnotes)

c. Hâ shaya wuung ma co.
   1PL.INCL work together CONJ 2SG.FR
   ‘We and you work together.’ (Or:) We work together with you.’
   (Bril fieldnotes)

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

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

1.2.3. Inclusory interrogative constructions

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

(27) Manam (SOV, Western Oceanic, North New-Guinea cluster, PNG)
   Náita ?án-ru ?
   who? 2PL.FR-DU
   'Who are you with?' (lit. who you2?) (Lichtenberk 1983: 431)

(28) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic, Malaita, Solomon Islands)
    Tei keeroqa ?
    who? 3DU.FR
    'Who (is) he with?' (Lichtenberk 2000: 28)

(29) Mwotlap (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Is., North Vanuatu)
    Kómyō yē ma-van me?—Kamyō Wilson
    2DU who? PFV-go VENT 1DU.EXCL W.
    'Who did you come with?' —'With Wilson.' (François 2000: 391)

2) Phrasal vs. non-phrasal syndetic constructions

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

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

Tolai also displays a syndetic phrasal inclusory construction.

(31) Tolai (SVO, Western Oceanic, Meso-Melanesian cluster, New Britain)
    Amur ma ia?
    2DU.FR CONJ who?
    'Who is with you?' [lit. you[DUAL] including whom?] (Mosel 1984: 41)
1.2.4. Inclusory possessive constructions

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

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

Inti-mamyō Wilson,

son-1DU.EXCL Wilson

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

(François 2000: 479)

(33) Māori (Eastern Polynesian, New Zealand)

Kei whea tākōrua moenga ko tō tāne ?

at where your.DU bed SPEC your husband

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

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

Mwõ-[bi ăbaa-nu].

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

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

(35) Samoan (Polynesian)

‘i te fa’atoaga a [lā’ua ma l-o-na tinā].

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

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

2. Syntactic and semantic constraints on inclusory constructions

Several questions crop up at this point. Do inclusory constructions result from some elliptical pronoun or referent? Are such constructions optional? What are the constraints on inclusory constructions?
2.1. Obligatory inclusory strategy: syntaxic constraints on the type of conjuncts

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

2.1.1. Constraint on pronominal conjuncts and person hierarchy

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

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

a. Hli u peeva [Teâ Pwayili ma horaaamwaleny Kaavo].
   3DU PFV argue T. Pwayili CONJ this.woman Kaavo
   ‘Teâ Pwayili and this woman Kaavo argue.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

b. Hli u peeva Ø ma horaaamwaleny Kaavo.
   3DU PFV argue CONJ this.woman Kaavo
   ‘He and this woman Kaavo argue.’ [lit. theyDUAL argue including this woman Kaavo]

c. Hli u peeva hli ma horaaamwaleny Kaavo.
   3DU PFV argue 3DU.FR CONJ this.woman Kaavo
   ‘They argue, he and this woman Kaavo.’ (Bril fieldnotes)

The superset pronoun abides by person and referential hierarchy: 1st includes 2nd person, which includes 3rd person. According to such hierarchy, ‘I and you’ yields a ‘we2.incl. you’ form; ‘I and him’ yields ‘we2.excl. him’ and ‘you and him’ yields a ‘you2 him’ form. No difference of inclusory pattern was observed for 1st, 2nd or 3rd persons. In contrast with languages which restrict inclusory constructions to 1st and 2nd person pronouns,
3rd person inclusory pronouns are also allowed, possibly because pronouns have distinct forms for dual, sometimes trial, and plural forms, thus preventing any referential ambiguity.

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

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

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

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

(38) Xârâcûù (Eastern Oceanic, South New Caledonia)
    Mwââ=gê **mê deêri Miâ.**
    house=2SG.FR COORD people Miâ
    ‘Your (sg.) and the people of Miâ’s house.’ (Moyse-Faurie 1995: 30)

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

13 The clitic -m is a singular definite nominal determiner.
### 2.1.2. Higher animacy hierarchy

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

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

\[
\text{Entêl} \ yê \ so \ van\ voñopñion – \text{Entêl} \ \text{Wilson} \\
\text{I} \text{TRI.INCL.FR who? PROSP go fishing} \ \text{I} \text{TRI.INCL.FR Wilson} \\
‘Who are we2 going to fish with?’ – ‘With Wilson’ (or:)
\‘Wilson and us.’
\]

\[\text{[lit. we3 who go fishing]}\]
\(\text{(François 2000: 392)}\)

There are subtle semantic features relating to the position of the inclusory pronoun, before or after the subset NP (40b), signalling differences in topicality, anaphoricity and empathy, the first conjunct is more topical.\(^{14}\)

\[(40b)\] kôyô Wilson

\[
3\text{DU Wilson} \ \\
‘(S)he and Wilson.’
\]

\(\text{(François 2000: 390)}\)

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

\[(40c)\] Nataŋ \(\text{mi/ba}\) \(\text{nañasel} \)?

\[
\text{basket with/COORD knife} \\
‘basket and knife’ (Crowley, in Lynch et al. 2002: 592)
\]

\[(40d)\] \(\text{ige imam wa ige tita}.\)

\[
\text{ART.PL father and ART.PL mother} \\
‘the fathers and mothers’ (François 2002: 263)
\]

\[(40e)\] \(\text{ige susu tiwag mi ige lililwo}.\)

\[
\text{ART.PL small.one together.with ART.PL big.one} \\
‘the children and the adults’ (François 2002: 263)
\]

---

\(^{14}\) A similar phenomenon is described in Toqabaqita by Lichtenberk (2000: 9-10, 27).
(40f) Ino, *tiwag mi nēk.*
1SG together with 2SG
'me and/with you (François 2002: 263)

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

(40g) *Na-manɡo tiwag mi nō-wōh, kōyō vēlēs neneh vēlēs.*
ART-mango together with ART-coconut 3DU only sweet only
'The mango and the coconut are as sweet.' (François 2002: 262)

(40h) *Nēk tog vanvan tiwag mi ige hōw en!*
2SG PROH go together with PL down DX
'Do not go with the people down there (to the north)! ' (François 2002: 262)

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

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

2.2.1. Sameness of syntactic function, semantic role and topicality

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

A] New Caledonian languages

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

\[
\text{Pe-kau-li } \text{ ma } \text{Hiixe.}
\]
\[
\text{RECP-year-3DU CONJ Hiixe}
\]

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

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

Various other New Caledonian languages, among them Bwatoo, Cêmuhi\textsuperscript{15} and Ajië (Bril 2004: 509-511), show similar contrasts. Oceanic languages generally distinguish comitative conjuncts restricted to higher animate NPs and marked by an 'and/with' coordinator (with number agreement), from associative adjuncts marked by a preposition 'with', without number agreement. They usually express differences in agency, animacy, and topicality.

B] Nakanai

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

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

a.  Eia ge voku la lum\[tamutou me la valalua taume].
\[
\text{3SG IRR work ART house your.PL and ART men your.SG}
\]

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

b.  La baa taku sesele, [amite me tabara-bara-gu], [egite la valua isahari] la baa tamite isasa.
\[
\text{ART area my true 1PL.EXCL and brother-RED-my 3PL ART men some ART area our.PL.EXCL one}
\]

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

c.  Amite umala ge pou vikapopo le-gite Siapanipani.
\[
\text{1PL.EXCL PROH IRR sit be.together with-3PL Japanese}
\]

'We were not to stay with the Japanese.' (Johnston 1980: 35)

\textsuperscript{15} In Cêmuhi (Rivierre, 1980: 194-95) the inclusory construction with the coordinator me triggers number agreement and is distinct from the non-co-agentive preposition imi with, carrying, derived from imwi 'seize, hold', without number agreement (see Ozanne-Rivierre 2004).
C] Manam

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

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

a. \([\text{gáu to?á-gu } ?é-ru ] \ ?i-réba-?u.\)
   1SG.FR older.brother-1SG.POSS 1EXCL.FR-DU 1EXCL-sail-DU
   ‘I and my older brother sailed.’ (Or:) I sailed with my older brother. (Lichtenberk 1983: 430)

b. \([\text{To?á-gu } ?é-ru ] \ ?i-reba-réba-?u.\)
   older.brother-1SG 1EXCL.FR-DU 1EXCL.RL-sail-RED-DU
   ‘My older brother and I were sailing.’ (Lichtenberk 1983: 275)

D] Toqabaqita

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

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

a. \([\text{gáu ma wela-nau ki] mili too siafaqa.}\)
   1SG.FR and child-1SG.PL 1PL.EXCL.(N.FUT) stay be.not.well.off
   ‘I and my children, we are not well off.’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 8)

b. \([\text{Kamaroqa tha Bita] moki lae bii kamiliqa ?}\)
   2DU.FR ART Bita 2DU.FUT go with 1PL.EXCL.FR
   ‘Will you (sg.) and Bita come with us ?’ (Lichtenberk 2000: 9)

E] Fijian

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

(45) Boumaa Fijian (Central Pacific)

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

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

2.2.2. Syntactic function: subject vs object function

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

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

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

---

\(^{16}\) Dual forms only exist for nominative pronouns, otherwise only SG vs PL pronouns.
(47) Toqabaqita (Central Eastern Oceanic, Malaita, Solomon Islands)

Toqa loo kera ngata taqaa suli [kamareqa wela nau].

people that.up 3PL.N.FUT speak be.bad about 1DU.EXCL.FR

child 1SG

‘The people up there speak badly about me and my child.’

(Lichtenberk 2000: 15)

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

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

Eau alalavi hilo [egira (me)17 e harua-la].

1SG yesterday see 3DU CONJ ART husband-3POSS

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

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

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

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

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

a. Kiya-a pe-mwang ni pe-wooxa[-va] ma

there.is.not.at.all RECP-bad in RECP-middle-POSS.1PL.EXCL CONJ

Teâ Belep].

T. Belep

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

b. Kiya-a pe-pwa-wo shi[-vaak18 ma axamaleena

there.is.not.at.all RECP-break-COLL side-POSS.1PL.EXCL CONJ these.M.DX2

Polo].

Polo

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

(Bril fieldnotes)

17 The coordinator me is optionally deleted when the NP is not in subject/topic function and position.
18 The possessive form -va is neutral, -vaak is emphatic.
3. Syndetic constructions: the status of the conjunctive morphemes

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

3.1. Etymology of the conjunctive morpheme

There are two frequent etymological sources for the conjunctive morpheme used in the various types of NP conjunction: a coordinator or a comitative adposition, often (but not exclusively) expressing co-agentivity\(^{19}\), and less frequently nouns meaning ‘friend, companion’, and verbs meaning “accompany, follow”.

3.1.1. Source: a comitative adposition

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

(50) Atayal (Formosan)

   PROG.PROX-1PL.EXCL.NOM AF-sing COM Temu  
   I'm singing with Temu.’ (Huang 2006: 223) [AF = actor affix]

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

\(^{19}\) In French, nous irons avec Michel (lit. we’ll go with Michel) is ambiguous: it generally refers to more than two participants with the standard adjunctive function and reading of avec, but if the context is clear, it may also refer to two participants (Michel and I, understood as a couple) with the inclusory reading. In Chilean Spanish (Schwartz 1988), the comitative preposition con with may be used with an inclusory reading, but only for co-agentive animates with close relationship (as in a-b below). With inanimates (as in c), the inclusory reading is impossible, con only has the instrumental adjunct reading; with distantly related animates (d), the reading cannot be inclusory either and must be that of a comitative adjunct:

a. fuimos a casa con mi madre  ‘I went home with my mother’;

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

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

d. fuimos al mercado con el Mayor de la ciudad  [comitative] ‘We went to the market with the Mayor of the city’.
In Takia (Oceanic), NPs with human reference are conjoined with the comitative conjunction *da* ‘and/with’ triggering plural agreement on the verb, whereas non-human NPs are simply juxtaposed.

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

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{Ab} & \text{a} & \text{oŋ} & \text{w-abi} & \text{ya-n} & [\text{nai} & \text{Meit} & \text{da}] & \text{lo} \\
\text{house} & \text{DX2} & \text{2SG} & \text{build} & \text{RL-DEF} & \text{1SG.F} & \text{Meit} & \text{COM} & \text{3.LOC.in}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{mu-mado} & \text{da.} \\
\text{1PL.EXCL-stay} & \text{IPFV}
\end{array}
\]

The house that you built, Meit and I are living in it.’ (Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 230)

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

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

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{Hiang} & \text{me} & \text{tik} & [\text{po} & \text{vio-n} & \text{to} & \text{elaio-n}]. \\
\text{3SG.M} & \text{come} & \text{call.name} & \text{3PL} & \text{father-in-law-3SG} & \text{COM} & \text{mother-in-law-3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘He came and uttered the names of his father-in-law and mother-in-law.’ (Throop & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 405)

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

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

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

In many Northern Vanuatu languages, *mV* comitative coordinators have conjunctive and inclusory functions.
In Hiw, the conjoining function of the comitative/associative preposition \textit{mi} ‘with’ appears in older texts and is thus not an innovation, but the conjoining function has increased in modern speech (Bauer 1997: 550). \textit{Me} conjoins humans (with group or generic reference) and inanimates, in all syntactic functions (subjects, direct or oblique objects). The choice between the comitative coordinator \textit{me} (55a-b) or a summation dual pronoun (55c) does not carry any semantic difference.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(53)] Hiw (Eastern Oceanic, Torres, North Vanuatu)
\begin{itemize}
\item Kemaře \textit{mi Edga peon tō.}
\item DU.EXCL and/with E. FUT go.INDIV
\item ‘Edgar and I will go.’ (François p.c.)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(54)] Lo-Toga (Eastern Oceanic, Torres, North Vanuatu)
\begin{itemize}
\item Kemor \textit{mi}²⁰ Edga të ōr-vēn ?
\item DU.EXCL and/with E. PROSP AOR.DU-go
\item ‘Edgar and I will go.’ (François p.c.)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

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

\begin{itemize}
\item[(55)] Māori (Eastern Polynesian)
\begin{itemize}
\item a. E kore [te tangata teina \textit{me} te tūtūā]
\item TAM NEG the man younger COM the low-born
\item e tae atu ki reira noho ai.
\item TAM arrive away to there sit PART
\item ‘People of junior rank and low-born people could never go and sit there.’ (Bauer 1997: 547)
\item b. I haere atu [a Hone \textit{me} Piri] ki te tangihanga.
\item TAM move away PERS John COM Bill to the tangi
\item ‘John and Bill went to the tangi.’ (Bauer 1997: 552)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

²⁰ In Lo-Toga, \textit{mi} has extended its conjunctive function to clause conjunction (François, p.c.).
c. I haere atu [a Hone rāua ko Piri] ki te tangihanga.
   TAM move away ART John 3DU SPEC Bill to the tangi
   ‘John and Bill went to the tangi.’ (Bauer 1997: 552)

The comitative preposition me also expresses set inclusion in Māori:

d. Ngā tāngata katoa i kata me te rangatira atu.
   the.PL people all TAM laugh COM the chief away
   ‘All the people, including the chief, laughed.’ (Bauer 1997: 219)

e. Kua tika [katoa ngā kai me ngā mīti atu].
   TAM right all the.PL food COM the.PL meat away
   ‘All the food, including the meat, should be ready now.’ (Bauer 1997: 219)

3.1.3. Source: a noun ‘companion, fellow’

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

(56) Mwerlap (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Islands, North Vanuatu)
   To-k i Edga s-van.
   COM-1SG ART E. AOR-go
   ‘Edgar and I will go.’ (François p.c.)

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

(57) Dorig (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Islands, Gaua Island, North Vanuatu)
   a. Kmur ta-ā i sē s-van ?
      2DU COM-2SG ART who PROSP-go
      ‘Who will you (sg) go with?’[lit. you2 your companion who will go?]
      (François p.c.)

   b. I vve kmur ta-ā i tma kmur.
      ART mother 2DU COM-3SG ART father 2DU
      ‘your father and your mother’(François p.c.)

In Vurës, the comitative marker (58a) has been further grammaticalised as an instrumental preposition tek with inanimate nouns (58b).
(58) Vurës (Eastern Oceanic, Banks Islands, North Vanuatu)

a. **(Kömörök)** te-k i Womtel ma-van me.
   1DU.EXCL COM-1SG ART W. PFV-go hither
   'I came with Womtel.' *[lit. (we2) my-fellow Womtel came here]*
   (François p.c.)

b. Në mō-bōl no tek o vin mōlō.
   3SG PFV-hit 1SG INS ART skin palm-tree
   'He hit me with the bark of a palm-tree.' *(François p.c.)*

3.1.4. Source: a verb ‘accompany, be with’

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

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

a. **[Aü-òra pūata=didi]** ma-saava=mēka=e.
   1SG-be.with woman=DX1 1PL.EXCL-marvy=only=IDX
   'I just marry this woman here.' *(van Engelenhoven 2004: 254)*

b. **[Aü-òra=o]** tata-līeri-nena=o.
   1SG-be.with=2SG NEG.1PL.INCL-speak-RL=IND
   'We cannot speak with each other.' *(van Engelenhoven 2004: 255)*

c. **[Tutküëi n-òra Vatūmīiaa]** ra-ara=e.
   T. 3SG-be.with B. 3PL-war=IDX
   'Tutukei and Batumiau were at war (with each other or someone else)' *(van Engelenhoven 2004: 254)*

In Tetun (Timor), the verb\(^\text{21}\) hoo ‘accompany, be with (person)’ has been reanalysed as a coordinator of co-actor NPs under the form no ‘and’ (from n-o [lit. 3sg-be with], a reduced third person singular form of hoo).

---

\(^{21}\) Another verb, hodi ‘bring, take, use’ has been reanalysed as a prepositional verb introducing instrument noun phrases, and as a coordinator of clauses *(van Klinken 2000).*
Several other conjoining strategies have previously been mentioned in Tetun: two of them (the summation pronoun (4) and inclusory constructions (23)) are restricted to NPs with human reference; the comitative coordinator hoo is also more frequent than the coordinator no ‘and’ for human NP conjunction.

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

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

— Additive xa vs. inclusory ma

(61) Nêlêmwa

a. Yaman ma axaleny. b. Yaman xa axaleny.
1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ this.one 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ this.one
‘Me and that man.’ (inclusion) ‘The two of us and/plus that man.’ (addition)

— Me and ma

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

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

Kaavo CONJ T. P.
‘Aloe and Mudae (two waves) rise up and take Kaavo and Teâ
Pwayili’s boat.’

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

(63) Nêlêmwa (Bril fieldnotes)

a. Na [hli u muuvi mwâ [Kaavo Dela ma Teâ Pwayili]] me
   CONJ 3DU PFV stay then K. D. CONJ T. P. CONJ
   aaxiik pwaxi-hli.
   one child-POSS.3DU
   ‘And Kaavo Dela and Teâ Pwayili lived there and/with their child.’

b. Hli u oda-me hli me hlaaleny shâlaga i hli.
   3DU PFV go.up-VENT 3DU.FR CONJ these.DX1 crab CONN 3DU
   ‘They(2) come back, they(2) with their crabs.’

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

A) Extraction

Extraction (e.g. topicalization, focus or wh-movement) is commonly used
to distinguish a coordinator from an adposition. An adposition may be
stranded, not a coordinator: who did you go with ?, but *who did you go
and ? is ungrammatical. An NP may be extracted together with its
adposition with whom did you go ?, not with a coordinator *and who did
you go ? The following test will bear on the properties of the comitative
coordinator ma in comparison with the deverbal associative preposition
ve–vi ‘with’ (from fhe ‘take, carry’). As far as focus movement goes, the
preposition ve–vi and the comitative coordinator ma behave similarly, with
a resumptive anaphoric pronoun *in situ*, the main distinctive feature between them is number agreement (see Bril 2004: 512-513, for details). But in topicalisation (64b), only *ma* behaves as a phrasal coordinator, *ve–vi* may not, as shown in (64c).

(64) Nêlêmwa (Bril fieldnotes)

a. **Mo** piila wuung **yamon ma** âlô-raamwa eli.
   2DU stroll together 2DU.FR CONJ young-woman that.ANAPH
   ‘You took a walk together, you and that girl.’ (emphatic)

b.  [**Yamon ma** âlô-raamwa eli] xe **mo** pwe wuung.
   2DU.FR CONJ young-woman that.ANAPH TOP 2DU fish together
   ‘You and that girl, you took a walk together went fishing together.’

c.  I fuk **vi** Kaavo ‘he flew with Kaavo’;
   but *ye vi Kaavo xe hli fuk (intended meaning: ‘he with Kaavo, they flew’) would be ungrammatical.

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

(64d) **O hî** tu haga **ma na** xe yo haga co,
   if 1DU.INCL go.down fish CONJ 1SG TOP 2SG fish 2SG.FR
   bu fo idaama-m...
   as there.is eye-POSS.2SG
   ‘When we go fishing, (you) and/with me, you will be able to fish
   since you have your eyes …’ (but what about me who have lost mine?)
Example (64d) displays the strange occurrence of a 1st person subset pronoun (na), instead of the expected 2nd person (co, yo) in constructions with standard person hierarchy (see (64e):

(64e) O hî tu haga ma co

‘when we go fishing, you (and me)’

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

B] Iteration

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

(65) Nélémwa (Eastern Oceanic, North New Caledonia)

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

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

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

‘She knows all our customs, and all the customs of our country, and our medicine and so on.’ (Bril fieldnotes)
By contrast, the comitative coordinator me in Māori cannot be iterated more than twice and seems to preserve more of its prepositional properties. Listing usually starts with juxtaposition and ends with one or two final me:

(66) Māori (Estern Polynesian, Bauer 1997: 552)

...e whiu ana i te taonga nei, i te hāpuku [...],
TAM collect TAM DO ART treasure near DO ART groper [...] i te huahua kuku me te huahua kākā
DO ART preserved.game pigeon CONJ ART preserved.game kaka
me te huahua kūaka.
CONJ ART preserved.game godwit
‘they collected these treasures, groper [...] and preserved pigeon, kaka and godwit.’

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

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

3.3.1. Position: Contiguous vs. non-contiguous conjuncts

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

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

Telengai dir rovoi ma ra pap.
Telengai 3DU hunt CONJ ART dog
‘Telengai and the dog hunted.’ (Mosel 1984:176)

In Nakanai, contiguous subject conjuncts indicate the concomitant involvement of the participants in an action or state, while non-contiguous subject conjuncts as in (68b) seem to indicate a slight shift of emphasis and
topicality\textsuperscript{22}, the men being slightly less topical in (b);

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

a. E hatavile, la valalua, egite o-io po-pou.
   ART women ART men 3PL at-there RED-sit
   The women and the men are there waiting. (Johnston 1980: 243)

b. E hatavile o-io po-pou, la valalua.
   ART women at-there RED-sit ART men
   'The women are there waiting, and the men.' (Johnston 1980: 243)

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

- Comitative conjunctions and the positional criterion

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

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

a. [?áíʔo náita \textit{záiza}]ʔa-pile-pile ?
   2SG who COM 2PL.RL-speak-RED
   'Who are you speaking with?' (Lichtenberk 1983: 432)

b. anúa ne-Ə i-láʔo [nátu-Ə \textit{záiza}].
   village POSS-3SG 3SG-go child-3SG COM
   'She went to her village with her child.' (Lichtenberk 1983: 376)

c. [[róa-Ə-be nátu-Ə] \textit{záiza}] di-sin-sín-ə-to.
   spouse-3SG.POSS and child-3SG.POSS COM 3PL-drink-RED-3PL-PC
   'He used to drink them (coconuts) with his wife and child.'
   (Lichtenberk 1983: 376)

\textsuperscript{22} Johnston is not more specific in his description.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Tiwag} originally meant 'one' (François p.c.).
In (69c), \textit{záiza} is also conjunctive as shown by the plural subject index referring to the three participants (including an unexpressed 3rd person singular participant), instead of the expected singular subject index if \textit{záiza} were an adjunctive comitative postposition. \textit{Záiza} functions as a set inclusion morpheme, while the standard coordinator \textit{–be} conjoins the two members of the subset (spouse and child).

- Negative comitative constructions

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

(69d) \[\text{3SG.FR NEG older.brother-3SG COM 3PL.RL.-arrive-PC} \]
\[\text{He came without his older brothers. (lit. he did not arrive with his older brothers) (Lichtenberk 1983: 432)}\]

(69e) \[\text{3SG.FR NEG older.brother-3SG 3PL.FR-8F-DU 3PL.RL.-arrive-DU} \]
\[\text{He arrived without his older brother.} \quad \text{(Lichtenberk 1983: 275)}\]

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

24 Similarly, in Chilean Spanish, inclusory construction with \textit{con ‘with’} may be discontinuous (as in (a)), while in its conjoining function, the conjuncts are contiguous (b):

(a) \textit{fuimos al mercado con mi amiga} I went to the market with my friend \quad \text{[lit. went \textit{we} to the market with my friend];}

(b) \textit{yo con mi amiga} \textit{fuimos al Mercado} I with my friend we went to the market (Schwartz 1988).
3.3.2. Semantic tests: collective or distributive readings

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

A] Collective and distributive readings of the conjunctive construction

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

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

a. Bi a pe-haze ma âbaa-nu.
   1DU.EXCL go RECP-separate CONJ brother-POSS.1SG
   ‘My brother and I went separately.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

b. Bi vara kibaò a-kò bwò ma âbaa-nu.
   1DU.EXCL each kill CLF-three bat CONJ brother-POSS.1SG
   ‘My brother and I killed three bats each.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

c. Li a kaze [Kaavo ma Hiixe].
   3DU go fish Kaavo CONJ Hiixe
   ‘Kaavo and Hiixe go fishing.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

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

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

In Fijian, the comitative conjunction kei ‘and, with’ is also compatible with the collective or distributive readings:
(71) Fijian (Central Pacific)

a. **Keirau lako kei Samu.**
   
   *1DU.EXCL go CONJ Samu*
   
   ‘Samu and I are going.’ (Milner 1967: 67)

b. **Erau sā dui kania na kona ika [ko Jone kei Filipe].**
   
   *3DU EMPH each eat ART his fish ART Jone CONJ Filipe*
   
   ‘Jone and Filipe are each eating their own fish.’ (Milner 1967, in Payne 1985: 22)

B] Predicate semantics

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

---

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

a. **Bi enô ma âbaa-nu.**
   1DU.EXCL young CONJ brother-POSS-1SG
   ‘My brother and I are young.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

b. **Kixa mwani-bi ma âbaa-nu.**
   there.is.no money-POSS.1DU.EXCL CONJ brother-POSS-1SG
   ‘My brother and I are poor [lit. there is no money of ours including my brother].’

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

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

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

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

4.1. Languages with multiple morphemes and constructions

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

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

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

Nat a-fwat nau qeq-au kyau.
child 3SG-bathe sea COM-1SG 1SG
‘The child bathed in the sea with me.’ (Implied meaning: I hold him)
(Wivell & Ross, in Lynch et al. 2002: 213)
Here are further examples of competing strategies in a sample of (mostly Western) Oceanic languages.

4.1.1. Maleu

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

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

a. Iou me Vulum.
   1SG.FR and Vulum
   ‘Vulum and I.’ (Haywood 1996: 168)

b. Iami-lua Vulum.
   2PL.FR-TWO Vulum
   ‘You and Vulum.’ (Haywood 1996: 169)

c. Ire-lua ti-vu-a.
   3PL.FR-TWO grand-father-POSS.3SG
   ‘He and his grand-father.’ (Haywood 1996: 169)

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

(75d) Ku-moi ta-rege ta-ualiu.
   2SG-come 1PL.INCL-be.with 1PL.INCL-wash
   ‘Come and bathe with us.’ (lit. come be with us we bathe) (Haywood 1996: 180)

This comitative verb is reanalysed as a deverbal preposition, sometimes involving metathesis, from ti-rege (3sg be.with) to tigere ‘with’.

(75e) na-melamela ti-jere tna-re
   NM-children COM mother-POSS.3PL
   ‘the children with their mother’ (Haywood 1996: 180)
4.1.2. Mangap-Mbula

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

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

a. [Nio niamru wae-ŋ] am-la.
\[1\text{SG.FR} \ 1\text{DU.EXCL} \ \text{associate-POS} \ 1\text{SG} \ 1\text{PL.EXCL}-\text{go}\]
\'I, together with my wife, went.' (Bugenhagen 1995: 114)

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

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

(76c) Ata ma Namono ti-mar ti-re yam.
\[\text{Ata} \ \text{CONJ} \ \text{Namono} \ 3\text{PL}-\text{come} \ 3\text{PL}-\text{see} \ 1\text{PL.EXCL}\]
\'Ata and Namo\n\no came to see us.' (Bugenhagen 1995: 213)

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

(76d) Ni i-mbot raama zin buzur sa\n\nsan-ŋa-n.
\[3\text{SG.FR} \ 3\text{SG}-\text{stay} \ \text{COM} \ \text{PL} \ \text{animal} \ \text{wild-NMLZ-GEN.3PL}\]
\'(S)he stayed with the wild animals.' (Bugenhagen 1995: 213)

(76e) Ni ko i-mbot raama yom totomen.
\[3\text{SG.FR} \ \text{UNC} \ 3\text{SG}-\text{stay} \ \text{COM} \ 2\text{PL} \ \text{always}\]
\'He will always be with you.' (Bugenhagen 1995: 114)

---

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

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

(i) amau po hinau ‘my father and mother, my parents’ (there is no other term for ‘parents’)

(ii) amau ma hinau ‘my father and/plus my mother’.

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

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

a. Tau ma Mika.
   1SG.FR CONJ Mika
   ‘Mika and I.’ (Ezard 1997: 157)

b. Taumi mite-u ta-kaoha.
   2PL.FR with-1SG 1PL.INCL-happy
   ‘Let’s be happy together.’ (Ezard 1997: 159)

c. Tau mite-mi ta-memae.
   1SG.FR with-2PL 1PL.INCL-stay
   ‘I and you are staying together.’ (Ezard 1997: 160)

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

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

(77e) Tau ma Bryan a manago mitehi to-gelu.
   1SG.FR CONJ B. POSS.3SG family together 1PL.EXCL-embark
   ‘I and Bryan and his family got on board.’ (Ezard 1997: 159)
There are further differences: po and ma are medial coordinators [NP po \sim ma NP], while mitehi is postposed to the second conjunct [NP NP mitehi]. The negative comitative ‘without’ is expressed by the negation marker ega which has scope on the comitative conjunct [NP [ega NP mitehi]] (lit. [NP [not NP together]]), as in Manam (69d). Comitative conjunction and set inclusion with mitehi is further distinguished from comitative adjunction which is marked by a preposition a ‘with’, without number agreement and referring to subservient actors (1997: 158).

4.1.4. Numèè (New Caledonia)

New Caledonian languages generally distinguish a comitative conjunction ‘and/with’ triggering number agreement with the conjuncts and expressing co-agentivity, from an associative preposition ‘with’ marking associative adjuncts. Comitative conjuncts and adjuncts express not only differences in agency, but also in topicality and animacy (see –vi vs. ma in Nélémwa (64b-c)). Numèè has several coordinators, the focus here will be on two of them, mê and mó. Mê is the standard coordinator which joins (± animate) NPs, possibly with listing effect (78a-b), as well as clauses. Mô ‘and, with’ is both conjunctive and adjunctive\(^{27}\), its functions are distinguished by number agreement, as shown by (78c vs. 78e-f). As a comitative conjunction, it joins all types of nouns, proper or common, ± animate.

(78) Numèè (Far South New Caledonia)

a. Nê ngê wè mê kâij mê yâre mê.  
3PL TRANSL do VENT food and fishing and  
‘They bring food and fish.’ (Rivierre p.c.)

b. Nê mwâ tûù vá niikwêrê mê vûë mê wawêrê kô.  
3PL then board group child and woman and everyone on.top  
‘They board the children women and everyone on them (boats).’ (Rivierre p.c.)

c. [Kwaraa mó Kwâjoro] wêé ngââ xiro ngê triiê ?  
K. and K. INTERJ 2DU pole(boat) with who?  
‘Kwaraa and Kwâjoro wééé ! who are you(2) travelling with ?’ (Rivierre p.c.)

\(^{27}\) Also marking complement of comparative:

Yaâ gu mê vê-têtê mó nê. ‘You won’t be similar to them.’  
NEG 2SG FUT be.similar with 3PL
d. ... pàkanô-ê wè-karêë mô kumwà mô dé.  
... full of fully mature corn-cobs and sweet potatoes and sugar-cane. (Rivierre p.c.)

(78c) à nyî ngê tùù mwêê më ngê ńuu ngê  
and 3SG TRANSL go.down again VENT with knife this  
mô wàbutrii ngê mwêê.  
and basket this again  
'and she runs down again towards the shore with her knife and basket.' (Rivierre p.c.)

4.2. Languages with a unique morpheme distinguished by number agreement

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

---

28 The coordinator coexists with co-agentive comitative prepositions or associative non-co-agentive, wèrè (+animate), kèrè (+/-animate) without agreement (Moyse-Faurie, 1995: 140).
set inclusion (Tolai, North New Caledonian languages), and possibly to VP or clausal coordination\(^\text{29}\) as an ‘and’ coordinator.

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

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

(79) Standard Fijian (Central Pacific)

a. **Erau** lako mai [na turaga \(kei\) na watina].
   3DU move here ART chief CONJ ART wife
   ‘The chief and his wife are coming.’ (Payne 1985: 29)

b. **Keirau** a vei-vosa-ki **kaya.\(^\text{30}\)**
   1DU.EXCL PAST DISTR-talk-TR KEL.3SG

c. **Au** aa vei-vosa-ki **kaya.\(^\text{30}\)**
   1SG PAST DISTR-talk-TR KEL.3SG

Dixon (1988: 157-160) also notes a growing tendency to use \(vata\ ~\tilde{e}\i\) instead of \(\tilde{e}\i\) alone:

**Boumaa Fijian** (Central Pacific)

(79d) **Au** aa sota vata ‘\(\tilde{e}\i\) Jone mai Viidawa.
   1SG PAST meet together with John at Viidawa
   ‘I met up with John at Viidawa.’ (Dixon 1988: 159)

---

\(^{29}\) Like \(me\) in Iaai (Ozanne-Rivierre 1976) and \(ma\) in Nemi (Ozanne-Rivierre 1979).

\(^{30}\) The form \(kaya\) is analysable as \(kei+3\text{sg pronoun}\).
Because of these two coexisting patterns (inclusory and adjunctive), Dixon (1988) and Schütz (1995:354) point out that sentences such as (79e) become ambiguous as to the number of people involved, two (in the inclusory reading) or three (in the adjunctive reading)?

Standard Fijian (Central Pacific)

(79e) **Drau** aa lako kei Samu.

\[2DU \text{PAST go CONJ S.}\]

'You and Samu went.' (Milner 1972: 68; in Schütz 1995: 354) (or: you.2 and Samu went)

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

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

(80) **Yuanga/Zuanga** (North New Caledonia)

a. **E** uda nô mwa mât i ?

\[3SG \text{enter in house COM who?}\]

'Who did he enter the house with?' (Bril Fieldnotes 2007)

b. **Li** uda nô mwa mât i ?

\[3DU \text{enter in house COM who?}\]

'Who did he enter the house with?' (Bril Fieldnotes 2007)

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

(81) **Nyelâyu** (North New Caledonia)

a. **Hor** ma ri ?

\[2DU \text{and/with who?}\]

'You (sg.) and/with whom?' (Ozanne-Rivierre 1998: 119)

b. **Yo** ma r i ?

\[2SG \text{and/with who?}\]

'You (sg.) and/with whom?' (Ozanne-Rivierre 1998: 119)
5. Final discussion

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesser asymmetry</th>
<th>Higher asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard NP</td>
<td>Non-phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± syndetic inclusory</td>
<td>± syndetic inclusory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inclusory</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Comitative</th>
<th>Associative</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nakanai</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleu</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangap-mbula</td>
<td>ma, mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manam</td>
<td>-he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawala</td>
<td>po, ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toqabaqita</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwotlap</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>tiwag mi</td>
<td>tiwag mi</td>
<td>tiwag mi</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nêlêmwa</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma, me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuanga/Yuanga</td>
<td>mā, mā, mani</td>
<td>mani</td>
<td>mani</td>
<td>mani</td>
<td>mani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyêlāyu</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemi</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bwatoom</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cêmûhî</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajiē</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xārācūù</td>
<td>mē</td>
<td>mē</td>
<td>māō</td>
<td>mō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numēã</td>
<td>mō, mē</td>
<td>mō</td>
<td>mō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drehu, Iaai</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>kei</td>
<td>kei</td>
<td>kei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahitian</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These morphemes are often cognates (see Lynch et al. 2002, Moyse-Faurie & Lynch 2004).
Table 2 sums up the various conjunctive or adjunctive constructions used in some Austronesian languages of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Inclusive asyndetic</th>
<th>Inclusive syndetic</th>
<th>Coordination asyndetic</th>
<th>Coordination syndetic</th>
<th>Summation pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atayal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leti</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetun</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papuan Malay</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairiru</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaulong</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakanai</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (pronouns)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangap-Mbula</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manam</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawala</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toqabaqita</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwotlap</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nêlêmwa, Zuanga/Yuanga</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyëlêyu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nêmi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bwatoo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajië</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numêê</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sâmoa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahitian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâorí</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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