



HAL
open science

AND and WITH Conjunctive Strategies in Some Austronesian Languages: Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics

Isabelle Brill

► **To cite this version:**

Isabelle Brill. AND and WITH Conjunctive Strategies in Some Austronesian Languages: Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics. *Language and Linguistics*, 2011, 12 (1), pp.239-272. hal-00591505

HAL Id: hal-00591505

<https://hal.science/hal-00591505v1>

Submitted on 9 May 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

AND and WITH Conjunctive Strategies in Some Austronesian Languages: Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics*

Isabelle Bril
LACITO-CNRS

This article investigates the competing NP conjunctive strategies displayed by a sample of Austronesian languages belonging to different subgroups. The strategies are (i) AND conjunction, (ii) comitative WITH conjunction, and (iii) inclusory-meronymic constructions, analyzed as a subtype of NP conjunctive strategy. Most languages of the sample appear to be mixed AND and WITH languages in two senses: (i) their WITH conjunctive strategy is also used as an AND strategy (Stassen 2003), or (ii) they use both AND and WITH conjunctive strategies with two distinct morphemes (as in some Formosan languages).

The analysis seeks to delineate the syntactic constraints, the semantic and pragmatic features at work in the choice of strategies. It will be shown that if AND-conjunction is structurally symmetrical, WITH-conjunction and meronymic constructions are more asymmetrical, both structurally and in terms of pragmatic saliency. For languages using distinct AND and WITH strategies and morphemes, the distribution of WITH conjunctions is more restricted in terms of conjoined categories, and carry different semantic features.

Key words: symmetrical and asymmetrical conjunction, inclusory-meronymic constructions, comitative, additive coordination

1. Introduction

This investigation of competing NP conjunctive strategies bears on a sample of Austronesian languages belonging to different subgroups. The sample (listed in Table 1 below) covers languages from Taiwan, the Philippines, the Solomons, New Caledonia, and Polynesia. The NP conjunctive strategies concerned are (i) standard AND-conjunction, (ii) comitative WITH-conjunction, and (iii) inclusory constructions which are analyzed here as a subtype of conjunctive strategy, expressing meronymic (part-whole) relation between a superset pronoun (holonym) and a subset NP (meronym). When marked syndetically, inclusory constructions often display a comitative morpheme and are a

* The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful and constructive remarks on an earlier version of this article.

subtype of comitative conjunction (not an adjunctive type), since the superset pronoun shows number agreement with the subset NP.

Stassen (2001, 2003) laid out the basis for a typology of NP conjunction using AND or WITH conjunctive strategies; language types are thus classified as AND-languages (those that only use AND coordinators), WITH-languages (which only use a comitative strategy), and mixed languages in which the comitative morpheme is re-analyzed as an AND coordinator and used both as an adjunctive and a conjunctive morpheme (as in Tuvaluan and Zuanga, see Table 1).

There is yet another way in which languages may be mixed, as the discussion will show, and that is when they have a dual system, using both AND and WITH strategies for NP conjunction, with two distinct morphemes, as in some Formosan languages (Atayal, Nanwang Puyuma) and in Toqabaqita (Oceanic).

Apart from Tagalog which is an AND-language, all the other languages of this sample belong to the mixed type, either in Stassen's terms, or because they use distinct AND and WITH strategies for NP conjunction. As a last, almost common feature, most of them also have inclusory-meronymic constructions.

Several questions will be addressed: Why are there several strategies for NP conjunction? What are their specific syntactic constraints and conditions of use? How are semantics affected? Another question addressed relates more specifically to the syntactic representation of coordination as a symmetrical structure or not.

Section 2 provides definitions of all three types, mostly centering on inclusory constructions. Section 3 outlines the competing strategies used for NP conjunction, their constraints and conditions of use (their distributional properties, the types and categories of NPs concerned), their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features. Section 4 discusses inclusory constructions involving complex NP subsets. Section 5 discusses the syntactic constraints, semantic and pragmatic features of these conjunctive types. Section 6 concludes.

It will be demonstrated that in languages using distinct AND and WITH strategies and morphemes for NP conjunction, the distribution of WITH conjunctions is more restricted in terms of the categories they may conjoin; it is semantically restricted to collaborative, collective, co-agentive NPs or to NPs with meronymic relation. WITH conjunctive strategies also have more asymmetrical properties than AND conjunction, which accounts for their use in inclusory-meronymic constructions.

2. Some definitions of coordination and their subtypes

The term conjunction, as used here, refers to all types of conjoining constructions, symmetric or asymmetric.

2.1 Symmetrical and asymmetrical coordination

Coordination and conjuncts are generally defined as having symmetrical properties and as being on the same structural level, displaying the same morphosyntactic features and the same syntactic functions for each conjunct. But it has been shown (Johannessen 1998) that, cross-linguistically, coordination may be asymmetrical, with the conjuncts evidencing asymmetrical status and different morphosyntactic features.

If AND conjunctive strategies generally display symmetrical properties, WITH conjunctive strategies are more asymmetrical, though still pertaining to the conjunctive domain since it triggers agreement with all conjuncts; it is different from the adjunctive domain in which the comitative morpheme is an adposition heading an adjunct which is excluded from number concord. The third type, inclusory-meronymic constructions,¹ displays even more asymmetrical properties, though also belonging to the conjunctive domain as will be shown. This asymmetry is particularly clear in Tagalog's inclusory constructions (§3.1.2) where the superset and the subset may display different case-marking.

2.2 Inclusory-meronymic constructions

When syndetically marked, inclusory constructions generally use a comitative conjunction and have inclusive interpretation. Thus, in Nêlêmwa, the conjunctive *ma* in (1a) (which is restricted to human NPs and Proper nouns, and certainly has comitative origins) also appears in inclusory constructions as in (1b), where it is a meronymic marker with inclusive interpretation (lit., they₂ including Teâ Pwayili). Example (1b) refers to only two participants; it is not additive.

(1) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia)

- a. *Hli u pwaala [Kaavo ma Teâ Pwayili].*
 3DU PFT sail Kaavo CONJ Teâ Pwayili²
 'Kaavo and Teâ Pwayili sail away.' (Bril fieldnotes 1995)

¹ See Lichtenberk (2000) for a general analysis of such constructions.

² ABS absolutive; ADD additive marker; AF/AV actor voice; AGT agent; AGR agreement; ALL allative; ANAPH anaphoric; ASRT/ASS assertive; CAUS causative; CM common noun; COM comitative; COMP complementizer; CONJ conjunctive marker; CNT contrastive absolutive marker; DEF definite; DIST distal; DU dual; DVN deverbal noun; DX deictic marker; ERG ergative; EXCL exclusive; FOC focal marker; FR free pronoun; FUT future; GEN genitive; INC inceptive; INCL inclusive; IND.OBL indefinite oblique; IPF imperfective; ITR intransitive; LG ligature; LIP low individuation of participants; LOC locative marker; NEG.V negative verb; NEU neutral; N.FUT non-future; NMZ nominalizer; NOM nominative; N.PAST non-past; OBJ object marker; OBL oblique; PART

- b. *Hli u pwaala ma Teâ Pwayili.*
 3DU PFT sail CONJ Teâ Pwayili
 ‘(S)he and Teâ Pwayili sail away.’ (Bril fieldnotes 1995)

Inclusory constructions comprise a superset pronoun (holonym) that includes the reference to a subset NP (the meronym), which may be another pronoun or a noun (see Brill 2004, and in press). In (1b), the superset is the dual pronoun *hli*, and the subset NP headed by *ma* is included in the reference of the superset pronoun. In Nêlêmwa, inclusory constructions are obligatory when one or both conjuncts are pronouns referring to animates; thus a third person singular pronoun (instead of the dual pronoun) would be ungrammatical in (1b). Other Austronesian languages also allow non-inclusory pronominal conjunction.

In Nêlêmwa, inclusory constructions are conjunctive, not adjunctive; they are a subtype of meronymic conjunction, obligatorily applying to noun-pronoun conjunction. The superset and subset are asymmetrical conjuncts since one includes the other in its reference (see Brill in press for more discussion). But in Nêlêmwa, where such constructions are obligatory for noun-pronoun conjunction, the subset-meronym headed by a comitative marker cannot be analyzed as an adjunctive specifier. For instance, if (1b) were rephrased as a focal construction as in (1c) {‘They sail away, (s)he and Teâ Pwayili.’}, the focal free pronoun would obligatorily be dual *hli*, its replacement by a 3rd singular free pronoun (*ye*) would be ungrammatical as shown by the starred tentative rephrasing under (c’).

- c. *Hli u pwaala hli ma Teâ Pwayili.*
 3DU PFT sail 3DU.FR CONJ Teâ Pwayili
 ‘They sail away, (s)he and Teâ Pwayili.’ (Bril fieldnotes 1995)
 (c’. * *Hli u pwaala ye ma Teâ Pwayili*)

An adjunctive analysis of (1b-c) is not available, but if it were, it would lead to the interpretation that more than two participants were involved, as in {‘They sailed away with Teâ Pwayili.’}, an interpretation which is ruled out in such inclusory constructions. Besides, a comitative adjunct would be marked by *me* in Nêlêmwa, while the reference to an additional conjunct would be marked by the additive coordinator *xa* ‘and also’ (*hli xa Teâ Pwayili* ‘they2 and/plus Teâ Pwayili’).

partitive; PAT patient; PERS personal; PERS.MKR personal marker; PF/PV patient voice; PFT/PFV perfective; PL plural; PM predicate marker; POSS possessive marker; PROFORE pronominal foregrounder; PROG progressive; PROJ projective; PROL prolativ; PROX proximal; Q question marker; R realis; REC reciprocal marker; RED reduplication; SEQ sequential; SG singular; SPEC specifier; STAT stative; TOP topic marker; TR transitive marker; TRI trial; VENT ventive.

To conclude, inclusory constructions are conjunctive, but the conjuncts are in a meronymic and asymmetrical relation. They are different from ‘AND’ additive conjunction and clearly distinct from adjunctive constructions.

Inclusory constructions are generally restricted to human co-agents of a process. In Nêlêmwa, looser associative situations, between humans and non-humans for instance, are marked by an adjunctive construction with an associative preposition as in (1d), without number concord with the associated entity.

- d. *I xam fuk vi ye a hooli maalic.*
 3SG ASS fly with 3SG AGT ANAPH bird
 ‘The bird flew with him (on its back).’ (Bril 2002:140)

3. Competing strategies for NP conjunction

Let us now analyze the facts in the sample of languages listed under Table 1 below. Table 1 shows that standard AND-coordination, WITH-coordination, and inclusory constructions may be marked by distinct morphemes and distinct constructions (as in Atayal, Nanwang Puyuma, Tagalog, Palawano, Toqabaqita), while at the other extreme, some languages (Zuanga, Tuvaluan) use one single morpheme whose conjunctive or adjunctive functions are then distinguished by agreement or position. In a few cases, that same morpheme may extend beyond NP coordination into clausal coordination (as in Toqabaqita, Zuanga, Tuvaluan).

3.1 AND and WITH morphemes

The first group of languages, Atayal and Nanwang Puyuma (Formosan) and Toqabaqita (Oceanic) use distinct morphemes for AND and WITH NP conjunction. This functional overlap is signalled by circles in Table 1. The comitative morpheme may also be used as an adjunctive or a conjunctive marker; the different functions are mostly distinguished by number agreement. The choice between AND and WITH conjunctions is semantically and pragmatically driven. AND coordinators have prototypical distributive or collective readings, whereas WITH coordinators are mostly chosen when some collective or meronymic reading is intended. There are also categorial constraints: WITH coordinators mostly operate on higher animate NP conjuncts and in inclusory constructions. By contrast, the general AND coordinator usually conjoins all types of NPs, as well as VPs, clauses and sentences (Bril in press). Pragmatically, AND conjunction indicates equal saliency between the conjuncts, while WITH morphemes tend to mark some imbalance in saliency.

Table 1: Functions of standard AND coordinators and WITH markers

		Pronoun	Noun	VP	Clause	Sentence
	Adjunction	Conjunction				
Atayal AND <i>lu', ru'</i> WITH <i>ki', ci'</i>	-	+	+	+	+	
	+	+	+	-	-	-
Nanwang Puyuma AND <i>aw</i> WITH <i>kay</i>	-	+	+	+	+	+
	+	only inclusory	+	-	-	-
Tagalog AND <i>at</i> WITH <i>sa, kay</i>	-	+	+	+	+	+
	+	-	-	-	-	-
Palawano AND <i>bo</i> OBL <i>et</i>	-		+			
	+	inclusory	-			
Toqabaqita AND <i>ma</i> WITH <i>bii, bia</i>	-	+	+	+	+	+
	+	+	+	-	+	rare
Nêlêmwa and/with <i>ma</i>	-	only inclusory	+	+	idiosyncratic	-
	(+)	-	+	+	+	+
	additive <i>xa</i>	+	+	+	+	+
Zuanga and/with <i>mã</i>	+	+	+	+	+	-
	additive <i>xo</i>	-	-	+	+	+
Tuvaluan and/with <i>mo</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+

3.1.1 AND and WITH morphemes: Atayal, Nanwang Puyuma, Toqabaqita

A) Atayal

(i) *lu'~ ru'* 'and', *ci'~ ki'* 'with'

In Pngawan Atayal, the coordinator *lu'* 'and' conjoins all types of NPs (\pm animates, (2a-b)), as well as VPs and clauses (Huang 2006:226), while the comitative marker *ci'* 'with' is restricted to animate (proper or common) NP conjuncts (2c-d) (see Huang & Hayung 2011).

(2) Pngawan Atayal (Formosan, Huang 2006)

- a. *cyel ma-sa-siliy [ka' Watan ru' Temu].*
 PROG.DIST REC-RED-beat NOM Watan and Temu
 'Watan and Temu are beating each other (with sticks).' (Huang 2006:226)
- b. *ramas ni'un caruy [ka' giluy ru' kukuk].*
 delicious.AF very NOM chicken and duck
 'The chicken and the duck are very delicious.' (Huang 2006:227)

When the comitative conjunctive strategy is chosen with animates (rather than the 'and' coordinator *ru'* as in (2a-b)), and when the participants are 3rd person, the form *laha' ci'* is obligatory (2c-d); the 3rd person plural summation pronoun *laha'* signals NP conjunction.

- c. *sa-silay-un=mu [ka' huril laha' ci' ngyaw].*
 RED-beat-PF=1SG.GEN NOM dog 3PL.FR COM cat
 'The dog and the cat will be beaten by me.' (Huang 2006:228)
- d. *ma-m-aha tanux [ka' yumin laha' ci' ngyaw].*
 RED-AF-go outside NOM Yumin 3PL.FR COM cat
 'Yumin will go outside with the cat / Yumin and the cat will go outside.'
 (Huang 2006:225)

(ii) Noun-pronoun or pronominal conjunction: inclusory constructions with *ci'*

Pronominal inclusory constructions also use the comitative marker *ci'*. The meronymic conjunct may be split (3a), or phrasal and contiguous with a free pronoun (3b).

(3) Pngawan Atayal

- a. *nyel=mamu m-awas [ci' Temu ga].*
 PROG.PROX=2PL.NOM AF-sing COM Temu Q
 'Are you singing with Temu?' (Huang 2006:223)
- b. *ma-m-aha=mamu inu' cuxan [cimu [ci' nabkis]].*
 RED-AF-go=2PL.NOM where tomorrow 2PL.FR COM old.man
 'Where will you and the old man go tomorrow?' (Huang 2006:227)

In Sqliq Atayal, *ki'* may conjoin a free pronoun and a noun inclusively (as in the first of the two readings of (3c) which refers to two participants) or non-inclusively (3d), yet with number agreement with all conjuncts marked by =*sami*:

- c. *sami ki' ciwas ga', m-qwas=sami krryax.*
 1PL.EXCL.NEU COM Ciwas TOP AF-sing=1PL.EXCL.NOM often
 'As for me/us and Ciwas, we often sing (together).' (Huang & Hayung 2011:22)
- d. *kuzing ki' ciwas ga', m-qwas=sami krryax.*
 1SG.NEU COM Ciwas TOP AF-sing=1PL.EXCL.NOM often
 'As for me and Ciwas, we often sing (together).' (Huang & Hayung 2011: 22)

A free pronoun and a noun may also be conjoined by *ru'* 'and' (3e), in this case it only has the additive reading:

- e. *sami ru' ciwas ga', m-qwas=sami krryax.*
 1PL.EXCL.NEU and Ciwas TOP AF-sing=1PL.EXCL.NOM often
 'As for us and Ciwas, we often sing (together).' (Huang & Hayung 2011: 28)

B) Nanwang Puyuma

(i) *aw* 'and', *kay* 'with'

Similarly in Nanwang Puyuma, the AND-coordinator *aw* 'and, then' conjoins NPs symmetrically, i.e. with similar case-marking as shown in (4a), as well as VPs and clauses (Teng 2008:275-276). *Aw* has some overlapping distribution for NP conjunction with the comitative marker *kay* 'with', but this is restricted to personal nouns. *Kay* is then used conjunctively with number agreement (4b) or as a comitative adjunct marker (4c). In (4b), agreement is marked by *na* (the plural nominative personal case marker); in (4c), there is no number agreement, the personal nominative marker *i* is singular.

(4) Nanwang Puyuma (Formosan)

- a. *i namali aw i baeli*
 SG.NOM my.father and SG.NOM my.older.sibling
 'my father and my elder brother' (Teng 2008:275)
- b. *tu=pu-dare-ay dra akan-an [na namali [kay baeli]].*
 3GEN=CAUS-earth-TR2 IND.OBL eat-NMZ PL.NOM my.father COM
 my.mother
 '[...] They put food on the ground for my father and my brother.' (Teng 2008:276)

- c. [*i tayban*] [*kay demalasaw*] *tu*³=*ki-anger-aw idrini*
 SG.NOM Tayban COM Demalasaw 3GEN=get-thought-TR1 this.NOM
na lemak.
 DEF.NOM thing
 ‘Tayban and Demalasaw remembered this thing.’ (Teng 2008:276)

(ii) **Noun-pronoun or pronominal conjunction: *aw* and inclusory constructions with *kay***

Nouns and pronouns may be conjoined by *aw* ‘and’ (5a) or in inclusory-meronymic constructions with *kay* in the first of the two readings of (5b) which refers to two participants.

(5) Nanwang Puyuma

- a. [*kuiku aw taytaw i*], *mare-kataguin.*
 1SG.NOM and 3SG.NOM TOP REC-spouse
 ‘He and I are husband and wife.’ (Teng 2008:275)
- b. *m-u-a-ruma*’=*mi kay nanali.*
 ITR-go-A-house=1PL.EXCL.NOM COM my.mother
 ‘I/we went home with my mother.’ (Teng 2008:275)

C) Toqabaqita

(i) *ma* ‘and’, *bii/bia* ‘with’

In Toqabaqita (Oceanic), there is a similar overlapping distribution for NP conjunction between the general AND-coordinator *ma*⁴ and the allomorphic comitative marker *bii~bia*⁵ (see Table 1). *Bii~bia*⁵ may head comitative adjuncts (6a) or may conjoin mostly animate NPs (6b-c) (ibid. 2008:541).

³ The pronominal form *tu*= neutralizes number (singular **or** plural), and case (nominative possessor or genitive).

⁴ *Ma* conjoins NPs, VPs (expressing concomitant actions), clauses with additive, sequential, consecutive, or simultaneous meanings, and sentences (Lichtenberk 2008:952). *Ma* also expresses contrast and unexpectedness (ibid. 2008:955).

⁵ *Bii* is used only if the coordinand is a pronoun, *bia* only if the coordinand is nominal, and preferably human (Lichtenberk 2008:541).

- (6) Toqabaqita (Central-Eastern Oceanic, North Malaita, Solomon Islands)
- a. *Qo ngata [bii nia]?*
 2SG.N.FUT speak COM 3SG
 ‘Did you speak with him?’ (Lichtenberk 2008:487)
- b. *Tootoo [maka nia ma thaina-na] keko lae.*
 later father 3SG and mother-3SG.PERS 3DU.SEQ go
[Maka nia bia thaina-na] kelo sore-a ...
 father 3SG and mother-3SG.PERS 3DU.SEQ say-3SG.OBJ
 ‘Later, his father and mother were about to go. His father and mother said ...’ (Lichtenberk 2008:538)
- c. *Kaleko nau baa ki bia waqi nau baa*
 clothes 1SG that PL and basket 1SG that
 ‘those clothes of mine and that basket of mine’ (Lichtenberk 2008:535)

Bii~bia have mixed properties: like coordinators they may be iterated (6d).

- d. *Si uqunu qeri qe lae sulia teqe wane*
 PART story this 3SG.N.FUT go PROL-3OBJ one man
bia kwai-na bia qa-daroqa teqe wela.
 and spouse-3SG and POSS-3DU one child
 ‘This story is about a man and his wife and a child of theirs.’ (Lichtenberk 2008:541-542)

Some other properties show that their comitative adpositional origin is retained; for instance *bii~bia* (i) may not conjoin prepositional adjunct phrases such as ‘they run on that road *in the mornings and in the evenings*’ (ibid. 2008:540, 547-48), (ii) they are rarely used in clausal conjunction (ibid. 2008:963) and are ungrammatical as sentence coordinators. In all such cases, *ma* is used.

(ii) Noun-pronoun or pronominal conjunction: *ma*, *bii*, and asyndetic inclusory construction

- There are two possible constructions for noun-pronoun or pronominal conjuncts.
- Inclusory constructions are the most common; they are asyndetic and juxtaposed. They are the rule in subject position (7a) and in object position; an inclusory pronoun heads the construction (Lichtenberk 2008:540).

- Nouns and pronouns may also be conjoined by *ma* or *bii* (7b-c), though less frequently and more restrictedly; conjunction with *ma* or *bii* only occurs in **topic** position when the conjuncts are both salient. It is rare in subject and object positions and functions, and it is ungrammatical in other functions (Lichtenberk 2008:540, 543-545).

(7) Toqabaqita

- a. [**Kamereqa** *tha* *Reni*] *teqe futa-a boqo*.
 1DU.EXCL.FR PERS.MKR Reni one be.born-DVN ASRT
 ‘I and Reni are one and the same family line.’ (Lichtenberk 2008:659)
- b. [*Doqora-ku ma ni nau*], *tootoo meki lae*
 sibling-1SG.PERS and PROFORE 1SG.FR later 1DU.EXCL.FUT go
uri Honiara.
 ALL Honiara
 ‘My brother and I (we) will go to Honiara one day.’ (Lichtenberk 2008:542)
- c. [... *ai qeri bii ni nau*] *qe=aqi*
 woman that and PROFORE 1SG.FR 3SG.N.FUT=NEG.V
mesi kwai-nago-fi.
 1DU.EXCL.NEG LIP-face-TR
 ‘... the woman and I would not face each other.’ (Lichtenberk 2008:538)

3.1.2 No overlap between ‘and’ coordinator and comitative marker: Tagalog

(i) *at* ‘and’, *sa/kay/kina* ‘with’

In Tagalog (see Table 1), an AND-language, there is no overlapping distribution between *at* ‘and’ and the comitative adjunctive marker. The coordinator *at* ‘and’ conjoins NPs, clauses and sentences (8a-b). Nouns and pronouns may be conjoined by *at* ‘and’ with symmetrically case-marked conjuncts (8c-d), or inclusory constructions are used (9a-b).

(ii) Standard NP coordination

(8) Tagalog (Philippines)

- a. *Nakita-ko ang babae at (ang) lalaki*.
 saw-GEN.1SG SPEC woman and SPEC man
 ‘I saw the woman and the man.’ (Schachter & Otanes 1972:114)

- b. *At* [*ang pare at siya*] *ay naghintáy ng sàsabihin*
 and SPEC priest and 3SG PM R.AV-wait GEN RED1-statement-PV
ng sundalo.
 GEN soldier
 ‘And the priest and he waited for what the soldier would say.’ (Bloomfield 1917:30/13, in Himmelmann 2007:266)
- c. *Ginawa* [*niya at ni Maria*] *ang trabaho.*
 made GEN.3SG and GEN.PERS.SG Maria SPEC work
 ‘(S)he and Maria did the work.’ (Reid 2009:286) [*ang* is the nominal specifier for common nouns]
- d. *Nakita-ko* [*siya at si Juan*].
 saw-GEN.1SG 3SG and PERS.SG Juan
 ‘I saw him/her and Juan.’ (Reid 2009:282)

(iii) Inklusory constructions: asymmetrical case-marking and default case on the subset

Inklusory constructions are asyndetic and do not make use of any comitative marker, but the subset receives a default genitive case-marker *ni*, independently from the superset’s case marking as shown in (9a-b). Thus, the asymmetrical meronymic relation between the superset pronoun and the subset NP is marked by the distinct, default case-marking as in (9a). According to Reid (2009:269), the subset NP is the more salient member of the construction.

- (9) Tagalog
- a. *Nakita-ko* [*silá ni Juan*].
 saw-GEN.1SG 3PL GEN.PERS.SG Juan
 ‘I saw him and Juan.’ (lit. I saw them Juan) (Reid 2009:288)
- b. *Ginawa* [*nila ni Juan*] *ang trabaho.*
 made GEN.3PL GEN.PERS.SG Juan SPEC work
 ‘(S)he and Juan did the work.’ (Reid 2009:269)

(iv) Comitative adjuncts with oblique marker *sa* or *kay/kina*

On the other hand, comitative adjuncts are marked by the oblique marker *sa* (for common nouns), *kay* (for singular personal nouns) or *kina* (for plural personal nouns) as in (10a); these markers have NO conjunctive function; compare with NP coordination (10c).

(10) Tagalog

- a. *Na-sa babae ang sanggol. / Na kay Maria ang sanggol.*
 R.STAT-LOC⁶ woman SPEC baby R.STAT OBL Maria SPEC baby
 ‘The baby is with the woman.’ / ‘The baby is with Maria.’ (Schachter & Otanes 1972:256)

Comitatives are also expressed with the prefix *maki--naki-* and the oblique marker *sa* or *kay* (10b-d), (for a detailed analysis of *maki--naki-*, see Liao 2011). Compare with coordination with *at* ‘and’ in (10c-e).

- b. *Naki-kikain ng hapunan si Ben sa Nanay.*
 AGT.COM-eat supper PERS.SG Ben OBL mother
 ‘Ben is eating supper with Mother.’ (Schachter & Otanes 1972:333)
- c. *Kumakain ng hapunan si Ben at ang Nanay.*
 eat supper PERS.SG Ben and SPEC mother
 ‘Ben and Mother are eating supper.’ (Schachter & Otanes 1972:333)
- d. *Naki-inom nang alak si Jose kay Juan.*
 AGT.COM-drink PAT wine NOM Jose OBL Juan
 ‘Jose drank wine with Juan.’ (Shkarban & Rachkov 2007:926)
- e. *Um-inom nang alak si Juan at si Jose.*
 PFV-drink PAT wine NOM Juan and NOM Jose
 ‘Juan and Jose drank wine.’ (Shkarban & Rachkov 2007:926)

Thus, in Tagalog, an AND-language, there are three distinct constructions without overlapping distribution: ‘and’-coordination with *at*, inclusory constructions with a default genitive case-marker on the subset (meronym), and comitative adjunction marked by an oblique marker.

3.1.3 No overlap between comitative conjunction and comitative adjunction: Nêlêmwa

In Nêlêmwa (see Table 1), there is no distributional overlap between comitative conjunction and comitative adjunction; different morphemes are used.

(i) *ma* ‘and’, *-vel/-vi* ‘with’, *buli, mudi* ‘with, in company of’

The comitative coordinator *ma* (used for animate NPs) is radically distinct from

⁶ Himmelmann’s gloss in ‘Notes on noun phrase structure in Tagalog’ (Himmelmann to appear).

associative adpositions (such as *-ve*, *-vi* ‘with’, or accompaniment nominal adpositions *buli*, *mudi* ‘with, in company of’ (Bril 2002)). The comitative coordinator *ma* ‘and/with’ is never used as an adjunctive adposition (i.e. without agreement) (Bril 2004, in press). *Ma* conjoins entities conceived of as belonging to a set, or in a meronymic relation, with obligatory number agreement. On the other hand, the general coordinator *me* ‘and’ is sometimes used as an afterthought-like marker of NP phrasal adjuncts without number agreement, as in (11): *ma* conjoins two proper nouns with number concord marked on the dual subject pronoun *hli*, while *me* adjoins another animate noun not included in the agreement pattern (otherwise the subject pronoun would be the 3rd person plural *hla* instead of *hli*). Nêlêmwa has [sV(O)S] order (where ‘s’ stands for the preverbal bound subject pronoun and S stands for the postverbal nominal argument).

- (11) Nêlêmwa (Eastern Oceanic, New Caledonia, Bril fieldnotes)

Na [*hli* *u* *muuvi* *mwâ* [*Kaavo* *Dela* *ma* *Teâ* *Pwayili*]]
 CONJ 3DU PFV stay then Kaavo Dela CONJ Teâ Pwayili
me *aaxiik* *pwaxi-hli*.
 CONJ one child-POSS.3DU

‘And Kaavo Dela and Teâ Pwayili lived there, and/with their only child.’

Ma and *me* have distinct distributions: *me* is the general coordinator without any animacy restrictions for NPs, for VPs, clausal and sentential conjuncts. *Ma* is more restrictive, it is mostly an NP coordinator restricted to Proper nouns and animates; but, due to contact with neighbouring languages where *ma* is the general coordinator, it may be idiosyncratically used as a clausal coordinator by some speakers (Bril 2004). Both *me* and *ma* can be repeated in coordinate lists of NPs. The major point is that neither *me* nor *ma* can ever be used as comitative adpositions in Nêlêmwa.

(ii) Obligatory inclusory constructions with *ma* for noun-pronoun or pronominal conjunction

Another important difference with Nanwang Puyuma, Tagalog, or Toqabaqita is that only nouns can be phrasally conjoined in Nêlêmwa, as in (11); conjunction of nouns and pronouns is ungrammatical (**you and me*, **she and her girl*) and inclusory constructions are a syntactic requirement (12). They can be contiguous in marked, focal constructions, when a free inclusory pronoun marks the superset (*yaman* in (12a)); or they may be split in the neutral construction as in (12b) when the superset is only marked by a bound subject pronoun which includes the subset headed by meronymic *ma* in its reference.

(12) Nêlêmwa (Bril fieldnotes 1995)

a. **Ma** *oda-me* *na* *Nixumwaak*, [**yaman**
 1DU.EXCL come.up-VENT from Koumak 1DU.EXCL.FR
 [**ma** *âlô* *Maeva*]].
 CONJ aunt Maeva
 ‘We came here from Koumak, me and my aunt Maeva.’

b. **Ma** *oda-me* *na* *Nixumwaak* **ma** *âlô* *Maeva*.
 1DU.EXCL come.up-VENT from Koumak CONJ aunt Maeva
 ‘I and my aunt Maeva came here from Koumak.’

On the other hand, an additional pronominal participant (a free pronoun in this case) may be added to a pre-established set by the additive coordinator *xa* ‘and, in addition’, as in (13), triggering the plural subject pronoun *hla*.

(13) Nêlêmwa

[**Hla** *u* *oda* *mwa* [**hlileny** *thaamwa* **xa** *ye*]].
 3PL PFV go.up ASS these2 woman ADD 3SG.FR
 ‘These two women and/plus him went up.’

Inclusory constructions are always marked by the inclusive-meronymic *ma*; they occur with NPs in all syntactic functions and with all persons. They express collective and part-whole semantics. In (14), the first *ma* is meronymic, it heads and includes the complex subset NP (*father* and *mother*) in the reference of the 2nd person plural possessor pronoun *-wa*; the second *ma* is the NP coordinator conjoining ‘father and mother’:

(14) Nêlêmwa

Mwa-[**wa** **ma** [*kââma-m* **ma** *axomoo-m*]].
 house-POSS.2PL CONJ father-POSS.2SG CONJ mother-POSS.2SG
 ‘(It’s) your house and your father’s and your mother’s.’
 (lit. your house and/with your father and your mother) (Bril fieldnotes 1995)

The NP headed by the meronymic *ma* (meaning ‘including’) specifies a subset of the superset pronoun. Various syntactic tests (Bril 2004, in press) show that *ma* in Nêlêmwa behaves as a comitative or a meronymic conjunctive marker, but never as a comitative adposition.

3.1.4 Comitative conjunction and comitative adposition: *ma* in Zuanga

In neighbouring Zuanga, and in clear contrast with Nêlêmwa, *ma* may be used either

as a comitative conjunction, or as a comitative adposition heading a comitative adjunct which is excluded from number concord on the subject pronoun as in (15). Comitative adjunction with *ma* is ungrammatical in Nêlêmwa, as shown by the ungrammatical use of a 2nd person singular pronoun (**co*) in (16).

- (15) Zuanga (New Caledonia, Eastern Oceanic)

E uda no mwa ma ti?

3SG enter in house CONJ who

‘Who did he enter the house with?’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

- (16) Nêlêmwa

*Mo kuut wuung ma axaleny. (*co kuut wuung ma axaleny).*

2DU stand together CONJ this.man *2SG stand together CONJ this.man

‘You (sg) are standing together with this man.’ (Bril fieldnotes 1995)

Apart from this major difference concerning their adpositional use, *ma* in Zuanga and Nêlêmwa are both coordinators (17a) and meronymic markers in split/non-contiguous inclusory constructions (16), (17b). The *ma* headed subset NP (*ma ābaa-nu* in (17b)) is the meronym of the superset pronoun *bi* ‘we2.excl’ and is included in its reference.

- (17) Zuanga

a. *E yu kòlò [kêê-je ma òã-je].*

3SG stay home father-POSS.3SG CONJ mother-POSS.3SG

‘He lives at his father and mother’s place.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

b. *Bi kibaò a-kò bwò ma ābaa-nu.*

1DU.EXCL kill three bat CONJ brother-POSS.1SG

‘My brother and I killed three bats.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2006)

In topic constructions, a superset free pronoun and the subset may be contiguous:

c. *Haxe me whamã na kòlò lina whamã malie, [ca but 1TRI.EXCL grow.up LOC side these2 old.people these2 TOP novwo ibi ma Paola] ca bi za mǎãni*

as.for 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ Paola TOP 1DU.EXCL ASS sleep

‘But we(3) grew up at these two old folks’ place, and as for us(2), Paola and me, we slept (there).’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

(the trial subject pronoun *me* refers to 3 siblings, Paola, Pajaa, and the narrator)

Another main difference between Zuanga and Nêlêmwa is that in Zuanga, inclusory constructions are common, but **not** obligatory as in Nêlêmwa. In Zuanga, in sentence initial topic position for instance, pronouns and nouns may be conjoined non-inclusively by *ma* as in (18a-b), not in Nêlêmwa.

(18) Zuanga

- a. [*Ije ma mōō-je*], *lhi uda no mwa*.
 3SG.FR CONJ wife-3SG 3DU enter in house
 ‘He and his wife, they went into the house.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)
- b. *Xa novwo [inu ma Pajaa], ca bi fami Nyaema*.
 but as.for 1SG.FR CONJ Pajaa TOP 1DU.EXCL family Nyaema
 ‘As for me and Pajaa, we are kin to the Nyaema.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

The choice between standard NP coordination (18a-b) and inclusory construction (17b-c) varies with the type of profiling and saliency of the conjuncts. Similarly, in Toqabaqita above (7b-c), equally salient subject pronouns in topic position are conjoined non-inclusively, while inclusory constructions (7a) are used with non-topic superset subject pronouns, including the subset-meronym in their reference.

There is no such distinction in Nêlêmwa, inclusory constructions are always obligatory, whether the subject arguments are topicalized as in (19a) or not as in (19b).

(19) Nêlêmwa

- a. [*Yaman ma thaamwa bai*] *xe ma pwe wuung*.
 1DU.EXCL.FR CONJ woman that.ANAPH TOP 1DU.EXCL fish together
 ‘Me and that woman, we went fishing together.’ (Bril fieldnotes 1995)
- b. *Ma pwe wuung ma thaamwa bai*.
 1DU.EXCL fish together CONJ woman that.ANAPH
 ‘I and that woman went fishing together.’ (Bril fieldnotes 1995)

Thus, while in Toqabaqita and Zuanga, there is some correlation between topicalized arguments and ‘AND’-coordination; there is no such correlation in Nêlêmwa, inclusory constructions are a syntactic requirement for noun-pronoun conjunction, independently from their pragmatic status.

In Zuanga, pronouns may also be conjoined additively with the coordinator *xo* ‘and, in addition’ as in (20), both conjuncts are then equally profiled. This use is more restricted in Nêlêmwa where *xa* mostly marks addition to a pre-established set (see (13)).

- (20) Zuanga
Axe inu ca, [inu xo nhye pòi-li] bi yu.
 but 1SG.FR TOP 1SG.FR CONJ this child-3DU 1DU.EXCL stay
 ‘But as for me, me and their child, we lived (there).’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

Zuanga thus displays three possible strategies for pronominal conjunction: (i) standard ‘and’ coordination with *ma*; (ii) inclusory constructions with *ma*; and (iii) additive coordination with *xo*. Nêlêmwa has only two: (i) inclusory constructions with *ma*; and (ii) additive with *xa* (only for addition to a pre-existent set).

Table 2: Pronominal conjunction in Zuanga and Nêlêmwa

	coordination of pronouns with <i>ma</i>	inclusory with <i>ma</i>	Additive construction
Zuanga	+	+	<i>xo</i>
Nêlêmwa	∅	+	<i>xa</i> (only addition to a pre-existent set)

Generally, AND-coordinators and constructions are compatible with the collective or the distributive readings, while WITH-conjunctors and constructions only have a collective reading. When used in inclusory constructions, the meronymic *ma* in Zuanga is compatible with both readings, collective as in (17c), and distributive as in (21) with a verb like *haze* ‘separate’ or with property or stative verbs as in (22a-b).

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

Property or stative verbs favor a distributive reading (Schwartz 1988:69-70). In (22), the property is distributed over the superset and the subset via the meronymic *ma*.

- (22) Zuanga
Bi whamã ma ābaa-nu.
 1DU.EXCL old CONJ brother-POSS-1SG
 ‘My brother and I are old.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

The comitative preposition *with* in English does not allow any distributive reading with property predicates; nor does French *avec* (**nous sommes vieux avec mon frère*

(lit., we are old with my brother) with the intended meaning *we are old, my brother and I*). They only have adjunctive properties, no conjunctive properties. But meronymic *ma* allows the distribution of the property over the subset as in (22).

Lichtenberk (2000:30-31) points out that “while the overt marker of an inclusory construction may have been historically a coordination conjunction or a comitative marker, when it relates an inclusory pronoun and its included NP, it is neither. It has acquired a new function, that of marking inclusion.”

But as argued here, it is not so much a new function as a mixed function: the meronymic marker of inclusory constructions is both inclusive and conjunctive as shown by agreement, despite the asymmetrical features of the superset and subset. Such mixed properties of meronymic-inclusory constructions are crucial to explain how a property may be distributed over the subset as in standard coordination; such distributive property is outside the scope of an adjunctive comitative adposition.

Synchronically, *ma* in Nêlêmwa and Zuanga behave as: (i) standard coordinators, and (ii) meronymic markers (heading a meronym) in inclusory constructions. Only in Zuanga, *mã* also has adjunctive function; it never does in Nêlêmwa.

The meronymic semantics of *mV* morphemes is a frequent feature of Oceanic languages (as shown by *mo* in Tuvaluan in (23d)).

3.1.5 Comitative conjunction and adposition: Tuvaluan

(i) the homophonous *mo*

The extreme case of polyfunctionality (and homophony) is represented by *mo* in Tuvaluan: (i) it is conjunctive with agreement marked on the verb (23a) and without any animacy restriction (as shown by (23c) *rice and bread*); (ii) it is a comitative adjunctive marker without agreement (23b) (*fano* is the non-plural form of the verb).

As a coordinator, it covers the whole spectrum (NPs, VPs, clausal and sentential conjunction; see Table 1).

(23) Tuvaluan (Polynesian, Besnier 2000)

- a. *Koo olo [Tevasa mo Tekie].*
 INC go.AGR Tevasa and Tekie
 ‘Tevasa and Tekie went (together).’ (Besnier 2000:167)
- b. *Koo fano Tevasa [mo Tekie].*
 INC go Tevasa with Tekie
 ‘Tevasa has gone with Tekie.’ (Besnier 2000:167)

It is also a polysemous adjunctive marker heading various types of VP modifiers as shown by the first occurrence of *mo* in ((23c) ‘fed up *with* rice’), and also expressing circumstance, quality and manner, as in ‘he read the letter with great joy’ (Besnier 2000: 317).

- c. *Laatou koo ffiu mo [laisi mo falaoo].*
 3PL INC fed.up with rice and bread
 ‘They’re fed up with eating rice and bread.’ (Besnier 2000:161)

It is also an inclusive NP adjunct marker (23d), meaning ‘including’:

- d. *E lagona nee au a mea, mo [te agi o te matagi].*
 N.PAST feel ERG 1SG ABS thing including the blow of the wind
 ‘I feel (all kinds of) things, including the wind blowing.’ (Besnier 2000: 160)

Various functions distributed over different morphemes in other Austronesian languages have thus been conflated over the homophonous morpheme *mo* in Tuvaluan.

(ii) Noun-pronoun or pronominal conjunction: optional inclusory constructions with *mo*

Inclusory constructions are highly preferred for noun and pronoun conjunction (24a) in Tuvaluan, but they are optional as shown by (24b), if additive-distributive semantics prevail over collective semantics. The coordinator *mo* can be repeated when there is more than one conjunct (24b).

(24) Tuvaluan

- a. [*Ko maatou [mo [Moeava mo Tevasa]]].*
 FOC we.PL.EXCL and Moeava and Tevasa
 ‘Moeava, Tevasa, and me.’ (Besnier 2000:394)
- b. [*Ko au [mo Moeava] [mo Tevasa]].*
 FOC I and Moeava and Tevasa
 ‘Moeava, Tevasa, and me.’ (Besnier 2000:394)

Inclusory constructions are restricted to co-agentive animates. If a pronoun is conjoined with a non-human noun (even in a part-whole relation) as in (24c), standard coordination is required and inclusory constructions are excluded.

- c. *Ko [koe eiloa] [mo tou agaaga].*
 FOC 2SG indeed and your soul
 ‘You and your soul.’ (Besnier 2000:395)

Inclusory constructions are further distinguished from comitative adjunction by the obligatory presence of an inclusory superset pronoun such as *maatou* in (24a) or *maaua* in (25a), in contrast with the comitative adjunct in (25b). Besides, comitative adjuncts headed by the preposition *mo* have distinct positions (25c), before the NP marked as the absolutive prime argument (see also (27)).

(25) Tuvaluan

- a. *Kaa gaalue [maaua [mo Tevasa]].*
 FUT work we2.EXCL and Tevasa
 ‘Tevasa and I are going to work.’ (Besnier 2000:167)
- b. *Kaa gaalue au mo Tevasa.*
 FUT work I with Tevasa
 ‘I’m going to work with Tevasa.’ (Besnier 2000:167)
- c. *Koo nofo ø mo tino kolaa e maasani a ia i ei.*
 INC stay ø with person those N.PAST used.to CNT she at ANAPH
 ‘[She] is staying with people she knows.’ (Besnier 2000:167)

3.2 Summary of distinctive features of comitative conjuncts and comitative adjuncts

Several criteria help distinguish homophonous comitative conjuncts from adjuncts: agreement, position, iteration of the coordinating morpheme, semantics.

- 1) Agreement with all conjuncts is the main distinctive factor in Austronesian languages.
- 2) If contiguity of the conjuncts is not an absolute prerequisite for ‘and’ coordination (provided that discontinuity is compensated by some other device like number agreement), on the other hand, contiguous conjuncts, together with number agreement with all conjuncts, tend to be prerequisites for a comitative adposition to be re-analyzed and to function as a coordinator (Bril in press). But inclusory constructions marked by meronymic-comitative conjunctions with *mV* form (such as *mo* in Tuvaluan, *ma* in Nêlêmwa or Zuanga) do not require the meronymic NP to be contiguous; constructions may be split, yet number agreement indicates the mixed meronymic-conjunctive properties of the morpheme.
- 3) Collective or distributive semantics are another possible indicator.

In Tuvaluan, agreement is the main distinctive feature between comitative conjuncts (26) and adjuncts (27). According to Besnier (2000), contiguous position is not distinctive, as conjuncts may be split for pragmatic purposes such as topicalization of the first conjunct to preverbal position⁷ [**NP** V_{AGR} *mo* **NP**] as in (26a); yet agreement with the conjuncts is preserved as shown by the plural form of the verb *olo*, as with contiguous conjuncts (26b).

(26) Tuvaluan (Besnier 2000)

- a. [**Pasene**] *koo olo saale [mo toku fakatuagaane]*
 Pasene INC **go.AGR** often **and** my in.manner.of-sibling
o aalo.
 COMP row
 ‘Pasene and my cousin now frequently go trawling-by-rowing [together].’
 (2000:173)
- b. *Koo olo saale [Pasene mo toku fakatuagaane]*
 INC **go.AGR** often Pasene and my in.manner.of-sibling
o aalo.
 COMP row
 ‘Pasene and my cousin now frequently go trawling-by-rowing [together].’
 (2000:173)

One distinctive position of comitative adjuncts, shown in (27), is when the *mo* headed NP immediately follows the verb, and precedes the other NP marked as its absolutive prime argument [**V** *mo* **NP**]_{absNP}. Thus *mo Teika* is clearly a comitative adjunct.

(27) Tuvaluan

- [*Koo ffusu mo Teika*] *a Tekie.*
 INC fight **with** Teika CNT Tekie
 ‘Tekie has gotten into a fight **with** Teika.’ (Besnier 2000:167)

Otherwise, all other conjunct orders are possible: split for pragmatic purposes (26a), contiguous conjuncts before the verb [[**NP** *mo* **NP**] V_{AGR}] or after the verb (as in (26b)) [V_{AGR}, [**NP** *mo* **NP**]].

Inclusory constructions may also be split with a topicalized superset pronoun, as in (28b-c), without affecting number agreement (as shown by the plural form of the verb

⁷ This is restricted to absolutive subjects of intransitive verbs.

in (28c)); compare with the neutral construction in (28a):

(28) Tuvaluan

- a. [*Laaua* [*mo Teika*]] e *maasaga tapu*.
 they2 and Teika N.PAST twin forbidden
- b. [*Laaua*] e *maasaga tapu* [*mo Teika*].
 they2 N.PAST twin forbidden and Teika
 ‘Teika and she are twins (of the opposite gender).’ (Besnier 2000:395)
- c. [*Laaua koo saassaale mai* [*mo tena maaloo*]].
 they2 INC walk.AGR DX and his guest
 ‘He and his guest are walking in this direction.’ (Besnier 2000:520)

Thus, comitative conjuncts and adjuncts are mostly distinguished by agreement with the conjuncts and in a lesser degree by position, as in (27).

4. Conjunctive strategies in inclusory constructions with complex subset

Let us now turn to the specific conjunctive strategies used in inclusory constructions whose subset includes more than one expressed nominal NP. Strategies are threefold:

- Strategies mixing the comitative conjunction and the general coordinator (Nanwang Puyuma, Zuanga, Nêlêmwa)
- Iteration of the comitative conjunction with different functions (Tuvaluan, Nêlêmwa)
- Strategies mixing asyndetic inclusory construction and standard coordinator (Palawano)

4.1 Inclusory construction and general coordinator for complex subset NP

Languages like Nanwang Puyuma do not repeat the comitative marker, but mix the comitative and the general coordinator.

4.1.1 Comitative and general coordinator: Nanwang Puyuma *kay* and *aw*

In Nanwang Puyuma (29), the first item of the complex NP subset is marked by the comitative marker *kay* ‘and/with’, while the other item(s) are conjoined by the general coordinator *aw* ‘and’. The use of *aw* rather than the repetition of *kay* indicates that *kay*

retains some comitative properties; *kay* originates from a comitative verb ‘be with/go with’ as shown by (29b).

- (29) Nanwang Puyuma (Formosan)
- a. *m-u-a-ruma*’=*mi* [*kay nanali*, [*aw i*
 ITR-go-A-house=1PL.EXCL.NOM and/with my.mother and SG.NOM
baeli]].
 my.elder.sibling
 ‘I/we went home with my mother and my elder sister.’ (Teng 2008:275)
- b. *andaman i*, *kay=ta=driya pa-ka-ladram-a*.
 days.later TOP be.with=1PL.NOM=IPF CAUS-KA-know-PROJ
 ‘A few days later, we all went together to let people know (about this).’
 (Teng 2008:276)

4.1.2 Comitative and additive coordinators: Zuanga *mã* and *xo*, Nêlêmwa *ma* and *xa*

In Zuanga, *mã* is not repeated beyond two NP conjuncts (30a), when there are more, as in (30b), they are organized in a binary way with the additive coordinator *xo* heading each set of two conjuncts. *Lhò* ‘they’ is the trial or paucal pronoun.

- (30) Zuanga (New Caledonia)
- a. [*Lhò a* [Brigit *mã kěě-je*] [*mã/xo òã-je*]].
 3TRI go Brigit CONJ father-POSS-3SG CONJ/ADD mother-POSS-3SG
 ‘Brigitte, her father, and mother left.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)
- b. *E thooma* [*kěě-je mã òã-je*] [*xo li*
 3SG call father-POSS-3SG CONJ mother-POSS-3SG ADD these2
ãbaa-je êmwê mã nye ãbaa-je thoomwa].
 sibling-POSS-3SG male CONJ this sibling-POSS-3SG female
 ‘He called his father, his mother, his two brothers, and his sister.’ (Bril
 fieldnotes 2007)

The inclusory construction is chosen if some participants are pronouns and if collective action is expressed as in (31a). The first included NP is marked by meronymic *mã*, the other included NPs are marked by *xo* which heads each subgroup of two NPs conjoined by *mã*.

(31) Zuanga

- a. [**Lhò** a [**mã** *kěẽ-lò*] [**xo** *õã-lò* **mã** *nye*
3TRI go CONJ father-POSS-3TRI ADD mother-POSS-3TRI CONJ this
ãbaa-lò *ẽmwẽ*]].
 sibling-POSS-3TRI male
 ‘He, his father, mother, and brother left.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

On the other hand, a comitative adjunctive construction expresses mere accompaniment of the agent (31b):

- b. **E** a **mã** *kěẽ-je* [**xo** *õã-je* **mã** *nye*
3SG go COM father-POSS-3SG ADD mother-POSS-3SG CONJ this
ãbaa-je *ẽmwẽ*]].
 sibling-POSS-3SG male
 ‘He left with his father, mother, and brother.’ (Bril fieldnotes 2007)

Nêlêmwa uses similar conjoining strategies beyond two conjuncts, but excludes the comitative adjunct construction allowed in Zuanga (31b).

4.1.3 Iteration of the comitative conjunct with different functions: *mo* in Tuvaluan

In Tuvaluan inclusory constructions such as (32a-b), *mo* is repeated but has different functions, the first *mo* is meronymic-inclusive, the second *mo* is the AND-coordinator (it conjoins Pule and Galu in (32a)). Agreement is marked by the plural form of the verb *olo*.⁸

(32) Tuvaluan (Besnier 2000)

- a. [**Maatou** [**mo** [*Pule mo Galu*]]] **ne** **olo** **o** **maattau**.
 we.PL.EXCL CONJ Pule and Galu PAST go.AGR COMP angle.AGR
 ‘Pule, Galu and I went angling.’ (Besnier 2000:520)
- b. [**Maatou** [**mo** [*ttamana o Faiva mo ttamana o Moeava*]]].
 we.PL.EXCL CONJ the.father of Faiva and the.father of Moeava
 ‘Faiva’s father, Moeava’s father, and me.’ (Besnier 2000:393)

Similarly, *ma* in Nêlêmwa may be repeated with different properties (see (14) above).

⁸ *Fano* is the singular form, *olo* the plural form of the verb ‘go’.

4.2 Mixed asyndetic and syndetic strategies

Another possible strategy, found in Palawano or Toqabaqita, is mixed syndetic and asyndetic constructions.

4.2.1 Asyndetic and syndetic strategies: Palawano

Palawano inclusory constructions are asyndetic. The subset NP is marked by the oblique case marker *et* (33a). Additional members of a complex subset are marked by the general, additive coordinator *bo* ‘and’ as in (33b) (Arlyn *bo si* Abil), the total number is specified by a numeral *telo kay* ‘we3’. The oblique marker *et* disappears in the plural, and number agreement is then marked by the plural form of the personal marker *de*.

- (33) S.W. Palawano (Philippines)
- a. *Mesubo kay banar, [dua kay [et si Arturo]].*
 early 1PL.EXCL true two 1PL.EXCL OBL PERS.SG Arturo
 ‘We were/will be early, two of us, Arturo and me.’ (Reid 2009:277)
- b. *Minuli kay, [telo kay [de Arlyn [bo si Abil]]].*
 went.home 1PL.EXCL three 1PL.EXCL PERS.PL Arlyn and PERS.SG
 Abil
 ‘We went home, the three of us, Arlyn, Abil, and me.’ (Reid 2009:283)

4.2.2 Asyndetic and syndetic strategies: Toqabaqita

In Toqabaqita, inclusory constructions are also asyndetic with one-member subsets; when the subset is a complex nominal NP, the other NPs are conjoined with *ma*.

- (34) Toqabaqita
[Kamiliqa [tha Demesi] [ma tha Dioni]].
 1PL.EXCL PERS.MKR Demesi and PERS.MKR Dioni
 ‘I and/with Demesi and Dioni.’ (Lichtenberk 2008:658)

5. Syntactic, semantic features and constraints on conjunctive types

Why are several conjunctive (additive, comitative, inclusory-meronymic) strategies and several types of conjunctions (general-additive and comitative) used synchronically?

In Austronesian languages, conjunctive strategies and types of conjunctions are sensitive to the category of the conjuncts (nouns or pronouns), to semantic properties (\pm animate, tight vs. loose relationship, additive, distributive vs. collective semantics), as well as to pragmatic properties involving \pm even saliency.

Syndesis is not predictable and strategies are language specific; they vary (i) with categories of conjuncts (nouns or pronouns, proper or common nouns), (ii) with semantic properties such as animacy or close vs. loose relationship. Syndetic coordination often correlates with accessory relationship, while asyndetic coordination marks close relationship between NPs, and concomitant actions with VPs. In Takia for instance (an Oceanic language from Papua New Guinea, Ross in Lynch et al. 2002), human NPs and pronouns are conjoined by the comitative marker *da* ‘and/with’ (with agreement), while conjunction of non-human NPs is asyndetic with juxtaposed NPs (see Brill in press).

Other languages restrict coordination to animates and a comitative adjunctive strategy is required for inanimates. In Tuvaluan, an animate and an inanimate NP may not be conjoined, a comitative adjunctive strategy is required, as in ((24c) above).

5.1 Pronominal conjuncts: banned or allowed?

The ban on pronominal conjuncts is not universal, nor is it definitory of inclusory constructions; Nêlêmwa requires inclusory constructions for pronominal conjuncts, but various other Austronesian languages (Nanwang Puyuma, Tagalog, Toqabaqita, Zuanga, Tuvaluan) also allow non-inclusory coordination of pronouns. If some choice is available, it is semantically and pragmatically driven: equal topicality and saliency correlates with standard (\pm syndetic) pronominal conjunction, while different saliency and set inclusion or meronymic relation correlates with (\pm syndetic) inclusory constructions.

5.2 Morpho-syntactic features

Conjuncts, whether of the additive, comitative, or meronymic types, usually share the same syntactic function at phrase level. But there are differences among those types. Coordination marked by AND-coordinators displays the most symmetrical morpho-syntactic features. On the other hand, comitative conjunction and especially inclusory-meronymic constructions are much more asymmetrical.

In syndetic inclusory constructions, the meronymic marker heading the subset NP is generally a comitative conjunction, and the subset is included in the agreement pattern.

In asyndetic inclusory constructions on the other hand, superset and subset may be (i) simply juxtaposed (as in Toqabaqita), or (ii) they may be asymmetrically case-marked, by an oblique case-marker on the subset NP (*et*) in Palawano (33a), or by a default genitive case-marker (*ng*) in Tagalog (35):

- (35) Tagalog
Maglalakad [tayo-ng tatlo ng Nanay].
 will.walk 1PL.INCL-LG three GEN.CM.SG mother
 ‘The three of us, Mother, you, and I will walk.’ (Reid 2009:271)

Yet morphosyntactic asymmetries in the marking of conjuncts are overridden by functional unity at the level of the conjunctive phrase, signalled by number agreement with all conjuncts. Actually, asymmetrical case-marking or the use of comitative conjunctions are strategies signalling a meronymic relation.

5.3 Semantic features

When several conjunctive strategies are synchronically available, general or additive ‘AND’ conjunction is compatible with either the distributive or the collective readings, while comitative conjunction usually expresses collective, co-agentive or co-operative (sometimes simultaneous) semantics. Inclusory constructions further express set inclusion and meronymic relation. Comitative conjunction and inclusory constructions are restricted to human or higher animate NPs with close relationship.

It is easy to see why inclusory-meronymic relations are expressed by pronouns including reference to nouns; but why there should be a syntactic rule excluding the conjunction of a pronoun with a noun (like ‘me and my father’) in languages such as Nêlêmwa is less clear.

5.4 Pragmatic features

Conjunctive strategies may be sensitive to differences in rank, saliency, and topicality. In standard ‘AND’-conjunction, each entity tends to be equally profiled and symmetrically case-marked. If not, comitative (for animates) or instrumental (for inanimates) adjunctive constructions are used.

Inclusory constructions are another way of achieving different pragmatic status, with slightly asymmetrically profiled entities, the subset NP is then generally more

topical. In Toqabaqita (see (7)), coordination of nouns and pronouns with *ma* ‘and’ or *bii* ‘with’ only occurs when the conjuncts are in topic position and both salient; otherwise, inclusory constructions are used. In Tagalog (see (8)-(9)), nouns and pronouns may be coordinated by *at* ‘and’ when equally topical, while in inclusory constructions, the subset NP is the more salient member. Facts are similar in Zuanga, the choice of ‘and’ coordination (18a-b) and inclusory construction (17b-c) varies with the type of profiling and saliency of the conjuncts. But in Nêlêmwa, inclusory constructions are not pragmatically driven, they are a syntactic constraint correlating with conjunct category.

5.5 Inclusory constructions and person hierarchy

Inclusory constructions are restricted to higher animate NPs. They almost universally follow person and referential hierarchy (1st > 2nd > 3rd). Constructions that run counter to this hierarchy, as in Tuvaluan (36), are not inclusory, but additive.

- (36) Tuvaluan (Besnier 2000:394)
 [[*Laatou*] [*mo au*]].
 they.PL and 1SG
 ‘They and/plus I.’ (not: *they including me)

Some languages (such as Ilokano, Philippines) restrict inclusory constructions to the top of the hierarchy (1st and 2nd person only), and use other strategies for 3rd person, such as associative plural strategies (Reid 2009:281). Others (Nêlêmwa, Tagalog) allow inclusory constructions for all persons. Pronominal number (singular, dual, trial/paucal, or plural) marks the number of participants; if ambiguous, numerals may further specify their exact number. Finally, the inclusive/exclusive properties of 1st person pronouns specify whether the addressee belongs to the set or not (you and I = we2 incl.; (s)he and I = we2 excl.).

In Tagalog’s inclusory constructions, a first person plural *exclusive* pronoun, unless otherwise specified by a numeral (as in (35)), only refers to two participants (the speaker and another included NP) as in (37a), while a first person plural *inclusive* pronoun has plural reference, as in (37b), and refers to the speaker, the addressee(s) and at least one other included NP (Reid 2009:270):

- (37) Tagalog
 a. *Maglalakad=kami ng Nanay.*
 will.walk=1PL.EXCL GEN.CM.SG mother
 ‘Mother and I will walk.’ (Reid 2009:271)

- b. *Lilisan=natin ni Maria ang bahay.*
 will.clean=1PL.INCL.GEN GEN.PERS.SG Maria NS.CM house
 ‘We, including Maria, are cleaning the house.’ (Reid 2009:271)

Superset pronouns of inclusory constructions are thus selected following person hierarchy; their dual, trial/paucal, or plural forms (possible with additional numerals) and their inclusive/exclusive features mark the extent of their reference.

6. Summary and conclusion

To sum up, as indicated by the different grades of shaded boxes in Table 3, Nanwang Puyuma, Atayal, and Toqabaqita use distinct morphemes for standard AND-conjunction and WITH-(NP)conjunction; while Nêlêmwa, Zuanga, and Tuvaluan use the same *mV* morpheme. Palawano and Tagalog, which are AND-languages, do not use comitative conjunction at all.

Several other generalizations can be made:

- In languages with different AND- and WITH-conjunctions, the comitative morpheme generally appears in inclusory constructions (Toqabaqita, with its asyndetic inclusory constructions, is an exception). The functional range of comitative morphemes is marked by squares in Table 3.
- The comitative morpheme is often used both as a conjunctive and an adjunctive marker, except in Nêlêmwa where comitative adjunction is marked by different strategies. In Zuanga and Tuvaluan, the functions of these homophonous morphemes are distinguished by agreement and position.
- In Palawano, the oblique case-marker *et* marks the subset of inclusory constructions and also marks comitative adjunction: number agreement distinguishes the two types.
- Finally Tagalog, an AND language, with distinct morphemes and strategies for coordination, inclusory constructions and comitative adjunction, shows no functional overlap whatsoever.

Table 3: Summary of the functions of AND and WITH markers

	Nanwang Puyuma	Pngawan Atayal	Toqabaqita	Nêlêmwa	Zuanga	Tuvaluan	Palawano	Tagalog
Adjective with	<i>kay</i>	<i>ci'</i>	<i>bii, bia</i>	∅	<i>ma</i>	<i>mo</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>sa, kay</i>
Inclusory construction	<i>kay</i>	<i>ci'</i>	∅	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>mo</i>	(<i>et</i>) or case-mkr	<i>ng</i> (case-mkr)
Conjunctive with	<i>kay</i>	<i>ci'</i>	<i>bii, bia</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>mo</i>		
'And' coord.	<i>aw</i>	<i>ru'</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma, me</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>mo</i>	<i>bo</i>	<i>at</i>

The shaded boxes in Table 4 highlight the functional range of comitative markers or other strategies (such as oblique or case markers): their adjunctive, inclusory, and conjunctive functions, as well as their possible extension beyond NP coordination. Their extension to VP or clausal conjunction is mostly restricted to Tuvaluan’s homophonous *mo*, and in a lesser degree to Zuanga’s *mã*, showing that these morphemes have been re-analyzed as homophonous coordinators. All other languages do not go beyond NP coordination.

Table 4: Functions of comitative markers

	Adjunctive	Inclusory	Conjunctive		Clause coord.
			NP conj.	VP conj.	
Nanwang Puyuma <i>kay</i>	+	+	+		
Pngawan Atayal <i>ci'</i>	+	+	+		
Tagalog OBL case-mkr <i>sa, kay</i> GEN case-mkr <i>ng</i>	+	∅ asyndetic, default <i>ng</i>			
Palawano OBL case-mkr <i>et</i>	+	+			
Toqabaqita <i>bii, bia</i>	+	∅	+	∅	rare
Nêlêmwa <i>ma</i>	∅	+	+	infrequent concomitance	idiosyncratic
Zuanga <i>mã</i>	+	+	+	∅	+
Tuvaluan <i>mo</i>	+	+	+	+	+

References

- Bauer, Winifred. 1997. *The Reed Reference Grammar of Māori*. Auckland: Reed Books.
- Besnier, Niko. 2000. *Tuvaluan: A Polynesian Language of the Central Pacific*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Bril, Isabelle. 1995. Nêlêmwa fieldnotes. Manuscripts.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2002. *Le nêlêmwa (Nouvelle-Calédonie): Analyse syntaxique et sémantique*. Paris: Peeters.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2004. Coordination strategies and inclusory constructions in New Caledonian and other Oceanic languages. *Coordinating Constructions*, ed. by Martin Haspelmath, 499-533. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2006-2007. Zuanga fieldnotes. Manuscripts.
- Bril, Isabelle. (in press). Noun-phrase conjunction in Austronesian languages: additive, inclusory and comitative strategies. *Morphosyntactic Aspects of Oceanic Languages*, ed. by Claire Moyse-Faurie & Joachim Sabel. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. (ed.) 2004. *Coordinating Constructions*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2007. Lexical categories and voice in Tagalog. *Voice and Grammatical Relations in Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Peter K. Austin & Simon Musgrave, 247-293. Stanford: CSLI.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (to appear). Notes on noun phrase structure in Tagalog. *Special Issue of Australian Journal of Linguistics*, ed. by Michael Ewing & Simon Musgrave.
- Huang, Lillian M. 2006. Case marking system in Pngawan Atayal. *Streams Converging Into An Ocean: Festschrift in Honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on His 70th Birthday*, ed. by Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang & Dah-an Ho, 205-238. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Huang, Lillian M., and Tali' Hayung. 2011. Coordination and comitativity in Squilq Atayal. *Language and Linguistics* 12.1:1-48.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2011. On the development of comitative verbs in Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 12.1:205-237.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2000. Inclusory pronominals. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39.1:1-32.

- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2008. *A Grammar of Toqabaqita*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross, and Terry Crowley. (eds.) 2002. *The Oceanic Languages*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2009. Inclusory constructions and their development in Philippine languages. *Austronesian Historical Linguistics and Culture History: A Festschrift for Robert Blust*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Andrew Pawley, 267-294. Pacific Linguistics 601. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schwartz, Linda. 1988. Conditions on verb-coded coordinations. *Studies in Syntactic Typology*, ed. by Michael Hammond, Edith A. Moravcsik & Jessica R. Wirth, 53-73. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shkarban, Lina I., and Gennadij E. Rachkov. 2007. Chapter 22: Reciprocal, sociative, and comitative constructions in Tagalog. *Reciprocal Constructions*, Vol. 3, ed. by Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, Emma Š Geniušienė & Zlatka Guentchéva, 887-931. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stassen, Leon. 2001. Noun phrase coordination. *Language Typology and Language Universals*, Vol. 2, ed. by Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible, 1105-1111. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stassen, Leon. 2003. Noun phrase conjunction: the coordinative and the comitative strategy. *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Frans Plank, 761-817. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Teng, Stacy Fang-ching. 2008. *A Reference Grammar of Puyuma, an Austronesian Language of Taiwan*. Pacific Linguistics 595. Canberra: The Australian National University.

[Received 31 December 2009; revised 8 November 2010; accepted 26 November 2010]

Lacito-CNRS
Centre Haudricourt
Campus CNRS, Bat D
7, Rue Guy Moquet
94800 Villejuif
France
ibril@vjf.cnrs.fr

南島語中的「和」及「跟」： 句法、語意及語用

Isabelle Bril
LACITO-CNRS

本文探討數個分屬於不同分群下之南島語的名詞組連接策略，這些策略包括 (i) 使用「和」的並列結構，(ii) 使用「跟」的伴同結構，以及 (iii) 包含式部件關係結構，此結構為名詞組連接策略的一個次型。從以下兩方面而言，本文中所探討的大多數語言似乎為「和」及「跟」語言的混合型：(i) 「跟」的伴同結構也可被用來作為標示「和」並列結構的一種策略 (Stassen 2003)；(ii) 這些語言用不同的詞素來標記「和」及「跟」的名詞組連接結構。

本文試圖描述當一個語言在選擇名詞組連接策略時會有的語法限制、以及語義和語用的特徵。我們發現，從結構及語用的顯著性而言，「和」型連接在結構上是對稱的，相對地，「跟」型連接和部件關係結構則較為不對稱。我們也發現，那些使用不同策略或詞素來表達「和」及「跟」的語言，其「跟」型連接分布較為受限，且帶有不同的語意特徵。

關鍵詞：對稱及非對稱連接，包含式部件關係結構，伴同結構，添加並列結構