

Indirect Duals

[Part I]

Frans Plank [and Wolfgang Schellinger [and Wilhelm Geuder]]

Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Konstanz

1. How it may need less than what you expect to have a dual

It is commonly assumed that languages have to be credited with a dual if they have grammatical (as opposed to lexical) forms for reference specifically to twoness—two persons, two things, two events, two anything. On this assumption it can be difficult to decide whether a language has or lacks a dual at any one time. Duals may be in the process of being innovated (typically by way of grammaticalization of a numeral 'two' or a quantifier 'both') or of being fossilized and lost, and drawing a boundary between not yet and already, or still and no longer, having a dual may therefore be arbitrary in periods of transition.

A problem of a different sort arises when the only ostensible dual of a language is that for 1st person inclusive, referring to the pair of speaker and addressee: if a pronominal system is best analysed in terms of a unit vs. augmented contrast rather than of singular, dual, plural numbers, then such speaker-and-addressee forms typically count as unit and within their system do not have the value of a dual.

However, these are not the only potential problems for dual spotters. What we will suggest here is that it is too restrictive an assumption to require particular forms specifically for twoness: duals can also be expressed indirectly, by syntagmatically combining forms for other numbers of opposite value, in particular singular and plural. We will present the variations on the theme of the indirect dual that we are aware of—in Chamorro (Section 2), in American Indian languages (Section 3), and in Irish (Section 4)—, and then discuss their significance as instances of disagreement (Section 5).¹

¹ Section 2, written by Plank in 1989 and therefore perhaps in some need of updating, urgently awaits to be complemented by write-ups of Sections 3 and 4 from a voluminous hand-out by Schellinger and of a draft by Geuder respectively, both also dating from the late 80s or early 90s. Section 5 was intended to modestly broach the wider subject of disagreement, especially in number. Among the various circumstances where forms may or

The theme has previously been alluded to, in one sentence, by Hagege (1982: 80), who finds it attested in two percent of the languages in his (unidentified) sample, mentioning Hopi, Paiute, and Chamorro. Also, in a specialist paper on number in Hopi (Bennett 1980: 280), a footnote points to an analogue in Chamorro.

2. Chamorro

2.1. Sources

There has been a steady flow of recent theoretical papers—including Chung (1980, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1994), Chung & Georgopoulos (1988), Cooreman (1982, 1983, 1984, 1988, 1992), Cooreman, Fox, & Givón (1988), De Wolf (1988), Scancarelli (1985), Campana (1989), and Woolford (1991)—whose focus has mostly been on the relational clause structure and on anaphora in Chamorro, an Austronesian language spoken on the Marianas (Guam, Saipan, and Rota) whose closer genealogical affinities are controversial. Grammatical relations and pronominalization, although not as such our primary concerns here, bear upon our present topic—the ways of expressing a dual without having special forms for this number.

Being less than fully appreciative of such unusual number marking, some pertinent factual questions are left unanswered, and indeed unasked, by our published sources—the descriptive grammar of Topping & Dungca (1973), supplemented, also for historical perspective, by Safford (1903/04/05), Callistus (1910), Kats (1917), von Preissig (1918), Costenoble (1940), and Izouï (1940), the specialist references given above, and personal communication from Donald Topping. Occasionally, therefore, our interpretation of the intricacies of the indirect dual in Chamorro has to remain speculative. What needs to be sorted out in particular are relevant differences between the dialects of Guam, Saipan, and Rota, with the latter appearing to be the most conservative one, retaining the indirect mode of expressing the dual abandoned elsewhere, in favour of lexical expressions for twoness.

must disagree in number we were not aware of other instances of indirect combinatory expressions of categories lacking direct expression—with the possible exception of the “associative”, which is rarely found to be expressed through combinations of a singular subject and a plural verb (‘my brother-SG also live-PL there’, meaning ‘my brother and his family also live there’).

2.2. Direct singular and plural

There is no doubt that number is a grammatical category of Chamorro, and that it is realized by two terms, singular and plural, distinguished, although not always obligatorily, on referring (nominal and pronominal) and on predicative (verbal) words. The existence of a dual is more elusive.

There is in fact a prefix *a-* which is added to the interrogative word *manu* 'which?' (also 'where?', but this meaning is irrelevant here) if the question involves a choice between two referents:²

- (1) a. *Manu na mannok i ga'-mu?*
which MOD chicken DEF CLASS-2SG.POSS
'Which chicken is yours?'
b. *A-manu na mannok i ga'-mu?*
'Which of the two chicken is yours?'

This prefix *a-*, not found with other interrogatives (such as *hayi/hai* 'who?' or *hafa* 'what?'), is formally identical to the prefix on distributive numerals and similar to the reciprocal prefix on verbs (which, unlike its doubles, obligatorily bears stress). If it qualifies as a dual marker at all, its scope is certainly marginal compared to that of the singular-plural opposition. (But then, such marginal duals limited to interrogatives are not unheard of elsewhere.)

And there has been claimed (by Safford 1903: 301 and von Preissig 1918: 8) to be a dual also on nouns, in the form of the infix or (with vowel-initial stems) prefix *(-)um-*. What this affix expresses, however, is not that a noun phrase straightforwardly refers to two individuals (it would not be used, for example, in 'John's two brothers'), but that it refers to a pair of individuals in a mutual or reciprocal relationship to each other:

² Abbreviations used in glosses, sometimes in combination: SG/PL/DU singular/plural/dual; 1/2/3 1st/2nd/3rd person; INCL/EXCL inclusive/exclusive; ERG/ABS/EMPH/POSS ergative/absolutive/emphatic/possessive set of pronouns; SBJ subject; TOP topic; AF/GF actor-focus/goal-focus; PASS passive; DETRANS detransitive; DEF definite article; DEFNF definite article for non-focussed argument; DEM demonstrative; CLASS classifier; MOD particle linking modifiers or determiners and their head (sometimes called LIGATURE); FUT future.

(2)	<i>chelo</i>	'sibling'	<i>ch-um-elo</i>	'brother-and-sister of each other'
	<i>asagua</i>	'spouse'	<i>um-asagua</i>	'husband-and-wife'
	<i>parientes</i>	'kinsman'	<i>p-um-arientes</i>	'(two) kinsmen of each other'

Duals of this kind, called *a potiori* or elliptic since only one representative of a pair is mentioned, are also found elsewhere, but normally only when there are also conceptually simpler duals. (As will be seen presently, the *(-)um* that Safford has in mind here is likely to be the same as that marking singular on intransitive verbs, and we may therefore be dealing with indirect duals, assuming that such nominal words are used predicatively and their subject, if there is an overt one, is plural—as is confirmed by Callistus (1910: 2*) and Costenoble (1940: 292), who translate *cume?lo* as 'sie [beide] sind Geschwister'.)

Now, these are not the only candidates for a dual in Chamorro, but the others are not exactly straightforward, either.

Pronominal paradigms include three persons plus an inclusive-exclusive contrast in 1st person, and singular and plural are consistently distinguished for all of these forms in four sets of pronominal elements—ergative, absolutive, possessive, and emphatic. Ergative pronouns, preceding or possibly prefixed to verbs, represent (or cross-reference) transitive subjects, and in the future/irrealis also intransitive subjects; absolutive pronouns, following verbs, represent direct objects, and in non-future/realis clauses intransitive subjects; possessives, always suffixed to nouns, may also represent subjects of nominalizations and of a few irregular verbs; emphatic pronouns are used in initial position as emphasized subjects or also objects, and non-emphatically as objects of prepositions.

Non-predicative nouns can be pluralized by *siha*, the 3rd person pronoun from the absolutive set following them; but such plural marking is optional. A number of nouns are pluralized, on the other hand, by (synchronically) idiosyncratic formal alternations (like those in (3a)) or by the prefix *man-* with attendant morphological modifications (3b).

(3)	SG	PL	
a.	<i>lahi</i>	<i>lalahi</i>	'man/men'
	<i>palao'an</i>	<i>famalao'an</i>	'woman/women'
	<i>patgon</i>	<i>famagu'on</i>	'child(ren)'
b.	<i>pale'</i>	<i>mamale'</i>	'priest(s)'
	<i>sakke</i>	<i>mañakke</i>	'thief/thieves'

Such morphological plural marking is only found with nouns denoting persons. It is obligatory, except in the company of numerals, where basic singular forms are used:

- (4) *dos (na) patgon*
 two MOD child
 'two children'

The marking of number on verbs will be surveyed in the following section. It creates the conditions for the emergence of the dual as an indirectly expressed category in Chamorro—or at any rate, in earlier and perhaps also current conservative varieties of Chamorro.

2.3. Indirect dual, getting direct

2.3.1. In many languages with a directly expressed dual, commanding grammatical forms of its own, its scope is limited to pronouns or to nouns, to particular subsets of either of these, or also to pronouns or nouns in particular grammatical relations (see Plank 1989, 1996). In Chamorro, dual marking is rather severely limited in relational terms, and person is a relevant parameter, too. More unusually, the domain of one kind of its dual marking is circumscribed in terms of tense (or mood).

2.3.2. In the non-future tense—or the realis, if the relevant opposition is assumed to be one of mood—it is primarily, although not exclusively, the subjects of intransitive and intransitive-like clauses that admit of a three-way number distinction.

Intransitive verbs usually take the infix *-um-* or the prefix *ma-* if their subjects are singular and replace these by the prefix *man-* if subjects are plural. Subject pronouns, chosen from the absolutive set, and verbs may agree in number (5a/b); if they fail to do so, with the subject marked plural and the verb singular, the subject is understood to have dual reference (5c).

- (5) a. *H-um-anao gue' para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go 3SG.ABS to Saipan
 '(S)he went to Saipan.'
- b. *Man-hanao siha para Saipan.*
 PL.SBJ-go 3PL.ABS to Saipan
 'They (more than two) went to Saipan.'
- c. *H-um-anao siha para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go 3PL.ABS to Saipan
 'The two of them went to Saipan.'

Even though relevant examples are missing from Topping & Dungca (1973), the same method is presumably also applicable to non-pronominal subjects, specially if these are personal nouns forming the plural morphologically (6); nouns optionally taking *siha* in the plural would obligatorily have to be accompanied by this pronoun for the dual to be distinguishable from the singular (7).

(6) *H-um-anao i famagu'on para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go DEF child.PL to Saipan
 'The two children went to Saipan.'

(7) *H-um-anao i estudiante siha para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go DEF student 3PL.ABS to Saipan
 'The two students went to Saipan.'

When accompanied by indefinite rather than definite direct objects, transitive verbs are detransitivized (or "anti-passivized"), and this is indicated by the verbal prefix *man-* or, exceptionally, by suppletion of verb stems.³ Just like basic intransitives, such detransitivized verbs require subject pronouns from the absolutive set and take the prefix *man-*, homonymous with the detransitivizing prefix, when the subject is plural. (In the case of suppletion, the detransitive stem also takes the infix *-um-* when the subject is singular.) As before, a dual is indirectly expressed by combining plural subjects with singular verbs:

- (8) a. *Hu li'e' i gima'.*
 1SG.ERG see DEF house
 'I saw the house.'
- b. *Man-li'e' yo' guma'.*⁴
 DETRANS-see 1SG.ABS house
 'I saw a house.'
- c. *Man-man-li'e' ham guma'.*
 PL.SBJ-DETRANS-see 1PL.EXCL.ABS house
 'We (I and several others, but not you) saw a house.'

³ Such detransitivized verbs may in fact also occur with definite objects, but these are then marked by prepositions, hence have presumably lost their direct-object status (see Cooreman 1988: 575-583).

⁴ *guma'* is a "vowel-harmony" variant of *gima'*.

- d. *Man-li'e' ham guma'.*
 DETRANS-see 1PL.EXCL.ABS house
 'We two (excluding you) saw a house.'

In an analogous manner the dual can be indirectly expressed in nearly all kinds of intransitive clauses, including passives, statives, and existentials. Only a few existential verbs are so defective as not to distinguish singular and plural (e.g., *guaha* 'have, exist' and *taya'*, its negative counterpart); adjectives used as stative predicates seem also incapable of contrasting numbers.

Most contemporary varieties of Chamorro seem to have abandoned indirect dual marking as just described, and use the obvious lexical form—the numeral for 'two', *dos*—when such numerical precision is deemed advisable. Arguably, however, there continues to be disagreement in number, insofar as the pronominals cross-referencing noun phrases containing *dos* are singular:⁵

- (5) c'. *H-um-anao i dos para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go DEF two to Saipan
 'The two of them went to Saipan.'

- (6) *H-um-anao i dos patgon para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go DEF two child (SG) to Saipan
 'The two children went to Saipan.'

- (7) *H-um-anao i dos estudiante para Saipan.*
 SG.SBJ-go DEF two student (SG) to Saipan
 'The two students went to Saipan.'

⁵ Cf. Costenoble (1940: 292), describing the Chamorro as he knew it in the first two decades of the twentieth century: "Diese Regeln mögen früher einmal streng innegehalten worden sein; heute ist man sehr nachlässig damit und benutzt anstatt des Dual lieber den Plural. Nur bei den Fürwörtern der ersten Person befolgt man noch einigermaßen die obigen Regeln, weniger in der zweiten Person, und in der dritten Person fast gar nicht mehr."

Safford (1903: 208; 1904: 510-511) still considers the indirect dual to be the rule; similarly Callistus (1910: 11*); Kats (1917: 120); von Preissig (1918: 16); Izouï (1940: 24-27).

As is partly seen in (8a), transitive verbs accompanied by a definite direct object lack the number markers *-um-/ma-* (SG) and *man-* (PL) that enable intransitives and detransitives to express a dual of their subjects by virtue of disagreement in number. In fact, since transitive verbs are obligatorily preceded by an ergative-set pronoun (in non-focussing constructions) which represents the subject/actor and serves as a cross-reference marker when there is an independent subject noun phrase, it would theoretically be possible for a subject noun phrase and its cross-referential pronoun to disagree in number:

- (9) **I lalahi ha li'e' i gima'*.
 DEF man.PL 3SG.ERG see DEF house
 'The two men saw the house.'

Alas, Chamorro (even in its conservative varieties) forgoes this opportunity of dualizing transitive subjects.

This is not to say, however, that all nouns or pronouns in transitive clauses are perforce outside the scope of indirect dual marking. Non-subjects indeed are, even though they may appear in the form of absolutive-set pronouns, which do participate in number disagreement yielding indirect duals in intransitive clauses: in transitive clauses there simply is no verbal number marking that would operate on the basis of an ergative-absolutive alignment and thus be responsive to number distinctions of direct objects. Our only transitive example so far, (8a), was a non-focussing construction, but Chamorro also has Philippine-style clause alternations differing in which of the arguments is in focus (i.e., is the topic or has special emphasis), and in such focus constructions transitive verbs are morphologically richer.

In the actor-focus construction, for instance, transitive verbs take an infix *-um-*, formally resembling the singular marker of intransitives:⁶

- (10) a. *Guahu l-um-i'e' i gima'*.
 1SG.EMPH AF-see DEF house
 'I am the one who saw the house.'

This *-um-*, moreover, alternates with the prefix *man-*, resembling the plural marker of intransitives. However, the distinction expressed by *-um-* and *man-* in actor-focus constructions is not one of number but of definiteness of the object:

⁶ Cooreman (1983: 478-480) gives examples of such constructions without emphatic pronouns; she denies that the actor is significantly more topical, more focussed on, than the goal.

- (10) b. *Guahu man-li'e' guma'.*
 'I am the one who saw a house.'
- c. *Hami l-um-i'e' i gima'.*
 1PL.EXCL.EMPH AF-see DEF house
 'We (I and several others, excluding you) are the ones who saw the house.'
- d. *Hami man-li'e' guma'.*
 'We (I and several others, excluding you) are the ones who saw a house.'

In goal-focus-constructions, on the other hand, verbal morphology does code number, with the infix *-in-* occurring with singular subjects/actors and the prefix *ma-* with plurals:

- (11) a. *I patgon ha li'e' i ma'estro.*
 DEF child 3SG.ERG see DEF teacher
 'The child saw the teacher.' (non-focussing)
- b. *L-in-i'e' i ma'estro ni patgon.*
 GF.SG.SBJ-see DEF teacher DEFNF child
 'The child saw the TEACHER.'
 (or, 'The teacher was seen by the child.')
- c. *Ma-li'e' i ma'estro ni famagu'on.*
 GF.PL.SBJ-see DEF teacher DEFNF child.PL
 'The children saw the TEACHER.'

Thus, it becomes possible again to narrow the set of subject referents down to two by combining plural-marked subjects with singular-marked verbs:

- (11) d. *L-in-i'e' i ma'estro ni famagu'on.*
 GF.SG.SBJ-see DEF teacher DEFNF child.PL
 'The two children saw the TEACHER.'

There actually are no such examples in Topping & Dungca (1973), but according to Safford (1903) (mentioned in Topping & Dungca 1973: 257) verbal *-in-* forms in this construction can be used with singular as well as plural subjects—or could be used, as Safford was staying on Guam.

What is unclear to us is which pronouns, if any, are to be used as subjects of goal-focus constructions. If there are noun subjects, goal-focus clauses dispense with the ergative cross-reference pronouns of corresponding non-focus clauses—compare (11b) with (11a). Regardless of whether an ergative (12a) or absolutive (12b) pronoun is used in the absence of a subject noun, it would have to be in the plural to be endowed with dual reference in conjunction with a singular verb form (note that these are hypothetical examples):

- (12) a. *Ma l-in-i'e' i ma'estro.*
 3PL.ERG GF.SG.SBJ-see DEF teacher
- b. *L-in-i'e' siha i ma'estro.*
 GF.SG.SBJ-see 3PL.ABS DEF teacher
- 'The two of them saw the TEACHER.'

For a (non-future/realis) transitive clause, the appropriate choice would seem to be an ergative-set pronoun. However, the transitivity of goal-focus clauses is in some doubt: they have also been analysed as a kind of passive, with the focussed goal as the grammatical subject and the out-of-focus actor as an oblique object, nonetheless retaining the capacity to determine verbal number marking.⁷ As an argument against the passive analysis, Topping & Dungca (1973: 247) mention the inomissibility of the actor. Cooreman (1983: 460), on the other hand, cites an example where the actor is absent and, moreover, a verb with the infix *-in-* takes the plural prefix *man-*, just like an intransitive verb, agreeing with a plural goal:

- (13) *Man-h-in-engang i taotao.*
 PL.SBJ-"PASS"-startle DEF people
- 'The people were startled.'

Depending on whether the active, transitive goal-focus or the passive, intransitive analysis is preferred for such constructions, the indirectly dualizable actor would be a non-topical, out-of-focus transitive subject or a relationally lower-ranking oblique object.

⁷ Cooreman (1983), like others before her, assumes two separate passive constructions, one marked by infix *-in-*, the other by prefix *ma-*, with the choice between them depending, perhaps among other things, on the singular or plural of the oblique object.

2.3.3. In the future tense, or irrealis mood,⁸ subject pronouns are the same for transitive and intransitive clauses. For 1st and 2nd person they are those of the ergative set, i.e. those functioning exclusively as transitive subjects in the non-future/realis. This neat pattern is disturbed in the 3rd person, and the picture is further complicated by elements accompanying the invariable future markers *para* or *siempre* whose distribution is also in terms of person (and which have therefore been analysed as parts of subject pronouns by Chung and Cooreman).

With singular subjects, intransitive verbs in the future shed the singular affixes (-*um-*, *ma-*) which they take in the non-future, but with plural subjects they continue to use a prefix, *fan-*, which may be considered a regular irrealis allomorph of *man-*. The scene is thus set again for the dual to be indirectly expressed in the by now familiar fashion, at least for 1st (14) and 2nd person (15) (examples from Topping & Dungca 1973: 262-263):

- (14) a. *Para bai hu saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 1SG.FUT 1SG.ERG stay (SG) in Yigo
 'I will stay in Yigo.'
- b. *Para bai in fañaga [<fan-saga] giya Yigo.*
 FUT 1PL.EXCL.FUT 1PL.EXCL.ERG PL.SBJ-stay in Yigo
 'We (I and several others) will stay in Yigo.'
- c. *Para (u) ta fañaga giya Yigo.*
 FUT (1PL.INCL.FUT) 1PL.INCL.ERG PL.SBJ-stay in Yigo
 'We (I and several of you and perhaps others) will stay in Yigo.'
- d. *Para bai in saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 1PL.EXCL.FUT 1PL.EXCL.ERG stay (SG) in Yigo
 'We two (I and another one) will stay in Yigo.'
- e. *Para (u) ta saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT (1PL.INCL.FUT) 1PL.INCL.ERG stay (SG) in Yigo
 'We two (I and you) will stay in Yigo.'
- (15) a. *Para un saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 2SG.ERG stay (SG) in Yigo
 'You (SG) will stay in Yigo.'

⁸ Another irrealis category would be the imperative, but owing to its lack of subject pronouns it is irrelevant here.

- b. *Para en fañaga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 2PL.ERG PL.SBJ-stay in Yigo
 'You (PL) will stay in Yigo.'
- c. *Para en saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 2PL.ERG stay (SG) in Yigo
 'You two will stay in Yigo.'

The 3rd person ergative-set pronouns are *ha* (SG) and *ma* (PL), but the form that appears in the future for both numbers is *u* (resembling the element optionally preceding the 1st person inclusive pronoun, as seen in (14c/e)), and the verb alone here distinguishes the plural from the singular:⁹

- (16) a. *Para u saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 3.FUT stay (SG) in Yigo
 '(S)he will stay in Yigo.'
- b. *Para u fañaga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 3.FUT PL.SBJ-stay in Yigo
 'They will stay in Yigo.'

To give the subject dual reference, *u* is followed by the normal 3rd person singular pronoun from the ergative set, *ha*, and the verb, as one expects, is in the basic singular form:

- (16) c. *Para u ha saga giya Yigo.*
 FUT 3.FUT 3SG.ERG stay (SG) in Yigo
 'The two of them will stay in Yigo.'

Notice that there is no single pronominal element in (16c) that is specifically plural: *u* is evidently number-neutral, and there are no grounds for attributing plural value to *ha* in this particular usage. It is at best the combination of *u* and *ha* that can be regarded as establishing plural reference, which would then be narrowed down to dual by the co-occurring singular verb, as with all other indirectly expressed duals so far. Alternatively, one might also consider analysing the combination of *u* and *ha* as a dual expression in its own right, consisting of two singular pronominals (with *u* also having plural potential) which are asyndetically conjoined and whose separate references add up to that of a dual.

⁹ According to Costenoble (1940: 185), *u* can be a preposition ('zu, um zu'), a conjunction ('daß, auf daß'), or a verb ('sollen, mögen, werden').

This latter interpretation gains plausibility when transitive verbs in the future are also taken into account. Like their non-future counterparts they are without number marking of their own, which precludes number disagreements of the kind utilized for indirect dual marking. Even so, there is a three-way number distinction exclusively for 3rd person subjects:

- (17) a. *Para u li'e' i gima'.*
 FUT 3.FUT see DEF house
 '(S)he will see the house.'
- b. *Para u ma li'e' i gima'.*
 FUT 3.FUT 3PL.ERG see DEF house
 'They will see the house.'
- c. *Para u ha li'e' i gima'.*
 FUT 3.FUT 3SG.ERG see DEF house
 'The two of them will see the house.'

It is the paradigmatic contrast between the companions of *u* alone— \emptyset , *ma*, and *ha*—which distinguishes singular, plural, and dual here. And this fits in well with the analysis of *u ha* as 'he + he' already suggested for the intransitive paradigm, differing from the transitive one only in in the 3rd person plural. In the absence of disambiguating verbal number marking on transitives, the conjunction of *u* and *ma*, 'he + they', comes in handy as a distinctive plural form. The transitive future 3rd person plural and dual forms, thus analysed, are compositional, with a singular and a plural pronoun (PL) and two singular pronouns (DU) as their components; but these combinations are firmly grammaticalized, entrenched in the pronominal paradigm.¹⁰ What we are faced with, then, is a direct rather than indirect, if compositional, expression of the dual for the 3rd person subject of transitive, and possibly also intransitive, clauses in the future tense. It would be instructive to examine these future paradigms from a diachronic perspective. Assuming that the ergative-set pronouns, partly employed in the future, are archaic, the combinations with the exclusively future element *u* would seem to be innovations.

2.3.4. To summarize, capable of INDIRECT dual marking in Chamorro are (a) the subjects of intransitive clauses (except those with adjectival and certain existential predicates), including detransitivized ones, regardless of whether they are pronominal or nominal and of whether the tense is non-future or future; and (b) the non-topical, out-of-focus actors, nominal and

¹⁰ What remains puzzling is why this *u* is also used, if optionally, for 1st person INCLUSIVE; on our analysis it would seem better suited for the exclusive ('(s)he + I').

possibly also pronominal, in goal-focus constructions in the non-future and perhaps also future tense, whose grammatical relation is that of transitive subject or oblique object, depending on the analysis of such constructions. Capable of DIRECT dual marking are the 3rd person subjects, pronominal and (via cross-reference) nominal, of transitive and possibly also intransitive clauses in the future tense. While direct dual marking consists in the combination of pronouns of identical number value, viz. singular, indirect dual marking results from combining plural-marked pronouns or nouns with singular-marked verbs, and is therefore limited by the availability and relational orientation of verbal singular-plural distinctions.

2.4. Related languages

The Austronesian family is one of the hotbeds of rich number differentiation. Yet, within this genetic context, the Chamorro mode of indirectly expressing a dual seems unique.

Among the languages variously considered to be closely affiliated with it, West Futuna (a Polynesian language of the New Hebrides; Dougherty 1983) has a pronominal trial as well as a dual, all expressed directly and non-combinatorily; Palauan (a language of Micronesia possibly related to the Philippine group; Josephs 1975) lacks a dual of any kind; and Tagalog (of the Philippine group; Schachter & Otanes 1972) has an obsolescent, directly expressed dual of the 1st person inclusive pronoun, tending to be replaced by the corresponding plural. Spanish, in close contact with Chamorro since the seventeenth century, and English, a more recent import to the Mariana Islands, lack a dual. Spanish has composite plural pronouns involving a 3rd person element for 2nd and 1st person, viz. *vos-otros* and *nos-otros*. (A likely influence of Spanish on the future paradigm of Chamorro consists in the 1st person singular and 1st person exclusive plural formative *bai*, possibly derived from *voy*, the 1st person singular present of the Spanish verb *ir* 'to go'; see Costenoble 1940: 307 and Topping & Dungca 1973: 262.)

Tagalog employs number markers for the indirect expression of genericity, in a manner that is reminiscent of how Chamorro takes care of the dual (Schachter & Otanes 1972: 231):

- (18) a. *Mga ma-ga-galing na komersyante iyong mga Intsik doon.*
 PL PL-good MOD businessman DEM PL Chinese DEM
 'Those Chinese over there are good businessmen.'
- b. *Magaling na komersyante ang mga Intsik.*
 good MOD businessman TOP PL Chinese
 'The Chinese (in general) are good businessmen.'

If a plural-marked subject/topic co-occurs with a modification construction as predicate which is also plural, its reference is specific (18a), but if such predicates are not plural-marked, the sentence is generic (18b).

to be continued with Part II

3. America
4. Irish
5. Number disagreement

References

- Bennett, Michael Eric (1980). Aspects of grammatical number in Hopi. In *The Sixth LACUS Forum 1979*, 271-281.
- Callistus, P. (1910). *Chamorro-Wörterbuch enthaltend I. Deutsch-Chamorro, II. Chamorro-Deutsch, nebst einer Chamorro-Grammatik und einigen Sprachübungen*. Honkong: Societas Missionum ad Exteros.
- Campana, Mark (1989). Chamorro morpheme *ma-*. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* 6-1: 1-20.
- Chung, Sandra (1980). Transitivity and surface filters in Chamorro. In Jim Hollyman & Andrew Pawley (eds.), *Studies in Pacific Languages and Cultures*, 303-339. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- (1982). Unbounded dependencies in Chamorro syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 39-77.
- (1987). The syntax of Chamorro existential sentences. In: Eric J. Reuland & Alice G. B. ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (In)Definiteness*, 191-225. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- (1989). On the notion "null anaphor" in Chamorro. In Osvaldo Jaeggli & Ken Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*, 143-184. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- (1990). VP's and verb movement in Chamorro. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8: 559-620.
- (1991). Sentential subjects and proper government in Chamorro. In Carol Georgopoulos & Robert Ishikana (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language*, 75-99. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- (1994). Wh-agreement and "referentiality" in Chamorro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 1-44.
- & Carol Georgopoulos (1988). Agreement with gaps in Chamorro and Palauan. In Michael Barlow & Charles A. Ferguson (eds.), *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*, 251-268. Stanford: CSLI.
- Cooreman, Ann (1982). Topicality, ergativity and transitivity in narrative discourse: Evidence from Chamorro. *Studies in Language* 6: 343-374.
- (1983). Topic continuity and the voicing system of an ergative language: Chamorro. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*, 425-489. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (1984). A semantic basis for the choice of complement clause types in Chamorro. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Parasession on Subordination*, 572-582.
- (1988). The antipassive in Chamorro: Variations on the theme of transitivity. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and Voice*, 561-593. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- (1992). The pragmatics of word order variation in Chamorro narrative text. In Doris Payne (ed.), *Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*, 243-263. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- , Barbara A. Fox, & Talmy Givón (1988). The discourse definition of ergativity: A study in Chamorro and Tagalog texts. In R. McGinn (eds.), *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*, 387-425. Athens, Ohio: Center for Southeast Asia Studies.
- Costenoble, H. (1940). *Die Chamorro Sprache*. (Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië te 's-Gravenhage.) 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.
- De Wolf, Charles M. (1988). Voice in Austronesian languages of Philippine type: Passive, ergative or neither? In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and Voice*, 143-193. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dougherty, J. W. D. (1983). *West Futuna-Aniwa: An Introduction to a Polynesian Outlier Language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hagège, Claude (1982). *La structure des langues*. (Que sais-je?, 2006.) Paris: Presse Universitaire de France.
- Izouï, H. (1940). Le système verbal du chamorro actuel de l'île Saïpan. *Gengo-Kenkyû* 6: 14-27.
- Josephs, Lewis S. (1975). *Palauan Reference Grammar*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Kats, J. (1917). *Het Tjamoro van Guam en Saipan, vergeleken met eenige verwante talen*. (Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië te 's-Gravenhage.) 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.
- Plank, Frans (1989). On Humboldt on the dual. In Roberta Corrigan, Fred Eckman, & Michael Noonan (eds.), *Linguistic Categorization*, 293-333. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- (1996). Domains of the dual, in Maltese and in general. In Albert J. Borg & Frans Plank (eds.), *The Maltese Noun Phrase Meets Typology* (=Rivista di Linguistica 8), 123-140. Pisa: Pacini.
- Preissig, Edward R. von (1918). *Dictionary and Grammar of the Chamorro Language of the Island of Guam*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Safford, William Edwin (1903/04/05). The Chamorro language of Guam. *American Anthropologist* 5: 289-311, 508-529; 6: 95-117, 501-534; 7: 305-319.
- Scancarelli, Janine S. (1985). Referential strategies in Chamorro narratives: preferred clause structure and ergativity. *Studies in Language* 9: 335-362.
- Schachter, Paul & Fe T. Otones (1972). *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Topping, Donald, with B. C. Dungca (1973). *Chamorro Reference Grammar*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Woolford, Ellen (1991). VP-internal subjects in VSO and nonconfigurational languages.
Linguistic Inquiry 22: 503-540.