Book Reviews

Dorothy G. Jauncey. 2011. *Tamambo, a language of Malo, Vanuatu.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics 622. 449 pp. ISBN 978-0-858-83633-4. $Aust. 110.00 (Australia), $Aust. 100.00 (elsewhere), paper.

Tamambo is a conservative Oceanic language of the Northern Vanuatu subgroup (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002) spoken on Malo, a small island just south of the country's largest: Santo. Tamambo is currently the only language of the island, another dialect (Tamapo) being almost extinct. Use of Tamambo is still strong, particularly on the western side of the island where it originated, and it is also spoken by sizable "off-island" communities in Vanuatu's main towns of Luganville and Port Vila. Jauncey estimates that there are currently approximately 3,600 speakers (a rising number). Like many Vanuatu languages, however, Tamambo is being impacted by widespread use of the country's lingua franca and national language Bislama (an English lexifier-creole).

Jauncey's grammar marks the first substantial documentation of Tamambo. Previously, only a few short wordlists and brief grammatical sketches (for example, Macdonald 1891, Tryon 1976), as well as religious materials (for example, Landels 1897, Sykes 1955), were available. Jauncey's grammar, as well as her online Tamambo dictionary, are the product of almost 20 years of research, multiple fieldtrips, and data-collection with a vast range of speakers in Malo as well as elsewhere in Vanuatu and abroad. Jauncey's extensive knowledge of the language, the place, and the people give this grammar a unique value. She is able to provide not only a rich grammatical description but to offer insight on change within the linguistic community over these years, differences across age groups and populations (on and off island), and Tamambo's evolving relationship with Bislama. The grammar is well-written, with clear descriptions of grammatical features. Even those who may take issue with some of her proposals will no doubt find a great deal of value.

The book is organized into fourteen chapters and also includes several glossed texts in an appendix. Chapter 1 provides a thorough overview of the language and linguistic community, past and present, as well as discussion of previous scholarship on Tamambo, Malo island, and other languages of the area. This is followed by the presentation of grammatical features in chapters 2–14.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the phonology.[1] Jauncey posits a phonemic inventory of 16 consonants and five simple vowels. Providing correspondences between Proto-Oceanic (POc) and Tamambo, she illustrates a "strong correspondence" (24) between the two. Her proposed inventory of consonants is arguably too conservative and probably best represents the speech of only the oldest speakers. Based upon Riehl's (2008) research as well as Jauncey's discussion in the chapter, the bilabial fricatives /β, βʷ/ are, for the

1. Thanks to Anastasia Riehl for her help in reviewing chapter 2.

majority of speakers, [w, v] in all contexts; the palatal stop /ɟ/ is consistently an affricate with variable voicing [ⁿdʒ] or [tʃ].

Tamambo, like a number of other Oceanic languages, has a contrast between plain and additionally labialized bilabials (ᵐb vs. ᵐbʷ, m vs. mʷ, β vs. βʷ). The latter sounds (also referred to as "labiovelar") have clear lip rounding in Tamambo, whereas in other Oceanic languages the contrast may primarily manifest in quality of the following vowel without apparent rounding (see Lynch 2002 for discussion). This contrast is, however, being lost for speakers below the age of 40 (as it is in other Vanuatu languages, such as those of southwest Malakula). The segment /x/ is notable for considerable varia- tion in its phonetic realization [ɣ, h, g, kʰ], both due to phonological conditioning and sociophonetic factors. Regarding vowels, the five simple segments /i, u, e, o, a/ can occur in sequences of up to four. Jauncey provides a nice description of vowel phenom- ena, including restrictions on sequences, contexts for vowel deletion, and phonetic reali- zation in the context of stress. With clear explanations and plentiful examples, there is a great deal of useful data.

In addition to the segmental descriptions, discussions of consonant cooccurrence, syl- lable structure ((C)V(N)), and stress, Jauncey includes sections on the structure of gram- matical and phonological words and intonation. Her notes on the orthography highlight the common dilemma of choosing symbols when there is disagreement within the com- munity. Notable in terms of orthography is that prenasalized stops are written with two symbols (thus ᵐb) when word-medial but one (thus b) when initial, following conven- tions of earlier missionaries. Jauncey's presentation of the phonology is more detailed than that found in many grammars. It would have been nice to see the addition of instru- mental data, even some basic acoustic data, although such additions are unfortunately still not typical in grammatical descriptions.

Chapter 3, "Basic clause structure and grammatical function," gives a typological overview of the syntax of Tamambo with references to the more detailed discussions in the following chapters. Jauncey follows Van Valin's (2005) conception of clause layering in her description, but the influence is mostly terminological (for example, the division of the clause into "periphery," "outer core," "inner core," and "nucleus"), as the work largely avoids theoretical modeling. The basic (SVO) combinatorics of predicates, argu- ments and phrasal adjuncts are presented here. Nominal and verbal predicates appear to differ sharply, with only verbal predicates cooccurring with (obligatory) subject proclit- ics. The classification of clause types could probably be optimized by eliminating the "semi-verbal" type, which is "only used where there is negative polarity of the predicate" (59), as, for example, in (1).

(1) Balosuri   mo-te   sohena.
     nowadays   3SG-NEG   the.same
     'Nowadays it is not like that.'   (p.59, ex. 42)

Without negation, the subject marker *mo* would be ungrammatical. as *sohena* is a non- verbal predicate and thus disallows subject agreement. But by analyzing *te* as a verbal element itself, we can eliminate an entire clause type devoted to negative predications.

Section 3.8 offers a brief discussion of grammatical relations, but this is mostly devoted to the mapping of thematic roles to the grammatical relations of subject, object,

and prepositional object. As may be expected from a language of this area, A and S pattern together in typical NOM-ACC fashion. As Jauncey observes (65):

(i)   both obligatorily indicate the person and number of the NP argument on the preverbal pronoun in the VP;

(ii) both always precede the verb in linear order; and

(iii) neither is morphologically marked for plurality, unless the head of the NP belongs to the small set of nouns that do indicate plurality.

Because Tamambo appears to display a canonical NOM-ACC alignment, there is perhaps less need for the more sophisticated subjecthood diagnostics commonly employed to discern the differing properties of S, A, and P in ergative languages. Nonetheless, it would have been good to know the unique syntactic properties of subjects with regard to clause combining, but these are left to chapter 12, on serial verbs.

A chart at the end of this chapter (69) nicely sums up the division of labor between direct objects (a.k.a. "direct core arguments") and prepositional objects (a.k.a. "oblique core arguments"), with optionality observed regarding recipients, themes, and "locutional topics."

One weakness of this chapter is the lack of clarity regarding the core-periphery distinction. For instance, Jauncey states (69) "the analysis of P-objects as 'central participants', functioning as arguments within the core is usually unambiguous, but there are times when it is difficult to decide if the P-object is part of the core and intrinsic to the predicate, or is more peripheral in the clause." It seems, then, that the distinction is not one that has a real basis in the grammar of Tamambo but rather is posited based on common conceptions of a universal argument-adjunct distinction. The closest thing to actual diagnostics for the core-periphery distinction are given by Jauncey (70) as:

(i)   the participant is intrinsic to the action of the predicate;

(ii) it fulfills an obligatory function and cannot be omitted; and

(iii) it occurs within the collocational restrictions of the semantics of the predicate.

As neither (i) intrinsic nor (iii) collocational restrictions are formally defined, we are left with obligatoriness as the sole diagnosable reflex of the core-periphery distinction. Since the core and periphery are posited as two actual fields within the clause, following Foley and Van Valin (1984), there is an implicit connection between obligatoriness and distance from the predicate. This is not explored however, and from the evidence presented, it is quite possible that there is simply no strong argument-adjunct distinction, and thus no need to posit two positions for prepositional objects depending on whether they are intrinsic to the predicate or not

Chapter 4 describes the word class system of Tamambo. Jauncey observes that the morphosyntax of verbs and nouns differs considerably, typical perhaps of Vanuatu languages but considerably different from other Austronesian languages (like those of the Philippines and Polynesia). This chapter could have benefitted from laying out the full range of ungrammatical combinations with elicited examples, although the facts are summarized in a chart on p.75. The properties are sometimes described in circular terms here: for instance, nouns but not verbs can function as "predicate of a nonverbal clause." A clearer way of stating this would be in direct relation to the clitic cluster containing sub-

ject agreement and TAM that identifies verbal clauses. What would also have made the discussion clearer are hypothetical examples such as those in (2) through (4).

    (2) *Mangisi mo   walau.
          happy   3SG   run
      (Constructed example intended for 'A happy one runs.')

    (3) *Walau mo   mangisi.
          run   3SG   happy
      (Constructed example intended for 'The one who runs is happy.')

    (4) Vavine mo mangisi
          woman   3SG happy
      'The woman is happy.' (Constructed example)

Based on the discussion, we can presume the hypothetical examples in (2) and (3) to be ungrammatical, although seeing rejected constructions such as these would banish any doubts. Similar examinations of Polynesian word class systems—for example, Mosel and Hovdhaugen (1992) for Samoan, and Broschart (1997) for Tongan—have yielded important insights into the nature of lexical categories.[2]

This chapter also lays out the spatial/directional modifiers in more detail than anywhere else in the book. The relevant forms could be subject to further morphological analysis as shown in table 1, where I have added the morpheme breaks and taken *rola* from the second column and placed it in the third one. Although the morphological components are frozen, they could still shed light on the subtle differences in use between what I label here the A, B, and C classes.

Jauncey describes differences in use between the A, B, and C sets, but it is ultimately unclear how they should be analyzed or glossed. Although a rearrangement of the paradigm may have shifted forms like *rola*, we can see a clear division of labor between the formatives -*ni* (speaker proximate), -*e* (hearer proximate), and -*la* (distal), although this is not made explicit in the text. It is noted, however, that the first formative in the A set resembles a POC locative proform *ai- reconstructed by Ross (1988:348, 459). The clearest statement about the difference in the three sets regards the C set, which Jauncey describes as referring to places that are "visible, and to which the speaker often points." This strongly suggests that the *nia* formative is related to the proximate demonstrative reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian as containing *ni (Blust and Trussel ongoing), making it similar to the colloquial English "this here," as in "This here barn needs fixing."

TABLE 1. SPATIAL/DIRECTIONAL MODIFIERS

	Speaker proximate	Hearer proximate	Distal
A	aie-n(i)	ai-e	
B	ro-ni		ro-la
C	nia-ni	nia-e	nia-la

---

2. The stricter link between lexical category and syntactic function in Tamambo could be related to the lack of case marking (for subjects at least), which serves to reinforce the argument function of phrases that denote properties or events, as in the hypothetical (2) and (3). See Kaufman (2010) for an idea along this line to account for widespread innovations common to many languages of Indonesia.

The pointing function of set C can thus be derived from the demonstrative function of the frozen component *nia* < *ni. This analysis is confirmed later in the chapter (4.7.2.1) where we find that *niani* and *niala* do double duty as demonstratives.[3] Further analysis of the distinction between the A and B sets must await a more detailed description of how they differ in usage as well as comparative notes from closely related languages.[4]

Among the minor categories, we find elements that are not clearly full words, as, for instance, the intensifier *tina*, seen in (5).

(5) ... le losu tina-hi-a
          TA strike INTEN-TR-O.3SG
    '...beat her a lot.'   (p.84)

As no evidence is presented that *tina* can stand alone, its placement in (5), where it precedes verbal suffixes (the applicative and object agreement), might suggest that it is a suffix that can attach to verbs and adjectives. However, since the position it occupies between the verb stem and suffixes is also available to certain adverbs, a clitic or incorporation analysis is also possible. Presumably, prosodic evidence could settle this, but the stress patterns are not given for the relevant example. More generally, we find that different types of morpheme breaks are not argued for rigorously. For instance, while the intensifier *tina* is treated as a full word that precedes the object suffix, we find the "discourse particle" *si* treated as a suffix despite appearing after object agreement, as in (6). This is not impossible, but it seems that syllable count has had a large hand in the classification of morphemes as affixes, clitics, or independent words.

(6) mo   soari-a-si ...
     3SG   see-O.3SG-just
    'he just saw her (but) ...'   (p.108, ex. 93)

Section 4.11 is devoted to clitics. Evidence from the basic penultimate stress pattern shows that the cluster including agreement and TAM morphology is treated as an independent phonological word; *kúle* in (7a) and *kuháse* in (7b) both receive a primary stress. The fact that *ku* receives primary stress in (7a) furthermore makes it clear that proclitics are treated as part of the same phonological word as their host.

(7) a. kú=le   váno
        1SG=TA   go
      'I am going.'
    b. ku=háse   váno
        1SG=self   go
      'I am going by myself.'   (p.105)

---

3. The organization of word classes in this chapter is an unusual mix that follows both form and function. For example, the C class above is listed under "spatial/directional modifiers" in 4.5.1.3, as "spatial deictics" in 4.7.2.1, and yet again as "spatial deictic modifiers" in 4.9.21. Their classification into three categories is based on distributional differences, although this would be better attributed to the syntax.
4. One of the most concrete statements given regarding how A and B differ is that, as a response to a question about someone's location, *Nia roni* 'He's right here' is acceptable but **Nia aien* is not (80). More minimal pairs of this nature would elucidate matters.

What is less clear, however, is whether there is similar evidence available for clitics attaching directly to the verb stem, as in (8) (although suggestive facts can be gleaned from the earlier chapter on phonology).

> (8) ku=váno
>   1SG=go
>   'I go.'   (p.105)

Jauncey states (105) that "prehead TAM markers similarly cliticise rightward to the verb, if they have not already been joined by the subject pronoun." This implies that the cluster in (7a) has not cliticized to the verb because it satisfies some minimality requirement for phonological words, but that such cliticization does take place whenever the preverbal material is monosyllabic. There are several ways this hypothesis could be substantiated, but the evidence is not presented. Some relevant data would be the comparison between (9a) and (9b), that is, a comparison of the stress of the initial syllables in monomorphemic quadrisyllables (9a), and proclitic + trisyllable combinations (9b).

> (9) a. kòlokólo
>   'Orion's belt'
>   b. ku=lolóso
>   1SG=bathe
>   'I bathe.'

Absence of a prosodic distinction between (9a) and (9b) would provide evidence for proclisis to the verb. Two other phonological processes mentioned in chapter 2 are possibly relevant as well, although their morphological domains are not spelled out there. Specifically, reduction of identical adjacent vowels and an apparent syncope process involving /u/ in connected speech likely refer to the phonological word as their domain of application. Jauncey gives the combination in (10) containing a TAM proclitic as an example of vowel deletion. If proclisis takes place strictly to fulfill a minimality requirement to phonological words, we expect that the same deletion would not be present with a larger clitic cluster, as in (10b).

> (10) a. [léno]
>   le=eno
>   TA=there
>   'It's there.'   (p.37)
>   b. [kúle éno] or [kuléno]?
>   ku=le eno
>   1SG=TA there
>   'I'm there.' (constructed)

Similarly, the syncope process shown in (11a) should be impossible in (11b) if the phonological word is the relevant domain and proclisis does not take place with a polysyllabic clitic cluster preceding the verb.

> (11) a. [kúmle]
>   ku=mule
>   1SG=go.home
>   'I'm headed home'   (p.40)

b. [kulémle] or [kúle múle]?
ku=le   mule
1SG=TA   go.home
'I'm still heading home.' (constructed)

On the right edge, clisis is more easily diagnosed, as it regularly shifts the primary penultimate stress rightwards.

Chapter 5 sets out to describe all the morphological processes of Tamambo, including compounding. Tamambo shows some conservative traits in its derivational morphology. This includes causatives with *va-, vaha-* < Proto–Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) **pa-* and **paka-*, statives with *ma-* < PMP **ma-*, nominalizations with *-a* < PMP **-an*, and use of the causative for multiplicatives, for example, *vaha-tolu* 'thrice', which can be compared to Tagalog *maka-tatlo* 'thrice'.

Regarding causatives, Jauncey does not recognize *va-* as an independent causative but rather suggests that it is a reduction of *vaha.* Neither form is productive today, with causation being introduced periphrastically. However, based on the frozen forms given, *va-hani* (CAUS-eat) 'to feed' and *va-turu-hi* (CAUS-stand-APPLIC) 'to make s.t. stand up' versus *vaha-mauru* (CAUS-alive) 'to save' and *vaha-mautu* (CAUS-break) 'to resolve', the distinction appears to clearly reflect the older pattern of **paka-* with stative stems and **pa-* with dynamic ones, however this is ultimately analyzed: see Zeitoun and Huang (2000), Blust (2003).

Jauncey observes an interesting development from the POC reciprocal marker **paRi-* to a prefix *vari-*, which now indicates "inclination towards," as in *vari-hati* 'inclined to bite' or *vari-wake* 'often pinches', and so on. She states that all the examples in her data indicate inclination rather than reciprocity, but later on p.181 (ex. 130) we find a form *varilosu* glossed as 'fight'. As *losu* by itself means 'strike', the form serves as a good example of *vari-* in its arguably original reciprocal marking function.

Reduplication is discussed in 5.4.1, where Jauncey divides the process into "full reduplication" and "partial reduplication/" Unfortunately, the term "partial reduplication" is used for reduplication of both one syllable and two syllables, which should be treated as distinct morphemes. "Full reduplication" is simply the coincidence of disyllabic reduplication with a disyllabic stem. The two processes are lumped together in the description almost as if they were two exponents of a single morpheme. Interestingly, one of the very few contexts for monosyllabic reduplication is plurality marking on adjectives:

(12) a. bu~mbusohi   b. ba~mbaravu
          PL~short   PL~tall/long

This is very possibly a retention from PMP, judging from its identical function in Tagalog, as in (13), among other Philippine languages.

(13) TAGALOG
      a. pa~pandak   b. ma-ga~ganda
          PL~short   ADJ-PL~beautiful

Chapter 6 discusses the noun phrase, where an immediate cut is made between common nouns, proper nouns, relational nouns, locational nouns, and numerals. Numerals have been included with nouns despite differing quite drastically in their distribution and

morphosyntactic potential. The categories here, as in other parts of the grammar, are cho-sen in part according to the acceptability of certain morphosyntactic distributions and combinations, but more according to their canonical use, a point I return to at the end of the review. For example, relational nouns (like top, bottom, and so on) do not seem to dif-fer categorically from common nouns in Tamambo, except that they are typically used to indicate parts of objects.[5] The so-called "locational nouns," discussed in 6.3.3.4, also present serious problems for their classification as nouns. Jauncey states (170), that "they cannot function as a direct core argument in a verbal clause. But in an oblique or periph-eral argument, they function in the same way as common nouns, except that they are not marked with a preposition." This suggests very little commonality between "locational nouns" and "common nouns." They appear better classed together with prepositional phrases or adverbs.

Section 6.2.6 contains a discussion of multifunction words. Surprisingly, the inven-tory of these words is very small, including items such as *sumbwe* 'chief' (cf. *mo sumbwe* 3SG chief 'he became a chief'), *maranjea* 'old man' (cf. *mo maranjea* 3SG old.man 'he is/was an old man'), and meteorological terms like *dondo* 'night' (*mo dondo* 3SG night 'it became night') and *kiri* 'rain' (*mo kiri* 3SG rain 'it rains'). One would have liked to see proof that this pattern does not extend further into the lexicon in the form of rejected com-binations of *mo* with other entity-denoting stems, especially given what we know about the flexibility of word classes in Polynesian.

Chapter 7 is devoted to possessive constructions. The literature on Oceanic languages appears to have developed a regrettable use of the term "linker" to refer to what is best glossed as genitive case. The term "linker" is used to describe a completely independent type of morpheme in Philippine and Formosan languages, namely one that indicates a symmetrical (reversible) relationship of modification. The "linker" described for Tamambo is not reversible, but instead indicates that the following phrase is a possessor of the preceding phrase. However, the terminology does not detract from the content of chapter 7, which offers a detailed explanation of how the different classifiers are used and the semantic generalizations behind their use. One curious use of possessive construc-tions in Tamambo is that in which a possessor expresses a benefactive adjunct.

> (14) Mo   oso-oso no-ku.
>   3SG feed.pigs CLFR-P.1SG
>   'He fed the pigs for me.'   (p.218 ex. 117)

In this construction, the possessor must be strictly right-adjacent to the verbal predi-cate. A final note of interest on possessives is the use of *koru* 'dry' as a classifier for items whose owners have passed away. This is especially unusual, as Jauncey does not men-tion any special marking on names of people who have passed away, as found, for instance, in some Cordilleran languages of the Northern Philippines. The distinction between living and dead only becomes morphologically relevant in the relation between possessions and their possessors.

Chapter 8 tackles prepositional phrases. Jauncey enumerates eleven different preposi-tions. In addition to careful exemplification of each preposition in the author's corpus,

---

5. Jauncey states (155) that "they differ from other common nouns in that they are usually linked to another common noun to specify the referent to which they relate."

Jauncey also discusses an unexpected usage of *hina*, a multifunctional preposition that introduces instrumentals, causes, partitive themes, sources, and even secondary predicates, as shown in (15).

(15) Mo   hani-a   hina baro.
      3SG   eat-O.3SG   PREP   raw
      'He ate it raw.'   (p.238, ex. 65)

Chapter 9 discusses the different types of verbs in Tamambo and the phrases that they head. Careful attention is paid to what constitute obligatory elements of the verb phrase (the verb and its preceding subject marking) versus optional elements (adverbials, "peripheral" phrases). Transitivity in Tamambo is determined by the verb root itself. Transitive verbs must always have an overt object, while intransitives disallow objects. Few verbs can be considered ambitransitive; Jauncey only finds four in her entire corpus.

With certain intransitive predicates in which the sole argument is an experiencer, it is expressed as an object, as in (16), a pattern common among the languages of Eastern Indonesia as well (Donohue 2004)

(16) Mo   jomahi-au.
      3SG   tire-O.1SG
      'I'm tired.' (lit. 'It tires me.')(p.242, ex. 1)

Although Jauncey depicts the division of lexical categories as strict, the classification of several items is unexpected. The quantifier *isonduhu* 'all', for instance, is expressed as a verbal clause following the object and agreeing with it for person. It must also agree with the preceding clause for realis vs. irrealis, as can be seen in (17) and (18).[6]

(17) O   lai   na   wewe   **a**   isonduhu!
      2PL   take   ART   laplap   3SG.IRR   all
      'Take all the laplap (a kind of food)!'   (p.252 ex. 52)

(18) Nia   mo   lai   na lanje   **mo**   isonduhu.
      IP.3SG   3SG.RL   take   ART   coral   3SG.RL   all
      'He took all the coral.'   (p.252 ex. 53)

Examples are also given of Bislama borrowings, which display an interesting accretion of transitivity marking. The formant *-em* (from English *him*) serves as a transitivity marker in Bislama on structural analogy with local Vanuatu languages. To this is then added the Tamambo object marker *ra*.

(19) mo   blokem-i-ra
      3SG   block-i-O.3PL
      'he prevented them'   (p.260, ex. 89)

Plenty of structural analogies exist between Tamambo and Bislama and it is unclear whether such analogies as the position and aspectual use of 'finish' in Tamambo (20) and Bislama (21) (cf. p.360) result from similarities between Tamambo and the Vanuatu substrate of Bislama or are due to more recent influences of Bislama on Tamambo.

---

6. Jauncey does not gloss realis/irrealis on the subject marking, as the difference is only visible on the third person singular (*mo* 3SG.RL vs. *a* 3SG.IRR).

(20) Nira   na   alolo mo-iso.
     3PL   3PL   inside 3SG-finish
     'They were already finished.'   (p.260, ex. 88)

(21) BISLAMA
     Hem i   kakae finis.'
     3SG 3SG   eat   finish
     'He already ate.'

Jauncey shows clearly that the subject and object markers are not tightly attached to the predicate head. There is a range of adverbial elements (for example, *mandi* 'simply', *hase* 'by oneself, independently') that separate the subject agreement + TAM complex from the left edge of the verb. Based on their semantics, we might imagine that some of these, like *andi* 'good at' and *limbo* 'pretend', are potentially independent clauses that take complements lacking subject agreement. Jauncey does not state explicitly that these cannot function as independent clauses, although this is implied by their classification as adverbs. There are also adverbial elements that intervene between the right edge of the verb and object marking, such as *wanju* 'quietly' in (22). The incorporation of adverbials into the right edge of the clitic host resembles a common pattern in the South Sulawesi languages (Kaufman 2008), as exemplified by Mamuju in (23). However, the treatment of the applicative -*hi* (glossed TR) as part of this cluster is highly unusual, and represents a historical process of degrammaticalization from verbal suffix to verb phrase enclitic.[7]

(22) O   hani wanju-hi-a!
     2SG eat   quietly-TR-O.3SG
     'Eat it quietly!'   (p.266, ex. 118)

(23) MAMUJU
     Me(l)-lampa   ma-siga=a'.
     AV-walk   ADJ-fast=1.ABS
     'I walk fast.'`   (Stromme 1994)

Chapter 10 covers adjectival words and functions, and is organized more along the lines of function than class. None of the data here are out of the ordinary until we reach the *hina* construction, shown in (24), in which an adjectival modifier or predicate is introduced via a prepositional phrase.

---

7. An alternative analysis would view the "adverb" as a transitive verb. This would not be unusual for an Austronesian language: cf. the Tagalog example in (i), where *bilisan* 'speed up' is the matrix predicate.

    (i) TAGALOG
         Bilis-an=mo=ng   kain-in iyan!
         speed-LV=2SG.GEN=LNK eat-PV   that
         'Eat it quickly!'

    In 12.8.3, Jauncey posits that these adverbs are historically derived from transitive verbs. However, this does not help to explain the adverbial position as following the notionally "main verb." A similar example with the adverb *lesi* 'try' is shown in (ii). Here, Jauncey demonstrates that the element in question cannot function as an independent predicate; that is, **O lesi-a!* for 'Try it!'.

    (ii) O   mai o   ruru lesi-a!
         2SG come 2SG dress try-O.3SG
         'Come and try it on!'   (p.270, ex. 146)

(24) Vulu-na   hina   vuriha.
      hair-P.3SG   PREP   black
     'His hair is black.'   (p.292, ex. 81)

Jauncey explains that this construction is restricted to cases where the adjective is being emphasized in the following syntactic contexts: predicate in a non-verbal clause, secondary predicate, or part of a NP in a verbal clause. Jauncey posits a visibility requirement on the types of adjectives that are possible in this construction. This would be more convincing if we could see more evidence from rejected sentences, but is intriguing nonetheless.

Chapter 11 describes the TAM system of Tamambo. Jauncey posits five slots for TAM morphemes but additional restrictions exist as well that disallow the cooccurrence of morphemes in different slots. Of particular interest in this chapter is the historical change discussed by Jauncey in which a realis marker *mo* came to be reinterpreted as 3SG. Changes such as these are understudied and can shed light on other nonetymological forms in agreement systems more generally (cf. Chamorro 3PL agreement marker *ma*-). Also of broader typological interest is the mood marker *ava*-, which Jauncey glosses as 'let' and analyzes as historically derived from *a-va-* 3SG.IRR-CAUS- (305). If this etymology is correct, it represents yet another case of degrammaticalization in which a historical prefix can now be separated from its verbal complement by agreement and TAM markers, as seen in (25).

(25) No   tamburongo – **ava**   ku   sora!
      2PL   listen   let   1SG   talk
     'You listen – let me talk!'   (p.305, ex. 27)

Several TAM markers present challenges in their distribution. The future marker *-mbo*, for instance, is described on p.305 as indicating that "... the speaker confidently expects the event to occur. The speaker is predicting that the event will, in fact, happen at some time after Speech time. It is a firm definite 'future'." This analysis is largely due to the noncooccurrence of *-mbo* with negation. Problematically though, it is described on the following page as also being used in hypothetical clauses, which would appear incompatible with the above description.

Chapter 12 discusses serial verb constructions, which are plentiful in Tamambo as they are in most Oceanic languages. Jauncey lays out a table of the most typical to the least typical serial verbs in the languages, with those most typical being basic motion and posture verbs and those least typical being transitive verbs. Serialization is analyzed as being of two basic types: core layer and nuclear layer serialization. In the former, we find the subject markers repeated for both verbs, while in the latter, two verbs share one agreement marker preceding the first verb. The difficulties in this chapter involve the lack of diagnostics for serial constructions versus canonical clause combining. The lines are especially blurred with the core layer serialization, in which the second verb possesses its own agreement marking. In regard to "switch subject serialization" as found with causatives, Jauncey states that the constructions satisfy both the description of independent clauses as well as those of serial verb constructions. In other cases, she brings prosodic evidence to bear on this distinction, and shows how two apparent clauses in a single pro-

sodic phrase are interpreted differently from the same combination in independent prosodic phrases (338).

Chapter 13, "Coordinated clauses," covers not only simple coordination but a whole variety of connectives. Most of this chapter is about how different coordinators and connectives link the clauses they introduce temporally to the discourse. Jauncey does not attempt to use coordination as a diagnostic of constituent structure in Tamambo but she does briefly examine anaphora in coordinate clauses of the type "Mary hit John and left", often included in the arsenal of subjecthood diagnostics, following Dixon (1994). She shows that, in Tamambo, either argument of a preceding transitive clause can be interpreted as the null argument in a second conjunct, as in (26).

(26) Uranji vorivori mo soari tina-na,   mo mana.
     child   little   3SG see mother-P.3SG 3SG laugh
     'The baby sees his mother, and he/she laughs.'   (p.377, ex. 26)

Jauncey suggests that this ambiguity is tolerable because native speakers have particular expectations about event types. It is also possible, however, that it is the obligatory subject clitic in the second clause that allows the freedom. Note that in an English sentence like "John saw Jim and he left," either argument of the first clause can be interpreted as the subject of the second one, but in the sentence "John saw Jim and left," only the preceding subject can antecede the null subject of "left." If Tamambo subject clitics are referential in a similar way to English pronouns, then another explanation may be possible for the ambiguity of (26).

Chapter 14 covers subordinate clauses, including relative clauses. Tamambo has an optional relative pronoun *mwende*, which, interestingly, is obligatory with subject relatives. This is, of course, highly reminiscent of the English pattern as well, shown in (27), where *that* can be dropped in nonsubject relatives but is obligatory in subject relatives.

(27) a. the rat (that) the cat ate
     b. the cat *(that) ate the rat

Also of typological interest is the unusual fact that resumptive object pronouns must be present whenever objects are relativized. The rest of the chapter examines a wide number of complement types. The focus is more on the basic expression of these different types rather than on an investigation of their syntactic structure.

The grammar is supplemented by an appendix containing five glossed texts of different genres totaling 24 pages. Jauncey furthermore makes available an online dictionary (Jauncey 2011), which serves as a valuable reference.

Grammars based on naturalistic corpora raise a host of interesting questions regarding "grammaticography" in general. The question that emerges most clearly from this particular grammar is the role and importance of frequency in a grammatical description. Jauncey goes to great lengths to include information about which variants are more common than others. In some cases, this provides valuable information about language change. There are two pitfalls with this practice in regard to syntax: (i) that the constructions being compared are not real variants of each other; (ii) that the frequency data are more an artifact of real-world usage than a fact about the particular language in question.

An example of (i) can be found in the following two examples, where (29) is preferred to (28), which has stacked adjectives.

(28) O   soari na   mwata vuriha tawera niala!
      2SG see ART snake black big   that
      'Look at that big black snake!'   (p.185, ex. 146)

(29) O   soari na   mwata tawera niala, mo   vuriha!
      2SG see ART snake black that   3SG black
      'Look at that big snake, it's black!'   (p.185, ex. 147)

It is an extremely interesting question both for description and theory whether certain languages actively avoid stacked modifiers. Such structures represent one of the basic cases of recursion in human language, which has taken front seat in the debate on Universal Grammar (see Everett [2005] and following responses). But the fact that (28) is attested puts aside the question of whether Tamambo grammar allows recursion of modifiers; it clearly can, although in practice such stacking may be rare. The problem is that (29) is not a variant of (28): it asserts a proposition that is presupposed in (28), namely that the snake is black. A few similar examples crop up in the discussion of frequency and preference. An arbitrary example of (ii) can be found on p.279 where, regarding the word *tinambu* 'different', Jauncey states that its modifier to predicative use appears in an 8 to 1 ratio in her corpus. Crucially, however, the grammar *allows* both predicative and modificational uses of adjectives. How much one or the other is used certainly belongs in the "user's manual," but what is its place in a description of the grammatical system? Jauncey's extreme attention to frequency and what types of speakers use which words is a testament to her careful fieldwork and immersion within the community. In many cases this information about frequency is suggestive of language change, but in others, it is very possible that we are dealing with real-world facts of language usage (for example, that certain word classes tend to be used either as modifiers or predicates).

Although I have taken a critical eye to certain analytical and organizational issues in the grammar, nothing here should detract from the contribution of Jauncey's work. By the time the reader reaches the texts in the appendix, perfect sense can be made of them, which is the best complement a grammar can be paid. Considering the importance of the language area and the lack of documentation on Tamambo previous to Jauncey's work, this grammar is an excellent addition to the growing documentation of Vanuatu languages, and Oceanic languages more generally.

DANIEL KAUFMAN
Endangered Language Alliance

REFERENCES

Blust, Robert. 2003. Three notes on early Austronesian morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42:438–78.

Blust, Robert, and Stephen Trussel. Ongoing. *Austronesian comparative dictionary.* Available from: http://www.trussel2.com/ACD.

Broschart, J. 1997. Why Tongan does it differently: Categorial distinctions in a language without nouns and verbs. *Linguistic Typology* 1(1):123–65.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donohue, Mark. 2004. Typology and linguistic areas. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43:221–39.

Everett, Daniel. 2005. Cultural constraints on grammar and cognition in Pirahã. *Current Anthropology* 46(4):621–46.

Jauncey, Dorothy. 2011. Dictionary of Tamambo, Malo. (http://paradisec.org.au/vandicts/Tamambolexicon/index-english/main.htm).

Kaufman, Daniel. 2008. South Sulawesi pronominal clitics: Form, function and position. *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures* 17:13–65. (*10-ICAL Pronoun Papers,* ed. by Sue McQuay.)

Landels, Rev. John D. 1897. *Maloese primer and hymn book.* Sydney: William Andrews.

Lynch, John. 2002. The Proto-Oceanic labiovelars: Some new observations. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41:310–62.

Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross, and Terry Crowley, eds. 2002. *The Oceanic languages*. Richmond: Curzon Press.

MacDonald, R. D. 1891. *South Sea languages*. Melbourne: Public Library, Museums and National Gallery of Victoria.

Mosel, Ulrike. 2006. Grammaticography, the art and craft of writing grammars. In *Catching language: The standing challenge of grammar writing*, ed. by Felix Ameka, Alan Dench, and Nicholas Evans, 41–68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mosel, Ulrike, and Evan Hovdhaugen. 1992. *Samoan reference grammar.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

Riehl, Anastasia. 2008. The phonology and phonetics of nasal-obstruent sequences. PhD diss., Cornell University.

Ross, Malcolm. 1988. *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Stromme, Kari. 1994. Person marking in the Mamuju language. *NUSA* 36:91–113.

Sykes, Rev. E. L. 1955. *Bembei talomuna*. Sydney: Australian Presbyterian Board of Missions.

Tryon, D. T. 1976. *New Hebrides languages: An internal classification*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Van Valin, Robert D, Jr. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth, and Lillian M. Huang. 2000. Concerning *ka-,* an overlooked marker of verbal derivation in Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39:391–414.