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Introduction

- Remnant movement
- Phrasal movement vs Head movement
- Results from Formal language theory (Stabler’s Minimalist Grammars)
- Comparative syntax

Explore the limits of variation, systematically record variation\(^1\).

---

\(^1\)Visit, participate, and help develop SSWL, an expert crowdsourced, community based database in development. "The syntactic Structures of the World’s Languages" at http://sswl.railsplayground.net/
Explore syntactic properties of Samoan, Polynesian

- Evidence for remnant VP movement
- Different Object positions
  
  *Case patterns pinpoint the location that leads to ergative/ absolutive patterns. Intervention*.

- PAGO constructions ("possessors as agent and goals") (Homer 08, 11) and their properties —— \( \rightarrow \) *Backward control*

- Can the properties of backward control be derived from known properties of structure building?
  
  *via: what we know about of*.
  
  *sketch an analysis (no backward control)*
  
  *An issue*: Does UG allow a parametric choice of spell out (pronounce "tail of A-chain under c-command" delete higher copy).
Samoan Basic facts

- VSO language (with Ergative-Absolutive Case-marking)
- Every (finite) sentence contains an Absolutive argument (pro-drop 3sg, pl)
Samoan Basic Facts

- "VSO"*, predicate fronting
- Remnant VP movement
- Adpositional case: P DP
- Voice suffixes (and stacking)
- No general active passive distinction
- No T morphology selecting V.
- Non verbal predication
- Postpredicate scrambling VSO, VOS

\textsuperscript{a}"TAM VSO: TOP DP C Scl T ...VSO"
Ergativity: Current Minimalist accounts

- little v lacks accusative
- absolutive = nominative: finite T

(1) \[ T \[ [S_v [VP V [O]] ] \] \]

- S is externally merged as ergative DP/ or PP, \textit{S stays in little }v, \textit{O (may) stay in big V, or raise to T}.
- detransitivization processes (S of transitive V is ABS, not ergative)
- incorporation/pseudo incorporation (transitive/intransitive little v)
- antipassivization (for any oblique objects)
Starting point

- basic syntactic properties
A typical (non-causative) transitive verb paradigm.

Tracking external argument marked **ABS** or **ERG**; **V invariant**

(2) na 'ai le teine
PST eat ABS.D.SG girl
The/a girl ate

"(pseudo)-Incorporated" object

(3) e [ 'ai i'a ] le teine
E eat fish ABS.D.SG girl
The girl eats fish

(4) na 'ai le teine i le i'a
PST eat ABS.D.SG girl OBL D.SG fish
The/a girl ate from the fish

---

\textsuperscript{2} Duranti & Ochs 1996
A typical (non-causative) transitive verb paradigm.

Tracking external argument marked ABS or ERG; V invariant

(2) na 'ai le teine
PST eat ABS.D.SG girl
The/a girl ate

(3) e [ 'ai i'a ] le teine
E eat fish ABS.D.SG girl
The girl eats fish

(4) na 'ai le teine i le i'a
PST eat ABS.D.SG girl OBL D.SG fish
The/a girl ate from the fish

(5) na 'ai le i'a
PST eat ABS.D.SG fish
the fish got eaten (by someone)/ the fish ate/ multiply ambiguous

(6) na 'ai e le teine le i'a
PST eat ERG D.SG girl ABS.D.SG fish
the girl ate a/the fish

(7) na 'ai le i'a a le teine
PST eat ABS.D.SG D fish POSS D girl
The/a girl ate her fish lit: the girls' fish ate

\[Duranti&Ochs 1996\]

Koopman

Remnant movement
Distribution?

- where are incorporated objects/ pseudo incorporated objects?
- where are oblique objects
- where are absolutive subjects
- where are absolutive objects
- where are ergative subjects
- how to derive VSO?
where in the structure?

- incorporated objects?
  low in the structure: (front with predicate

- pseudoincorporate objects
  low in the structure: (may) front with predicate

- oblique objects
  outside the fronted predicate, no Q-float

- absolutive subjects
  outside of the fronted predicate, Q-float

- absolutive objects outside of the fronted predicate, Q-float

- ergative subjects
  outside the fronted predicate, Q float

- what size constituent fronts?
  quite a big chunk! a remnant predicate
Q-float from Ergative and absolutive DP

- Q-float from ergative and absolutive; not from obliques.

(8) **Q-float from ergative:**

\[ e \text{ [ilo.a 'uma ] e tamaiti le pese} \]
\[ E \text{ [know.VOICE all ] ERG children ABS.D.SG song} \]

The children all know the song

(9) **Q-float from absolutive:**

\[ e \text{ [ilo.a 'uma ] e le tamaiti Øpese} \]
\[ E \text{ [know.VOICE all ] ERG D.sg child ABS D.pl.song} \]

The child knows all the songs
Q-float: impossible from obliques

(10)  * ’e [ fiefie ’uma ] Malia i Ø pepe
   * E [ like all ] Mary OBL D.PL.baby
   *Mary likes all the babies

(11)  ’e [ fiefie ] Malia [ Ø pepe ’uma ]
   E [like ] Mary [ OBL D.PL.baby all ]
   Mary likes all the babies
Q-float: analysis

a. DPs move past Q (Sportiche 89, ),
b. floated Q merges in the spine above S or O (vP) (updated Sportiche 96) and pied-pipes with the predicate
c. obliques stay lower: no floating from OBL
c-command:
\[
\text{Erg} > \ldots \text{Abs}_S/O \ldots > Q > \text{Oblique O}
\]
d. All Samoan internal evidence points towards Ergative P and Abs P merged in a structural layer above Q.
e. no evidence that subjects of transitive verbs ever start out as ergative DP or PP, (though they are not in Spec, TP)
Q float and Pred fronting: a classical argument for remnant movement

- At the point where DP merges with Q, and xp has fronted

```
                             xp
                             1
                     V....  DP₂
                             Q  xp
```

- Merge K/ P: DP₁ moves to K, Q strands, and fronts with the predicate in the next step:

```
         P_{abs}
        /   \
DP₂  K  PRED
     /   \
xp  Q  xp
   /   \  
V.... DP₂
```
PRED

xp

V....

DP₂

Q

xp

P_{abs}

DP₂

K

(12) \[ \text{... } [ V \ldots Q ] \text{ (FOC) } P_{(hightone)} \text{ DP } K \]
When is the external argument Abs, when is it Erg?

- Depends on the type of object
  - Abs on S with pseudo-incorporated objects or oblique objects
  - But never on S with absolutive object
External argument is absolutive

(13) e [ 'ai i’a ] le teine "(pseudo)-Incorporated" object
    E eat fish ABS.D.SG girl
    The girl eats fish

(14) na 'ai le teine i le i’a
d object
    PST eat ABS.D.SG girl OBL D.SG fish
    The/a girl ate from the fish

Nothing special to say, once we understand distributional properties of objects.
Trouble with Absolutive "objects"

(15) na 'ai le i'a
PST eat ABS.D.SG fish
the fish got eaten (by someone)/ the fish ate/ multiply ambiguous

(16) na 'ai e le teine le i'a
PST eat ERG D.SG girl ABS.D.SG fish
the girl ate a/the fish very sparse in primary data\(^3\)

(17) na 'ai le i'a a le teine
PST eat ABS.D.SG D fish POSS D girl
The/a girl ate her fish *lit: the girls’ fish ate*

why?

---

\(^3\)Oaks and Duranti
Theoretical problem..

- VP internal subjects (K&S 83, 91, and many others...)
- Objects not in argument positions/ "VP" external objects/ (K&S 83, 91, many others ..)

There is no minimality problem:

(18) \[ [S \ v \ [O [VP]]] \]

(K&S 91, Sportiche 96, ..Chomsky 01, Probe Goal)

There is a minimality problem:

(19) a. \[ [O.. [S \ v \ [VP]]] \]

b. Chomsky 91, .. V to v, to AgrO, Equidistance...

Chomsky 95: chapter 4 multiple specifiers
Based on interpretative properties and scopal interactions:\footnote{\(\delta\): Weak NPs (stage-level interpretation); \(d\): Weak NPs (individual-level interpretation); \(D\): Strong NPs). Hallman, Peter. 04. NP-interpretation and the structure of predicates, Language 80.4; Diesing 97, Yiddish VP order and the typology of object movement in Germanic.}

\[(20) \quad \left[ d\, S \right] \cdots \left[ D\, O \right] \cdots \left[ \text{vP} \, \delta\, S \right] \text{v} \left[ \text{dOBJ} \cdots \left[ \text{vP} \, \delta\, \text{OBJ} \, \text{V} \right] \right] \]
Intervention

There is no intervention problem for objects below S.

(21) \[ S \ v \ [ \ O \ [ V_P \ ] ] \] 

- low objects distribute like Dutch/German no need for special statements w.r.t case Universal?

There is an intervention problem for all languages:
for strong, affected objects.

(22) \[ [O.. [S v [V_P ]]] \]

- Intervention.. (both for accusative and nominative objects)
  V-movement ("object shift"), multiple specifiers, tucking in under, S moves out of the way, Oblique subjects, ergative...
  Others? Samoan?
Samoan absolutive objects C Sc T .. V .. S O

- trouble: for high objects: \[ [O][S \, V \, [\text{VP} \, ] \, ] \]
- (Low) Passivization VP movement, smuggling object )
- **PAGO construction**: lit: *rides John’s bike = John rides his bike* for ABS objects only Homer 09, 11.

---


A close look at the PAGO Puzzle

(23) Na sasa Ø le maile a Seu.
PST beat ABS DET.SG dog POSS Seu

‘Seu’s dog was beaten.’ Or: ‘S/he beat Seu’s dog.’
Or: ‘Seu beat his own dog.’

Possessors of Absolutive objects can be coreferential with silent Agents (or Goals) without creating Condition C effects.

Restrict discussion to silent Agents (see Homer for goals)

(24) Na ‘aumai e Sina nai ata a/o Seu.
PST bring ERG Sina some pictures POSS Seu

‘Sina brought pictures of Seu/Seu’s.’
Or: ‘Sina brought pictures of Seu_i/Seu_i’s to himself_i.’

7 Cf also John’s body sat down: John sat down
8 All PAGO data from Homer 09,11; thanks to Vincent Homer for sharing his slides with
Our first exposure to the phenomenon

John Fruean, Field Methods Class, UCLA, 01.09.08 (about the ‘Pear story’):

(25) Lae vili mai íā ə le uila a le
LAE ride towards IA ABS DET.SG bicycle POSS DET.SG
kamaikiki sau ə le kamaikiki...
boy come ABS DET.SG boy
‘Then the boy rode his bike down and came upon...’

PAGO
In a nutshell

- external argument is syntactically present
- possessor is coreferential or bound by external argument
- External argument/possessor is DP internal (at surface constituent) *we do not know if it starts DP internal*
Homer’s proposal

- (Backwards) Control
- Control as movement: a DP can ‘check’ several θ roles (Hornstein 1999 a.o.)
- Possessor Raising (Landau 1999)
- PF deletion of higher copy
- In the case of QNPs, only the higher copy is interpreted, the lower one behaves like a variable
- Extraction blocked out of Obliques, (to which I add: or from derived absolutes)
Basic Facts: Possessives

- Possessive morphemes: A for alienable possession and O, used for inalienable possession as well as for themes of Nouns.

how are possessives structure build: of insertion. remnant movement

(26) ‘o Ø le ta‘avale a Ioane
O ABS DET.SG car POSS John

(27) ‘o Ø le ulu o Ioane
O ABS DET.SG head POSS John

(28) Na ‘oti e Sina Ø le ata a/o Seu.
PST cut ERG Sina ABS DET.SG picture POSS Seu
‘Sina cut Seu’s picture/ Sina cut the picture of Seu.’

(29) Na ‘oti e Sina Ø l-a/o-na ata.
PST cut ERG Sina ABS DET-POSS-3SG picture
‘Sina cut her picture.’
Basic Facts: Pro-drop

- Samoan is pro-drop only for 3rd person singular and plural.

(30)  (Q: Did you go to Apia?)
I, na *(ou) alu i Apia.
Yes PST 1SGCL go OBL Apia
‘Yes, I went to Apia.’
Overt pronouns create **Condition C** effects.

(31) Na sasa e ia ø le maile a Seu.
PST beat ERG 3SG ABS DET.SG dog POSS Seu
’S/he; beat Seu*’s dog.’
(32) Na sasa Ø le maile a Seu.
PST beat ABS DET.SG dog POSS Seu
‘Seu beat his own dog.’

PAGO from the Absolutive
Restrictions

- Not all transitive predicates participate in PAGO: ⁹

(33)  E iloa ə le tinā o le pepe.
PRS know ABS DET.SG mother POSS DET.SG baby
‘S/he knows the baby’s mother.’
Not: ‘The baby knows his own mother.’

*PAGO

---

⁹the morphologically complex verb ilo.a ‘know. VOICE’ (experiencer verbs are abs/oblique: ilo.a derives via passive)
No PAGO from the Oblique argument.

(34) E alofa i le maile a Seu.
PRS like OBL DET.SG dog POSS Seu
‘S/he; likes Seu’s dog.’
Not: ‘Seu likes his own dog.’
Under coreference (PAGO), the possessive reading is mandatory.

(35) Na sasa Ø le maile a Seu.
    PST beat ABS DET.SG dog POSS Seu
    ‘Seu’s dog was beaten.’
Or: ‘S/he beat Seu’s dog.’
Or: ‘Seu beat his own dog.’
Not: ‘Seu beat a dog.’
Constituency: the **PAGO** Possessor-DP forms a constituent with the NP or the coordination of NPs it modifies, just like regular Possessor-DPs.

How are regular possessors build? Stay tuned Kayne -of

\[(36) \text{Na sasa} \emptyset \text{ le } \text{ maile ma } \emptyset \text{ le pusi } a \text{ Seu.} \]

PST beat ABS DET dog with ABS DET cat POSS Seu ‘S/he, beat some dog and Seu’s cat/Seu’s dog and cat.’

Or: ‘Seu beat some dog and his own cat.’

Or: ‘Seu beat his own dog and his own cat.’

Not: ‘Seu beat his own dog and some cat.’
The Absolutive object can be Ā-moved without loss of the PAGO effect.

(37) ‘O le maile a Seu na sasa.
   TOP DET.SG dog POSS Seu PST beat
   ‘It was his own dog that Seu beat.’

(38) ‘O lea le ata o Seu na ‘oti?
   TOP thing DET.SG picture POSS Seu PST cut
   ‘Which picture of Seu was cut?’
   Or: ‘Which picture of himself did Seu cut?’
It appears that the coreference is asserted, rather than being simply compatible with the beliefs of the speaker.

(39) (Context: The girl was asked if she wanted to address the audience. . .)
Na luelue Ø le ulu o le teine ona PST shake ABS DET.SG head POSS DET.SG girl then failmai . . .
say
‘The girl nodded and then she said. . .’

\[^{10}^\text{see Homer for many more cases}\]
Presence of external argument: Agreement

- Few verbs inflect for number; plural agreement is optional; certain verbs agree with the external argument only.
- Verbs can agree in number with the **Possessor** of their **Absolutive** argument in the **PAGO** construction.

(40) Na (pe)pese Ø le pese a Ioane ma Sina.
PST (<RED>)sing ABS DET.SG song POSS John and Sina
‘John and Sina sang their common song.’

- Verbs don’t normally agree with Absolutive-internal Possessors.

(41) Na (*pe)pese e Seu Ø le pese a Ioane
PST (<RED>)sing ERG Seu ABS DET.SG song POSS John
ma Sina.
and Sina
‘Seu sang John and Sina’s song.’
A floating ‘uma ‘all’ can be associated with the Possessor-DP in PAGO constructions.

(42) Na pepese ‘uma ə le pese a ə PST <RED>sing all ABS DET.SG song POSS DET.PL tamāloloa.
<RED>man
‘All the men; sang their; song.’
Presence of the Subject: Q-float

- A floating ‘uma ‘all’ can be associated with the Possessor-DP in PAGO constructions.
- This is not possible with regular Possessor-DPs.

(43) Na pese (*‘uma) e Ioane (*‘uma) Ø le pese PST sing all ERG John all ABS DET.SG song a Ø tamāloloa.
POSS DET.PL <RED>man
‘John sang the song of all the men.’
The PAGO Possessor appears to bind a variable in the position of the null external argument.

(44) For each x, x beat x’s dog.

(45) Na sasa 0 le maile a 0 tamāloloa
PST beat ABS DET.SG dog POSS DET.PL <RED>man
ta‘itasi.
each
‘The dog that belongs to all the men was beaten.’
Or: ‘S/he beat the dog that belongs to all the men.’
Or: ‘Each man beat his own dog.’
(46) For each x, x should sing x’s song.

(47) E usu ā 0 le pe se a le tagata
GENR sing EMPH ABS DET.SG song POSS DET.SG person
ia.
INT

‘Each person should sing their own song.’

(Duranti and Ochs 1996, ex. 7)
Presence of the Subject: Pronominal Binding

(48) Na sasa 0 le maile a 0 tamāloloa taʻitasi.
PST beat ABS DET dog POSS DET.PL <RED>man each

Not a case of Genitive Binding/Inverse binding (see Homer). (could Absolutive move higher than pro(external argument, and bind the subject.)

(49) [[Every child]ʼs mother] thinks that he; is clever.
(50) Na sasa e le matai a 0 maile taʻitasi
PST beat ERG DET.SG owner POSS DET.PL dog each
ia.
3SG
ʻThe owner of [each dog]; beat it;.’
Assuming that there is no Genitive Binding at play, there is an additional problem for the pro Hypothesis:

- The non specific plural quantifier nai ‘some’ enters into the construction, which is unexpected under a pro based theory, as pro is specific.

(51) Na sasa Ø le maile a nai teine.  
PST beat ABS DET.SG dog POSS some girls  
‟Some girls or others beat their own dog.’
The *pro* Hypothesis wrongly predicts Strong Crossover in ??.

(52)  (Context: At a party, all the guests came with cooked rice...)  
‘O ₀ le alaisa a ai na ‘ai?
TOP ABS DET.SG rice POSS who PST eat  
‘Whose rice was eaten?’  
Or: ‘Who ate his own rice?’
Beyond Homer’s proposal: further theoretical questions

- (Backwards) Control?
- Control as movement: a DP can ‘check’ several θ roles (Hornstein 1999 a.o.)
- Possessor Raising (Landau 1999)
- PF deletion of higher copy?
- In the case of QNPs, only the higher copy is interpreted, the lower one behaves like a variable?
- Extraction blocked out of Obliques,?

What about a? Is it like English of?
What we know about of. Kayne 1994, 2000..

- A picture of John’s/ A picture of John.
- relative clause.

```
        SC
       /   \
      /     \\     \\
John picture
```

- Merge K, attract John, merge P, attract "Pred" (complement of K:
  (continues on next)slide)

```
P/C
  /   \
 /     \\     \\
 John K
     /     \  \
 of      s       \
```

11 chapter 15. Note on Prepositions, complementizers, Word Order Universals..
Derivation continued

Merge complement of $K$ with $P$, Merge $D$:

$D$

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a \\
\text{xp} \\
\text{John picture} \quad \text{P/C} \\
\text{of} \\
\text{John} \\
K
\end{array}
\]

- Expectations: c-command binding, pronominal binding, parasitic gaps, (Hoekstra 99...)

---

$^{12}$Hoekstra 1999 *Parallels between nominal and verbal projections* (in Adger et al)
Follow up on 94. Where is of allowed to merge? What does it buy us?

\[(53) \quad \text{Where can } P.. K \text{ be merged? } \textit{variable}\]

a. $P...K \ "of\"$ merges with "$\text{nominal T}\" \quad \rightarrow \quad P \ K$
   strictly DP internal

b. $P.. K$ merges with vP (di/de Romance prepositional complementizers), attract IP

c. $P... K$ merges with vP \textit{PP extraposition, and DP islands} (Kayne 2000, chapter 15)
PP extraposition from structure building. (there is no PP extraposition per se)

(54)  .. showing [John a picture] to me --- > merge K of
.. K showing [John a picture] to me --- > attract John
.. John K showing [t a picture] to me --- > merge P of ..
of John K showing [t a picture] to me --- > move complement of K
.. [showing [t a picture] to me] of John K

- extends to P stranding outside of DP, derivation of subject islands.
An (attempt) to "Backwards control" via movement/relative clause formation: a is like -of

The external argument starts out as spec, vP, but ends up DP internal as a side effect of the derivation.
Step 1

1. Merge [ PRO/Seu NP ] as theme. *no convergence if you don’t*
2. Merge *Seu* as agent in Spec, little v
3. delete *Seu* under c-command/ Pronounced highest copy

![Diagram of a tree structure with nodes labeled as follows:

- vp
- Seu
- v
- V
- SC
- sasa_{beat}
- PRO/seu
- dog]
Step 2

1. Case: ABS (for affected theme) and GEN a (for external argument/possessor, full DP).

2. **Order of Merge Abs > GEN a**

3. Merge P.. K a with "vP" (or any structure below Abs but above Q, a. attracts DP)
Step3

1. P (a) attracts NP predicate. Merge (relative clause) D: this will just look like a DP with the first copy silent.
1. Merge complement of K with D: this yields Homer’s backward controls structures. (Pabs K still needs to be build.)
Conclusion

- Explored basic properties of Samoan, Polynesian
  - Evidence for remnant VP movement deriving VSO surface order
  - Strong evidence for different Object positions and their interpretive properties: universal? Hierarchy of object positions interacts with Case and help localize the problem of oblique/ergative subjects and absolutive/nominative objects/ accusative).
- Strategy of getting around Intervention: low passivization–Ergative is always optional
  - bunding agent as possessor. PAGO constructions ("possessors as agent and goals") (Homer 08, 11) and their properties
  - Derive backward control from known properties of structure building?
    - what we know about possessives, of, attempt at a possible account (inward bound, derivations become deeper but simpler)
Samoan absolutive objects C Sc T .. V .. S O

- trouble: for high objects: [O [S V [VP]]]
- external argument optional (→ > "passive": VP movement, smuggling object) 13
- No accusative, but absolutive (No accusative in canonical passives): (related to spell out (verb is in big V))
- Ergative, only if absolutive. ERG builds on absolutive: (second round of smuggling, necessary to get around intervention)
- independent evidence: Cause causatives: no possible "accusative" alignment with morphologically simplex verbs (i.e. ERG mapping on Cause, ABS on theme)
  *the storm destroyed the house; *the fever killed him; *the key opened the door *this made John laugh
the house destroyed from the storm, etc

- PAGO construction: lit: rides John’s bike = John rides his bike for ABS objects only Homer 09, 11. 14.

13 Koopman, Hilda. ÔSamoan ergatives as double passivizationÔ, in L. BrugÔ, A. Cardinaletti, G Giusti, N. Monera, and C. Poleto (eds), Functional Heads, Oxford University Press: "Passive" (Samoan)
Basic Facts: C-Command

- TAM V  \( \text{Erg} \quad > \quad \text{Abs} \)
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{Condition C violation expected in PAGO} \]

- TAM V  \( \text{Abs} \quad >/< \quad \text{Erg} \)
  \textbf{Absolutive} DPs c-command \textbf{Ergative} DPs only if they are ‘scrambled’ past them. Ergative c-commands Absolutive.
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{Condition C violation expected in PAGO} \]
Basic Facts: C-Command

- **Absolutive** DPs can be ‘scrambled’ past **Ergative** DPs;
- An **Ergative** DP binds into an **Absolutive** DP, whatever the surface order may be.

(55) Na tutuli e tamā ‘uma l.o.na
PST <RED>chase ERG boys all DETSG.POSS.3SG tinā.
mother

‘Each boy chased his own mother.’

(56) Na tutuli l.o.na tinā e tamā
PST <RED>chase DETSG.POSS.3SG mother ERG boys ‘uma.
all

‘Each boy chased his own mother.’
Basic Facts: C-Command

- **Oblique** DPs can be scrambled past **Absolutive** DPs;
- An **Absolutive** DP binds into an **Oblique** DP, whatever the surface order may be.

(57) \[
\text{E} \quad \text{alolofa} \quad \emptyset \quad \emptyset \quad \text{tamā} \; \text{‘uma} \; i \\
\text{PST} \; <\text{RED}>\text{love} \; \text{ABS} \; \text{DET.PL} \; \text{boys} \; \text{all} \quad \text{OBL} \\
\text{l.o.na} \quad \text{tinā}. \\
\text{DETSG.POSS.3SG} \; \text{mother} \\
\text{‘Each boy loves his own mother.’}
\]

(58) \[
\text{E} \quad \text{alolofa} \quad i \quad \text{l.o.na} \quad \text{tinā} \quad \emptyset \\
\text{PST} \; <\text{RED}>\text{love} \; \text{OBL} \; \text{DETSG.POSS.3SG} \; \text{mother} \; \text{ABS} \\
\emptyset \quad \text{tamā} \; \text{‘uma}. \\
\text{DETSG.POSS.3SG} \; \text{mother} \; \text{ABS} \\
\text{DETSG.POSS.3SG} \; \text{mother} \; \text{ABS} \\
\text{‘Each boy loves his own mother.’}
\]
Basic Facts: C-Command

- Goal-DPs bind into Theme-DPs in the canonical and in the scrambled order:

(59) Na fā‘ali e Sina ∅ l.o.na tinā i PST show ERG Sina ABS DET SG POSS.3SG mother OBL tamā ‘uma.
boys all
‘Sina showed each boy his own mother.’

(60) Na fā‘ali e Sina i tamā ‘uma ∅ l.o.na PST show ERG Sina OBL boys all ABS DET SG POSS.3SG tinā.
mother
‘Sina showed each boy his own mother.’