FIJIAN WEAK QUANTIFICATION AS HEAD-INTERNAL RELATIVIZATION*

Raúl Aranovich
University of California Davis
raranovich@ucdavis.edu

Fijian weakly-quantified DPs are formed with a determiner preceded by a particle and a word expressing number, quantity, or existence. These anomalous constructions depart from the head-initial phrasal pattern generally found in other nominal expressions. I propose to analyze weakly-quantified DPs as internally-headed (IH) relative clauses. Evidence for this analysis is that these DPs are structurally identical to regular existential sentences. Fijian IH relatives, however, are restricted to existential sentences (Fijian follows a strict N-Rel arrangement in other cases). The use of IH relatives to express weak quantification, then, is a highly restricted construction in Fijian, motivated by the general structure of the Fijian clause, and in the semantics of IH relatives. Following Basilico 1996, I argue that weakly-quantified DPs in Fijian are presuppositional, being outside the scope of the existential quantifier associated with VP (Diesing 1992). This is consistent with an analysis of Fijian as a pronominal argument language (Aranovich 2013), in which only incorporated nouns, pronouns, and proper nouns are internal to the VP. An objection to the IH relative analysis of weakly-quantified DPs in Fijian is that IH relatives are found in OV languages, but Fijian is a VO language. However, exceptions to the correlation between OV and Rel-N orders exist, most of them in the Austronesian family. I speculate that the restricted use of IH relatives in Fijian reflects a general feature of the Austronesian family, preserved as a specialized construction to express weak quantification.

1. Introduction

Fijian DPs seem well-behaved as head-initial syntactic structures, since they are headed by a determiner (*na*), which is followed by an N. This N has its modifiers to the right, as in (1a), and possessors to the left, between the N and the determiner, as in (1b).[1] But weak quantifiers are anomalous in that they seem

* The original examples in this paper come from fieldwork conducted in Fiji and Northern California since 2006. Thanks to France Mugler for welcoming me at the University of the South Pacific, and to Mikaele Sela, Kalivati Qolicakota, Vasiti Ritova, and Isireli Volau for providing me with examples and answering my questions about the language. I also benefited from conversations with Masha Polinsky, Eric Potsdam, Heidi Harley, and the audience at the AFLA meeting in Honolulu. All errors are my own.

[1] The following abbreviations are used: ACC: accusative, ASP: aspectual, DEM: demonstrative, DET: determiner, DIR: directional, EMPH: emphasis, HAB: habitual, INDEF: indefinite, INT: intensive, LIM: limitation, LK: linker, PART: particle, PERF: perfective, PL: plural, POSS: possessive, PROG: progressive, REL: relativizer, SEQ: sequential, SG: singular, SUB: subordinator, TR: transitive.

to precede the determiner, and are formed with the particle *e* and a word expressing number, quantity, existence, etc. (2a-b) offer some examples.

(1) a. na no-na lako
DET POSS-3.SG journey
'his journey' (Milner 1956:11)
b. na vale levu
DET house big
'the big house' (Milner 1956:11)

(2) a. keirau dau rawata mai [$_{DP}$ **e** **levu** na ika]
1.PL HAB get.TR out PART many DET fish
'We would catch many fish.'
b. au a qarava tiko [$_{DP}$ **e** **dua** na bui-ni-qone]
1.SG PAST look.after.TR PROG PART one DET grandmother
'I take care of an old lady'

I propose to analyze weakly-quantified DPs like the one in (2a-b) as *internally headed relative clauses* (IHRC). Evidence for this analysis is that the DPs in (1a-b) are identical to regular existential sentences.

I will first give an overview of Fijian syntax, including a more detailed discussion of copulative and existential sentences. After that I will summarize the similarities between existential sentences and weakly-quantified DPs, arguing that they can be accounted by analyzing those DPs as IHRCs. I will then present evidence from the distribution of adverbial particles to support the claim that weakly-quantified DPs are in fact clausal in nature. I will then address a potential objection to the analysis based on the fact that Fijian is an OV language. Before concluding the paper, I will examine the semantics of weakly-quantified DPs, in the context of Basilico's (1996) proposal that IHRCs are inherently quantificational, and my own analysis of Fijian as a pronominal argument language (Aranovich 2013).

2. An overview of Fijian grammar

Fijian is a VOS language. The verb is obligatorily preceded by a particle expressing agreement with the subject, but an overt DP expressing the subject is not obligatory. In (3a) the particle *e* expresses agreement with a 3rd person singular subject (the proper noun *o Kali*), and in (3b) the 3rd person plural subject is expressed in the particle *eratou* only.[2] These person/number particles can co-occur with an overt subject pronoun, as in (3c). Because this emphatic pronoun is optional, I take Fijian to be a *pro*-drop language.

[2] The 3.SG particle *e* is often omitted before the emphatic particle *sa*, being used only in emphatic questions. Otherwise, *sa* may precede or follow other personal particles in Fijian. The semantics of *sa*, however, is still poorly understood. Schütz (1985:262) suggests it indicates contrast with a previous action or state.

(3) a. e tarā na vale o Kali.
3.SG build.TR DET house DET Kali
'Kali built a house.'
b. eratou sa tarā oti na vale
3.PL EMPH build.TR PERF DET house
'they have already built the house.'
c. au sa cakava **ko iau**
1.SG EMPH do.TR DET 1.SG
'I did it myself.' (Milner 1956:99)

A number of aspectual particles expressing tense, aspect, mood, and other categories (including the aspectual/emphatic *sa*, the tense markers *a* PAST, and *na* FUTURE, the sequentials *mani* 'then, accordingly' and *qai* 'then, next', *dui* 'each', dau HABITUAL, *rui* 'excessively', and some others) may separate the person/number particles from the verb.

(4) Au **se qai** yadra mai.
1.SG ASP SEQ wake DIR
'I just woke up.'

Other particles that express a variety of aspectual, temporal, modal, directional, and more adverbial meanings occur in a fixed position after the verb (I will refer to them simply as 'adverbial particles'). These postverbal particles are different from the preverbal particles discussed earlier, even if sometimes they overlap in function.[3] Particles that occur in this position include *tiko* PROGRESSIVE, *tu* INDEFINITE (in time or place), *mai* 'here, hither', *yani* 'away, hence', *rawa* 'possible', *oti* 'finished' or PERFECTIVE, *sara* EMPHATIC, and a few more. There is a fixed order among these postverbal adverbial particles, which may occur alongside each other in a clause. Some examples are provided in (5). In (5b), the verb *tubu* 'grow' is followed by three such particles: *tale* 'also', *tu* 'indefinite', and *ga* 'only'.

(5) a. sa kani-a **oti** na koli na benu
EMPH eat-TR PERF DET dog DET leftovers
'the dog finished eating the leftovers.'
b. e tubu **tale tu ga** na dalo
3.SG grow also INDEF only DET taro
'taro grows also.' (Milner 1956:93)

[3] Some particles that appear after the verb can also occur before the verb, with a different but related meaning. *Mai*, for instance, means 'here' or 'hither' in postverbal position, but it behaves as a converb meaning 'come and ...' when it precedes the verb.

3. Copulative and existential sentences

There is no copula in Fijian. Copulative sentences are formed by juxtaposition of two DPs, or by placing an adjective right after the subject marker.

(6) a. e lekaleka na lawa
3.SG short DET net
'the net is short.' (Milner 1956:13)
b. na yaca ni gone o Tubarua
DET name of child DET Tubarua
'the name of the child was T.' (Schütz 1985:79)

Existential sentences can be formed with an expression (usually an adjective) of number or quantity as the head of the predicate. A couple of examples were introduced in (2). Besides *levu* 'many' and *dua* 'one', some of these expressions include other numerals as in (7), and *so* 'a little, a few, some'; *vuqa* 'many'; and *vica* 'a few, how many', as in (8).[4]

(7) a. e **dua** na drau-ni-kau ka vakā na levu ni dua na sede.
3.SG one DET tree.leaf REL resembles DET size SUB one DET cent.
'there is a leaf that is about the size of a penny.'
b. e **tolu** na nodratou waqa na lewe-ni-koro.
3.SG three DET POSS.3.PL boat DET village.crew
'the villagers have three boats.' (Milner 1956:37)[5]

(8) a. e **so** na vulagi.
3.SG some DET visitor
'there were some visitors' (Schütz 1985:329)
b. e lewe **vuqa** (na tamata)
3.SG PERSONAL many DET person.
'(there are) many people' (Miner 1956:36)
c. e **vica** na uvi oqori?
3.SG few DET yam there
'how many yams are there?'

4. Weakly quantified DPs

In general, the same quantificational expressions that occur in existential sentences can also occur in DPs with a weak quantificational meaning.

---

[4] Schütz includes also *bini* 'plentiful' and *lailai* 'few', but I have no examples of these expressions being used. In fact, he reports that *bini* and *lailai* cannot be used in existential constructions in standard Fijian (Schütz 1985:102). Thus, sentences like **e bini/lailai na vale*. 'there are lots of/few houses' cannot be found in the standard dialect. He also notices that *vuqa* used as a numeral with common nouns is not accepted by Fijian linguists.

[5] Possessive sentences are expressed in Fijian as existential clauses with a possessed noun.

(9) a. e **tolu** na waqa
3.SG three DET boat
'three canoes.' (Milner 1956:14)

b. e **vitu** na gone lalai
3.SG seven DET child small
'seven small children' (Milner 1956: 24)

c. era yaco mai [e **so** na vulagi]
3.PL arrive DIR 3.SG some DET foreigner
'some visitors arrived (Schütz 1985:329)

d. erau raica [e lewe **vica** (na yalewa)]
3.PL see.TR 3.SG PERSONAL few DET woman
'they saw a few women.' (Milner 1956:37)

There are several reasons to think that existential clauses and weakly quantified DPs must have a common source, sharing a representation at some level. First, some of the expressions of quantity have identical selectional restrictions. The numerals, *vuqa* 'many', and *vica* 'a few' must be preceded by *lewe* when they refer to people, as in example (9d). Compare it to the use of *vica* in an existential sentence:

(10) e lewe **vica** na tamata?
3.SG PERSONAL few DET person
'how many people are there?'

The particle *so* 'some', on the other hand, is exempt from this restriction in existential clauses and in DPs as well. Second, some expressions have the same idiosyncratic uses in existential sentences and in DPs. For instance, *levu* means 'many' in these contexts, but as an adjective it means 'big'. On the other hand, so 'some' cannot be used as an adjective at all.

The close connection between weakly quantified DPs and existential clauses in Fijian has not escaped the attention of dedicated Fijian grammarians. This can be glanced from the following quotes, the first one from Milner's grammar (Milner 1956), the second one from Schütz's (Schütz 1985).

> The Fijian numerals are bases. It is not possible to use *dua* (one) or *rua* (two) for example, as in the English: one house, two men, etc., without using either a sentence, e.g. "the house is one" (see paragraph 35) or a phrase e.g. "the one house." (Milner 1956:23)

> The following examples show how a specified subject and object (respectively), definite because of sentence structure, are made contextually general (...). In each sentence, the NP that has been more general is derived from an existential VP. (Schütz 1985:329)

What these grammarians did not have at their disposal was a natural and elegant way of making the connection between the two categories explicit, making it to follow from more general principles about the structure of human language. I will suggest that an analysis of weakly quantified DPs in Fijian as IHRCs.

5. Relativization in Fijian and the interpretation of DPs

Example (11) shows an Internally headed Relative Clause in Ancash Quechua (from Cole 1987).

(11) [nuna **bestya-ta** ranti-shqa-n] alli bestya-m ka-rqo-n.
man horse-ACC buy-PERF-3 good horse-VALIDATOR be-PAST-3
'The horse that the man bought was a good horse. '

In this sentence, the head of the main subject is *bestya* 'horse'. But this noun occupies a position inside the relative clause that modifies it. This head noun bears the case suffix appropriate to its function inside the relative clause (i.e. accusative), which is where a relative pronoun would originate from in an externally-headed relative clause.

In Cole's analysis, an IHRC is left-adjoined at S-structure to an empty nominal head, which is coindexed with the internal head of the relative clause (12a). Basilico (1996) offers an alternative analysis in which there is no empty head external to the clause. Rather, the internal head introduces a free variable that is bound by an operator in D (12b). This D takes a sentence (i.e. an IP) as its complement.

(12) a. $[_{NP1}\ [_{S''}$ nuna bestya-ta$_i$ ranti-shqa-n$]\ [_{NP2}\ e_i]]$
b. $[_{DP}\ [_{D'}\ [_{IP}$ nuna bestya-ta ranti-shqa-n] D]]

In this paper I will follow Basilico's analysis. The structure for a relative clause like (9a) is presented in (13). Because Fijian is head-initial, I am placing the head of DP to the left of the IP.

(13) $[_{DP}\ [_{D'}$ D $[_{IP}$ e tolu na waqa]]]

The IHRC analysis of weakly-quantified DPs captures the similarity in the use of numerals and expressions of quantity across DPs and existential sentences. It also accounts for the presence of the particle *e* in those DPs, and for the word order facts. But these facts are not enough, in my mind, to justify a clausal analysis of weakly-quantified DPs. What is missing is some other piece of evidence that those DPs do indeed have the internal properties of clausal constructions. Adverbial particles provide that evidence.

Like other predicates in Fijian, existential ones can be modified by adverbial particles: the locative *kina* in (14a), the progressive *tiko* in (14b), *ga* in (14c), and *tu* in (14d).

(14) a. e levu **kina** na kubou .
3.SG big there DET smoke
'there is a lot of smoke there.'
b. e rua **tiko** na turaga e na gauna koya
3.SG two PROG DET chief in DET day those
'there were two (rival) chiefs in those days' (Milner 1956:29)
c. e rua **ga** na yava-na
3.SG two only DET foot-3.SG. POSS
'it has only two feet (i.e. wheels)' (Schütz 1985:92).
d. sa rua **tu** na tabua.
EMPH three INDEF DET whale.tooth
'There are two whale's teeth (no more are expected).'

The prediction made by the IHRC analysis of weakly-quantified DPs is that these particles will also show up between the numeral or quantity expression and the internal DP in these expressions. The examples in (15) show that this is indeed the case.

(15) a. eratou a rogoca ni sa yaco mai [e dua **tale** na waqa]
3.PL PAST hear.TR SUB PART arrive DIR 3.SG one also DET boat
'they heard that another boat had arrived.' (Milner 1956:49)
b. [e tolu **ga** na tamata] eratou kauta mai na kedratou kakana.
3.SG three only DET man 3.PL bring.TR DIR DET 3.PL.POSS food
'only three of the men brought their own food.'
c. e vuku [e dua **tale ga** na qase-ni-vuli]
3.SG smart 3.SG also only one DET school.teacher
'There is also another teacher that is smart.'

6. Fijian IHRC in the context of relativization in Fijian.

A serious objection to the IHRC analysis of weakly-quantified DPs in Fijian is that IHRCs are usually found in OV languages, but Fijian is a VO language. In Cole's (1987) analysis, IH relatives are a sub-type of prenominal relative. He makes the observation that IHRCs are restricted to left-branching languages (OV). To account for this generalization, he proposes the structure in (12a), in which IHRCs are left-adjoined to a null anaphoric head. In this configuration, the anaphoric head commands the antecedent, but it does not precede the antecedent (which is inside the relative clause), making it possible for the antecedent to bind the anaphoric head.

The problem with Cole's analysis is that it is based on a false generalization. IHRCs are found in Mooré, an SVO language of the Niger-Congo family, spoken in Burkina Faso (Lehr et al. 1966, Tellier 1989). Comrie (2006) finds a score of exceptions to the correlation between OV and Rel-N orders, most of them in the Austronesian family (the rest of them in the Sinitic branch of Sino-Tibetan). In fact, Comrie suggests that the combination of OV and Rel-N orders may be a distinctive typological trait of the Austronesian languages. Some languages in this family -- Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999), Seediq, Tagalog (Aldridge 2004)-- display a mix of prenominal, postnominal, and IH relatives, while also being VO. The Tagalog sentences below, for instance, show a head-initial relative (16a) and an internally-headed relative (16b) (Law 2014). These cases weaken the argument in favor of Cole's empty final head analysis, and turn the fact that Fijian has IHRCs in spite of being a VO language into a non-issue.

(16) a. guron-ng dumating kahapon
teacher-LK PERF.arrive yesterday
'The teacher who arrived yesterday.'
b. dumating na guro kahapon
PERF.arrive LK teacher yesterday
'The teacher who arrived yesterday.'

The conclusion I arrive at is that Fijian weakly-quantified DPs are IHRCs. But the construction is not very productive in Fijian. In fact, I have not found it in other types of DP. Fijian relative clauses are normally postnominal, of the externally-headed type. Example (17) shows an object relative.

(17) au dau taleitaka [$_{DP}$ na sikoni [$_{CP}$ e dau bulia o koya]]
1.SG HAB like.TR DET scone 3.SG HAB make-TR DET she
'I like the scones that she makes.'

Fijian, then, is a "mixed type" language (like Tagalog) from the point of view of its relativization strategies. The use of IH relatives to express weak quantification, I suggest, is a highly specialized construction in Fijian, which may have been inherited from a more productive construction in an ancestral language. For some reason, however, IHRCs survived as the expression of weak quantification in Fijian. As I will explain in the next section, the reason behind this may be found in the general structure of the Fijian clause, and in the semantics of IH relatives.

7. The semantic interpretation of IHRCs in Fijian

In a recent paper (Aranovich 2013), I argue that Fijian is a Pronominal Argument (PA) language. Except for incorporated nouns, pronouns, and proper

nouns, all other arguments are external to the VP, and are introduced by a pronominal affix. The PA hypothesis accounts for some observations about transitivity in Fijian. Transitive verbs are distinguished from intransitives by the presence of a verbal suffix, often of a *-Ca* shape. In fact, many two-argument verbs are also used as single-argument verbs when the suffix is absent. Thus, besides *bulu-ta* 'to bury it' and *lako-va* 'to go on/for something' one finds *bulu* 'to be buried' and *lako* 'to go' as the intransitive counterparts. Based on data like these, Schütz (1985) divides Fijian predicates into active (the same argument is subject of the transitive and the intransitive forms, e.g. *lako*) and stative (the subject of the intransitive and the object of the transitive are the same argument, e.g. *bulu*).

When the *-Ca* suffix is used, it is not necessary to specify a complement by means of a DP, as (18) shows.

(18) e ronqo-ta tiko na marama.
3.SG hold-TR PROG DET woman
'The woman is holding him.'

Pawley (1986) suggests that the *-Ca* ending consists of two suffixes: a transitive extension of the form *-Ci*, and a 3.SG pronominal suffix -a. In a sentence like (18), then, the meaning of the suffix *-a* provides the reference of the internal argument of the verb, saturating the valence of the predicate. When the object DP is overt, on the other hand, the suffix *-a* cross-references the DP. Under the hypothesis that Fijian is a pronominal argument language, object DPs are adjoined to a projection above VP, and are coindexed with the pronominal suffix *-a*.

Like many PA languages, Fijian allows for noun incorporation (NI). In (19), the object is immediately adjacent to the verbal root, without the transitive suffix, and the adverbial particles follow the incorporated noun. Moreover, the object has no article.

(19) keitou tara-vale tiko.
1.PL build-house PROG
'we are building houses.'

It is worth noting that Fijian has a third construction type in which the object also precedes the adverbial particles, but in which the verb keeps its transitive suffix. This happens when the object is a pronoun or a proper noun.

(20) o bu-qu kau-ti **keitou** rawa
DET grandmother-1.SG.POSS 3.SG.bring-TR 1.PL POSSIBLE
mai ki vanua.
DIR to land
'my grandmother managed to bring us to land.'

Notice that in this case the transitive suffix has the -Ci form. In Aranovich (2013) I argued that these object DPs are *bona fide* complements of V, and that therefore there can be no pronominal affix *-a* attached after the transitive suffix *-Ci*.

There are some consequences from an analysis of Fijian as a PA language for the semantics of DPs, and the article *na* in particular. In Aranovich (2013) I argue that na-DPs are indefinites. They are interpreted as indefinites in some positions (i.e. when performing a predicative function),[6] and they can also be unselectively bound by a strong adverbial quantifier like *kece*.

(21) a. na gone levulevu o Lavinia
DET child big.big DET Lavinia
'Lavinia is a chubby baby.'
b. e kani-a oti **kece** sara ga **na benu** na koli.
3.SG eat-TR PERF all INT LIM DET leftovers DET dog
'the dog did finish eating all the leftovers indeed!'

The adverb *kece* 'all' deserves special mention here. As an adverbial particle, *kece* occurs in a position that is not necessarily adjacent to the DP it modifies, as shown in (21b). It must follow *oti* (and *rawa*), but it must precede the other adverbial particles. The fact that *kece* has a fixed place in the sequence of adverbial particles is evidence for its own adverbial nature.

Following Diesing (1992), I assume that sentences have a semantic representation consisting of an operator, its restriction, and its nuclear scope. Indefinite DPs introduce free variables into the semantic representation of a clause. If an indefinite is in the nuclear scope, the free variable it introduces is bound by an existential quantifier (existential closure), yielding a cardinality reading. But indefinites are ambiguous between this cardinality reading, which is nonpresuppositional, and a presuppositional reading, under which they behave like strongly quantified DPs. Presuppositional indefinites, Diesing suggests, must be outside the nuclear scope, inducing their own restriction. Diesing also notes a syntactic effect on the interpretation of indefinites: only those indefinite DPs that are inside the VP receive a cardinal interpretation, while indefinite DPs that are extracted from the VP (either overtly or at LF) are always

[6] Weakly quantified sentences are not "idiomatic" in that position. A sentence like *#o koya e dua na vu-ni-wai* 'He is a doctor' sounds like a quick translation into Fijian of an English sentence, a typical and frequent error in broadcasting (Schütz 1985:334).

presuppositional. Na-DPs, then, have no quantificational force of their own, and are usually placed outside the VP. In that structural position they can only have a presuppositional reading, not a cardinal one. This presuppositional reading is the one that gives rise to the "definite" interpretation of na-DPs.

A weakly-quantified DP, then, must be presuppositional, since it is outside the scope of the existential quantifier associated with VP. This is precisely the kind of semantic structure that Basilico (1996) argues IH relatives must have. IHRCs are inherently quantificational. They are associated with an operator that binds a variable introduced by the head of the IHRC. I assume that the operator associated with a IHRC creates a generalized quantifier (an expression of type <<e,t>,t>). Applying this analysis to a weakly quantified DP like the one below would yield the semantic representation in (22).[7]

(22) a. e rua na tamata
'two men'
b. (λP)(∃x)(man(x) & two(x) & P(x))

For the analysis to work, however, it is crucial that the internal head be interpreted as an indefinite, since it needs to introduce a free variable for the existential operator associated with the IHRC to bind.[8] This is not a problem, since I have already provided independent evidence that na-DPs are indefinites. In fact, several languages allow the head of IHRCs to be marked with an indefinite pronoun. This is shown by the Lakhota example in (23).

(23) Mary **owįža wą** kağe ki he ophewathų
Mary quilt a make the DEM buy.1.SG
'I bought the quilt that Mary made.' (Williamson 1989:171)

There are, however, some Fijian examples that are still problematic for my approach. Some existential sentences are formed with the help of verbs usually employed to express bodily position (*tiko, tu*), instead of the adjectives denoting quantity or number, which I discussed before. Some examples are presented in (24).

---

[7] Basilico's analysis is an alternative to the "anaphoric head" analysis of Cole. In Cole's analysis, the internal head is anaphorically bound to an empty category which is the head of DP. Regarding the interpretation of the operator, Basilico suggests it is an operator yielding an expression of type e (an individual with a unique denotation), instead of the alternative interpretation as a generalized quantifier.

[8] Moreover, this head must move to a position outside the domain of existential closure (i.e. adjoined to V' or I'). This accounts for the optional movement of the internal head in some languages, discussed in Basilico 1996.

(24) a. e **tiko** e so na raisi?
3.SG stay 3.SG some DET rice
'is there any rice?' (Schütz 1985:101)
b. e **tu** e dua na vu-ni-niu mai Serua.
3.SG stay 3.SG one DET coconut.tree in Serua
'There is a coconut tree somewhere in Serua.' (Milner 1956:28)

In these existential sentences, the verbs *tu* and *tiko* are followed by weakly-quantified DPs, but these are not in a position where presuppositional indefinites should appear (i.e. in the scope of an existential operator). What I suspect is that the sentences in (24) do not have the semantics of true existential sentences, but this is an area of Fijian grammar that should receive more attention in the future.

8. Conclusions

I have reviewed the evidence for a common origin of some existential clauses and weakly-quantified DPs. I suggested that this connection can be formalized in an analysis that treats weakly quantified DPs as IHRC's, in which the head is the subject of a relativized existential clause. The occurrence of adverbial particles in weakly quantified DPs is evidence of their clausal status, and provides an argument for the IHRC analysis of those constructions. I have also argued that there is nothing typologically abnormal about a language that has IHRCs and is head-initial, as is the case in Fijian. In fact, other Austronesian languages are like Fijian in having a mixed group of relative clauses (including IHRCs), and being of the VO type.

From a semantic point of view, The analysis of weakly-quantified DPs as IHRCs is consistent with Basilico's (1996) hypothesis that the internal head must be indefinite, introducing a free variable to be bound by an operator associated with the head of DP. The resulting picture shows a language in which there are no nominal quantifiers to speak of. Strong quantifiers like *kece* are adverbial, while weak quantifiers are predicational. The only true common determiner in Fijian is *na*, which ends up as an indefinite. I have also shown that this system of expressing quantification works quite well for a PA language, an analysis I have suggested for Fijian (Aranovich 2013).

I would like to speculate that the reason why Fijian preserved the IHRC strategy precisely for existential clauses, and nothing else, is because they allow for the expression of weak quantification without introducing a new category of quantificational determiners, optimally fulfilling an expressive need within the structure of a PA language. Of course, this assumes that Fijian has inherited its IHRCs from its Austronesian ancestry, and that it is not an innovation of the language. Whether this assumption is correct or not I will leave as a question for further research.

References

Aldridge, Edith. 2004. Internally headed relative clauses in Austronesian languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5: 99-129.

Aranovich, Raúl. 2013. Transitivity and polysynthesis in Fijian. *Language* 89: 465-500

Basilico, David. 1996. Head position and internally headed relative clauses. *Language*, 72: 498-532 .

Cole, Peter. 1987. The structure of internally headed relative clauses. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 5: 277-302 .

Comrie, Bernard. 2008. Prenominal relative clauses in verb-object languages. *Language and Linguistics* 9: 723-733.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Law, Paul. 2014. The syntax of Tagalog relative clauses. *AFLA 21*, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Lehr, Marianne; James E. Redden, and Adama Balima (1966). *Moré basic course*. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute.

Milner, George Bertram. 1956. *Fijian grammar*. Suva: Government Press.

Pawley, Andrew. 1986. A reanalysis of Fijian transitive constructions. *Te Reo* 29.81–112 .

Schütz, Albert. 1985. *The Fijian language*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Tellier, Christine. 1989. Head internal relatives and parasitic gaps in Moore. *Current approaches to African syntax* 6, ed. by Isabelle Haik and Laurice Tuller, 298-318. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Williamson, Janis S. 1989. An indefiniteness restriction for relative clauses in Lakhota. *The representation of (in)definiteness*, ed. by Eric J. Reuland and Alice G. B. ter Meulen, 168-190. Cambridge: MIT Press.