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Alan Pence analyzes the pronouns of Kunimaipa in a fashion that depends 
centrally on regarding reipi as two homophous forms: 'thou and I' and 'we two (excl.).'  
There is no quarrel, of course, with the fact that this phonological shape may refer ambigu-
ously to these two pronominal situations, or sets. The question is whether semantically
the two situations are categorized just that way, i.e. as one cell each of a 3 x 2 matrix,
in Kunimaipa. I would like to propose tentatively for discussion a different possibility.

From an inspection of the surface shapes of the pronouns, it is clear that all
will be simplest if we can regard dual as a sub-species of plural, and not as coordinate.
(This would accord with what we also find in Australia). That is:

1 reipi = rei + pi
incl. rari pi = rari + pi
2 aripi = ari + pi
3 parupi = paru + pi, or '(pron.) non-sg. + 2'

Following this line of thought and continuing to observe the
surface shapes, we may schematize the various non-singular involvements of 1 (or ne) as
follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{rei}^2 & \text{Sp} & \text{Aud} \\
\hline
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \\
\end{array}
\]

i.e. '1 pl. unmarked'

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{rei-pi} & \text{Sp} & \text{Aud} \\
\hline
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \\
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \\
\end{array}
\]

i.e. '1 pl. totalling 2'

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{rari} & \text{Sp} & \text{Aud} \\
\hline
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \\
\end{array}
\]

i.e. 'inclusive pl.'

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{rari-pi} & \text{Sp} & \text{Aud} \\
\hline
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \\
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \\
\end{array}
\]

i.e. 'incl.pl.including 2'

Now if we consider the syntactic features minimally needed to link pronomi-
nal reference to aspctual paradigms, we see from Figure (4), p. 110, that 3rd person may
be specified against all others simply by the features \([- \text{pers}]\), and 1/2 du. and pl. by
\([\text{+ pers}]\); that 2 sg is specified by \([- 1]\), and 1 sg / inclus. by \([- 1]\). From Figure (3)
we then find that additionally we must distinguish 1 sg as \([- \text{else}]\) from inclus. as \([\text{+ else}]\).
Applying these features, then to the pronouns, we must recognize:
It will be found by experiment that the extraction of these features supports Pence's discrimination of two reipi's. The specification of the above pronouns is, then:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rei} & \quad [-2, -\text{ else}] \\
\text{reipi incl.} & \quad [+] \text{ else} \\
\text{reipi excl.} & \quad [+] 2, -\text{ else} \\
\text{rari} & \quad [-2, +\text{ else}] \\
\text{raripi} & \quad [+] 2, +\text{ else}
\end{align*}
\]

Redundancy rules fill in the remaining specifications:

1. \[
\begin{bmatrix} [+] 2 \\ [-] \text{ else} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} [+] \text{ p} \\ [-] \end{bmatrix}
\]

2. \[
\begin{bmatrix} [+] 1 \\ [-] \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} [+] \text{ pers} \\ [-] \text{ p} \end{bmatrix}
\]

Certain of these features are spelt out phonologically in very simple fashion.

\[
\begin{align*}
[+] 2 & \rightarrow -\text{ pi} \\
[-] \text{ pers} & \rightarrow \text{ p (i)}\text{--}
\end{align*}
\]

The rest have no such simple relation.

Footnotes


2. \text{Sp} = \text{Speaker's constituency}; \text{Aud} = \text{Audience}. Speaker is indicated by a cross.