

FIJIAN - POLYNESIAN EMBEDDED SUBJECT PERSONALS

Eric P. Hamp

University of Chicago

In an excellent article for the Capell Festschrift reconstructing certain grammatical elements of Polynesian and Fijian and their development to the observed languages, Andrew Pawley has dealt *inter alia* with the embedded subject personals. It is of interest both for Oceanic studies and for its contribution to comparative-historical matters to reconsider the reconstruction of these elements. While we will attend closely to the equivalences of phonetic-*semanto/syntactic* form of the individual elements, and in this fashion set up correspondences which form the backbone of comparative procedures ever since the Neogrammarians, we will also pay continuous attention to the correspondences and alterations in the paradigms to which a form belongs, and attempt to reconstruct not lists, but earlier stages of paradigms, with motivated functions linking the phonetic correspondences. In so doing, one must observe closely the interplay of elements within the same system, whereby old elements receive new values by virtue of new oppositions.

The relevant forms are given by Pawley in his pre-print (§§3.2.2 & 3.3.2, pp. 26, 27, 40) for Samoan, Nanumea Ellice, East Futunan, Mae, Tokelauan, Rennell-Bellona, West Uvean, East Uvean, Tongan, Banan for Eastern Fijian, and Wayan and Nadi for Western Fijian. They are reproduced here for convenient reference. Also reproduced is Pawley's reconstruction (3.4.2., p.46) for Proto-Samoic-Outlier and Proto-Polynesian (PPN). In the course of the following argument a bolder reconstruction will be offered.

| | <u>SAMOAN</u> | <u>NANUMEA ELLICE</u> | <u>EAST FUTUNAN</u> |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>ʔou-oʔu</u> | <u>kau</u> | <u>kau</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ʔe</u> | <u>ke</u> | <u>ke</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>ia-na-ona</u> | <u>na</u> | <u>ina</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>maa</u> | <u>maa</u> | <u>maa</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>taa</u> | <u>taa</u> | <u>taa</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>lua</u> | <u>lua</u> | <u>kulu</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>laa</u> | <u>laa</u> | <u>laa</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>maatou</u> | <u>motou</u> | <u>motou</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>taatou</u> | <u>ttou</u> | <u>tou</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>tou</u> | <u>tou</u> | <u>kotou</u> |

| | <u>SAMOAN</u> | <u>NANUMEA ELLICE</u> | <u>EAST FUTUNAN</u> |
|------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 3rd plural | <u>laatou</u> | <u>llou</u> | <u>lotou</u> |
| 1st sing. | <u>ta</u> | | <u>(?) kita</u> |
| affective | | | |

| | <u>TONGAN</u> | <u>EAST UVEAN</u> |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>u~ku~kau~oku~ou</u> | <u>u~au</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ke</u> | <u>ke</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>ne</u> | <u>ina</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>ma</u> | <u>ma</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>ta</u> | <u>ta</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>mo</u> | <u>lua</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>na</u> | <u>na</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>mau</u> | <u>matou</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>tau</u> | <u>tou</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>mou</u> | <u>koutou</u> |
| 3rd plural | <u>nau</u> | <u>natou</u> |
| 1st sing. | <u>ta</u> | |
| affective | | |

| | <u>TOKELAUAN</u> | <u>WEST UVEAN (HEO)</u> | <u>MAE</u> |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>ko</u> | <u>gu</u> | <u>ku</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ke</u> | <u>ge</u> | <u>(?)ke</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>ia</u> | <u>ia</u> | <u>(?)∅</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>kimaa</u> | <u>gimA</u> | <u>mA</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>kitaa</u> | <u>gitA</u> | <u>tA</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>koulua</u> | <u>gola~goulua</u> | <u>kore</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>kilaa</u> | <u>gilA</u> | <u>kire</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>kimaatou</u> | <u>gimAdou</u> | <u>matu</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>kitaatou</u> | <u>gidou</u> | <u>tu</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>koutou</u> | <u>godou</u> | <u>kote</u> |
| 3rd plural | <u>kilaatou</u> | <u>giladou</u> | <u>tere</u> |

The following series of short person-marker forms occurs in Rennell-Bellona, preposed to the verb phrase.

| | |
|---------------|--------------|
| 1st exc. dual | <u>kimaa</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>kitaa</u> |

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| 2nd dual | <u>kougua</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>kigaaua</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>kimatou</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>kitatou~tou~tatou</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>koutou</u> |
| 3rd plural | <u>kigatou</u> |
| | <u>BAUAN</u> |

WAYAN

| | | <u>past</u> | <u>present-future</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>au~u</u> | <u>qu</u> | <u>qi</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ko~o</u> | <u>o</u> | <u>e</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>∅</u> | <u>a</u> | <u>ei</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>keirau</u> | <u>aru</u> | <u>eri</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>daru</u> | <u>tu</u> | <u>tu</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>(ko)drau</u> | <u>oru</u> | <u>oru</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>rau</u> | <u>aru</u> | <u>eri~eiri</u> |
| 1st exc. tr. | <u>keitou</u> | <u>aba</u> | <u>eba</u> |
| 1st inc. tr. | <u>datou</u> | <u>teva</u> | <u>teva</u> |
| 2nd trial | <u>(ko)dou</u> | <u>oba</u> | <u>oba</u> |
| 3rd trial | <u>ratou</u> | <u>aru</u> | <u>eri~eiri</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>keimami</u> | <u>mam</u> | <u>mam</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>da</u> | <u>tE</u> | <u>tE</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>(ko)nii</u> | <u>om~m</u> | <u>om~m</u> |
| 3rd plural | <u>ra</u> | <u>ara</u> | <u>ere</u> |

NADI (nakavu)

| | <u>past</u> | <u>present-future</u> |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>qu</u> | <u>qi</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>o</u> | <u>e</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>a</u> | <u>ei</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>maru</u> | <u>maru</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>daru</u> | <u>deri</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>murū</u> | <u>miri</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>aru</u> | <u>eri</u> |
| 1st exc. tr. | <u>matu</u> | <u>mati</u> |
| 1st inc. tr. | <u>duu</u> | <u>di</u> |

| | NADI (nakavu) (contd) | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | <u>past</u> | <u>present-future</u> |
| 2nd trial | <u>mutu</u> | <u>miti</u> |
| 3rd trial | <u>aru</u> | <u>eri</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>mam</u> | <u>mami</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>dei</u> | <u>dei</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>mu</u> | <u>mi</u> |
| 3rd plural | <u>ara</u> | <u>ere(i)</u> |

| | <u>PROTO-PN</u> | <u>PROTO-SAMOIC OUTLIER</u> | <u>PROTO- NUCLEAR-PN</u> | <u>PROTO- CENTRAL EASTERN</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1st sing. | * <u>kau</u> | * <u>kau</u> | | |
| 2nd sing. | * <u>ke</u> | * <u>ke</u> | | |
| 3rd sing. | * <u>na</u> | * <u>na-ia</u> | | |
| 1st exc. dual | * <u>(ki)maa</u> | * <u>(ki)maa</u> | | |
| 1st inc. dual | * <u>(ki)taa</u> | * <u>(ki)taa</u> | Probably the same as for Proto-Samoic- | NIL |
| 2nd dual | ** <u>(mou)rua</u> | * <u>(ou)lua</u> | Outlier | |
| 3rd dual | * <u>(ki)laa</u> | * <u>(ki)laa</u> | | |
| 1st exc. pl. | * <u>(ki)mato(l)u</u> | * <u>(ki)maatou</u> | | |
| 1st inc. pl. | * <u>(ki)tato(l)u</u> | * <u>(ki)taatou</u> | | |
| 2nd plural | ** <u>(mou)to(l)u</u> | * <u>(ou)tou</u> | | |
| 3rd plural | * <u>(ki)lato(l)u</u> | * <u>(ki)laatou</u> | | |
| 1st sing. affective | * <u>ta</u> | * <u>ta</u> | | |

When we inspect these paradigms, having arranged them into natural groups, we see immediately that Rennell-Bellona exactly equals Tokelauan, once we allow for the simple phonetic change l > g. Similarly West Uvean is also identical with Tokelauan, allowing for initial k- > g- and a marked monosyllabic reduction in the first syllable.

Taking now the Mae paradigm, we find there a clear metathesis in the 3 plural and the presence of ki- in the 3 dual; these two facts must be connected since they form a compact rime. Otherwise Mae lacks ki-, although the language does show ko- < kou- in the 2 dual/plural. Therefore Mae matches East Futunan with 2 dual/plural in *kou-. It should be noted that East Futunan has 3 sg. ina with i-, matching in this fashion Tokelauan ia. Therefore we reconstruct for 3 sg. *ia.

This brings us to a Mae-E Futunan paradigm.

| | |
|---------------|------------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>*kau</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ke</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>ia</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>maa</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>taa</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>kou-lua</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>laa</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>maa-tou</u> |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>(taa)-tou</u> |
| 2nd plural | <u>kou-tou</u> |
| 3rd plural | <u>lou-tou</u> |

and such a paradigm lies developmentally between Samoan-Ellice and Tokelauan-W Uvean-Rennellese. That is, Mae-E Futunan adds kou- in the 2nd person, while Tokelauan etc. adds ki- (from other pronominal forms) to all other non-sg. forms. Mae -E. Futunan and the last group also share ia preponderantly in the 3rd sg. In this progression Samoan-Ellice is taken as the original conservative picture since the other paradigms can be built up by coexisting elements which are easy to dissect once we see the simplest arrangements of the sets of paradigms.

Having established this, we see that East Uvean adds a 1st sg. form u to our inventory, and agrees substantially with Samoan-Ellice. However, we must then assume that the 3 non-sg. na has been diffused from Tongan. The 2 pl. koutou matches Mae-E Futunan-Tokelauan, with an element clarifying the form by distinguishing it from the normally developed 1st inc. plural. Therefore we may say that the Mae-E Futunan kou- taken from the inherited "nuclear" pronouns, probably started in the plural as a clarifying device after the syncope of unstressed a between t and t. Thus East Uvean turns out to be clearly a member of Nuclear Polynesian, with only diffusional features from Tongan; this result supports Pawley's claim JPS 76, 1967, 291-2.

When we turn to Tongan we find two main differences, an n-form throughout the 3rd person and mo in the 2nd dual. In the face of Nuclear PN 3 non-sg. laa the Tongan na- is surprising and cannot be a direct phonetic equivalence. However if we assume laa to be from original *raa, this would yield a Tongan *a(a). We may then readily suppose that Tongan took the n-initial from the singular. Having posited this, we find the *r- borne out by Fijian ra-. One might speculate on the Polynesian evidence that *raa was some

old reduced form of *rua '2', but that would be unlikely in the Fijian context where ra- is found in dual, trial, and plural.

Taking all the evidence so far into consideration, we now reconstruct by paradigms as follows:

| | <u>*NUCLEAR</u> | <u>TONGAN</u> | <u>*PPN</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>kau~u</u> | <u>k(a)u~u</u> | <u>kau~u</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ke</u> | <u>ke</u> | <u>ke</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>ia~na</u> | <u>ne</u> | <u>ia~nV</u> |
| 1st exc. dual | <u>maa</u> | <u>ma</u> | <u>ma(a)</u> |
| 1st inc. dual | <u>taa</u> | <u>ta</u> | <u>ta(a)</u> |
| 2nd dual | <u>lua</u> | <u>mo</u> | <u>mo, ø</u> |
| 3rd dual | <u>laa</u> | <u>n-a</u> | <u>ra(a)</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>maa-tou</u> | <u>ma-u</u> | } + PL |
| 1st inc. pl. | <u>taa-tou</u> | <u>ta-u</u> | |
| 2nd plural | <u>tou</u> | <u>mo-u</u> | |
| 3rd plural | <u>laa-tou</u> | <u>n-a-u</u> | |
| 1st affective | <u>ta</u> | <u>ta</u> | <u>ta</u> |

The above paradigm calls for a few remarks. We see that in Nuclear PN 2 non-sg. is simply 2 and PL. In this connexion on Nuclear *(k)ou-(lua, -tou) as an innovation see Pawley, JPS 76, 1967, 265.

Note further that for PPN the length of 1 and 3 non-sg. is not justified; on this see Pawley, op.cit. 268-9. In view of the interaction already observed, and also considered below, between the "nuclear" pronouns and the possessive and embedded subjects, we may perhaps see a solution to this otherwise unmotivated alteration of vocalic length. It would be reasonable to see original length in perhaps just one of these forms, which then suffered shortening in unaccented embedded position much as we see carried through at a later date in Ellice and East Futunan. Then by analogy a full set of "restored" forms with length could have been created, first for the "nuclear" pronouns and later for the others. Regardless of just how the length got redistributed in PN, it is of further interest to speculate on a possible source for such length. I suggest that an old PPN shape in *-aa may be derived from an earlier PEO sequence *-aRa, perhaps itself an old complex form. This then gives us a possible solution for a further anomaly. It is generally admitted that the plural (old trial) *-tou shows irregular loss of *l from *tolu '3';

yet Tongic actually attests the undisturbed form -tolu (which would best not be considered a recent innovation). It seems worth considering that a sequence *-aRa-tolu originally optionally assimilated to *-aRa-toRu; this would then have resulted naturally in *aa-tou. Perhaps the assimilation was not even optional, but regular; then we should have had *-aRa-toRu but *-a-tolu, thus giving the sources for all observed PN and Fijian forms as we shall see.

Turning now to Fijian we see that, discounting the umlauts produced by final -i (marking the present-future), Nadi shows original ma-ru (dual) and ma-tu (trial) for 1st exc., and mu-ru, mu-tu, respectively, for 2nd. Exactly parallel to this, Wayan has a-ru (dual), a-ba (trial) for 1st exc., and o-ru, o-ba for 2nd. In the endings -ru and -tu we see a match for Bauan -rau 'du.', and -tou 'tri.', and Bauan further corresponds (despite the divergent paradigmatic morphology) in the plural with 1st exc. -mami opposite Wayan (and Nadi) mam (instead of dual and trial a-, where Bayan has simply kei-).

Despite the large array of forms, we seem then to be dealing with the following small set of terms and relations:

| | <u>BAUAN</u> | <u>WAYAN-NADI</u> | <u>*FIJIAN</u> |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 1st sing. | <u>au~u</u> ¹ | <u>qu</u> | <u>(a)u~qu</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ko~o</u> ¹ | <u>o</u> | <u>ko~o</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>∅</u> | <u>a</u> | <u>∅~a</u> |
| 1st exc. | <u>kei-</u> | <u>ma/a-</u> < <u>*a-</u> ² | <u>kei-~a-</u> |
| 1st exc. pl. | <u>-mami</u> | <u>mam</u> | <u>mami</u> |
| 2nd pl. | <u>(ko)nii</u> | <u>mu/o-</u> | <u>(nii~)mu~o-</u> ³ |
| 1st inc. | <u>ta(ru)</u> | <u>taru(du.), tu(tri.?),</u> <u>tE(pl.)</u> | <u>ta(ru), tu; tE</u> |
| 3rd non-sg. | <u>ra</u> | <u>a(ru) (du., tri.), ara</u> | <u>a(du.tri.?): (a)ra</u> ⁴ |
| dual | <u>-rau</u> | <u>-ru</u> | <u>-rau</u> |
| trial | <u>-tou</u> | <u>-tu/ba</u> | <u>-tou, -ba</u> |

Notes to the above:

1. Additionally, in Pawley's "Notes...I. Bauan possessive constructions" (*Oceanic Linguistics*, p.19 of the pre-print) we find "after possess. qu, preverbal au." And *ibid.*, for 2, mu ~ -ko.
2. I assume that in Western Fijian the m- has been levelled from the plural and from the parallel 2 non-sg.

3. Note again, matching PN, that 2 non-sg, can be simply 2 and 3. What is nii --- 'many'?

4. It therefore seems that in 3 we have a 'non-pl' and ra 'pl.'

We proceed now to observe the correspondences of form (phonetic-semantic) and function (grammatical rule, plus semantics) between the two paradigms sketched for PPN and for Fijian.

| | <u>*FIJIAN</u> | <u>*PPN</u> | <u>*FIJIAN-PN</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1st sing. | <u>(a) u ~ qu</u> | <u>kau ~ u</u> | sg. <u>(a) u ~ (n) ku</u> |
| 2nd sing. | <u>ko ~ o¹</u> | <u>ke</u> | <u>koe²</u> |
| 3rd sing. | <u>∅ ~ a</u> | <u>ia ~ nV</u> | ? |
| 1st exc. | <u>kei- ~ a-; mami</u> | <u>ma(a)</u> | <u>ma ~ a-; mami</u> |
| 2nd non-sg. | <u>mu ~ o-; ∅</u> | <u>mo; ∅</u> | <u>mu ~ o-; ∅</u> |
| 1st inc. | <u>ta; tu; tE</u> | <u>ta(a)</u> | <u>ta</u> |
| 3rd pl. | <u>ra</u> | <u>ra(a)</u> | <u>ra</u> |
| dual | <u>-rau</u> | | <u>-2?</u> |
| trial | <u>-tou, -ba</u> | <u>-tou(...?pl.)</u> | <u>-tou(< -toRu) ~ -tolu</u> |

1. Just as we see in part of Fijian the 2 non-sg. mu generalised for 2, I propose to see o similarly generalised at an earlier time.

2. It is difficult to say at what time the reductions oe > e and > o took place.

Now some more far reaching remarks may be made on the basis of the above paradigm. We see that we have strengthened evidence for PPN *-ku '1 sg. possessive' (Walsh and Biggs, PPN Word List I, p.38), and further for PPN and PEO *au '1 sg'. On the other hand, the 2nd person form above fits well with *.koe (Walsh and Biggs, p. 35) and the 3 pl. with PEO *ira '3 pl. focal and object' and *kira (Christine Cashmore, some Proto-Eastern Oceanic Reconstructions..., to appear; preprint pp.10 and 13); we appear here to have the simplex without prefixed *i- or *ki-.

The 1 exc. and 2 non-sg. are very interesting. I assume that *ma has been extracted from *kima, which in turn is from *kami (see Pawley, Fiji Conference paper 1969, preprint p.30). But I am also led to assume that *kami continued in certain collocations, and crossed with *ma to produce *mami.

Further, the doublet sets *ma ~ a- and *mu ~ o- now give us a basis for explaining both the PNP "loss" of m- (see JPS 76.265) and the odd metathesis *kami > *kima.

The latter would have arisen by forming a more regular riming alliterating pair *ma a- to *mu' o-. This then places the origin of these adjustments in the 2 non-sg. mu~ o-. Here I see the beginnings of the levellings that led to the divergent Nuclear PN (and Tongic) "nuclear" and possessive forms. Let us assume an original paired set *ki-mu-rua, o-rua, ki-mu-to(l)u, o-to(l)u. These then crossed to produce two descendant sets:

| <u>PTongic</u> | <u>PNuclear</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| <u>*kimorua</u> | <u>*k(i)oulua</u> |
| <u>morua</u> | <u>oulua</u> |
| <u>kimotolu</u> | <u>k(i)outou</u> |
| <u>motolu</u> | <u>outou</u> |

Thus, in this respect neither Tongic nor Nuclear PN is more conservative.