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1 Introduction

Arthur Capell once said that ‘the languages of Eromanga [sic], Tanna, and Aneityum diverge most of all from the rest of the New Hebrides, while not agreeing among themselves’ (1962:383; my emphasis). Certainly, there is a reasonable amount of truth in this statement, as will be seen in the chapters which follow. However, there is much more information available on these languages now than was available to Capell in the 1950s and 1960s. It is clear, for example, that these languages do form a closed subgroup of Oceanic (Lynch 1978a, 2000b), and that they share many more similarities than he or other contemporary observers recognised; it will also be pointed out here that these languages are rather more conservative under their veil of phonological radicalism than many scholars might expect.1

The aim of this work is to reconstruct the protolanguage ancestral to these languages, to show its development from Proto Oceanic, and to elucidate the linguistic history of Southern Vanuatu.

1.1 The islands of Southern Vanuatu

Vanuatu is a republic in the southwest Pacific. Formerly the Anglo-French Condominium of the New Hebrides, it achieved political independence in 1980. The current population of close to 200,000 lives on a dozen or so largish islands and many more smaller ones.2 The capital, Port Vila, is located on the island of Efate in the south-central part of the archipelago.

---

1 I am indebted to Malcolm Ross for the very apt phrase “veil of phonological radicalism”.
2 A census is in progress as I write. The last census was in 1989 (Government of Vanuatu 1989), and this figure of approximately 200,000 is an estimate based on the assumed rate of population increase.
Chapter 1

Torres Islands

Map 1: Vanuatu

Map 2: Languages of Southern Vanuatu
South of Efate is the Tafea Province (formerly the Southern District), consisting of five inhabited islands: Erromango, Tanna, Aniwa, Futuna and Aneityum (see Maps 1 and 2). Table 1.1 shows the area and population (as of 1989) of these five islands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island</th>
<th>Area in sq. km</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erromango</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>27,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniwa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futuna</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aneityum</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures do not necessarily represent the number of people indigenous to each island. There has been considerable in- and out-migration from the islands of Tafea, with on the one hand ni-Vanuatu from other islands living in Erromango and Tanna, and on the other many people from the Tafea islands living and working in Port Vila, elsewhere in the archipelago, and overseas – especially in New Caledonia.

The Tafea Province was probably first settled about 3,000 years ago, with Erromango probably the first island to be settled (Bedford, Spriggs, Wilson & Regenvanu 1998). The presumption is that the settlement of Vanuatu proceeded roughly north-south, so one might reasonably assume that Erromango was the first of the Tafea islands to be settled, although there is likely to have been no significant pause before people moved to the other islands of the province, as any two islands are within sight and a day’s sailing. Later – probably within the last four to seven hundred years – the islands of Futuna and Aniwa received further settlers from western Polynesia who came to dominate those islands linguistically.

Although Erromango is the largest of the three islands with which I am concerned, it also has one of the lowest population densities in Vanuatu – a little less than two people per square kilometre. Aneityum too is sparsely populated (just over four per sq. km.), at least in comparison with Tanna (around 45 per sq. km.). This is due to severe depopulation in the nineteenth century, the result largely of introduced European diseases. Spriggs (1997:258-259), for example, shows for Aneityum the effects on population of a series of epidemics between the 1850s and the early years of the twentieth century: from an approximate population of about 3,600 in 1857, outbreaks of influenza, measles, whooping cough and dysentery – often exacerbated by cyclones – took their toll to the extent that the population of Aneityum fell to 186 in 1941. Similar stories can be told for Erromango (see, for example, Lynch 1983a), where an 1850s population of about 5,000 fell to a low of 381 in 1931. Tanna, of course, also experienced some of these epidemics and natural catastrophes, but the population did not decline nearly so drastically.

---

3 Population data in Tables 1 and 2 are from Lynch and Crowley (1992), extrapolated from the 1989 census: areas are from Chambers (1992:29).

4 See, for example, Spriggs (1997:255-263) for a discussion of depopulation in Tafea and elsewhere in Melanesia, and also McArthur and Yaxley (1968).
1.2 The languages of Southern Vanuatu

There are nine languages currently spoken in the Tafea Province. These are listed below in Table 1.2, together with approximate numbers of speakers and the major sources of data I have used in this monograph. More detailed information is given following the table, and in Lynch and Crowley (f/c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. of speakers</th>
<th>Major data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erromango</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>Crowley 1998a, 2000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>5±</td>
<td>Crowley 1998b, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tanna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tanna</td>
<td>3,500–5,000</td>
<td>own notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesands</td>
<td>5,500–7,500</td>
<td>own notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenakel</td>
<td>8,500–11,000</td>
<td>Lynch 1975a, 1977a, 1978b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Tanna</td>
<td>4,000–5,000</td>
<td>Lynch 1982a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aneityum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anejoři</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Lynch 1982b, 2000a; Lynch &amp; Tepahae 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Futuna and Aniwa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futuna-Aniwa</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Capell 1958, 1984; Dougherty 1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1 Futuna-Aniwa

Futuna and Aniwa are occupied by speakers of a single Polynesian Outlier language, known in the literature variously as West Futuna, West Futuna-Aniwa, or Futuna-Aniwa. This language is the source of a number of loanwords in the languages of the other Tafea islands (see especially §8.4 below), but it is not the main focus of this study, which is concerned with the languages of Erromango, Tanna and Aneityum.

Although the population of the two islands is only about 900, there are probably almost as many speakers of this language – and especially of the Futuna dialect – living in Tanna, Aneityum and Port Vila as there are in Futuna and Aniwa, giving a figure of at least 1500 speakers for this language.\(^5\)

1.2.2 Erromango

The recent linguistic history of Erromango has been discussed in some detail by Lynch (1983a) and Crowley (1997). A number of languages – possibly five – were spoken on the island in the early nineteenth century, but with the drastic reduction in the population the

---

\(^5\) Clark's (1994:110) figure of 350 speakers for this language is clearly a severe under-estimate.
linguistic situation has become considerably simplified. Named speech-traditions (whether languages or dialects) which have become extinct include Sorug, Utaha, Uravat and Novul-Amleg. Ura, originally the language of northern Erromango, is now spoken by no more than half-a-dozen elderly people. The only viable remaining Erromangan language is Sye, spoken by all Erromangs, numbering possibly 1900 (Crowley 1998a:1).

Sye itself may be something of a mixed language, as a result of speakers of different speech-traditions being moved into central mission stations once villages ceased to be self-supporting after the ravages of epidemics and cyclones. Modern Ura also shows strong Sye influence: given that individual Ura speakers have probably only three or four other people to speak the language to, and that they thus speak Sye far more frequently – and fluently? – than they do Ura, it is not surprising that Sye lexical items have been incorporated wholesale into modern Ura. It is unfortunate that very little of this language was recorded before the number of its speakers was substantially reduced.

1.2.3 Tanna

Tanna is generally regarded (Lynch 1978a) as having five languages, all of which are dialectally complex. The situation is complicated further by dialect-chaining, especially in the northern half of the island, which makes drawing language-borders and estimating numbers of speakers quite difficult. These five languages, with approximate populations and major sources of data, were listed in Table 1.2.

Three of these languages – Lenakel, Whitesands and Kwamera – have been used as church languages for over a century, and they have thus acquired considerable prestige on the island. There is evidence that the two other languages have undergone a certain amount of influence from these languages – North Tanna from Whitesands and Lenakel, and Southwest Tanna from Lenakel and Kwamera. In addition, because of the similarities in grammatical structure between all Tanna languages, most Tannese are passively bilingual in some or all of the other languages on the island.

1.2.4 Aneityum

There is only one indigenous language spoken on Aneityum, and dialectal variation today is very small. The situation before depopulation may have been rather more complex than this: certainly, Inglis (1882) commented on greater dialect variation, and there is also oral tradition that there were once two 'languages' on the island (Lynch & Tepahae 1999). Anejoffi has been written for over a century, and was in fact one of the better-known Oceanic languages in the nineteenth century.

1.3 Previous research

As elsewhere in the Pacific, explorers provided the first information on the languages of Vanuatu (e.g. Forster 1778; Bennett 1831, 1832), with the early missionaries providing some grammatical and more detailed lexical data (e.g. Inglis 1854, 1882; Turner 1861; Gray 1891). The most recent descriptive studies are listed in Table 1.2.

A fuller survey of descriptive and comparative studies can be found in the appropriate sections of Lynch and Crowley (f/c).

1.4 Organisation

The Southern Vanuatu (SV) languages belong to the Oceanic subgroup of the Austronesian family. Members of other subgroups are spoken in Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia and Malagasy. Members of the Oceanic subgroup, all of whom share certain innovatory developments from Proto Austronesian, are spoken in Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

The internal subgrouping of Proto Oceanic is still not absolutely clear. It is probable that there are three major first-order branches: an Admiralty Islands branch (which may or may not include Yapese), a Western Oceanic branch (New Guinea area and the western Solomons), and an Eastern Oceanic branch (the remainder). Eastern Oceanic itself – sometimes referred to as Central-Eastern or Remote Oceanic (not always with exactly the same membership) – apparently divides into a number of branches, including Southeast Solomons, Utupua-Vanikoro, Micronesia, Central Pacific (Fijian, Polynesian, and Rotuman), and Southern Oceanic (Vanuatu and New Caledonia). It is to this last branch, Southern Oceanic, that the Southern Vanuatu languages belong (Lynch 1999a, 1999b).

This volume begins with a reconstruction of Proto Southern Vanuatu (PSV) phonology and its development from Proto Oceanic (POc). Chapter 2 deals with the consonants of PSV, Chapter 3 with the vowels, and Chapter 4 with a variety of other issues relating to morpheme structure, stress, vowel deletion, rule ordering, and the behaviour of POc *q in PSV.

The next three chapters deal with the reconstruction of PSV grammar. Chapter 5 deals with pronouns, nominal morphology, and the syntax of the noun phrase; Chapter 6 with verbal morphology and verb phrase morphosyntax; and Chapter 7 with clause-level and sentence-level grammar.

Chapter 8 deals with historical reconstruction. In that chapter, I examine the internal relationships of the Southern Vanuatu languages and their external links, and attempt to reconstruct something of the linguistic history of the area, including a significant section on contact with Polynesian languages.

1.5 Phonological systems and orthographies

This section briefly outlines the phonemic inventories of the modern Southern Vanuatu languages and of Proto Oceanic and Proto Southern Oceanic, the orthography used in this monograph, general phonotactic patterns and rules regarding stress assignment. More detailed descriptions of the phonological systems of certain individual languages can be found in the sources listed in Table 1.2.
1.5.1 Consonants

**Errromango**

The two extant Errromangan languages, Sye and Ura, have the following consonant phonemes:

**Sye Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ura consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ura /b d g/ are prenasalised. Terry Crowley (1999:110-111) says of the Ura liquids that, despite the fact that there is a phonemic contrast between the two liquids, I have encountered a considerable amount of variation between [l] and [r] in transcriptions both within my own data, and between my data and that recorded by Jerry Taki, William Mete, John Lynch and Arthur Capell...This can sometimes be put down to lack of clarity in articulation due to the old age of the speakers...It may also be, however, that /l/ and /r/ are phonetically closer to each other in Ura than in Sye.

These comments will need to be taken into account when the liquids are examined in §2.4.

**Tanna**

The five Tanna languages have similar phonological systems, though there are differences. Below are the consonant phonemes of two of these languages:

**Lenakel consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kwamera consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>k*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whitesands has the same system as Lenakel except that it may also have the labialised fricative /\(f^w\)/. Some dialects of North Tanna (see e.g. Blaymires 1995) have the same system as Lenakel, but the dialect on which I have the most material, and the one cited here, has, in addition to the voiceless stops, an incomplete set of prenasalised voiced stops /b' b dl/.\(^6\) Southwest Tanna has the same system as Kwamera, except that most dialects have /l/ instead

\(^6\) It is not clear whether North Tanna and Whitesands have the phoneme /w/: see the discussion in §2.2.3 below.
of /t/. In all Tanna languages, nasals, liquids, /w/ and semivowel allophones of the high vowels devoice when adjacent to /h/, which is then lost: thus underlying /mh/ and /hm/ clusters, for example, surface as voiceless [m], while /uh/ and /hu/ in environments where /u/ becomes a glide surface as [w].

**Aneityum**

The consonant system of Anejom is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anejom consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m̃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5.2 Vowels, phonotactics and stress

Anejom and the languages of Erromango have five surface vowel phonemes /i e a o u/: Sye also has an underlying sixth vowel /a/ which surfaces as /o/ in some contexts and zero in others (see §3.2.5 for further discussion). The Tanna languages have six phonemic vowels: /i e a o u/. Vowel length is contrastive in Anejom and the Tanna languages, though this contrast is found more frequently in the final syllable than anywhere else. High vowels have non-syllabic allophones when adjacent to vowels in certain contexts.

There are few restrictions on the occurrence of consonants and vowels in relation to position in the word, or in relation to participation in consonant or vowel clusters. Any relevant specific restrictions will be noted in the appropriate sections in Chapters 2 and 3.

Syllables may be open or closed in all SV languages, thus allowing word-medial two-consonant clusters. In Anejom and the Tanna languages, no initial or final surface consonant clusters, and no medial three-consonant clusters, are allowed in non-borrowed words; where these occur in underlying forms, vowel epenthesis generally resolves the unacceptable cluster (although the Tanna rule devoicing certain consonants before /h/ applies before the epenthesis rule). So Anejom underlying /nyat/ 'basket' surfaces as inyat, while Lenakel underlying /nruw/ 'sugarcane' surfaces as naruw. In Sye, there is a wide range of allowable initial and medial two-consonant clusters, and a smaller range of medial three-consonant clusters, but only /nt/ and /nt/ may occur finally. Ura, on the other hand, allows a smaller range of medial clusters than Sye, and disallows initial and final clusters.

Clusters of two vowels occur, though clusters of more than two vowels are rare. In Anejom, there appear to be no principled restrictions on vowel clustering, though not all possible clusters have been recorded. The languages of Erromango and Tanna are more restrictive: in Erromango, only clusters of non-high vowel + high vowel may occur; while in Tanna, high vowels may be followed by any vowel, but there are restrictions on clusters in which the first vowel is non-high, and /a/ may not occur as a member of a surface cluster.
Primary stress is invariably on the penultimate syllable in Erromango. In Anejom and the Tanna languages, it is normally penultimate, but (a) final if the vowel of the final syllable is long, and (b) antepenultimate in certain very restricted contexts. Secondary stress normally occurs two syllables to the left of the primary-stressed syllable.

1.5.3 Orthography

Normal IPA symbols are used in citing language data, except that I use:

(a) \( j \) to represent the affricate /ʃ/ in Anejom,
(b) \( b^*, b, d, g \) to represent the prenasalised stops in Ura and North Tanna;
(c) \( a \) to represent the central vowel in Tanna (and Sye); and
(d) double vowels (ii, aa etc.) to represent vowel length.

Published sources generally use the standard orthographies, and the following ‘translations’ need to be made in comparing data cited here with those sources:

(a) /ŋ/ is represented by \( g \) in the orthographies of all SV languages;
(b) /γ/ is represented by \( c \) in Sye, Ura and Anejom;
(c) in Sye, the sequence /nt/ is traditionally written nd;
(d) the labialised consonants /pʷ mʷ kʷ/ are written with a following \( w \) in Tanna (pw, mw, kw); the first two of these are written as \( p \) and \( m \) in Anejom;
(e) the Tanna central vowel \( /a/ \) has been written as \( i \) in some publications; and
(f) in Anejom orthography, /θ/ is represented by \( d \).

1.5.4 Proto Oceanic and Proto Southern Oceanic

Proto Oceanic (Ross 1988, inter alia) is reconstructed as having had the five vowels *i, *e, *a, *o and *u and the following consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Oceanic consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>w</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>y</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto Oceanic probably had penultimate stress, but apparently did not distinguish vowel length. Both open and closed syllables were permitted, though open syllables were far more frequent, especially in non-final syllables.

Sources of POc lexical items are diverse, but include Osmond (1996), Pawley (1996), Ross (1995, 1996), as well as various papers in Pawley and Ross (1994) and Ross, Pawley and Osmond (1998). Proto Polynesian reconstructions are from Biggs (2000).
Proto Southern Oceanic is the putative ancestor of the languages of Vanuatu and New Caledonia. Ross Clark (n.d.) has reconstructed the phonology and lexicon of Proto North-Central Vanuatu (PNCV). However, it now appears that there may not be a North-Central Vanuatu subgroup per se. Nevertheless, it does seem – at least until further research contradicts this – that the phonological system Clark reconstructs for PNCV is actually attributable to PSOc. PSOc had the same five vowels as POc and the following consonants:

**Proto Southern Oceanic consonants**

* t  k  q  
* b  d  z  g  
* r  (*dr?)  
* v  s  
* m  n  (*n?)  
* l  
* w  y  

Note (i) that the POc voiceless labial stop *p has become *v, (ii) that there has been a merger of some POc palatals and (iii) that there has also been a merger of some liquids.

### 1.6 Conventions and abbreviations

I use the following conventions and abbreviations throughout the text.

#### Language names

Three-letter abbreviations are used for modern language names (with the Futuna and Aniwa dialects of Futuna-Aniwa being labelled separately where necessary). Abbreviation conventions for both modern languages and protolanguages follow Reid (1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern languages</th>
<th>Protolanguages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj Anjoffi</td>
<td>PEOc Proto Eastern Oceanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anw Aniwa</td>
<td>PEr Proto Erromango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm Kwamera</td>
<td>PNCV Proto North-Central Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Lenakel</td>
<td>PNT Proto Northern Tanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn North Tanna</td>
<td>POc Proto Oceanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT Southwest Tanna</td>
<td>PPn Proto Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uth Utaha</td>
<td>PST Proto Southern Tanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFu West Futuna</td>
<td>PSV Proto Southern Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn Whitesands</td>
<td>PTn Proto Tanna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clark uses different symbols from Ross (*g for *ŋ, *q for *g, *ʔ for *q), but I will follow Ross's POc orthography in writing PSOc phonemes. Clark is unsure at this stage of research about the phonemic status of *dr and *n.

Note that Sye and Ura do not need to be abbreviated.
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In lists of data, where column headings specify a subgroup (e.g. Erromango) or an intermediate protolanguage (e.g. Proto Tanna), then only initial letters are used for language names, for reasons of space. Thus S under the (Proto) Erromango column refers to Sye but under the (Proto) Tanna column S refers to Southwest Tanna.

In citation of data and sound correspondences
* marks a protoform which is an established reconstruction.
+ marks a protoform which is a new or varied POc reconstruction based on data presented in this work; a full list of these is presented in Appendix IV.
\( x:y:z \) \( x \) in one language corresponds with \( y \) in another and \( z \) in a third. The order of the languages will usually be obvious in each section: for example in dealing with Proto Erromangan, Sye forms are always cited first, Ura forms second; thus ‘the s:h correspondence’ in this section means ‘the correspondence between Sye s and Ura h’.

Where any ambiguity might arise the languages involved will be specified.
\( x-y-z \) \( x \), \( y \), \( z \) (i.e. initial \( x \), medial \( y \) and final \( z \)).
/ separates non-cognate material from cognate material.
\( x \sim y \) in charts of correspondences, means ‘\( x \) or \( y \), but more often \( x \)’.
else in charts of correspondences, means ‘elsewhere’.
{ } (i) in discussion of sound correspondences, a form so enclosed is cognate but does not show the correspondence under discussion. For example in the discussion of reflexes of POc *p, the notation POc *topu > {Sye ne/t-}, NTn ne/tap, SWT na/tuk” ‘sugarcane’ indicates that Sye net- is derived from *topu but does not reflect the second syllable (which contains *p).
(ii) in the discussion of morphology, the form so enclosed is not cognate. For example, POc */i]au > Sye yau, Len io, {Anj añak} ‘I’.
= clitic boundary.
< > typical subject/object/possessor (e.g. ‘(pig) grunt’ – pig is the typical subject of grunt).
+ a + sign indicates that other similar subjects, objects, or possessors are allowed (e.g. ‘dry (clothes+) by placing in the sun’ – clothes and similar things, like mats or towels, are the typical objects).
unexpl. unexplained.

In reconstructions
\{x\} the item is reconstructible in two forms, one with and one without *x.
\{x,y\} the item is reconstructible in two forms, one with *x and the other with *y.
\( x \) *x may or may not have been present.
\( x,y \) either *x or *y was present.
\{ \} a segment was present, but there is no evidence as to what it was.
\( V \) a vowel was present, but there is no evidence as to which vowel it was.
In lexical glosses
k.o. kind of
s.o. someone
s.t. something
sp. species
w. with

In morpheme glosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>adjective suffix</th>
<th>FUT</th>
<th>future</th>
<th>OPT</th>
<th>optative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>general possessive</td>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEF</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>cause, causative</td>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>hortative</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMIT</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>concurrent</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td>PROHIB</td>
<td>prohibitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>INTEN</td>
<td>intentional</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>recent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>construct suffix</td>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>iterative</td>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distant</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>subject marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>dual</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
<td>SUBORD</td>
<td>subordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>echo-subject</td>
<td>NONSG</td>
<td>non-singular</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXC</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD</td>
<td>food possessive</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Consonants

In this and the following two chapters, I reconstruct the phonological system of Proto Southern Vanuatu (PSV) and two of its daughter languages, Proto Erromangan (PER) and Proto Tanna (PTn), and describe the development of the Proto Oceanic (POc) phonemes and morpheme structure in the Southern Vanuatu languages. I assume for the purposes of this discussion that (a) there are three subgroups of the Southern Vanuatu family, Erromango, Tanna and Anejom, and (b) that within Tanna there are two subgroups, Northern and Southern — although this will not be explicitly justified until Chapter 8.

I have tried to give adequate illustration of each sound correspondence set without burdening the reader with successions of unnecessarily long lists. In addition, because of the sequential nature of the presentation of PSV protophonemes, the reader is asked to take on trust reflexes of those protophonemes not as yet discussed. A full chart of sound correspondences appears as Appendix I, while Appendix II contains reconstructed PSV lexical items, where further illustrations of reflexes of POc phonemes may be found. In the lists of POc forms in these chapters, I have sometimes given a Proto Southern Oceanic (PSOc) form instead: these forms, a full list of which appears in Appendix IV, have known POc antecedents but both North-Central Vanuatu and Southern Vanuatu languages show the same innovation. In general, I have not cited in the text PSOc forms with no apparent external cognates.

In discussing the phonemes of Proto Erromango, I have generally not included data from the extinct language Utaha, but I have included Utaha reflexes in the tables of sound correspondences. These are highly tentative, based as they are on the most fragmentary of data, but they give some indication of the way in which the phonology of that language developed.

2.1 Overview of Proto Southern Vanuatu

Proto Southern Vanuatu will be reconstructed as having had the phonemes listed in Table 2.1. The consonants will be discussed in this chapter (with more on *q in Chapter 4), and the vowels in Chapter 3.
Table 2.1: Proto Southern Vanuatu phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>i</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em></td>
<td><em>e</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em></td>
<td><em>a</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>v</em></td>
<td><em>o</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td><em>u</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>l</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although changes in the structure of POc morphemes will not be elaborated on until Chapter 4, some brief mention needs to be made here, so that reflexes of POc forms will be more recognisable.

1. POc word-final consonants were generally retained in PSV, though the Erromangan languages tend to lose final nasals and Anejoř appears to have lost most final consonants other than *t; e.g. *saqat ‘bad’ > Sye sat, Lenakel taat, Anejoř has.
2. POc *q* was regularly lost: *luaq ‘vomit’ > Sye e/lwo, Southwest Tanna lua, Anejoř a/lou.
3. POc vowels in absolute word-final position were regularly lost, but a vowel was retained before word-final *q*: compare *mate ‘die’ > Sye mah, Lenakel mas with *mataq ‘raw’ > Sye e/mte, Lenakel a/mra.
4. Certain unstressed pretonic vowels were also lost: *na lima-ña ‘his hand’ > Lenakel nelm,m, Anejoř nijman.
5. The majority of verbs have accreted an initial vowel: *toka ‘sit, stay’ > Sye e/te, Lenakel a/rak, Anejoř a/tey, e/tey.
6. The majority of nouns have accreted either the POc article *na or some other noun-marker as part of the root: *na Rum*aq ‘house’ > Sye n/imo, Lenakel n/im*a, Anejoř n/iom*.

All other conventions used in this and the next two chapters are explained in §1.6.

2.2 Labials

Proto Southern Vanuatu made a distinction between velarised and simple labial stops and nasals, and between voiceless and prenasalised voiced stops. I thus reconstruct in this section PSV *mʷ, *m, *pʷ, *p, *bʷ and *b. In addition, there is clear evidence for a voiced labial fricative *v and for a phoneme *w whose phonetic characteristics are not completely clear.

2.2.1 Labial nasals

The Erromangan languages have only a single bilabial nasal /m/, and I reconstruct Proto Erromangan *m for the correspondence Sye m: Ura m: Utaha m. Anejoř and the Tanna
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languages, however, make a phonemic distinction between the velarised labial nasal /mʷ/ and the simple labial /m/, and this distinction can be reconstructed for Proto Tanna.

PTn *m^w*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn m*</td>
<td>m^walam^wala</td>
<td>m^walam^wala</td>
<td>m^walam^wala</td>
<td>m^walam^wala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eruh/äm^wain</td>
<td>eh'äm^wein</td>
<td>om^wein</td>
<td>om^wein</td>
<td>om^wein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nim^w</td>
<td>nim^w</td>
<td>nim^w</td>
<td>nim^w</td>
<td>nim^w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nöm^wij</td>
<td>nöm^wij</td>
<td>m^wij</td>
<td>m^wij</td>
<td>m^wij</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some cases of variation in these reflexes — either most languages reflect one but one or two reflect the other, or because final m^w has not been recorded.1 (The same situation applies with the labial stops — see below.) For example, the following probably reflect *m^w*, although some cases are more clear-cut than others:

PTn *m^w*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn m</td>
<td>m^wane</td>
<td>m^wane</td>
<td>m^wane</td>
<td>m^wane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mauL</td>
<td>maul</td>
<td>maul</td>
<td>maul</td>
<td>maul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>nömei</td>
<td>nöm</td>
<td>nömel</td>
<td>nömer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ietemim</td>
<td>ietamimi</td>
<td>ieramiim</td>
<td>ielmama</td>
<td>iermama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fum</td>
<td>fum</td>
<td>uhum</td>
<td>uhun</td>
<td>visim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto Southern Vanuatu also had both velarised and simple bilabial nasals (and, as the next section will show, this distinction occurred in the stops as well). The development of these nasals is as follows:

---

1 The velarised labial nasal m^w occurs word-finally in Lenakel and Kwamera; it probably does in the other languages as well, but poor recording may be responsible for the fact that it has not been identified in this position. Where Lenakel or Kwamera final m^w corresponds with final m in other Tanna languages, I assume PTn *m^w*.

2 Previous descriptions of the Tanna languages had roots like these as consonant final, with the schwa being inserted by regular phonological rule: for example, Lenakel underlying {n:lmwan-n} ‘her brother’ > In:lmwan:lnl. However, on historical grounds there is no motivation for the loss of the root-final vowel, and on synchronic grounds there is no strong evidence that the vowel was not there in underlying forms. I thus write forms like these with root-final schwa.
In the illustrative examples below, note the occasional fluctuation between $m$ and $m^\ast$.

**POc $m^\ast$ > PSV $m$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rum</em>&quot;aq</td>
<td>n/imo</td>
<td>n/im&quot;a</td>
<td>n/im&quot;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ta-m</em>&quot;agane</td>
<td>na/man</td>
<td>ie/räm&quot;aan</td>
<td>ie/rman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em>&quot;alo</td>
<td>a/m&quot;a</td>
<td>a/m&quot;eta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POc *m* else > PSV *m**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mutusi</td>
<td>a/m&quot;i</td>
<td>mürh</td>
<td>m&quot;ers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *gomu</td>
<td>a/ŋkm-i</td>
<td>a/kum&quot;</td>
<td>a/km&quot;-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qumun</td>
<td>-n/um</td>
<td>n/um&quot;an</td>
<td>n/em&quot;aŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ñamuk</td>
<td>yomoy</td>
<td>mumuk</td>
<td>m&quot;i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POc *m* else > PSV *m**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*manuk</td>
<td>menuy</td>
<td>menuk</td>
<td>menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma&quot;ug&quot;a</td>
<td>meta-</td>
<td>mëra-</td>
<td>mare-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma&quot;ri</td>
<td>e/m&quot;e</td>
<td>a/m&quot;a</td>
<td>a/m&quot;e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mi&quot;mar</td>
<td>n/m&quot;ar</td>
<td>n&quot;a/m</td>
<td>n/emer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mi&quot;m</td>
<td>evla/mi</td>
<td>a/mi</td>
<td>a/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mo&quot;no</td>
<td>na/men</td>
<td>na/m&quot;lh</td>
<td>na/m&quot;rhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*molis</td>
<td>ne/m&quot;i</td>
<td>na/m&quot;lhi</td>
<td>na/m&quot;rhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The Anejom form ne/pjeθ shows irregular development of *m as p.

As in Proto Tanna, there are some correspondence sets where we find variation between $m$ and $m^\ast$, like those below; these generally occur adjacent to POc or PSV *u.

**POc**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
<td>e/tenom</td>
<td>re&quot;nom</td>
<td>num&quot;-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *munim</td>
<td>o/mon/ki</td>
<td>a/mnunm&quot;</td>
<td>a/num&quot;-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*nomol *nəməl *namur nom\"oj *‘Cycas sp.’
2.2.2 Labial stops

I will show in this section that PSV had four labial stops, *p′, *p, *b′ and *b, reflecting a contrast between velarised and simple stops and between voiceless oral and voiced prenasalised stops.

2.2.2.1 Proto Erromango

Regular correspondences involving the labial stops suggest two separate stop phonemes in Proto Erromango, which I will write as *p and *b, the latter being prenasalised. This contrast is clear in initial position:

**PEr** *p-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pɔŋkevɾe</td>
<td>pɔgevɾe</td>
<td>'k.o. large snapper'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pɔki</td>
<td>pɔki</td>
<td>'sea eel'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purou</td>
<td>purou</td>
<td>'hat'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEr** *b-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peⁿtop</td>
<td>bedop</td>
<td>'ashes'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poyp</td>
<td>boyup</td>
<td>'heaven'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pɔnti-</td>
<td>bohni/n</td>
<td>'base'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pwayah</td>
<td>balayi</td>
<td>'daytime'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Sye, medial *p and *b merge as p post-consonantly, and the unit phoneme *b has been reanalysed as the cluster mp elsewhere; this reanalysis, as will be seen below, has occurred with the other prenasalised stops as well. In Ura, medial *p and *b merge as b intervocally, and the prenasalised stop loses its stop quality pre-consonantly. Thus the medial correspondences are as follows:

**PEr** *-p/-b-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p / C__; mp else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b / V__; b else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are illustrated below.

**PEr** *-p/-V*V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aлепo</td>
<td>ahleiba</td>
<td>'sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tαιpɔtɔyɔnei</td>
<td>daiboryeni</td>
<td>'k.o. yam'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tαιpelay</td>
<td>tabelek</td>
<td>'open'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tɔputwai</td>
<td>doburwai</td>
<td>'bush'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Some forms cited here for Erromangan languages may differ from those listed in the lexical sources. Crowley has generally given citation forms for verbs, which consist of the root with the nominalising prefix n-; I give just the root.
PEr *-p- else
Sye -p- | Ura -p-
neplele    neplele    'canoe-tree'
ehe        espe       'reflexive verb'
etpin      etpin      'win a point'
arpor      arpor      'numb'
ahpi       aspi       'lick'
ulpei      ulpei      'k.o. fish'
yaypon     yaypon    'egret'

PEr *-b- / C__
Sye -p- | Ura -b-
ehpi       isbi       'count'
enpar      enbar       'quiet, silent'
moypo-    boybo/n    'grandchild'
potpot     burbut     'near, close'

PEr *-b- / _C
Sye -mp- | Ura -m-
amplehi    amlesi     'stick on to'
empyu      emyu       'dance'
nompwau    nomwau     'cloud'
nimrap     nimrap     'multi-pronged spear'

PEr *-b- / _V_V
Sye -mp- | Ura -b-
ulompot    lobut      'croton'
sompoŋ     aban         'snore'
empai      abai        'make a fence'
nampinti   nabidi    'edible fungus'

There is only one correspondence set in final position. Since neither the Sye cluster mp nor the Ura phoneme b occurs word-finally, I assume that the examples below reflect *p, and that *b did not occur in this position in Proto Erromango.

PEr *-p
Sye -p | Ura -p
nousap    nousap    'flood'
oyep      erkep      'to fly'
nevahrip  nesvarip  'tabu place'
potnetop  bohnetop  'k.o. fish'
nup        nup        'yam'

Thus the reflexes of the two labial stops are as set out below. The Utaha reflexes are, as throughout this chapter, extremely tentative and based on just a few comparisons.
There is adequate evidence supporting the reconstruction of the four labial stops \(*p^\prime\), \(*p\), \(*b^\prime\) and \(*b\) in Proto Tanna. Only North Tanna data support the oral/prenasalised distinction, since the prenasalised and oral stops merge in the other four languages; however, the oral/prenasalised distinction is also reconstructed for other orders of Proto Tanna stops, and for Proto Erromango. The regular correspondences are listed below; recall that the notation \(b \sim b^\prime\) means 'usually \(b\) but sometimes \(b^\prime\) with no apparent conditioning'.

The correspondence sets above are exemplified below:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{PTn} & *p' & *p & *b' & *b \\
\text{NTn} & p' & p & b \sim b' & b \\
\text{Wsn} & p' & p & p'' & p \\
\text{Len} & p' & p & p'' & p \\
\text{SWT} & p' & p & p'' & p \\
\text{Kwm} & p' & p & p'' & p \\
\end{array}
\]

Consonants
As with the nasals, there is a certain amount of fluctuation between velarised and simple labials. A comparison of such cases in Lenakel and Kwamera, for example, shows a tendency in Kwamera for *p or *b to be reflected as *p' adjacent to a high back vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Len p</th>
<th>Kwm p p'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alpan</td>
<td>erup' un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apuk</td>
<td>ap'u uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asiakapun</td>
<td>ahiap' un</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, there are numerous cases of Kwamera p adjacent to u, like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Len p</th>
<th>Kwm p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apus</td>
<td>apus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epu</td>
<td>epui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apkapak</td>
<td>pukpeki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as well as cases where the p:p' (or p*:p) correspondence has no obvious conditioning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arhapok</td>
<td>ares-ip'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p'ia-</td>
<td>piav-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koulap'øn</td>
<td>kaurapøn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.2.3 Proto Southern Vanuatu

The four PSV stops have the reflexes as shown below (recalling that there is often some fluctuation between velarised and simple stops in individual lexical items):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*p'</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p'</td>
<td>*p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b'</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the nasals, the distinction between simple and velarised stops was lost in Erromango. Anejom has lost the voicing distinction but has retained the simple/velarised distinction.

The PSV voiced stops have quite clear POc antecedents. PSV *b' has three separate sources: POc *b' and *p' in all environments, and POc *b before *u. Reflexes appear to be fairly regular in Erromango and Anejom; in Tanna, however, there seems to be more variation between simple and velarised stops, and expected p'u or p'ø often becomes pu; I thus treat Tanna forms as being less reliable witnesses in this area.
Other cases of PSV *b* where I do not know of a POc source are as follows:

**POc *b* / *u > PSV *b***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>b</em> / *u</th>
<th>PSV <em>b</em></th>
<th>Anj p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bulut</em></td>
<td><em>S a/mpleh-i</em></td>
<td><em>L a/p&quot;iti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kabu</em></td>
<td><em>U n/ab/aveŋ</em></td>
<td><em>K, S n/ap&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td><em>U boybu-</em></td>
<td><em>L m&quot;ip&quot;-ŋ-, S mukupu-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>butog-</em></td>
<td><em>U yo/but</em></td>
<td>*N na/but, L na/prəŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tabu</em></td>
<td><em>U dobo/r</em></td>
<td><em>L ho-a/rpu/l</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other cases of PSV *b* where I do not know of a POc source are as follows:

**POc ？ PSV *b***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>b</em></th>
<th>PSV <em>b</em></th>
<th>Anj p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>S ompuy</em></td>
<td><em>L a/bəŋam, K ap&quot;am</em></td>
<td><em>op&quot;oy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S nempyu</em></td>
<td><em>N nab&quot;əŋ, L nap&quot;uk</em></td>
<td><em>uhup&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S nampo</em></td>
<td><em>K nap&quot;esəŋ</em></td>
<td><em>np&quot;omoθ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>U nobo</em></td>
<td><em>K niepur</em></td>
<td><em>nlop&quot;ot</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>U lobot</em></td>
<td><em>S mompol</em></td>
<td><em>nmop&quot;ol-hat</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S nompyor</em></td>
<td><em>N aba, S ap&quot;a</em></td>
<td><em>yap&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *b* derives from POc *b* when not before *u. The list below gives first those forms which have a known POc antecedent, then other cases of PSV *b*; recall that the notation *" as in *(p,b)ikuR implies a modification to a POc reconstruction; all of these are detailed in Appendix IV.

**POc *b* else  > PSV *b***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>b</em> else</th>
<th>PSV <em>b</em></th>
<th>Anj p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bal(q,k)un</em></td>
<td><em>S ni/mpa</em></td>
<td><em>N na/bəŋ, L na/prəŋ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bak(i,e)wa</em></td>
<td><em>U w/beu</em></td>
<td><em>W pauŋəŋ, K paveŋəŋ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>baga</em></td>
<td><em>U bogu</em></td>
<td><em>L ne/pek, K na/pek</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>balur</em></td>
<td><em>(p,b)alapu</em></td>
<td><em>N a/boŋ, S a/prəŋ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(p,b)alapu</em></td>
<td><em>boni ‘night’</em></td>
<td><em>a/peŋ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>boni</em></td>
<td><em>U i/bin</em></td>
<td><em>i/piŋ-i</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bo-</td>
<td><em>U ibu</em></td>
<td><em>a/bien, L a/pien</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>bokasi</em></th>
<th>S no/mpyahi</th>
<th>N pukas, L pukas</th>
<th>pikaθ</th>
<th>'pig'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(p,b)ikuR-</em></td>
<td><em>(p,b)ikuR-</em></td>
<td>N na/bike-</td>
<td>n/iye-</td>
<td>'tail'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U obahlini</td>
<td>N ahbel, L hapel</td>
<td>nepel</td>
<td>'Pseuderanthemum'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S nempi</td>
<td>K pire</td>
<td>neprij</td>
<td>'banded rail'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S nempoq</td>
<td>nepek</td>
<td>'green-snail'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S yempa</td>
<td>K ispa</td>
<td>n Yep</td>
<td>'unicornfish'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U burbut</td>
<td></td>
<td>upotopet</td>
<td>'near'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U nenbarata</td>
<td></td>
<td>ninya</td>
<td>'peace'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *p* and *p"* occur less frequently than their voiced counterparts, and have less obvious sources. Below is a near-complete list of unambiguous cases of these two protophonemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV <em>p</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td><em>p&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>p&quot;*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>tubuq</em></th>
<th>U e/ropo</th>
<th>K rupu</th>
<th>atop</th>
<th>'grow, swell up'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U yay/pon</td>
<td>L p&quot;an</td>
<td>np&quot;an</td>
<td>'reef bird'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S youpat</td>
<td></td>
<td>nup&quot;ut</td>
<td>'k.o. tuber pudding'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV <em>p</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>bati-</em></th>
<th>'tooth'</th>
<th>N, L ka/paas</th>
<th>n/pas</th>
<th>'axe'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tob</em>a-*</td>
<td>S ne/tpo/lu</td>
<td>N n/apα-</td>
<td>L ne/tpα-</td>
<td>'belly'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will show in §2.2.3 that POc *p* became a fricative, PSV *v*. It may well be that, after this took place, there was the beginning of a drift from voiced to voiceless stops – a drift which is complete in Anejoqm and in all Tanna languages except North Tanna. Alternatively, it is possible that the distinction between PSV *p* (and *p") and *v* may simply reflect a fortis/lenis distinction which developed independently in a number of post-POc languages (Ross 1988:47ff.) – i.e. that fortis *p* became PSV *p* and lenis *p* became PSV *v*.

### 2.2.3 Other labials

While three other labial consonants can be reconstructed for Proto Erromango (a voiceless fricative *f*, a voiced fricative *v*, and a semivowel *w*), there is evidence for only two such consonants in PSV, *v* and *w*. None of these phonemes occur word-finally.

---

5 The North Tanna form suggests PTn *p*- rather than *b*.

6 There is only one word in Crowley’s (1999) mini-dictionary of Ura with initial *f*, and *f* does not occur in Sye, so the support for *f* in initial position is weak (though it is quite strong in medial position).
The reflexes of these protophonemes are given below. Utaha data are insufficient to determine whether *f was reflected differently from *v.

However, we can reconstruct only two other labial phonemes for Proto Tanna — a fricative *v, and what may have been a labialised velar stop which I write as *k". There is no evidence for a protophoneme *f: the phoneme f is rare in all Tanna languages, and f" in those languages in which it occurs is rarer still, and its phonemic status is marginal. Many occurrences of f are in words which are borrowings from Polynesian languages or Bislama; for example:
A number of other occurrences of \( f \) seem to be recent developments resulting from the devoicing of \( p^\prime \), \( p \) or \( v \) when the following syllable contained \( h \):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{NTn} & \text{Wsn} & \text{Len} & \text{SWT} & \text{Kwm} \\
\text{alp}^*\text{ah} & \text{alp}^*\text{ah} & \text{alp}^* \text{ah} & \text{alp}^* \text{ah} & \text{alp}^* \text{ah} \\
\text{avh} \text{a} & \text{avh} \text{a} & \text{avh} \text{a} & \text{avh} \text{a} & \text{avh} \text{a} \\
\text{av} \text{ha} & \text{av} \text{ha} & \text{av} \text{ha} & \text{av} \text{ha} & \text{av} \text{ha} \\
\end{array}
\]

I therefore do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to support the reconstruction of a voiceless labial fricative in Proto Tanna. Indeed, a similar explanation can be given for the development of PEr \( *f \). Although there are only a couple of cases of words reconstructed with PEr \( *f \) which have cognates in other SV languages, these suggest that PEr \( *f \) derives from PSV \( *v \) when an adjacent syllable contained a sibilant, reflected as \( h \) in at least some languages:

\[
\text{PSV} \quad \text{Errromango} \quad \text{Tanna} \quad \text{Anjoj} \mbox{ñ} \\
\text{*a-vaseli(p)} & \text{S savel, U afel} & \text{L avh} \text{a}, \text{K averh} \text{op} & \text{ahej} & \text{‘whistle’} \\
\text{*a-v(u)s,j)aki} & \text{S owwaki, U ofwaki} & \text{L ahuuak, K afaki} & \text{‘pray’} \\
\]

There is strong evidence, however, for the reconstruction of the voiced labial fricative PTn \( *v \). This is reflected as \( v \) in all environments in all languages, except that it is lost before \( i \) in North Tanna:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{NTn} \text{Ø} & \text{Wsn} v & \text{Len} v & \text{SWT} v & \text{Kwm} v \\
\text{i} & \text{vi} & \text{vi} & \text{vi} & \text{vi} & \text{‘pull’} \\
\text{aier} & \text{avier} & \text{aviet} & \text{aviah} & \text{‘defecate’} \\
\text{ailəŋ} & \text{aviləŋ} & \text{aviləŋ} & \text{avirəŋ} & \text{‘thin, wasted’} \\
\text{iŋ} & \text{ivŋ} & \text{ivøk} & \text{i} & \text{iva} & \text{‘to fly’} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{NTn} v & \text{Wsn} v & \text{Len} v & \text{SWT} v & \text{Kwm} v \\
\text{van} & \text{vaan} & \text{vaan} & \text{vaan} & \text{vaani} & \text{‘burn (TR)’} \\
\text{vanaŋ} & \text{vanaŋ} & \text{vanaŋ} & \text{vanaŋ} & \text{vanaŋ} & \text{‘flying-fish’} \\
\text{nivaŋ} & \text{nivaŋ} & \text{nivaŋ} & \text{nivaŋ} & \text{nivaŋ} & \text{‘a sail’} \\
\text{navea} & \text{navea} & \text{navea} & \text{navea} & \text{navea} & \text{‘a paddle’} \\
\text{arəvarəv} & \text{arəvarəv} & \text{arəvarəv} & \text{arəvarəv} & \text{‘red’} \\
\end{array}
\]

7 The phoneme /v/ in Tanna languages is actually a high central glide [j] in which the two lips approximate but do not touch. Since it derives from a labial historically, however, I will treat it as such here. Note also that the high back vowel \( u \) has a semivowel allophone [w] in a variety of contexts adjacent to another vowel.
There is sporadic variation between \( v \) and labial stops or \( u \) (\( \approx [w] \) adjacent to a vowel), as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N'Tn</th>
<th>W'sn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( anan )</td>
<td>( anan )</td>
<td>( anan )</td>
<td>( anan )</td>
<td>( anan )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( nav-)</td>
<td>( nav-)</td>
<td>( nav-)</td>
<td>( nav-)</td>
<td>( nav-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( nelva-)</td>
<td>( nelu-)</td>
<td>( nelu-)</td>
<td>( k-el-)</td>
<td>( k-ar-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Southwest Tanna and Kwamera have a labialised velar stop phoneme \( k' \) which does not occur in the northern Tanna languages. Lenakel, however, has been analysed as having a phoneme \( w \) which (i) corresponds with Southwest Tanna and Kwamera \( k' \) in cognate forms and (ii) does not contrast phonetically with the semivowel allophone \( [w] \) of the vowel \( u \). Underlying \( w \) is posited in Lenakel for two reasons:

(a) \( o \)-initial verbs form the dual by prefixing \( ia-\) and the plural by prefixing \( ar-\); while \( a \)-initial verbs form the dual by prefixing \( u-\) and the plural by infixing \( -i-\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonetic</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Underlying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( [oti] ) ‘separate’</td>
<td>oti</td>
<td>ia-oti</td>
<td>ar-oti</td>
<td>/oti/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [akar] ) ‘speak’</td>
<td>akar</td>
<td>u-akar</td>
<td>a-i-akar</td>
<td>/akar/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain verbs which begin with phonetic \( [ow] \) behave as if they were \( o \)-initial, while others behave as if they were \( a \)-initial: the former are treated as beginning with \( ou \), the latter with \( aw \) (with subsequent rounding of the vowel). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonetic</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Underlying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( [owyek] ) ‘change skin’</td>
<td>ouiek</td>
<td>ia-ouiek</td>
<td>ar-ouiek</td>
<td>/ouiek/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [owas] ) ‘be old’</td>
<td>owas</td>
<td>u-owas</td>
<td>a-i-owas</td>
<td>/owas/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) There is a contrast in final position in Lenakel between \( [u] \) and \( [u] \), as in \( [nu] \) ‘water’, \( [nu] \) ‘yam’. Normally, \( [u] \) only occurs in a closed syllable, and I suggest that final \( [u] \) reflects underlying \( /uw/ \) – i.e. that the form meaning ‘yam’ is underlying \( /nuw/ \).

There is comparative evidence supporting both of these decisions. The underlying form \( awas \) ‘old’ in (a) above, which was analysed as having the phoneme \( w \), has cognates SWT, Kwm \( ak'as \), while the form \( nuw \) ‘yam’ is cognate with SWT \( nek' \), Kwm \( nuk \).

Because detailed phonological analyses have not been undertaken for North Tanna and Whitesands, it is not clear whether there is in fact a phoneme \( w \) in those two languages as well. Even if there were, there is no way of deciding whether the vast proportion of surface manifestations of \( [w] \) in all three northern languages derive from \( u \) or from \( w \), and traditionally they have been written as \( u \).

Given this background, I reconstruct for Proto Tanna a labialised velar stop \( *k' \). I reconstruct this as a stop (rather than, say, a semi-vowel) partly because of the stop reflexes in the southern Tanna languages, but also because it is reflected word-finally as \( p \) in North Tanna. Word-finally after \( u \) we find the following correspondences (with Kwamera showing sometimes \( k' \), sometimes \( k \)):

---

8 The ‘phonetic’ forms below are underspecified, omitting phonetic details irrelevant to the present discussion (e.g., \( [oti] \) is more accurately \( ['odəri] \)).
Before u, *k" is usually lost in the northern languages and reflected as k in Kwamera:

Before u, *k" is usually lost in the northern languages and reflected as k in Kwamera:

Elsewhere, *k" has the following reflexes (with occasional loss before a in North Tanna):

The following table summarises this discussion:

For Proto Southern Vanuatu, I reconstruct the phonemes *v and *w, whose origins and reflexes are:

PSV *v derives from POc *p; PTn has *k" when POc *p was adjacent to *u, and *v elsewhere:
POc *p / u > PSV *v

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn *k”</th>
<th>Anj</th>
<th>h-h-Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*paqus-i</td>
<td>S e/vi</td>
<td>L o/wh, K Kus-i</td>
<td>a/hoθ</td>
<td>‘weave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*punuq</td>
<td>S a/vni-i</td>
<td>L a/uni-in</td>
<td>ù/hni-i</td>
<td>‘finish’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puaq</td>
<td>S o/vwo</td>
<td>L o/uα, K kua</td>
<td>o/hou</td>
<td>‘bury’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puaq-</td>
<td>S no/vwa- ‘seed’</td>
<td>L no/ua-, K na/k“a-</td>
<td>no/howa-</td>
<td>‘fruit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tupa</td>
<td>S a/v-</td>
<td>K a/ruk”-</td>
<td>a/θe-i</td>
<td>‘blow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*iput</td>
<td>S o/vos-i</td>
<td>N ep, K ek”-i</td>
<td>aihoi</td>
<td>‘sugarcane’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*topu</td>
<td>{S ne/t-}</td>
<td>N ne/tep, S nα/tuk”</td>
<td>ne/to</td>
<td>‘rat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasupe</td>
<td>S ula/kis</td>
<td>N kahap, K i’esuk”</td>
<td>n/yeθo</td>
<td>‘yam’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qupi</td>
<td>S n/up</td>
<td>N n/up, S n/ek”</td>
<td>n/u</td>
<td>‘ashes’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *p else > PSV *v else

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn *v</th>
<th>Anj</th>
<th>h-h-Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*pano</td>
<td>S a/van</td>
<td>L vən, a/ven</td>
<td>hαn</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paŋan</td>
<td>S vaŋ, U e/veŋ</td>
<td>L a/vəŋ, K a/veŋeñ</td>
<td>hαŋ, heŋαŋ</td>
<td>‘eat (INTR)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paqan-</td>
<td>S n/va-</td>
<td>L nə/va-, K nu/νa-</td>
<td>nχa-</td>
<td>‘thigh’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pekas</td>
<td>S e/vyah</td>
<td>L a/vhe, S a/vkaa</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘defecate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pisiko-</td>
<td>S u/a/kis</td>
<td>L nu/vhaka-</td>
<td>no/hoby-e-</td>
<td>‘meat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*piRaq</td>
<td>S ne/vie</td>
<td>L, K nu/via</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘taro sp.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pican</td>
<td>S. n/ve</td>
<td>W ku/vah, K ke/va</td>
<td>e/heθ</td>
<td>‘how many?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qapat(a,o)</td>
<td>S n/avat</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/ahat</td>
<td>‘wood-grub’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lipon-</td>
<td>S ne/lve-</td>
<td>N ne/lva-, K revu-</td>
<td>ne/jhe-</td>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapika</td>
<td>L n/kavνακ, K n/ova</td>
<td>n/yehey</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Syzygium sp.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qunap-i</td>
<td>S n/ievi-</td>
<td>n/inehe-</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘scale’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rarap</td>
<td>S n/arap</td>
<td>L n/aiν</td>
<td>nara</td>
<td>‘coral tree’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapak</td>
<td>S o/yep ‘to fly’</td>
<td>L nα/kavkav- ‘wing’</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘wing/to fly’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the following cases where *v is reflected as Anejoffi final h rather than zero, suggesting that *v may also have been originally reflected as h finally but that it underwent deletion in this environment:

POc PEr *-p PTn *-v Anj -h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn *-v</th>
<th>Anj</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mapo</td>
<td>S nemlap</td>
<td>L a/mav</td>
<td>mah</td>
<td>‘heal(ed)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a fairly clear case for POc *w > PSV *w, although the reflexes in Proto Tanna are variable:

9 Presumably, *p came to be adjacent to *u after pretonic vowel deletion and regular loss of *q – i.e. *paqus-i > Pre-PSV *a-pqus-i > *a-pus-i.
There are, however, some cases where the Anejoffi reflex is \( w \) or \( u \) rather than \( v \):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc ( w )</th>
<th>Erromango</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*waiR</td>
<td>S n/u</td>
<td>L n/u, K n/ui</td>
<td>n/wai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kawili</td>
<td>S naŋkau</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/yowoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[maŋ]awa</td>
<td>U lau/pe</td>
<td></td>
<td>niŋyowos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma-wiri</td>
<td>S mor</td>
<td>L mul, K mour</td>
<td>n/m’awu-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am unable to specify the conditioning of the \( v \) and \( u \) - \( w \) reflexes in Anejoffi.

It is unclear from these data exactly what kind of sound \( *w \) was. It is reflected as a semivowel in Erromango, as a fricative in Anejoffi (which also has a /w/ phoneme, < \( *u \)), and variously as a stop and a semivowel in Tanna. Just as there is a simple/velarised contrast in the stops and nasals, it is possible that PSV \( *w \) was the velarised equivalent of \( *v \) – i.e. something like /vw/. The symbol \( *w \), however, seems the most satisfactory one at this stage of research.

2.2.4 Summary

The labial phonemes of Proto Southern Vanuatu are as follows:

- **voiceless stops**: \( *p^w \), \( *p \)
- **voiced stops**: \( *b^w \), \( *b \)
- **nasals**: \( *m^w \), \( *m \)
- **others**: \( *w \), \( *v \)

The development of these phonemes is summarised in Table 2.2.
2.3 Velars

The velars in Proto Southern Vanuatu parallel the simple labials, in that there is a contrast between an oral voiceless and a prenasalised voiced stop, and there is a voiced fricative and nasal. The PSV velar phonemes reconstructed in this section, then, are *k, *g, *ɣ and *ŋ.

### Table 2.2: Proto Southern Vanuatu labial correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*b&quot;, *p&quot;; <em>b/&quot;_u</em> else</th>
<th>*b&quot;</th>
<th>*p&quot;</th>
<th>*p&quot; fortis?</th>
<th><em>p</em>/u* lenis?</th>
<th>*p else lenis?</th>
<th>*w</th>
<th>*m&quot;, m/_u</th>
<th>*m else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*b&quot;</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*p&quot;</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*v</td>
<td>*w</td>
<td>*m&quot;</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*v-v-p</td>
<td>*w-w-u</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*b&quot;</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*p&quot;</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*k&quot;</td>
<td>*v</td>
<td>*k&quot;</td>
<td>*m&quot;</td>
<td>*m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>*p&quot;</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p&quot;</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>h-h-∅</td>
<td>*v</td>
<td>*m&quot;</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Velar nasal

A velar nasal *ŋ can be reconstructed for Proto Southern Vanuatu – and for Proto Erromango and Proto Tanna – with the reflex ŋ in all languages in all environments except as specified below.

### POc *ŋ > PSV *ŋ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *ŋ</th>
<th>PSV *ŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye ŋ</td>
<td>Len ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*niŋis</td>
<td>*niŋosiwō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pagaŋ</td>
<td>*vaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*laŋo</td>
<td>*waŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(k)naŋaŋaRi</td>
<td>*naŋai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(t)alaŋa-</td>
<td>*teləŋa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(t)owane</td>
<td>*owoŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*yaŋo</td>
<td>*mel/yaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len ŋ</td>
<td>Kwm ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/iŋaŋa-</td>
<td>n/iŋaŋa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/veaŋa</td>
<td>a/veaŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k/iaŋa</td>
<td>k/iaŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/ane</td>
<td>n/ane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakwa-renja-</td>
<td>n/tiŋa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owaŋ</td>
<td>ak&quot;aŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj ŋ</td>
<td>'gums'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*talis</td>
<td>*bolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*laŋi</td>
<td>*Laljo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(t)awaŋ</td>
<td>*owaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*yaŋo</td>
<td>*mel/yaŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exception referred to above is that, before *i (and *e?), the Anejōmī reflex of *ŋ is ĩ:

### POc *ŋ/_i,*e? > POc *n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *ŋ/_i,*e?</th>
<th>Sye ŋ</th>
<th>SWT ŋ</th>
<th>Anj ĩ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*taŋis</td>
<td>*toni</td>
<td>*taiā</td>
<td>‘cry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*boni</td>
<td>*ie-n/poni</td>
<td>n-e/peĩ</td>
<td>‘night’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*liŋi</td>
<td>*i/jiŋi-i</td>
<td>‘put’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anejōmī also shows an ĩ reflex of POc *n in the same environment, and I will leave discussion of this broader phenomenon of nasal palatalisation until §2.5.1.2.
2.3.2 Velar obstruents

The same kind of 'slippage' that occurred with the labial stops occurred also with the velars. That is, the voiced stop seems to have remained a voiced stop in PSV, the voiceless stop became a fricative, but a voiceless stop apparently developed at some later stage or through some other process. In this discussion of the velars, it will be useful to make reference to the developments of the Proto Oceanic velars at each stage, since the conditioning factors are quite complex. I will begin the discussion here with Anejoffi, where the development of the POc velars is clearer than in the other languages.

2.3.2.1 Anejoffi

Anejoffi has two velar obstruents, k and y. Both unambiguous occurrences of POc *g in my data became k in Anejoffi:

POc *g  Anj k
*-gu   -k       ‘my’
*baga  n/pak   ‘banyan’

However, there are three other forms which have been reconstructed for PNCV with *g, even though their POc antecedents had *k, and Anejoffi (and other SV languages) also suggest that PSOc had *g in these forms:

POc PSOc Anj
*[i]ko[e] *igo a/ek ‘you SG’
*kiita *gida a/kaj- ‘we INC’
*komu *gomu a/kum* ‘put in mouth’

In looking at the two focal pronouns, it is important to point out that most of the POc pronouns reconstructed as containing *k appear to have changed this *k to *g at some Pre-PSV stage. Compare the POc pronouns below with those reconstructed for Proto North-Central Vanuatu (Clark 1985, n.d.),10 and with those that I will reconstruct for PSV in Chapter 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PNCV</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*[i]ko[e]</td>
<td>*n/igo</td>
<td>*igo(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC.NONSG</td>
<td>*kiita</td>
<td>*kida</td>
<td>*gadi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.NONSG</td>
<td>*ka[m]ji, *kamami</td>
<td>*gam{am}ji</td>
<td>*gam(i)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>*ka[m]u, kamiu</td>
<td>*gamuyu</td>
<td>*gami(u)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I suggest that Anejoffi a/ek ‘2SG’ and a/kaj- ‘1INC.NONSG’ reflect Pre-PSV forms *igo and *gida respectively. We are thus on fairly sure ground in suggesting that POc/PSOc *g became Anejoffi k.

---

10 Recall that I use POc orthography for PSOc/PNCV and not the orthography used by Clark. Note that the first exclusive and second person non-singular pronouns have undergone separate developments in Anejoffi.
POc *k, like most other POc consonants, seems to have been lost in AnejoM when it was in absolute final position in POc. The vast majority of occurrences of non-final *k in my data become AnejoM y; for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *k</th>
<th>Anj y</th>
<th>Erromango</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kani</td>
<td>yiɲ</td>
<td>‘eat (TR)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kaRaka</td>
<td>a/yray</td>
<td>‘creep’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*keli</td>
<td>a/yji-i</td>
<td>‘dig’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kita</td>
<td>e/yet, e/yta-i</td>
<td>‘see’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kona</td>
<td>a/yen, e/yni-i</td>
<td>‘bitter, poison’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kuu</td>
<td>ne/yet</td>
<td>‘louse’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*liko(s)</td>
<td>a/yje-i</td>
<td>‘hang up’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(p,b)ikuR-</td>
<td>n/iy-e-i</td>
<td>‘tail’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bak(i,e)wa</td>
<td>n/e/pyev</td>
<td>‘shark’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pisiko-</td>
<td>no/hɔthye-</td>
<td>‘flesh’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tokon</td>
<td>i/se-y</td>
<td>‘walk w. stick’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma-taku</td>
<td>e/mi-tay</td>
<td>‘fear’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toka</td>
<td>a/tey, e/tey</td>
<td>‘stay’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rakum~a</td>
<td>n/ra-y</td>
<td>‘k.o. crab’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*siko</td>
<td>ne/θey</td>
<td>‘kingfisher’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a small group of words in which non-final POc *k is inexplicably lost; I attempt to note parallels with other SV languages in the list below, where the symbol — means that the form is not reflected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *k</th>
<th>Anj Ø</th>
<th>Erromango</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*masakit</td>
<td>e/mθa</td>
<td>‘sick’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mata-kut</td>
<td>e/miθ/a-ɲ</td>
<td>‘fear’</td>
<td>lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td>m&quot;ap&quot;o-</td>
<td>‘grandchild’</td>
<td>PEr *γ PTn *γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kurup’ena</td>
<td>no/up’on</td>
<td>‘fishing net’</td>
<td>PEr *γ PTn *k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kurat</td>
<td>no/uras</td>
<td>‘Morinda citrifolia’</td>
<td>PEr *γ lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka-pé</td>
<td>n/ahθ/e-θ</td>
<td>‘k.o. crab’</td>
<td>PTn *γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tuqaka-</td>
<td>e/wa-</td>
<td>‘same-sex sibling’</td>
<td>lost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a small group of words in which POc *k is reflected as *k:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *k</th>
<th>Anj k</th>
<th>Erromango</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*karis</td>
<td>a/krθ</td>
<td>‘scratch (a person)’</td>
<td>but cf. a/yreθ ‘scrape (a thing)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*potak</td>
<td>a/htak/wai</td>
<td>‘split (wood)’</td>
<td>may not be cognate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tabakau</td>
<td>ni/jip-akau</td>
<td>‘special k.o. mat’</td>
<td>may be a loan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bokasi</td>
<td>pikaθ</td>
<td>‘pig’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the last form, *bokasi, Tanna languages also show *k for expected *γ, though Erromango has a *γ reflex.

Thus it appears that *g > k and *k > y, though there were some cases in which *k was lost, and some in which *k > k.
Proto Erromango is reconstructed as having had three velar phonemes, \(*k\), \(*g\) and \(*\gamma\), a system which matches the velar obstruents of Ura. In the Erromangan languages, velar consonants are not particularly common word-initially, and this is especially true of the fricative \(\gamma\) (except for the 3SG verbal prefix \(\gamma\)-). In final position, Sye disallows \(\eta k\) and \(k\) is rare, while Ura disallows \(\gamma\).

PEr \(*k\) is reflected as \(k\) in both Sye and Ura in all positions, except that in final position the Sye reflex is \(\gamma\) rather than \(k\):

**PEr \(*k\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye (k-\kappa-\gamma)</th>
<th>Ura (k)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kilkil</td>
<td>kilkil</td>
<td>'fish-hook'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompaloji</td>
<td>kobahlini</td>
<td>'thank you!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kou</td>
<td>kou</td>
<td>'but'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulakih</td>
<td>ulakis</td>
<td>'rat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netukus</td>
<td>netukus</td>
<td>'salt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etikum</td>
<td>etikum</td>
<td>'close the mouth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etvuraknį</td>
<td>ervuraknį</td>
<td>'share out'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navsokikrai</td>
<td>navsokikrai</td>
<td>'bat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekil</td>
<td>neskil</td>
<td>'snake'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selkivan</td>
<td>selkivan</td>
<td>'bear children at close intervals'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atoy</td>
<td>atok</td>
<td>'salty'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esomsay</td>
<td>esomsak</td>
<td>'haemorrhoids'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nevoy</td>
<td>nevok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yamoy</td>
<td>yamek</td>
<td>'k.o. banana'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prenasalised voiced stop \(*g\) behaves similarly to its labial counterpart. In initial position, it is reflected as Sye \(k\), Ura \(g\):

**PEr \(*g\)-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye (k-\gamma)</th>
<th>Ura (g)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kahai</td>
<td>gasu</td>
<td>'only, alone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam</td>
<td>gim</td>
<td>'we EXC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koh</td>
<td>gis</td>
<td>'we INC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>gu</td>
<td>'or'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medially, it is reflected as \(\eta k\) in Sye, and as \(g\) in Ura except when it is preconsonantal, in which environment it loses its stop quality and is reflected as \(\eta\):

**PEr \(*g\)-/ \(-C\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye (-\eta k)</th>
<th>Ura (-\eta)-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nanfrai</td>
<td>uŋlai</td>
<td>'flying-fox'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tungklaŋ</td>
<td>dʊŋlaŋ</td>
<td>'sea-snake'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tagkli</td>
<td>talŋi</td>
<td>'ask' [subsequent metathesis in Ura – (təŋli &gt; talŋi) ?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consonants

PEr *-g- else

Sye -ŋk- Ura -g-

anŋkau agau ‘crooked, bent’
nayku nago ‘if’
monŋkum mogum ‘parrotfish’
nevloŋko- nevlege/n ‘piece, part’
tonŋilnau togilnau ‘juvenile mackerel’

One comparison, Sye namkai, Ura namgai ‘dry coconut’, suggests that Sye ŋk loses the nasal when preceded by another nasal. In final position, PEr *g appears to be reflected as Sye ŋ, Ura k:11

PEr *-g

Sye -ŋ Ura -k

-ŋ -k ‘my; 1SG possessive suffix’
nivson ŋivsek ‘midrib of coconut leaf’

The third velar obstruent, *y, is reflected as y in all environments in Sye except before i, where it is reflected as k. In Ura, it is reflected as y non-finally but as Ø finally:

PEr *-y/-_i

Sye -k- Ura -y-
mor-uki mor-uye ‘k.o. breadfruit’
soki eyi ‘climb up, copulate’
oryoki eleyi ‘pick up, carry’
atki aryi ‘knock’
workirki worryiyi ‘narrow’

PEr *y else

Sye y Ura y-y-Ø

yorevenwo yorevenuwo ‘k.o. yam’
y- y- ‘3SG verbal prefix’
ayup ayup ‘cloudy, about to rain’
nayah nayas ‘cool season’
novvat novvat ‘plantar wart’
novri- novri/n ‘side’
telyor delyor ‘(spear) point’
tampyi tamyai ‘brace self when walking downhill’
utyol netyol ‘k.o. fish’

11 I have found two cases of k:k in final position: Sye, Ura tokak ‘cluck’, and Sye, Ura nakik ‘foam, froth’. The first of these is suspiciously onomatopoeic, and I suggest that the second be treated as irregular unless more such cases can be identified.
There are also a number of instances of sporadic loss of medial velar consonants in one of the Erromangan languages, a feature which occurs also in Tanna; for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k:Ø noki</td>
<td>nei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k:Ø mehikai</td>
<td>misai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k:Ø sukrim</td>
<td>suworem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k:Ø omonki</td>
<td>omni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k:Ø elki</td>
<td>elei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø:k telouni</td>
<td>telkouni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarise, the velar obstruent correspondences are as follows. (I do not have sufficient data to decide how *γ was reflected in Utaha.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*g</td>
<td>k-η</td>
<td>g-η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>γ-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I now turn to examine the reflexes of the POc velars in Proto Erromango. PEr *g derives from POc or PSOc *g:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *g &gt; PEr *g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye k-η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gam{amji}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *igo[e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gomu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *baga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also that PSOc *gamiu 'you PL' develops regularly in Sye as kimi but irregularly in Ura as 1imi (for expected gimi).

By far the commonest reflex of POc *k is PEr *γ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *k &gt; PEr *γ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye k-/-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kaRaka n/arayaray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*keli o/ŋəl-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kita o/yhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kilala o/kili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kona a/ŋan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kopu a/ŋup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kuliti no/ŋyleh-nan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When initial *ku was preceded by the animate prefix u- in Ura, the sequence *uku appears to have become wi. That is, I suggest that although the Sye forms below accreted *na-, the Ura forms derive from *u-kuRita and *u-kutu respectively. 12

POc  Sye  Ura  Compare
*kuRita  no/ywoh  wis  ‘octopus’
*kutu  no/yut  wit  ‘louse’

There is also a handful of words in which POc*k is unpredictably lost in the Erromangan languages, though it is retained in at least one other SV language; the first example below refers to initial *k only.

POc *k > PEr Ø  

Sye  Ura  Compare
*kaRaka  n/arayaray  ‘k.o. creeper’  A a/rray
*matakut  e/metet  e/metet  ‘fear (INTR)’  A e/metay
*toka  e/te  e/ra  ‘stay’  A a/tey
*kani  eni  eni  ‘eat (TR)’  A yiin
*kape  n/ev/lah  w/av/llis  ‘k.o. crab’  L kav/los
*bak(e,i)wa  ne/mpou  u/beu  ‘shark’  A ne/pev
*ka/yu  n/ei  n/i  ‘tree’  A n/yai

There are only a very few cases in which POc *k > PEr *k:

POc *k > PEr *k  

Sye  Ura  k-k-γ
*sake  say  yok  ‘(go) up’
*kasupe  ula/kih  ula/kis  ‘rat’
*tasik  a/toy  a/tok  ‘salty’

With the last item above, compare *tasik > Sye no/toy, Ura de ‘sea’, in which *k regularly becomes PEr *y.

12 Ura seems to have prefixed u- to a much wider range of animate nouns than Sye – see §5.2.1.
It thus appears that, at least as far as Proto Erromango is concerned, we have a similar situation as with the labial stops: the voiced stop remained a voiced stop; the voiceless stop became a fricative, but a small number of occurrences of POc *k developed into voiceless stops.

2.3.2.3 Proto Tanna

The distribution of prenasalised stops in North Tanna – the criterion Tanna language for the oral/prenasalised distinction – is defective: there are prenasalised stops corresponding to p̆, p and t, but none corresponding to k. In addition, note that, unlike in the Erromangan languages, there is no velar fricative phoneme in any modern Tanna language.

The evidence suggests, however, that Proto Tanna was like Anejo¯m: it had a voiceless stop and another velar obstruent, almost certainly a fricative. There are five reasonably regular sets of velar correspondences, but four of these reflect PTn *y:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn *k</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*k</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I reconstruct *γ for the four sets on the right – whose conditioning will be discussed below – since it appears to represent a more lenited phoneme than *k, with stop, nasal and zero reflexes. Positing *γ, even though this phoneme does not occur in any Tanna language, seems the best hypothesis on both internal and external evidence.

I reconstruct Proto Tanna *k for the correspondence set which has k in all positions in all Tanna languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn *k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kat-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kat-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kᾱi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kᾱi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kᾱi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kop*iel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kop*iel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aikuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aikuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eikuaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eikuaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>åskasèk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>åskasèk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ausèk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ausèk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>øvsøk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>øvsøk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avahak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avahak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'we inclusive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'flying-fox'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'and (clausal)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'stone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'wash (TR)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'k.o. spider'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'scratch'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be dry'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phoneme derives from POc (or PSOc)*g and corresponds with Proto Erromango *g. Note first the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc*g</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PTn *k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn k</td>
<td>Wsn k</td>
<td>Len k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gida</td>
<td>*kii-</td>
<td>*kat-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gam[am]i</td>
<td>*kam-</td>
<td>*kam-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gamiu</td>
<td>*kami-</td>
<td>*kami-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *gomu</td>
<td>a/kum*</td>
<td>a/k*&quot;m*-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*logu</td>
<td>laku/\bn</td>
<td>ruku/\bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc *igo[e]</td>
<td>ik</td>
<td>ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*baga</td>
<td>na/pək</td>
<td>ne/pək</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-gu</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also the following additional cases where PTn \*k corresponds with PEr \*g:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *g</th>
<th>PTn *k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye \ŋk</td>
<td>Ura g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mon\ŋkum</td>
<td>mogum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na/ŋkrai</td>
<td>ű/lai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aŋkau</td>
<td>agau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a large group of words which show POc \*k > PTn \*y. There is a complex set of correspondences here, and I am not wholly satisfied that I clearly understand the conditioning. However, it appears to be as follows.

(a) Adjacent to a front vowel, \*y is reflected as \*k in Southwest Tanna and is lost in the other languages. (The last form in the examples below shows the same correspondence set, but in a different environment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *k / *i,*e</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PTn *y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn Ø</td>
<td>Wsn Ø</td>
<td>Len Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*keli</td>
<td>il</td>
<td>il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-akini</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ilikos</td>
<td>ə/liis</td>
<td>ə/liis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tasik</td>
<td>dehi</td>
<td>nə/tehi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*palij(i)k</td>
<td>-n/\vəhl</td>
<td>-n/\vəhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pekas</td>
<td>nien</td>
<td>nien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td>\m&quot;i/p”ə-</td>
<td>\m&quot;i/p”ə-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Although there is not a great deal of evidence, \*y in absolute initial position (before a non-front vowel), or root-finally before a possessive suffix, was apparently lost in all Tanna languages except Lenakel, which retains it as \*k.

---

\(^{13}\) This form may have had a final \*k in some Pre-PSV language.
POc *k/#, __-POSS > PTn *γ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn Ø</th>
<th>Wsn Ø</th>
<th>Len k</th>
<th>SWT Ø</th>
<th>Kwm Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kaRat-i</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>kas</td>
<td>ahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kani</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qutok</td>
<td>no/uta-</td>
<td>no/hta-</td>
<td>neno/urek</td>
<td>kura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naβ*ato-</td>
<td>nα*ato-</td>
<td>nα<em>p</em>elak*α-</td>
<td>nαpplaa-</td>
<td>nαpra-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) In final position other than as outlined above, *γ is reflected as η in North Tanna and Whitesands, k in Lenakel, and was lost in Southwest Tanna and Kwamera.

POc *k/# > PTn *γ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn η</th>
<th>Wsn η</th>
<th>Len k</th>
<th>SWT Ø</th>
<th>Kwm Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*toku</td>
<td>α/τοη</td>
<td>α/τοη</td>
<td>a/rok</td>
<td>a/ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapak</td>
<td>αιη</td>
<td>αιη</td>
<td>ivak</td>
<td>iva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*manuk</td>
<td>menη</td>
<td>menη</td>
<td>menuk</td>
<td>mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nامuk</td>
<td>κα/μαη</td>
<td>μω/μαη</td>
<td>μω/μυκ</td>
<td>m*i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mouη</td>
<td>mouη</td>
<td>mouη</td>
<td>makua</td>
<td>makwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*aiη</td>
<td>aiη</td>
<td>aiη</td>
<td>aru</td>
<td>aru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metmetη</td>
<td>metmetη</td>
<td>metruk</td>
<td>malamala</td>
<td>mου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) In other environments, *γ is reflected as η in North Tanna and Whitesands, as k in Lenakel, and is normally lost in Kwamera (though there are one or two instances of k); in Southwest Tanna it is sometimes lost and sometimes reflected as k.

POc *k > PTn *γ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn η</th>
<th>Wsn η</th>
<th>Len k</th>
<th>SWT k ~ Ø</th>
<th>Kwm Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kutu</td>
<td>κα/νατ</td>
<td>κα/νατ</td>
<td>kur</td>
<td>kel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapak</td>
<td>να/η</td>
<td>να/η</td>
<td>nα/k</td>
<td>n'ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kayu</td>
<td>αιη</td>
<td>ατη</td>
<td>αρκι</td>
<td>alki-pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naŋanmabo-</td>
<td>naŋanmopra-</td>
<td>amnhok</td>
<td>nakanmopra</td>
<td>nakanmpau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anjaban</td>
<td>n'enjo</td>
<td>n'iko</td>
<td>lau</td>
<td>‘canoe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naβenεηα-</td>
<td>naβanαηα-</td>
<td>ap'am</td>
<td>‘forehead’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aβanam</td>
<td>aβηηom</td>
<td>p'am</td>
<td>‘hot’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kutu(m,η)</td>
<td>katem</td>
<td>katem</td>
<td>karom</td>
<td>‘basket’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasupε</td>
<td>kahap</td>
<td>kahau</td>
<td>i'ahuk&quot;</td>
<td>‘rat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kup-evena</td>
<td>na/kap'εm</td>
<td>na/kapun</td>
<td>na/kapun</td>
<td>‘fishing net’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bokasi</td>
<td>pukαs</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>pukah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there is also a sizeable number of cases where POc *k is reflected as PTn *k – i.e. as k in all languages (with sporadic loss):

POc *k > PTn *k

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn k</th>
<th>Wsn k</th>
<th>Len k</th>
<th>SWT k</th>
<th>Kwm k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kalo</td>
<td>ma/kel</td>
<td>ma/kali</td>
<td>ma/kal</td>
<td>m'a/kal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*katem(m,η)</td>
<td>katem</td>
<td>karom</td>
<td>‘basket’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasupε</td>
<td>kahap</td>
<td>kahau</td>
<td>i'ahuk&quot;</td>
<td>‘rat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kup-evena</td>
<td>na/kap'εm</td>
<td>na/kapun</td>
<td>na/kapun</td>
<td>‘fishing net’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bokasi</td>
<td>pukαs</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>pukah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, then, we have the following reflexes of the POc velar stops in Tanna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*g</td>
<td>*g</td>
<td>*g</td>
<td>*g</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*k (fortis?)</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*k (lenis?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>*i, *e; O</td>
<td>#; else</td>
<td>*i, *e;</td>
<td>else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>*i, *e; O</td>
<td>#; else</td>
<td>*i, *e;</td>
<td>else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>*i, *e;</td>
<td>_; else</td>
<td>_; else</td>
<td>_; else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>#; else</td>
<td>#; k else</td>
<td>#; k else</td>
<td>#; _; k else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>_; else</td>
<td>_; k else</td>
<td>_; else</td>
<td>_; k else</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.4 Proto Southern Vanuatu

I suggest that the development of the velar obstruents in the SV languages was as shown in Table 2.3 which, for completeness, also includes the reflexes of POc *ŋ.

| Table 2.3: Proto Southern Vanuatu velar correspondences |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| POc             | *g  | *k fortis? | *k lenis? | *ŋ/ _*i, *e |
| PSV             | *g  | *k | *ŋ | |
| PEr             | *g  | *k | *ŋ | |
| PTn             | *k | *ŋ | |
| Anj             | k | *ŋ | *ŋ | |

PSV *g derives from POc *g, and the regular reflex of POc *k was PSV *ŋ. However, after the lenition of POc *k to *ŋ, a third velar obstruent, PSV *k, developed. It is difficult to see what the conditioning was, and it may reflect the same kind of fortis/lenis distinction which I mentioned in relation to the labial stops (§2.3.3; see Ross 1988:47ff.).

2.4 Liquids and Proto Oceanic *R

Proto Southern Vanuatu is reconstructed as having had two liquids, *l and *r. These derive from the POc liquids *l, *r, *R (and possibly also *dr – see §2.4.5), all of which show interesting developments in the Southern Vanuatu languages.

2.4.1 Proto Oceanic *R

Proto Oceanic *R has long been of interest to Oceanists because of the sporadic and unpredictable nature of its reflexes in many languages. Geraghty (1990:51), for example, prefaced his thorough study of Proto Eastern Oceanic *R by saying that,
in the historical phonology and classification of Oceanic languages, probably no phoneme has been more extensively studied and used than *R...Because of its varied reflexes, there is uncertainty as to its original phonetic nature, though the most recent appraisal (Ross 1986 [published as Ross 1988]) argues that it was a uvular fricative in Proto Oceanic. In any case, it must have been a highly unstable sound, since it is nowhere retained as a distinct phoneme.

It is possible to make the generalisation that POc word-final *R was lost in the SV languages. The only apparent exception is the following:

\[ \text{POc} *\text{mimiR} \text{‘urinate'} \rightarrow \text{Wsn a/mialili, Len a/miamiil, SWT a/mialil} \]

This set of forms may actually derive from the transitive form *mimiR-ı ‘urinate on’, in which *R was not word-final; note that *mimiR has another set of reflexes which do show loss of *R: NTn a/m, Wsn, Len, Kwm a/mi, SWT aa/m, a/mi.

Of the non-final occurrences of etyma containing POc *R which have reflexes in the Southern Vanuatu languages, about half show a merger of *R with *r (as PSV *r), while the other half show zero reflexes in all languages which reflect that etymon. Further, there seems to be no way of predicting the retention of non-final *R. The examples in Table 2.4 will illustrate this. In that table, the labels E, T and A stand for Erromango, Tanna and Anejoffi; R indicates retention of *R, Ø indicates loss, -# indicates regular loss of word-final PSV *r in Anejoffi, and a blank indicates no reflex. In the discussion which follows, therefore, expressions such as ‘the reflexes of *R’ are to be interpreted as ‘the reflexes of POc non-final *R in those etyma in which it is retained’.

| Table 2.4: POc *R in Southern Vanuatu |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| POc *R retained | POc *R lost    |
|                 | E   | T   | A  |   | E   | T   | A  |
| *Rapi ‘evening’ | R   | R   | R  | *Ropok ‘fly’ | Ø   | Ø   |
| *maRi ‘breadfruit’ | R   | R   | -# | *waRisa ‘two days away’ | Ø   | Ø   |
| *paRa ‘wall’    | R   | -#  |    | *taRaqi ‘cut’ | Ø   | Ø   |
| *tuRi ‘sew’     | R   | R   | R  | *tapuRi ‘conch shell’ | Ø   | Ø   |
| *yaRu ‘Casuarina sp.’ | R   | R   | -# | *paRu ‘Hibiscus tiliaceus’ | Ø   | Ø   |

2.4.2 Proto Erromango

There are three correspondence sets involving liquids in the Erromangan languages, suggesting three protophonemes, which I will write as *l, *r and *L. The basic correspondences are:

\[ \text{PEr} \quad *l \quad *r \quad *L \]
\[ \text{Sye} \quad l \quad r \quad r \]
\[ \text{Ura} \quad l \quad r \quad l \]

The following illustrate these correspondences:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *l</th>
<th>Sye l</th>
<th>Ura l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lator</td>
<td>lator</td>
<td>'line'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levsau</td>
<td>levsau</td>
<td>'disciple'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elani</td>
<td>elani</td>
<td>'avoid'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nilar</td>
<td>nilar</td>
<td>'a light'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tali</td>
<td>tali</td>
<td>'satiated'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helnivi</td>
<td>selnivi</td>
<td>'beam at top of roof'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alyap</td>
<td>alyap</td>
<td>'attach(ed)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nelpo-</td>
<td>nelpo/n</td>
<td>'trunk, main part'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amplehi</td>
<td>amlesi</td>
<td>'stick on to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noyleh ntan</td>
<td>noyles dan</td>
<td>'skin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nayal</td>
<td>nayal</td>
<td>'arrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savel</td>
<td>afel</td>
<td>'whistle through pursed lips'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nehkil</td>
<td>neskil</td>
<td>'snake'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *r</th>
<th>Sye r</th>
<th>Ura r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ra</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>'oblique preposition'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amarat</td>
<td>amarat</td>
<td>'sick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orari</td>
<td>arare</td>
<td>'flow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oranj</td>
<td>ergji</td>
<td>'hear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aryar</td>
<td>aryar</td>
<td>'jealous'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avrui</td>
<td>avruk</td>
<td>'cough'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aromprom</td>
<td>aromrom</td>
<td>'shy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nivir</td>
<td>nifir</td>
<td>'(fruit) bunch'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahor</td>
<td>asor</td>
<td>'shout'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayur</td>
<td>ayur</td>
<td>'wilt, mourn'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *L</th>
<th>Sye r</th>
<th>Ura l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/renyuŋ</td>
<td>lanynŋ</td>
<td>'wild cane'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/rau</td>
<td>lau</td>
<td>'heliconia'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/rewo-</td>
<td>lere-</td>
<td>'paternal aunt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/romo</td>
<td>lama</td>
<td>'strong'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narep</td>
<td>nalip</td>
<td>'vein, tendon'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nr/uru</td>
<td>g'/elu</td>
<td>'two'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noromuntan</td>
<td>nilomudan</td>
<td>'dorsal fin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norop</td>
<td>nelip</td>
<td>'k.o. roof beam'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narvin</td>
<td>nalvin</td>
<td>'sand, beach'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nevre</td>
<td>nevla</td>
<td>'sprouting coconut'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petrihoŋ</td>
<td>netlisonŋ</td>
<td>'(house) back wall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etri</td>
<td>ehi</td>
<td>'pierce, sew'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ovronj</td>
<td>ovlehnji</td>
<td>'call'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is also correspondence between Sye \textit{nr} and Ura \textit{d} in non-final position, which I suggest derives from an *\textit{n} + *\textit{r} cluster. In final position, *\textit{nr} becomes Ura \textit{n}.

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{PEr} & \textbf{*n} & \textbf{+} & \textbf{*r} \\
\textbf{Sye} & \textbf{l} & \textbf{r} & \textbf{r} \\
\textbf{Ura} & \textbf{t} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{V} & \textbf{; O} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{;} & \textbf{r} & \textbf{else} & \textbf{l} \\
\textbf{Uth} & \textbf{l} & \textbf{r} & \textbf{l} \\
\end{tabular}

I suggest that *\textit{r} > Ura \textit{t} after *\textit{n}, with \textit{nt} regularly coalescing as \textit{d} (see §2.5.2.2). The following example suggests that this analysis may be correct:

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Sye} \textit{nr} & \textbf{Ura} \textit{t / C} _\textbf{—} \\
\textit{imnu} & \textit{imnuru} & \textbf{‘feel pity’} \\
\end{tabular}

The Ura form above suggests underlying \textit{imnuru}, with the \textit{n} being deleted in the middle of the three-consonant cluster, and \textit{nt} not undergoing the change to \textit{d} in this case.

Thus the preliminary set of correspondences given above can be modified as follows:

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{PEr} & \textbf{*l} & \textbf{+} & \textbf{*r} & \textbf{+} & \textbf{*L} \\
\textbf{Sye} & \textbf{l} & \textbf{r} & \textbf{r} \\
\textbf{Ura} & \textbf{t} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{V} & \textbf{; O} & \textbf{n} & \textbf{;} & \textbf{r} & \textbf{else} & \textbf{l} \\
\textbf{Uth} & \textbf{l} & \textbf{r} & \textbf{l} \\
\end{tabular}

There are a few \textit{l}:\textit{r} correspondences, which may involve the \textit{l} ~ \textit{r} variation mentioned by Crowley (cf. §1.5 above):

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{Sye} & \textbf{l} & \textbf{Ura} & \textbf{r} \\
\textit{ilampe} & \textit{erpa} & \textbf{‘over there’} \\
\textit{elpo} & \textit{erpo} & \textbf{‘bald’} \\
\textit{oiki} & \textit{oyori} & \textbf{‘know’} \\
\textit{nulu} & \textit{nouri/n} & \textbf{‘penis’} \\
\end{tabular}

POC *\textit{l} is reflected as PEr *\textit{l} in all environments:
POc *l > PEr *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye l</th>
<th>Ura l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*laŋo</td>
<td>w/laŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*likos</td>
<td>e/lei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*luaq</td>
<td>elwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bulut</td>
<td>a/mlesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kali. *keli</td>
<td>o/yal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kuliti</td>
<td>no/yleh-ntan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*quloc</td>
<td>n/ila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tsaŋ</td>
<td>ne/lis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*talise</td>
<td>n/teli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *R (when retained) merges with *r, but there appear to be two reflexes – PEr *r (Sye, Ura r) and PEr *L (Sye r, Ura l). Below I give the relevant forms.

POc *r,*R > PEr *r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye r</th>
<th>Ura r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*roŋor</td>
<td>o/rəŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*raŋap</td>
<td>n/arap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maqurip</td>
<td>o/murep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*māruqen</td>
<td>nuv-mori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qaRa(r)</td>
<td>n/ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paRi</td>
<td>u/var</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *r,*R > PEr *L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye nr-r-r</th>
<th>Ura l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*rua</td>
<td>nru/ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ra(n,ŋ)i</td>
<td>n/ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rapi</td>
<td>pwa/rap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*=ra</td>
<td>-il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(k)ira</td>
<td>IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paraq</td>
<td>ne/vre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maRi</td>
<td>na/mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tuRi</td>
<td>e/tri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am unable at this stage to account for this variation. However, I note again Crowley's comment (see §1.5 above) concerning accountable variations between l and r in transcriptions of Ura data. There may have been some fluctuation between these two phonemes in Ura, or a partial change from r > l in that language. For our purposes here, I will treat PEr *r and *L as variant reflexes of PSV *r.

Note also the following comparison, which shows the reverse mismatch (Sye l, Ura r): POc *(w,v)ele > Sye velŋah, Ura ni/verŋi `Barringtonia edulis'.

---

14 The POc and Sye terms refer to *Terminalia catappa*, the Ura to *Inocarpus* sp.
2.4.3 Anjom

In Anjom, POC *R and *r merge as r initially and medially; with the single exception of *paRi > n/har 'stingray', both *R and *r are lost word-finally:

POC *r, *R > Anj r-, -r-, Ø

|rarap| n'ara | 'coral tree' |
|raqan-| n/'ra-| 'branch' |
|rakum"a| n'ray| 'k.o. crab' |
|rua| e/'rou| 'two' |
|Rapi| n/jup-ura| 'afternoon' |
|=ra| -r-| '3NSNSG object suffix' |
|karis| a/'kreθ| 'scratch' |
|a/'yreθ| | 'scrape' |
|kaRaka| a/'ray| 'creep' |
|(kjira| a/'ar-| '3NSNSG focal pronoun' |
|irip| e/'rerei| | 'fan' |
|kurat| no/'uras| 'Morinda cirrifolia' |
|maRi| n/mar-, n/mer-| 'breadfruit (in compounds)' |
|n/ma| | 'breadfruit' |
|ñoro| ya| 'flow uncontrollably' |
|maqurip| w/mu| 'live' |
|balur| pela-ñ| 'mix' |

Anjom has two reflexes of *l conditioned by the following vowel. Before POC *i, *e and *o, POC *l is reflected as j:

POC *l/ *i, e, o > Anj j

kalisi, *keli| a/'jjje-i| 'dig' |
|likos| a/'jjei| 'tie up, hang' |
|lima-| n/jma-| 'hand' |
|lipon-| ne/jhe-, ni/jho-| 'tooth' |
|molis| ne/pjeθ| 'citrus' |
|talise| n/tejjeθ| 'Terminalia catappa' |
|talije-| n/tjjeθ-| 'ear' |
|paliqi| na/pjes| 'grass' |
|muli| aθw/m'ojo| 'return' |
|b"ilo| ne/pje-| 'container' |
|quloc| n/ija| 'maggot' |
|m"alo| n/m'oje| 'reef' |

There is also the comparison *kawil > n/yowoj 'fish-hook'. This may involve palatalisation of word-final *l after *i. On the other hand, the POC source may have had the transitive suffix (with the meaning 'fish with a hook') which was later lost – i.e. *kawil-i > n/yowoj.

In other environments, *l is reflected as Anjom i:

44 Chapter 2
There are only a few exceptions to these rules. POc *l does not undergo expected palatalisation in *lisaq > na/laθ ‘nit’ nor in *tolo > a/tlen, e/tlen ‘to swallow’. The form ne/lom ‘algae, moss’ looks as if it derives from POc *lumut, though forms in other SV languages apparently derive from the doublet *limut.

2.4.4 Proto Tanna

In Northern Tanna, there are two correspondence sets involving liquids (other than those involving r as a reflex of a stop or a sibilant in some Tanna languages); in Southern Tanna, however, there is only one. I will show below that POc *l, *r and *R all merged in Proto Tanna, and I reconstruct the protophoneme as *r for reasons I will explain in §2.4.6. This phoneme was continued as *r in Proto Southern Tanna (PST), but split in Proto Northern Tanna (PNT) into *i (often phonetically [y]) and PNT *l; the conditioning of the split will be discussed below.15

---

15 The SWT reflex of *r is l in the dialect I have most data for, but r in another (l-less) dialect for which I also have some data. Note also (i) that ai often coalesces as e, and (ii) that Lenakel has lost the final VC in the word meaning ‘breadfruit’, and thus does not retain PTn *r here.
As I said above, POC *l, *r and *R all merge as PTn *r. Before POC *i, *e and *o, PTn *r is reflected as PTN *l:

POC *l, *r, *R/ *i, *e, *o > PTN *r, PNT *l

*kali, *keli
L il, K eri
'dig'

*likos
L a/liis, K a/rihi
'tie up, hang'

*lina-
L ne/la-, S k'a/lmi-
'hand'

*lipon-
L ne/lu-, K k"a-revu-
'tooth'

*limut
L, S lamos
'moss, seaweed'

*lisha
L k'i/la, K k"a-resa
'nit'

*molis
L na/molh, K na/mari
'citrus'

*taline
L telh
'Terminalia catappa'

*talija-
L nam"atelna-, K nak"a-renei
'ear'

*paliij
L na/vhaal, K nurhi
'grass'

*kalo
L makal, K ka/mari
'(k.o.) spider'

*b"ilo
L uw/pol
'container'

*quloc
S n/ilha
'maggot'

*logu
L laku/n, K ruku/vn
'carry under arms'

*irip
L il-il, K eri-eri
'to fan'

*tuRi
L, S a/lel
'sew'

*ma-wiRi
L mul, K mour
'left (hand)'

PEOC *buRe
L a/p"ol-a/p"ol, K a/p"or
'bubble, boil'

There is also some evidence that POC *l, *r and *R became PNT *l immediately following *i. The PSV oblique preposition *ira- is reflected as Lenakel le, and there are also the cases below:

POC *l, *r, *R/ *i__ > PTN *r, PNT *l

*(k)ira
L il-, K ir-
'3NONSG focal pronoun'

*b"ilo
L uw/pol
'coconut shell container'

In other environments, PTn *r is reflected as PNT *i:

POC *l, *r, *R else > PTN *r, PNT *i

*lab"at
L ip"er, K repu-
'big'

*laoo
L k/iang, S e/lao
'a fly'

*luaq
L eu (<a-iua), S lua
'vomit'

*bulut
L a/p"iit
'stick, stick to'

*quran
W ae-rohi, S luan-tahik
'crayfish'?

*rapar
L na/isv
'coral tree'

*rakum"a
L iakem
'crab sp.'

*ral(n)i
L n/ian, K ia/ran
'day'

*paraq
L nien-w/via, K nw/vera
'sprouting coconut'
There are, however, some cases in Northern Tanna where we find *i for expected *l or *l for expected *i. Most of these seem to be, in other respects, fairly clear cognates, and I have no explanation for the ‘wrong’ reflexes:

POc *l, *r, *R / _*i,e,o > PNT *i for expected *l
*tales W na/rei, S na/tel 'taro'
*maRi W na/mei, K ne/mer 'breadfruit'
*liqo-si L e/i/i/ny-, S e/iha- 'look in certain direction'

POc *l, *r, *R else > PNT *l for expected *i
*malaso L mlal, S l/mla 'cold'
*qulug-an L aluga 'lay head on pillow' (may be a Futuna loan)
*marana L a/mls, K mer 'shine'
*uRat L noua-n/nul, S na/ur 'vein'
*yaRu L n/iel, K n/ier 'Casuarina sp.'

2.4.5 Proto Oceanic *dr

I have so far not discussed the reflexes of POc *dr. This an infrequently occurring phoneme in POc, and etyma reflecting it are particularly infrequent in the SV languages. A few etyma suggest that *dr merged with POc *r and *R as PSV *r:16

POc *dr > PSV *r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*draRaq</td>
<td>n/ta-</td>
<td>na/ra-</td>
<td>na/ta, na/taa-</td>
<td>na/tau-</td>
<td>ne/ta, na/te-</td>
<td>n/ja</td>
<td>'blood'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOc *ma-dreu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ripe(n)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there are other etyma showing *dr > PTn *d, Anj j, suggesting a merger with POc*d:

| POc *dr > PSV *d |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| *draRaq | n/ta- | na/ra- | na/ta, na/taa- | na/tau- | ne/ta, na/te- | n/ja | 'blood' |
| PEOc *ma-dreu | | | | | | | ‘ripe(n)’ |

16 The PSV 3SG possessive pronoun is reconstructed as *ni-ra, so initial n(V) in various languages reflects the first syllable of the PSV root.
The following forms for which I know of no POc reconstruction also suggest a merger with *d in Tanna and Anejoñ, though Sye has medial nr, which is neither the medial reflex of *d nor of *r:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na-dVw</td>
<td>nenru</td>
<td>nejev</td>
<td>‘kauri, Agathis sp.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na-dani</td>
<td>nanre</td>
<td>netan</td>
<td>netan</td>
<td>najeñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sye also has nre ‘blood’ (see above): it is not clear to me whether nr in this etymon reflects *dr, or whether this is n (article) + re < *draRaq. (Ura uga ‘blood’ is presumably not cognate.)

All of this fairly limited and confused information suggests that *dr may have been a cluster – perhaps *nr? – in (pre-)PSV, and that that cluster simplified sometimes as *d and sometimes as *r.

### 2.4.6 Proto Southern Vanuatu

The discussion in this chapter has established the reconstructions and correspondences listed in Table 2.5 (bearing in mind that POc final *R was lost, and that there are many cases of non-final *R > Ø).

| POc |  
|-----|---|
| PSV |  
| *l | *l, *e, *o |
| PEr |  
| *l | *i, *e, *o |
| PTn |  
| *i | *l |
| PNT |  
| PST |  
| Anj |  
| j | l |

| Table 2.5: Proto Southern liquid correspondences |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| POc | *l/ _i,*e,*o | *l else | *r,*R/ _i,*e,*o | *r,*R else | *dr |
| PSV | *l | *r | *d ~ *r |
| PEr | *l | *r ~ *L | *r ~ *L |
| PTn | *i | *l | *i | *d ~ *l |
| PNT | *r | *r | *r | *d ~ *r |
| PST | *r | *r | *r | *d ~ *r |
| Anj | j | l | r-r-Ø | j, r |

Now while *l > Anejoñ j before front vowels (and *o) is very clearly palatalisation, since the reflex is a palatal, the POc *l > Proto Northern Tanna reflex *i seems less like the result of palatalisation since, although the reflex can be considered palatal, the environment is the direct opposite of a normal palatalising one. Bhat (1978), however, notes that there is a tendency for non-lateral liquids to palatalise as liquids: that is, *r > l before front vowels is in fact a regular kind of palatalisation, and it is at least partly for this reason that I reconstruct the PTn reflex as *r rather than *l. There would then have been a subsequent change of *r > Proto North Tanna *i (phonetically [y] adjacent to another vowel) in a non-palatalising environment; although this is a somewhat unusual change, it does occur in at least some other Oceanic languages (Lynch 1996b:89-90).

---

17 Just why *l should palatalise before *o is a matter I will leave until the next chapter.
Consonants

Liquid palatalisation in Tanna only occurs in the Northern Tanna languages, and only occurred after the merger of POc *l, *r and *R. In Anejom, *l did not merge with *r or *R, and only *l underwent palatalisation. It appears therefore that, although Anejom and Northern Tanna liquid palatalisation are quite similar on the surface, they were actually two quite independent developments.

2.5 Other coronals

Proto Southern Vanuatu is reconstructed as having had the coronal stops *t and *d, the stop, affricate or sibilant *c, the sibilants *s and *j, the nasal *n and the glide *y. I begin with the last two, since they are the simplest to deal with. I will then deal with the stops, which pose more problems, and finally with the sibilants, which pose more problems still.

2.5.1 Coronal nasals and *γ

The evidence suggests that POc *n and *n̄ were distinct in PSV: POc *n is reflected as PSV *n, while POc *n̄ merges with *γ as PSV *γ.

2.5.1.1 POc *n̄ and *γ

Proto Southern Vanuatu *γ is reflected as *γ (occasionally *i) in PEr, as *i in PTn, and as *γ in Anejom. PEr and PTn *i will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 3; PEr *γ is reconstructed on the basis of the following cognates:

PEr *γ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye y</th>
<th>Ura y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yau</td>
<td>yau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yomput</td>
<td>yobut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyar</td>
<td>eyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nimpyau</td>
<td>nimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nivenye</td>
<td>nivenya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that POc *n̄ and *γ merged as PSV *γ, as suggested by the following, although the Tanna evidence is far from adequate:18

POc *γ > PSV *γ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘bayani</th>
<th>Sye y ~ i</th>
<th>Len i</th>
<th>Kwm i</th>
<th>Anj y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*yaRu</td>
<td>n/yar</td>
<td>n/iel</td>
<td>n/ier</td>
<td>n/ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*yanjo</td>
<td>mel/yan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 The palatal nasal in the 3SG possessive suffix *-na is an exception to this, being reflected as n in all SV languages. However, this development is found in a wide range of Oceanic languages which otherwise distinguish the reflexes of *n̄ from *n, and this suggests that the form was inherited as *-na in the SV languages.
POc *ñ > PSV *y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye y ~ i</th>
<th>Len i</th>
<th>Kwm i</th>
<th>Anj y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ñatuq</td>
<td>yetu</td>
<td>n/ier</td>
<td>n/yat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ñuu</td>
<td>or-a/yu</td>
<td>a/iyu</td>
<td>‘shade, shadow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ñamuk</td>
<td>yomoy</td>
<td>{mumuk}</td>
<td>n/yam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ñoRo</td>
<td>ninu</td>
<td>nenav</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comment is necessary on the last set. Two forms have been reconstructed with the meaning ‘yesterday’ in POc: *ñoRap and *qana-napi. In addition, Clark reconstructs a PNCV form *nanovi. I reconstruct PSV *na-yan(a,u)v, which suggests an earlier **ñana(v,w)V (preceded by the article *na- in Erromango and Tanna and by a locative/temporal prefix in Anejɔf). which appears to be some kind of blend of the two POc forms.

2.5.1.2 POc *n and nasal palatalisation

Proto Erromango and Proto Tanna both had the coronal nasal *n, which is reflected as n in all environments in all daughter languages and which derives from POc *n in all environments. Like its velar counterpart *ŋ, however, POc *n underwent palatalisation in Anejɔf, being reflected as ŋ before a front vowel and n elsewhere:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>n / __</em>i,*e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bayani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*boni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *munim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-m”agane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-pine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall from §2.3.1 that POc *ŋ underwent the same palatalisation in Anejɔf; that is:

POc *n, *ŋ / __*i,*e > Anj ŋ
POc *n else > Anj n
POc *ŋ else > Anj ŋ
Nasal palatalisation must have preceded final vowel loss, since final front vowels condition the palatalisation of a nasal before they are lost.\textsuperscript{19} However, nasal palatalisation clearly followed the merger of *\(\hat{n}\) and *\(y\) as PSV *\(y\), Anj y, since \(\hat{n}\) < POc palatalised *\(n\) does not merge with *\(\hat{n}\) (and *\(y\)).

\subsection*{2.5.1.3 Velarisation of *\(n\)}

There are a few etyma in which POc *\(n\) is reflected as \(\eta\) in the SV languages. This appears to have taken place when there was a *\(q\) in an adjacent syllable and when the intervening vowel was lost by one of the vowel loss rules: thus *\(nq\) and *\(qn\) both became \(\eta\). The following Lenakel examples illustrate this (the rules themselves being discussed in more detail in Chapter 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Pre-PSV</th>
<th>PRE-DELETION RULES</th>
<th>MEDIAL V DELETION</th>
<th>ARTICLE REDUCTION</th>
<th>*(n)-VELARISATION</th>
<th>FINAL V DELETION</th>
<th>OTHER RULES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(qanusi)</td>
<td>a-qa’(nusi)</td>
<td>a-qa’(nusi)</td>
<td>a-qa’(nusi)</td>
<td>(\hat{n}\si)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>‘(\eta)us’</td>
<td>(\eta) ‘(\eta)us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(na tinaq(e)-(\eta)a)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of the velarisation of POc *\(n\) are given below, with braces surrounding items which reflect *\(n\) as \(n\), and square brackets surrounding cognates in which the *\(n\) is not reflected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(qanusi)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
<td>a(\eta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(na tinaq(e)-(\eta)a)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
<td>(\eta si)na(\eta)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of POc *(\(q\)aca(n,\(\eta\)) ‘name’ > NTn, Wsn \(n/\epsilon\eta\)-, SWT \(n/\epsilon\eta\)-, Kwm \(n/\epsilon\eta\)h, it is not clear whether the form was inherited with *\(\eta\) or *\(n\); if the latter, then *\(q\) is responsible for velarisation of *\(n\) here as well. (POc *\(q\) is also responsible for the stop reflexes of *\(c\) in the Northern Tanna languages – see §2.5.3.3.). These and other aspects of the behaviour of POc *\(q\) in the Southern Vanuatu languages will be discussed in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{19} It should also be pointed out that modern Anejom allows sequences of \(n\) or \(\eta\) + a front vowel, and that in these cases there is no palatalised allophone; for example:

| a\(\epsilon\)\(n\)pin | *(\(q\)aca(n,\(\eta\)) ‘name’ > NTn, Wsn \(n/\epsilon\eta\)-, SWT \(n/\epsilon\eta\)-, Kwm \(n/\epsilon\eta\)h, it is not clear whether the form was inherited with *\(\eta\) or *\(n\); if the latter, then *\(q\) is responsible for velarisation of *\(n\) here as well. (POc *\(q\) is also responsible for the stop reflexes of *\(c\) in the Northern Tanna languages – see §2.5.3.3.). These and other aspects of the behaviour of POc *\(q\) in the Southern Vanuatu languages will be discussed in Chapter 4.

The front vowels in words like these developed from a non-front vowel after the palatalisation rules had ceased to apply. For example, *\(qunap\(i\) > n/\(\epsilon\eta\)he- ‘(fish) scale’ and *\(pa\)\(\epsilon\)\(d\)\(a\) > a\(\epsilon\)\(h\)ej ‘forage on reef’ show *\(n\) > \(n\) and *\(\eta\) > \(\eta\) before e in the modern language, but this e derives regularly from a POc non-front vowel in each case.
2.5.2 Coronal stops in non-palatalising environments

POc *t (and possibly *d?) underwent palatalisation before front vowels, and the reflexes in this environment are similar to those of the POc sibilants: e.g. *mate 'die' > Sye mah, Lenakel mas, Anejoñi mas. For this reason, I will deal with the palatalised reflexes of POc *t and *d along with the sibilants, in §2.5.3. In this section, references to POc *t and *d are thus to their occurrences in a non-palatalising environment. I have very few cases of etyma containing POc *d in my data. However, there is clear evidence to suggest that PSV had two coronal stops, *t and *d.

2.5.2.1 Anejoñi

Anejoñi reflects POc *d as j:

POc *d > Anj j
*pa'oda a/hanej 'forage on reef'
*-da -j- '1 INC.PL.POSS'
POc *gida a/kaj- 'we INC'

POc initial and medial *t are reflected in Anejoñi as t:

POc *t-t- > Anj t
*tama- e/ema- 'father'
*tanum e/tenom 'bury'
*talina- n/tna- 'ear'
*tawan ne/iva 'lychee'
*toka a/tey 'sit'
*tuki a/tya-n 'pound'
*mutusi a/m*ot 'broken'
*kita e/yet, e/yta-i 'see'
*mataq mat 'raw'
*matuqa metou 'ripe'

POc final *t, when retained in absolute final position, seems to have been reflected as Anejoñi s.²⁰

POc *-t Anj s
*lab*at alp*as 'big'
*kurat nouras 'Morinda citrifolia'
*kaRat a/yas, a/yes 'bite'
*saqat has 'bad'

²⁰ There is some problem with the correspondence *saqat > has 'bad', in that *s > h is an apparently irregular correspondence found in just a few lexical items; while ays, ayes 'bite' may derive from the form with the transitive suffix (*kaRat-i).
The comparison *ma-takut-akini > e/miita-ŋ ‘fear (TR)’ suggests that it was only word-final (not morpheme-final) *t which became s.

The following summarises this discussion:

POc  \( *_{t,i} \quad *_t \quad *_d \)
Anj  ₁  s  j

2.5.2.2 Proto Erromango

The process of Article Reduction (see Chapter 4) involves loss or reduction of the vowel of the accreted article *na when the first vowel of the noun root was *a. With *ta-initial nouns in the Erromangan languages, *na-ta... became *n-t..., which regularly developed into an nt cluster in Sye but into the prenasalised stop d in Ura, as the first five examples below show. I presume that other cases of this initial correspondence also represent earlier ta-initial nouns.

POc *t-
\begin{align*}
 tawan & \quad n/tau & \quad dau & \quad ‘lychee’ \\
 talos & \quad n/tal & \quad dal & \quad ‘taro’ \\
 talŋa- & \quad n/telŋo- & \quad delŋe- & \quad ‘ear’ \\
 talise & \quad n/telĩ & \quad dire & \quad ‘Terminalia catappa’ (see footnote 14) \\
 tasik & \quad n/toy & \quad de & \quad ‘sea’ \\
 ntorani & \quad dorani & \quad ‘rifle’ \\
 tample & \quad damle & \quad ‘in-law’ \\
\end{align*}

Other than these cases (which represent POc and PSV clusters of *n + *t), if we adopt a strict bottom-up approach, then there is evidence for both PEr *t and *d. In word-initial position, we find the following correspondences:

PEr *d-
\begin{align*}
 Sye t- & \quad Ura d- \\
 tali & \quad dayali & \quad ‘shadow’ \\
 tetovu & \quad detovu & \quad ‘mound’ \\
 tetnay & \quad dehnak & \quad ‘k.o. cicada’ \\
 tori & \quad dori & \quad ‘a mark’ \\
 tru & \quad duru & \quad ‘k.o. vine’ \\
 tunklah & \quad duŋlas & \quad ‘sea snake’ \\
\end{align*}

PEr *t-
\begin{align*}
 Sye t- & \quad Ura t- \\
 tavi & \quad tavi & \quad ‘practise sorcery’ \\
 tetai & \quad tarai & \quad ‘flick with finger’ \\
 torpehi & \quad torpesi & \quad ‘pour’ \\
 tuvtup & \quad tuvtup & \quad ‘sip’ \\
\end{align*}
While the set labelled *t- consists entirely of verbs, the set labelled *d- consists entirely of nominals, and it is possible that this also represents initial *nt-, and that there has been sporadic simplification of initial nt as t in Sye.

In medial position, there is evidence which, on initial inspection, supports the reconstruction of two stops, though only Ura maintains a distinction between them. At the same time, however, it would appear that both PEr stops derive from POc *t, and I am unable to establish any conditioning. I will give the data first and then discuss the implications for this apparently unconditioned split.

In one set of correspondences, POc *t, Sye t, correspond with Ura d after m and t elsewhere:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *t</th>
<th>Sye -t-</th>
<th>Ura -d- / m_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mutusi</td>
<td>o/mti</td>
<td>o/mde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amtut</td>
<td>amdut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *t</th>
<th>Sye -t-</th>
<th>Ura -t- else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tasik</td>
<td>a/toy</td>
<td>a/tok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metuy</td>
<td>metuk</td>
<td>'slowly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervote</td>
<td>netvote</td>
<td>'possessions'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netyol</td>
<td>netyol</td>
<td>'k.o. fish'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netrihoŋ</td>
<td>netlihoŋ</td>
<td>'back wall of house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eviti</td>
<td>eviti</td>
<td>'meet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noytip</td>
<td>utap</td>
<td>'a tick'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the other set, POc *t, Sye t corresponds with Ura h before n and with Ura r elsewhere:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *t</th>
<th>Sye -t-</th>
<th>Ura -h- medially before n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tunu</td>
<td>e/tni</td>
<td>e/hni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b'oto-</td>
<td>pot/ni-</td>
<td>boh/nin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itnom</td>
<td>ihnom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natnei</td>
<td>nahnei</td>
<td>'former garden site'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netnap</td>
<td>nenhnap</td>
<td>'calf'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *t</th>
<th>Sye -t-</th>
<th>Ura -r- else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*natu-</td>
<td>nitu-</td>
<td>neru-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*matuqa</td>
<td>etwo</td>
<td>erwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>atau</td>
<td>arau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itais</td>
<td>irais</td>
<td>'grandfather; moon'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itis</td>
<td>iris</td>
<td>'smile'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neteme</td>
<td>yerema</td>
<td>'person'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nempati</td>
<td>nabare</td>
<td>'(pig) tusk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wittit</td>
<td>urit</td>
<td>'grated squeezed coconut'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 There is also one example of this correspondence before r/l: Sye erri, Ura ehli ‘pierce, sew’ < POc *ruRi.

22 The 3SG possessed form is nehni, confirming the r ~ h alternation.
Consonants

etponr  urpon  'cold'
etvani  arvani  'spit'
umpatmonuy  ubarmonuk  'heart'
atnap  arnap  'taste'
tevtap  tavrap  '(fish on shore) shake'

Note also the reflexes of POc *tama- 'father': Sye e/yme-, Ura rimi/n. There is evidence (see §5.2.1) for a personal/kin prefix *e-, which would suggest that the Ura reflex of *t in this form was originally word-medial, and that Ura subsequently lost this prefix in this word (though it is retained in *e-tina- 'mother' > ehne/n).

In final position, the only regular correspondence is t:t, which suggests that *t (but not *d) occurred word-finally:

POc *t > PEr *-t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*buton</td>
<td>yo/mput</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mataku</td>
<td>e/metet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noyvat</td>
<td>noyvat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evtit</td>
<td>evtit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is confirmed by the cognates Sye potpot, Ura burbut 'near, close', which seem to be reduplicated forms, suggesting earlier *botbot: note that the medial occurrence of *t is reflected as r in Ura but the final occurrence is reflected as t.

Let me now return to the problem of Ura medial t and r both reflecting POc *t. The following doublet is instructive in this regard:

POc *tRaq-i 'cut' > Sye e/tai 'cut out, excise; write; sharpen (end of stick)' Ura a/rai 'sharpen (end of stick)', e/tai 'write'

What I suggest is that POc *t developed regularly as PEr *t, with the medial reflexes Sye *-t-. Ura *-r (-h- before n). Subsequently, however, because Sye became the prestige language on the island due to religious reasons, and because the drastic depopulation means that an Ura-speaking population of less than ten speak Sye more frequently than they speak Ura, large numbers of Sye words were subconsciously incorporated into the vocabulary of Ura-speakers. Cases of *t > Ura *-r-, therefore, are likely to be Sye loans, and the two Ura reflexes of *tRaq-i tend to support this: a/rai 'sharpen (end of stick)' is presumably the directly inherited form, whereas e/tai 'write' is suggestive of borrowing on both phonological and semantic grounds.

There is however an additional correspondence set which occurs only intervocally:

POc  Sye -nt-  Ura -d-

| *tapuR | pen/top | be/dop | 'ashes'
wonte | wode | 'sea-urchin'
evinte | evida | 'look after'
nampinti | nabidi | 'edible fungus'
tantumpwi | tadumwi | 'ask permission'
noromuntan | nilomudan | 'dorsal fin'

There is some evidence to suggest that this correspondence – like the initial n:t:d correspondence – may involve a cluster of nasal + stop rather than a unit protophoneme.
There are only a dozen or so words showing this correspondence. Of these, the following are, or appear to have once been, compounds in which the second element begins with *n + coronal stop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noromuntan</td>
<td>nilomudan</td>
<td>‘dorsal fin’</td>
<td>cf. Sye *nta-n ‘his/its back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tavuntan</td>
<td>tavudan</td>
<td>‘gossip about’</td>
<td>cf. Sye *nta-n ‘his/her back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonote</td>
<td>wode</td>
<td>‘sea-urchin’</td>
<td>cf. Ura *de ‘sea’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, other examples of this correspondence do not admit of this kind of explanation. I suggest that what we have here is a reflex of PEr *d, at least in those cases which cannot be explained by compounding.

Finally, the only apparent reflex of POc *d in my data is:

POc *-da > Sye *t-nt ‘IEXC.PL.POSS’

Thus the directly inherited coronal stops seem to have developed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Uth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2.3 Proto Tanna

The discussion of the coronal stops in the Erromangan languages will help us make sense of a similarly complex situation in Tanna, and I will suggest that Proto Tanna, like Proto Erromango, had two coronal stops, *t and *d.

Proto Tanna *t, which derives from POc *t, can be reconstructed on the basis of the following correspondences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *t &gt; PTn *t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tapuR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nau-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PTn *t assimilates to an *l in a following syllable in Lenakel, with *tVl > lVl rather than expected rVl:
Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *t</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PTn *t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn t</td>
<td>Wsn t</td>
<td>Len t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tuRi</td>
<td>*tel</td>
<td>*tel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teləŋ</td>
<td>teləŋ</td>
<td>leləŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netual</td>
<td>netual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *d seems to be reflected as t in all Tanna languages, which I suggest below derives from PTn and PSV *d:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *d</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PTn *d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn t</td>
<td>Wsn t</td>
<td>Len t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *gida</td>
<td>*-da</td>
<td>*donu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit-</td>
<td>-t-</td>
<td>-t-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t-</td>
<td>-t-</td>
<td>-t-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *d > PTn *d / 🅱️ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn k</th>
<th>Wsn r</th>
<th>Len t</th>
<th>SWT t</th>
<th>Kwm t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*akŋe</td>
<td>*arŋai</td>
<td>*tŋai</td>
<td>*tŋai</td>
<td>atŋai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*akŋe</td>
<td>*arŋa</td>
<td>*atŋa</td>
<td>*etŋa</td>
<td>‘cough’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *d > PTn *d / 🅱️ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn d</th>
<th>Wsn r ~ rh</th>
<th>Len t</th>
<th>SWT t</th>
<th>Kwm t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eduadəp</td>
<td>orhuarhu</td>
<td>etuatu</td>
<td>etk“atuk”</td>
<td>atuk“atuk”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m“adəp</td>
<td>maru</td>
<td>m“atu</td>
<td>matuk”</td>
<td>m“atuk”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suadəp</td>
<td>suaru</td>
<td>suatu</td>
<td>suatuk”</td>
<td>suatuk”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are not many cases of coronal stops in strict noun-initial position. There are some items which reflect noun-initial POC *t as PTn *d, and I suggest that what happened here is the same as what happened in Erromango – Article Reduction applied to *na-ta... sequences, giving *n-t... which fused as PTn *d:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *t-</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PTn *d-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn t</td>
<td>Wsn t</td>
<td>Len t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanoq</td>
<td>*təŋ</td>
<td>*təŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>təpəŋ</td>
<td>təpəŋ</td>
<td>təpəŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tup”alukaluk</td>
<td>tup”alukaluk</td>
<td>tup”oluelua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 This might possibly derive from POC *matuqa-. However, we would not only need to explain the unmotivated change POC *t > PTn *d, but also the labial reflex of *q.
A second set, however, show a slightly different set of correspondences, and these suggest that initial *nt remained as a cluster, at least in North Tanna (where it then became d) and Whitesands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *t</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PTn *d-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tasik</td>
<td>**dehi</td>
<td>na/tehi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taliŋa-</td>
<td>-delŋa-</td>
<td>-telŋa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNCV *tavua</td>
<td>doat</td>
<td>na/touat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *tama- ‘father’, shows neither of these patterns, but this is probably because it was originally prefixed with *e- (see §5.2.1) and the *t was not noun-initial; its reflexes are NTn, Wsn *tami-, Len *rom-, SWT *lam-, Kwm *remu-, suggesting PTn *t, not *d.

These data are summarised below; note that PTn *d probably did not occur word-finally.

**POC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*t/ n-</th>
<th>*t else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>r ∼ rŋ/ _ŋ; d/ _<em>Vk</em>; t else</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>l/ _V(V)l; r else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2.4 Proto Southern Vanuatu

In general terms, the following correspondences between the POC and PSV coronal stops in non-palatalising environments have been established:

**POC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*d</th>
<th>*t/ *n-</th>
<th>*t, *-t-</th>
<th>*-t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*nt</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*d?</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In initial position in nouns which took the article *na, a process of nasal accretion took place. This developed initially as nt- or nVt-, but began to merge with *d in at least some words in Proto Erromango and Proto Tanna.

---

24 This form only occurs as the second element in compounds – e.g. Lenakel *nom**a-telŋa- ‘the outside of the ear’, *nɔp**ap-telŋa- ‘the inside of the ear, the earhole’.

25 There is a further correspondence set, r/r:/:h/h, which I will deal with in the section on sibilants, since this derives from POC *s.
2.5.3 Coronal sibilants

The sibilants form an area of considerable complexity in the Southern Vanuatu languages; I will show here that Proto Southern Vanuatu can be reconstructed as having had the three sibilant phonemes *c, *s and *j.

2.5.3.1 Some problem areas

Before discussing the origin of the sibilants in detail, however, a couple of more general points need to be examined.

First, even though all SV languages make a phonemic distinction between s and h (and Anejofii also distinguishes these from θ, which derives from a proto-sibilant), there is nevertheless a certain amount of fluctuation between them in most of the modern languages (with Sye showing the most fluctuation, and only Ura and Anejofii apparently immune from it). To take two examples:

(a) According to Crowley (1998b:4-5), while /s/ and /h/ contrast in modern Sye, there is ‘massive variation between [h] and [s] in the corpus’. This variation is particularly common in initial, intervocalic and final positions, though ‘some words appear to be more amenable to this kind of free variation than others’. On the other hand, [s] frequently occurs as the second member of a consonant cluster, but [h] almost never occurs in this position; while [h] frequently occurs as the first member of a consonant cluster but [s] almost never does.

(b) In Lenakel, although s and h clearly contrast, there is free variation between them in word-final position in some words (usually those in more frequent use). This appears to be a change in progress, since the number of words which allow word-final s ~ h appears to have increased considerably since my first contact with Lenakel-speakers in 1970.

In addition, there also seems to have been some fluctuation in the past, with the effect that the reflexes of proto-sibilants are often somewhat blurred.

The second problem area is this. The major source of one of the sibilants, PSV *c, is POc *t in a palatalising environment. So while POc *t became PSV *t before, say, *a and *u, it became PSV *c before *i and *e. For example:

POc | Ura | SWT | Anj
--- | --- | --- | ---
*tina- | e/nee/n | na/sanə- | ri/si- | ‘mother’
*mate | i/mis | mha | mas | ‘die’

However, before POc *o the reflexes vary; and I will use just Lenakel to illustrate this, although the same is true of the other languages. There is one set of words in which, as one might expect, POc *t > PSV *t before *o; e.g.:

POc *t / _o > Len r (< PSV *t)
*butoŋ | na/ŋaŋ- | ‘navel’
*topu | na/ruw | ‘sugarcane’
*toka | a/rək | ‘stay’

There is another set of words, however, where POc *t before *o is reflected as PSV *c:
Chapter 2

POc *t / _o > Len s (< PSV *c)
*tokon 'crutch'  a/skan 'limp'
    k-a/skan 'walking-stick'
*ma-tolu  asuul 'large'
*tolu  ka/sil 'three'

Now the words in the second set may have undergone a vowel change. Clark reconstructs for PNCV *tiko 'crutch, walking-stick', which suggests that the vowel had changed in Proto Southern Oceanic. However, he reconstructs *ma-tolu 'thick' and *tolu 'three', with no change in the vowel. But there are languages in his sample and others in North and Central Vanuatu which reflect the *o as a front vowel – e.g. Paamese matetelu 'thick, deep', Paamese and Lewo telu 'three' – which suggest that *o may have been in the process of changing to *e in these words, or that there were in fact doublets in PSV. Indeed, they may have been triplets, since there is evidence from both SV and other Southern Oceanic languages supporting final *i as well as final *u, like Anejom *es ej, Tambotalo *oli 'three'. In what follows, I will assume the latter, and suggest that Lenakel ka/sil 'three' derives from a competing PSOc form *tel i.

Because of all of this, this discussion of the SV sibilants will proceed in a slightly different manner from the way in which other consonants have been handled. I will take more of a top-down approach, since this will allow us to pinpoint idiosyncratic variation in a single language or subgroup; and I will also present more data than in other sections, because of the general confusion. I will begin by looking at the POc reflexes in Anejom, since it shows no synchronic and very little diachronic fluctuation between the sibilants.

2.5.3.2 Anejom

The two Anejom consonants that I am mainly concerned with here are s and ß.26 Anejom s appears to have two major sources: POc *t (and possibly *d?) in certain palatalising environments and (as I showed in §2.5.2.1) in word-final position, and POc *j, although I will leave any discussion of *j until I have dealt with the Tanna languages.

POc *t / _i,e > Anj s
*tina-  rü/si- 'mother'
POc *tikon  i/say 'walk w. stick'
*maqati  mas 'low tide'
    mesei 'dry'
POc *mateli  a/mesej 'thick'
POc *teli  e/sej 'three'
*bati 'tooth'  n/pas 'axe'
*mate  mas 'die'
*alito(n)  n/ijis 'torch'

26 I will also briefly mention h as an irregular reflex of the proto-sibilants, though recall that the main source of Anejom h is PSV *v, POc *p.
With the following, it is not clear whether we are dealing with final *t > s or whether the root-final *t was followed by a transitive suffix:

POc *t > Anj s

*kawit(-i) ni/yowos 'breadfruit-picker'
*kaarat(-i) a/yas 'bite'
*pililt(-i) hujis 'peel'

The only case of POc *d before *i is *pudi > no/hos 'banana'. I will show later, however, that the PSV 1NC focal pronoun has to be reconstructed as *gadi, and the Anejom reflex of this is a/kaj-. It is possible, then, that the form for banana derives from a Pre-PSV form *pui rather than *pudi. In any case, the data available are so few that we cannot be sure what happened to *d in this environment.

Anejom θ also has two main sources: POc *s and *c.

POc *s > Anj θ

*karis a/kerθ, a/yreθ 'scratch, scrape'
*masakit e/mθa 'sick'
*susu e/θeθ 'suck'
*susu- na/θe- 'breast'
*ganusi anθe-i 'spit'
*sipo a/θe 'go down' (but cf. *sipo > -se)
*paus-i a/hoθ 'plait'
*asu ni/aθ 'bailer'
*SuRuq- ni/θi- 'juice'
*SuRi- ne/θuo- 'bone'
*bokasi pikaθ 'pig'
*molis ne/pjeθ 'citrus'
*nusi niθ 'octopus, squid'
*kasupe n/yeθo 'rat'
*pisiko- no/hoθye- 'flesh'
*sko ne/θey 'kingfisher'
*taliite n/tejeθ 'Canarium sp.'
*waRisa n/viθ 'two days from today'
*sei θi 'who?'

POc *c > Anj θ

*palauc a/heleθ 'to paddle'
*(q)aca(n,η)- n/iθa- 'name'
*(q)ana-nicai i/niθ 'when?'
*pican e/θeθ 'how many?'

So we have the following correspondences:

POc *s, *c *t / __ *i, e
PSV *s *c
Anj θ s
I write the PSV protophonemes as *s and *c: the first seems to reflect a genuine voiceless fricative; the second involves palatalisation of a POc stop, and it may well have been a palatal stop or affricate in PSV.27

There is, however, some 'slippage' in this system. First, there are a few possible cases of proto-sibilants having the reflex h, although I will leave these for the present (but see §2.5.3.6). Second, there is a residual group of reflexes which appear to show s < *s:

POc *s > Anj s

*wasi(n)- n/asi-ntal 'taro stem for planting'
*masi na/mas 'tapa cloth'
*sinaR naŋe/ŋa 'sun'
*sipo -se 'down (suffix)' (but cf. *sipo > aθe in the list above)

All of these involve *s before *i, although there are other cases of *s before *i where the reflex is θ (cf. the reflexes of *gansi, *paus-i, *bokasi, *nusi, *pisiko and *siko in the list above). Note also the doublet reflexes of *sipo '(go) down': the verb aθe and the verbal suffix -se. It may be that θ began to change to s before *i in some words, but that this change did not work its way through the whole lexicon.

2.5.3.3 Proto Tanna

The Tanna languages show some synchronic fluctuation between s and h, particularly in word-final position. Even excluding obvious cases of synchronic fluctuation, however, there are five regular correspondence sets involving s and/or h. The nature of the problem can be illustrated by the following examples, each of which reflects a frequent correspondence between Lenakel and Kwamera:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s:s</td>
<td>asanoŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h:h</td>
<td>ahak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h:s</td>
<td>omha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s:h</td>
<td>kapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t:h</td>
<td>aviet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, where Lenakel has s the other Tanna languages (except Kwamera) have s, and where Lenakel has h the others (again except Kwamera) also have h. Thus it appears that we have two major sets of correspondences (two s-sets and two h-sets), with Kwamera having made subsequent changes.28

I will leave the t:h set till later. The two s-sets are illustrated below:

---

27 The reflex s is of course not palatal. Presumably, *r before *i first palatalised as sf or f (as it has done in many Oceanic languages), and then developed further as s (as it has done in many others). I will, however, retain the term palatalisation here, slightly inaccurate though it may be.

28 In addition to these five sets of correspondences, there are sporadic cases of loss in one language but not the other; and of course, there are some crossovers where, for example, one language has s for expected h or h for expected s. I will ignore these for the moment.
### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suadap</td>
<td>suaru</td>
<td>suatu</td>
<td>suatuk</td>
<td>suatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asanən</td>
<td>asanən</td>
<td>asanən</td>
<td>asanən</td>
<td>asanən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nəsiiu</td>
<td>nisiiu</td>
<td>nisiiu</td>
<td>nisiiu</td>
<td>nisiiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vənas</td>
<td>vənas</td>
<td>vənas</td>
<td>vənas</td>
<td>vənis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uulpas</td>
<td>-ulpas</td>
<td>k°ulpas</td>
<td>kurpas</td>
<td>‘flying-fish’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aikuasaas</td>
<td>aikuasaas</td>
<td>aikuasaas</td>
<td>aikuasaas</td>
<td>aikuasas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>kəs</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>ah/i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>ehi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aksasak</td>
<td>aksak</td>
<td>aksak</td>
<td>avvak</td>
<td>avahak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nəsəŋəa-</td>
<td>nəsəŋəa-</td>
<td>nəsəŋəa-</td>
<td>nəsəŋa-</td>
<td>naninha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asum</td>
<td>asum</td>
<td>asum°</td>
<td>asim</td>
<td>amhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kəpas</td>
<td>kəpas</td>
<td>kəpas</td>
<td>kəpas</td>
<td>paha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kəsəl</td>
<td>kəsəl</td>
<td>kəsəl</td>
<td>kəsəl</td>
<td>kahar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below also are examples of the two h-sets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nemaha</td>
<td>niemaha</td>
<td>niemha</td>
<td>niamha</td>
<td>niamha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nəhla-</td>
<td>nəhla-</td>
<td>nəhla-</td>
<td>nhelə-</td>
<td>nhelə-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aŋəšəl</td>
<td>aŋəšəli</td>
<td>aŋəšəli</td>
<td>aŋəšəli</td>
<td>erŋəhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alp°ah</td>
<td>alp°ah</td>
<td>alp°ah</td>
<td>alp°ah</td>
<td>əp̚a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ouh</td>
<td>ouh</td>
<td>awh</td>
<td>k°uh</td>
<td>kusi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nəŋə-</td>
<td>-nəŋə-</td>
<td>-nəŋə-</td>
<td>-nəŋə-</td>
<td>-sə鼻-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuhən</td>
<td>nuhən</td>
<td>nuhən</td>
<td>nəñən</td>
<td>nəñən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhulə</td>
<td>nhulə</td>
<td>nhulə</td>
<td>nəñən</td>
<td>nəñən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ałea</td>
<td>ałea</td>
<td>ałea</td>
<td>ałea</td>
<td>ałea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abomaah</td>
<td>apom°ah</td>
<td>p°omh</td>
<td>apom</td>
<td>apom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aklah</td>
<td>aklah</td>
<td>aklah</td>
<td>akla-kən</td>
<td>akres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uuŋən</td>
<td>uuŋən</td>
<td>uuŋən</td>
<td>k°ungən</td>
<td>k°um°esin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auiəh</td>
<td>auiəh</td>
<td>auiəh</td>
<td>auiəh</td>
<td>ak°eis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dehi</td>
<td>na-tehi</td>
<td>tehi</td>
<td>tahik</td>
<td>tosi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 The Len and SWT forms also reflected *h as h in this form, but seem to have undergone a subsequent development in which pVh has become fV; see §2.2.3.
30 This form occurs as the second member of a compound expression; for example, Len nəp°aŋ-nəŋə- = ‘hole-nose’.
Although one might assume that the two s-sets reflect one protophoneme and the two h-sets another, it seems impossible on the basis of synchronic data to condition the occurrence of s and h in Kwamera in either set. Theoretically, therefore, one would be required to reconstruct four Proto Tanna phonemes here. However, it would appear from all of the languages except Kwamera that only two phonemes are involved; and I will explore this line of reasoning first, trying subsequently to account for the variation within Tanna.

Let us look first of all at the two s-sets. Their origins appear to be as set out below (note that I have no data on the behaviour of POC *d before a front vowel in Tanna languages):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *t/ *i,e</th>
<th>Others s</th>
<th>Kwamera s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tikon</td>
<td>L a/skн</td>
<td>a/skн ‘walk w stick’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mateli</td>
<td>L asuul</td>
<td>asori ‘big’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *t/ *i,e</th>
<th>Others s</th>
<th>Kwamera h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kaRat-i</td>
<td>L kos</td>
<td>ahi ‘bite’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maqati</td>
<td>W a/mas</td>
<td>maha ‘low tide’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maqati</td>
<td>S mesia</td>
<td>mhia ‘dry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tina-</td>
<td>L ka/sil</td>
<td>ka/har ‘three’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bati ‘tooth’</td>
<td>L ka/paas</td>
<td>paha ‘axe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mate</td>
<td>L mas</td>
<td>e/mha ‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tinaqe-</td>
<td>L na/sqa</td>
<td>na/ninha- ‘intestines’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*quti(n)-</td>
<td>N n/us-a</td>
<td>n/ihi- ‘penis’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pati</td>
<td>S k/uas</td>
<td>ke/fa ‘four’ (Kwm form via **kevah)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear that the most frequent reflex of palatalised *t is h in Kwamera, s in the other languages.

Now let us turn to the two h-sets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *s,(*c?)</th>
<th>Others h</th>
<th>Kwamera h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*sake</td>
<td>L a/hak</td>
<td>aka/hak ‘(sun) rise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*susu-</td>
<td>L na/ha-</td>
<td>nan/ho- ‘breast’ (but cf. below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*molis</td>
<td>L na/malh</td>
<td>na/marhi ‘citrus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*njijis-</td>
<td>L n/igha-</td>
<td>n/igha- ‘gums; smile’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*masawa</td>
<td>W na/m”ahan</td>
<td>k”a-n/mahan ‘open space’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *s</th>
<th>Others h</th>
<th>Kwamera s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*masakit</td>
<td>L a/mha</td>
<td>a/misa ‘sick’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mutusi</td>
<td>L murr</td>
<td>m”eres ‘broken off’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paus-i</td>
<td>L a/wh</td>
<td>kusi ‘weave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qasu-</td>
<td>L n/ha-</td>
<td>n/ase- ‘smoke’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*suRuq-</td>
<td>L n/hi-</td>
<td>na/se- ‘juice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*suRi-</td>
<td>S nu/hu-</td>
<td>na-su- ‘bone/leg’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*susu-</td>
<td>L na/ha-</td>
<td>na/s ‘breast’ (but cf. above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nusa</td>
<td>L ihi</td>
<td>is ‘octopus, squid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasupe</td>
<td>L kahau</td>
<td>i/esuk* ‘rat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lisaq</td>
<td>L ki/tha</td>
<td>k”a/resa ‘nit’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consonants

*tasik  S tahik  ṭasi  ‘sea’
*qusan  L n/ihin  n/esn  ‘rain’
*wasa  L nw/hua  nw/vas  ‘edible greens’
*waRisa  L n/ihi/n  n/eis  ‘two days from today’
*sei  L pe/he  si  ‘who?’
*pisiko-  L nw/vhakə-  n/əsa-  ‘flesh’

POc *c  Others h  Kwamera s
*(q)ana-ŋican  W na/ŋhan  n/esn  ‘when?’
*icuŋ-  L -n/ŋaŋə-  -ṣeŋi-  ‘nose’
*taci-  L no/rha-  p/raşi-  ‘younger same sex sibling’

Once again, we have one set of reflexes which seems to predominate (*s, *c > Kwamera s, other Tanna languages h) and another, the h:h set, which is marginal. I take the h:s set to be the predominant one, and thus suggest the following reconstructions:

PTn  *s  *h
NTn  s  h
Wsn  s  h
Len  s  h
SWT  s  h
Kwm  h (∼ s)  s (∼ h)

It is not clear what gave rise to the variability in the Kwamera reflexes (and similar comments will have to be made in the next section for Erromango). There is a slight tendency for Kwamera to prefer s initially, finally and before i, and to prefer h adjacent to consonants; but this seems to be only a slight tendency. The situation is further complicated by other irregular correspondences. For example, POc *bokasi ‘pig’ is regularly reflected as Wsn and SWT pukah, but irregularly as NTn pukas, Len pukas and Kwm pukah; while POc *asu ‘bail’ is regularly reflected as Kwm ʔas but irregularly as Len os-ni/’es.

In general terms, though, the Anejoffi and Tanna data given above suggest the following:

POc  *t/._*i,  *e  *s,  *c
PSV  *c  *s
PTn  *s  *h
Anj  s  θ

I have not as yet discussed the reflexes of POc *j in Anejoffi and Tanna. Below is an apparently complete list of reflexes containing this protophoneme in Anejoffi and the Tanna languages:

POc  *j  Tanna  Anj
*(q)ab’aji  K i/ap’as  ‘coconut fruit bud’
*paliği  N m’a-n/vähl, W nəm’a-n/vähl,  na/pjes  ‘grass’
L na/vhaal, S na/vhla/k, K n/urhi
*(s,j)ulii(q)-  L nel/hala-  ni/sji-  ‘(plant) shoot (n.)’
*tajim  a/tes  ‘sharpen’
*laJe  n/las  ‘coral’
*[j]ojon-a(n,ŋ)  L to/səŋ, K ruk’a/haŋən  a/θaθi-ŋ  ‘plug, stop up’
The last form seems to have aberrant reflexes in both Tanna and Anejōfn. Ignoring this form, *j seems to be reflected as PTn *h but as Anejōfn s. This suggests that *j was kept distinct from *c and *s, and it seems simplest to keep the symbol *j here for the PSV phoneme. The full set of reflexes of the POc sibilants in Tanna and Anejōfn, then, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*t/ *i, *e</th>
<th>*s, *c</th>
<th>*j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*c</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>*h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I mentioned earlier, there is a further set of correspondences involving h in some Tanna languages, reflecting what I reconstruct as Proto North Tanna reflex *z of PTn *h. This is exemplified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>&gt; PNT *z, PST *h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>NTn r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(q)aca(n,η)-</td>
<td>n/erŋa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*saqat</td>
<td>a/raat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a/ier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eranŋam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>øvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>øaruaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>øair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The POc source for this appears to be *s or *c in the environment of the glottal stop *q in an adjacent syllable.

2.5.3.4 Proto Erromango *s and *h

Given the relative consistency of the sibilant reflexes in Tanna and Anejōfn, it is probably logical to assume that the Proto Southern Vanuatu sibilants developed from Proto Oceanic as outlined in the previous section. I will therefore start with the initial assumption that Proto Erromango also originally reflected this PSV system, and will try to account for subsequent changes. An examination of the reflexes of the POc sibilants (including *t in a palatalising environment) shows the following reflexes occurring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>&gt; PSV &gt;</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*t/ *i, *e</td>
<td>*c</td>
<td>s, h</td>
<td>s, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>s, h, Ø</td>
<td>s, Ø (y?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*c</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>h, Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*j</td>
<td>*j</td>
<td>s, Ø (y?)</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 The first part of this root may possibly derive from POc *legos, though one would expect NTn and Len to reflect *l in this environment as l and not i; if this is correct, I do not know where the -anum might derive from.

32 Note, however, that this does not occur with reflexes of *qusan 'rain' (e.g. Lenakel nihin, Kwamera nesfan), for reasons which I cannot explain here.
I mentioned the nature of the variation between s and h in Sye in §2.5.3.1. There is no such synchronic variation in Ura. However, h has a restricted distribution in Ura: it does not occur initially or finally, and its occurrence in intervocalic and post-consonantal environments is extremely rare — in other words, almost all occurrences of h in Ura are in pre-consonantal position. Table 2.6 outlines the occurrence of s and h in these two languages. The situation is complicated further by zero reflexes of the same POc phonemes which, in other etyma, have developed into s or h.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>Before C</th>
<th>After C</th>
<th>Finally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>s (h)</td>
<td>s, h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s, h</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the distinction between Sye and Ura s and h is neutralised in a wide range of environments, there is still sufficient evidence to reconstruct *s and *h for Proto Erromangan. This evidence is discussed in this section. Where possible, I will give POc etyma or Tanna and/or Anejom cognates to identify which PSV protophoneme is involved.

In initial position, there are two frequent correspondence sets, s:s and s:0. While the former occurs across a wide range of word classes, including verbs, the latter appears to occur only in verbs, for reasons I cannot explain here. I suggest that the former reflects PEr *s and the latter PEr *h:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *s-</th>
<th>POc, Other SV</th>
<th>Suggests PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye s-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si-</td>
<td>si/n</td>
<td>*taqe-, L nəsii-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selai</td>
<td>selai</td>
<td>L sel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorvat</td>
<td>sorvat</td>
<td>L asul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suju</td>
<td>suju</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanwis</td>
<td>sanwis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesi</td>
<td>sesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesimansi</td>
<td>sesimansi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soyurwavoḥ</td>
<td>soyurwavoṣ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sam</td>
<td>sam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sukrim</td>
<td>sworem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘excrement’
‘shine light on’
‘remove stones from fire’
‘kiss’
‘wild boar’
‘show’
‘index finger’
‘dolphin’
‘retract foreskin’
‘five’

33 Recall also that some cases of pre-consonantal h in Ura derive from non-palatalised *t — cf. §2.5.2.2.
34 Two comments are necessary here. First, I have identified two cases of an initial h:s correspondence: Sye hai, Ura sai ‘one’, and Sye hongku, Ura soku ‘like, as; too, also’. I take these to represent a more recent change of s > h in Sye: indeed, when I first studied Sye in 1968, I recorded these two forms as being s-initial. Second, with the s:0 set, note that, with one exception (the last example), any Sye vowel following s- appears to be neutralised as a in Ura.
PEr *h-

Sye s-  Ura Ø- only in verbs  POC, Other SV  Suggests PSV
sei ai ‘spear’ *sua, A aθwu-i *s
sat arw-at ‘bad’ *saqat, L raat *s
savel afel ‘whistle’ L avhal, A ahebej *s
somp at abit ‘shut, close’ L uhum *s
somp onj abanj ‘snore’ L asierap *s
sensi amsi ‘choose’
sayauqi ayouqi ‘extend (leg)’
seswai aswai ‘support’
sen tvi anvu ‘wipe’
sausel yo auselŋo ‘twitch’
sempyai amyai ‘turn round’
soputŋo- aburŋen ‘push into fire’
soki eyi ‘climb up, copulate’

And note also:

Sye s
say – hay ‘go up’ *sake, L ahak *s
se ‘what?’ *sei, A əi ‘who?’ *s

Despite the paucity of external cognates, we seem to have reasonable grounds for proposing that, in initial position, PSV *c > PEr *s (Sye, Ura s), and PSV *s > PEr *h (Sye s, Ura Ø).

We also find evidence for a distinction between PEr *s and *h intervocally and preceding a semivowel. Here, however, the PSV (and POC) antecedents show more variability:

PEr *-s-

Sye -s-  Ura -s-  POC, Other SV  Suggests PSV
nouse- nesou- ‘intestines’ *tinage, L nasŋa- *c
tesi tesi ‘sharpen’ *tajim, A ates *j
nusye nusye ‘waterfall’ L nuhia *s
asyasye tasyasye ‘smooth’ L ehiahia *s
asau asau ‘moan’
ususu ususu ‘fantail’
wosila wosila ‘k.o. banana’
nesur nesur ‘clam shell’
amiswo amiswa ‘sneeze’
seswai aswai ‘support, hold up’
teswai teswai ‘tell lie’
nusya- nusya/n ‘large one’
In other environments where there is more than one correspondence set, these appear to be in complementary distribution. For example, in pre-consonantal position, we find the following:

**Before r and n:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye -h-</th>
<th>Ura -h-</th>
<th>POc, Other SV</th>
<th>Suggests PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ehrem</td>
<td>ehrem</td>
<td>‘collapse’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tovahri</td>
<td>tavahri</td>
<td>‘tear, rip’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pehnikri</td>
<td>fihniyre</td>
<td>‘little finger/toe’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pehnuri</td>
<td>behnuri</td>
<td>‘after(wards)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Before l, m and y:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye -Ø-</th>
<th>Ura -h-</th>
<th>POc, Other SV</th>
<th>Suggests PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alei</td>
<td>ahlei</td>
<td>‘lie down’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompalonji</td>
<td>kobahlini</td>
<td>‘thank you!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talei</td>
<td>tahlei</td>
<td>‘make dirty’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntamah</td>
<td>dahmas</td>
<td>‘very, a lot’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omol</td>
<td>ohmol</td>
<td>‘fall’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poji</td>
<td>bohji</td>
<td>‘dative preposition’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enw-avsonji</td>
<td>ovvl-avsehni</td>
<td>‘teach right from wrong’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ovronji</td>
<td>ovlehni</td>
<td>‘call’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 2

Before any other consonant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye -h</th>
<th>Ura -s</th>
<th>POc, Other SV</th>
<th>Suggests PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye -h</td>
<td>Ura -s</td>
<td>POc, Other SV</td>
<td>Suggests PSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ehpe&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ehpe&quot;</td>
<td>'do reflexively'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nehrop&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;nehrop&quot;</td>
<td>'drinking coconut'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;elehvi&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;alasvi&quot;</td>
<td>'pick (fruit)'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ahpi&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;aspi&quot;</td>
<td>'lick'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nehkil&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;neskil&quot;</td>
<td>'snake'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nehmar&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;nesmar&quot;</td>
<td>'k.o. tree'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And in word-final position, we have almost complete complementary distribution of correspondences, with only a couple of exceptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye -s</th>
<th>Ura -s / i,u___#</th>
<th>POc, Other SV</th>
<th>Suggests PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;asis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;asis&quot;</td>
<td>'fart silently'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nelis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ilis&quot;</td>
<td>'nits'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;sanwis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;sanwis&quot;</td>
<td>'wild boar'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;itas&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;irais&quot;</td>
<td>'grandfather; moon'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;itis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;iris&quot;</td>
<td>'smile'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;uvwis&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;uvwis&quot;</td>
<td>'small grouper'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;netukus&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;netukus&quot;</td>
<td>'salt'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;vormus&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;vormus&quot;</td>
<td>'k.o. fish'</td>
<td>*s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sye -h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye -h</th>
<th>Ura -s / e,a,o___#</th>
<th>POc, Other SV</th>
<th>Suggests PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;noyleh-&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;noyles&quot;</td>
<td>'skin'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;mah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;imis&quot;</td>
<td>'low tide'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;koh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;gis&quot;</td>
<td>'we INC'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;natmah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;yarmis&quot;</td>
<td>'devil'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;aveh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;avis&quot;</td>
<td>'add coconut milk'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;noywoh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;wis&quot;</td>
<td>'octopus, squid'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nemah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;namas&quot;</td>
<td>'cloth(es)'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;evyah&quot;</td>
<td>{ivek}</td>
<td>'defecate'</td>
<td>*c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nevlah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;wavlis&quot;</td>
<td>'rock crab'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;jinmah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;jinimis&quot;</td>
<td>'many'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;pwayah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;balayis&quot;</td>
<td>'daytime'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;telwoh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;delwis&quot;</td>
<td>'k.o. yam'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;teveh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;deves&quot;</td>
<td>'k.o. banana'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-veh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;-ves&quot;</td>
<td>'well (adv.)'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;tormeveh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;tormeves&quot;</td>
<td>'do unintentionally'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;unmeh&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;unmes&quot;</td>
<td>'early'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nayah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;nayas&quot;</td>
<td>'cool season'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;neimah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;neimas&quot;</td>
<td>'cassia'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;tunjklah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;dunjas&quot;</td>
<td>'sea-snake'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;unorah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;unoras&quot;</td>
<td>'oval stone'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;uvrah&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;uvras&quot;</td>
<td>'brain'</td>
<td>*s?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can probably assume, then, that Proto Erromangan *s and *h were distinct in initial and intervocalic positions, and there is a reasonable amount of evidence – particularly in initial position – to suggest that PSV *c > PEr *s and PSV *s > PEr *h. It would also seem that, at some quite early stage, PEr *s and *h merged (probably as s) finally and adjacent to a consonant. Subsequently:

(a) medial s in Ura became h before a continuant consonant;
(b) medial s in Sye became h before any consonant, and was lost before l, m and η;
(c) final s in Sye became h when preceded by a non-high vowel.

It may well have been this complex conditioned shifting of s to h which led to more unconditioned shifting in Sye.

2.5.3.5 Proto Oceanic sibilant reflexes in Erromango

All of this makes it exceedingly difficult to describe exactly what has happened to palatalised POc *t (and *d) and to POc *s, *c and *j! The only environments which distinguish PEr *s and *h are initial and intervocalic, and therefore these are the only ones we can seriously consider in deciding on the development of the POc phonemes in PEr.

The following examples suggest that POc *s > PSV *s > PEr *h:

POc *s > PEr *h

POc *s > PEr *h

Sye s-, -h-

Ura Ø-, -s-

*waRisa [no]wisas

*sei ‘who?’ se

*saqat sat ar-w/at

*sua sei ai

*nasul(q) nahwo-num naswo-num

*bokasi no/mpyahi w/myas

‘some days from today’

‘what?’

‘bad’

‘to spear’

‘steam’

‘pig’

As in Anejof (there is no evidence from Tanna), there is one case of *d in a palatalising environment (*pudi > Sye no/voh, Ura no/vus, ‘banana’), which is insufficient to base any hypothesis on.

There seems to be just one example, *taqe ‘excrement’, supporting the development POc *t / *i, *e > PSV *c > PEr *s. In the case of *taqe-, the *aq sequence was lost (as it was also in Tanna), and *t palatalised before *e.

The POc form and most of its reflexes in Southern Vanuatu refer to ‘two days from today’. The Sye and Ura forms, however, means ‘five days from today’, with the Sye prefixed form nowisas referring to the past.
POc *t / __ *i, *e > PEr *s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye s</th>
<th>Ura s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*taqe-</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>si/n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtually all other reflexes do not distinguish PEr *s and *h. Further, there are many cases of loss.

POc t / __ *i, *e > Sye s, h  Ura s, h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye s, h</th>
<th>Ura s, h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*maqati</td>
<td>mas</td>
<td>‘low tide’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tina-</td>
<td>(nrinme-)</td>
<td>e/hne/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pitik</td>
<td>tor/pis</td>
<td>dor/pis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kuliti</td>
<td>no/yleh-ntan</td>
<td>no/yles dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mate</td>
<td>mah</td>
<td>i/mis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *tel | nre/hel | ge/hli | ‘three’ |

POc *j, when reflected, occurs as s in both languages:

POc *j > Sye s  Ura s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye s</th>
<th>Ura s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tajim</td>
<td>a/tes</td>
<td>tesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[jjo]joni-a(n,η)</td>
<td>i/sonin</td>
<td>‘to plug’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paliji</td>
<td>novloevsi</td>
<td>‘(k.o.) grass’?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are, however, two cases where *j is lost in Sye (there being no Ura reflex that I am aware of):

POc *j > Sye Ø  Ura

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye Ø</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(s,j)uli(q)-</td>
<td>ne/lye-</td>
<td>‘a shoot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jalatolj</td>
<td>n/elyat</td>
<td>‘nettle tree’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *c > Sye Ø (h)  Ura Ø

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye Ø (h)</th>
<th>Ura Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(q)a(n,η)aca</td>
<td>n/i-</td>
<td>‘name’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*quloc</td>
<td>n/ilah</td>
<td>ila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(q)a(n,η)ana- içan</td>
<td>ni/ñoi</td>
<td>ni/ñei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pican</td>
<td>nra/ve</td>
<td>gi/va</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *s also shows sporadic reflexes. In this first set of words, it is retained in both languages:

POc *s > Sye s, h  Ura s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye s, h</th>
<th>Ura s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*sii</td>
<td>a/sis</td>
<td>a/sis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*masi</td>
<td>ne/mah</td>
<td>na/mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sana</td>
<td>nem/son</td>
<td>‘fork’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*njinis</td>
<td>no/njos/iwo</td>
<td>no/njos/iwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasupe</td>
<td>ula/kih</td>
<td>ula/kis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lisaq</td>
<td>ne/lis</td>
<td>i/lis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second set shows retention of *s in Sye but not in Ura, with the last two items suggesting that Ura has accreted a locative marker PSV *i:36

POc *s > Sye s,h Ura Ø
*qasawa- ahwo- awi/n 'spouse'
*pekas e/vyah i/vek 'defecate'
*sake say - hay -yok 'up there, rise'
*sipo -sep ~ -hep -yip 'down'

Finally, the third set – by far the largest – shows loss of *s in both languages:

POc *s > Sye Ø Ura Ø
*suluq ilwo 'make a) torch'
*likos e/iki, o/iki e/lei 'tie, hang up'
*mutusi o/mti o/mde 'broken'
*legos e/la- e/l- 'look at/for'
*suRi- no/ura- no/wira/n 'bone'
*susu- n/i- n/a/n 'breast'?
*molisi ne/mli 'citrus'
*tasik n/toy de 'sea'
*talise n/tei dire 'Terminalia catappa'

It is difficult to make any statements about the conditioning of these reflexes, since *s, for example, is retained in some etyma but lost in others in almost identical phonological environments. I would presume that, where *s and *c were lost, this probably involved a change *s, *c > h > Ø, which in itself implies a wider distribution of h in some earlier form of Ura.

2.5.3.6 Proto Southern Vanuatu

This long and fairly complex discussion suggests the relationship between the POc and PSV coronals as shown in Table 2.7.

---

36 Supporting this are the following cognates, most of which are locatives of some kind:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye s,h</th>
<th>Ura y</th>
<th>Sye s,h</th>
<th>Ura y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-say</td>
<td>-yek</td>
<td>emp-hep</td>
<td>ouba-youp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empi-hay</td>
<td>oube-yok</td>
<td>yehep</td>
<td>youp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yahay</td>
<td>yok</td>
<td>-su</td>
<td>-ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sep</td>
<td>-yip</td>
<td>isuma</td>
<td>yomo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'that's all!'
Table 2.7: Proto Southern Vanuatu coronal correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc *t/ *i, *e</th>
<th>*t-t- else</th>
<th>*-t</th>
<th>*d</th>
<th>*s, *c</th>
<th>*j</th>
<th>*n/ *i, *e</th>
<th>*n else</th>
<th>*i, *y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*c</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*j</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*d/ *n-</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>*s?</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*y- *i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*d/ *n-</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*z/ *q; *h</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Proto Erromangan (of the earlier languages) and Sye and Kwamera (of the modern ones) provide the most extreme examples of apparently unexplained variation between s and h, no SV language seems to have escaped this. Even Anjomal, which seem to be the ‘best-behaved’ of these languages in this regard, is not immune. Although h is not the regular reflex of any of the proto-palatals or -sibilants – indeed, Anjomal h derives from *p – there are apparent cognates showing an h reflex of a palatal/sibilant:

POc *s, *j > Anj h
*saŋa nem/hanŋ ‘fork’
*saqat has ‘bad’
*kojom-i a/yhem ‘to husk’

Thus the sets of correspondences given here must be read in the light of this fluctuation.

2.6 Summary

This chapter has provided evidence for the PSV consonant system as outlined in Table 2.1 with the exception of PSV *q. POc *q seems to have been retained in PSV, but was subsequently lost in all SV languages. The main argument for its retention will be presented in Chapter 4, since it is tied in with the deletion or non-deletion of vowels in certain environments; however, minor arguments in favour of its retention were proposed in this chapter in the discussion of reflexes of *n and the sibilants.

The development of the POc and PSV protophonemes, including full sets of sound correspondences, are given in Appendix I. In the table there, I have added in Proto Northern and Southern Tanna forms, although except in the discussion of the liquids and sibilants these were not specifically mentioned. Conditioned reflexes are given in parentheses, and the reader is referred to the relevant sections above for details of the conditioning.
3 Vowels

In this chapter and the next, I will be examining developments in the POc vowels. Chapter 4 examines morpheme structure, which involves the deletion of POc vowels in certain contexts, and the accretion of initial elements to nouns and verbs. Before looking at that, however, it will be useful to continue our discussion of segmental phonology and examine the reflexes of the POc vowels in those contexts and roots in which they are reflected. Note that I will be concerned only with root-internal vowels in this chapter; the behaviour of the *a of the accreted article *na and the accreted initial vowel on verbs will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Although POc had a five-vowel system, PSV probably had a six-vowel system. There is strong evidence for PSV *i, *ə, *a and *u, quite strong evidence for PSV *e as a conditioned reflex of POc *a, and weaker evidence for PSV *o. This six-vowel system matches the surface systems of the Tanna languages and the underlying system of Sye. Some interesting developments have occurred in individual subgroups: for example, Anejoffi lowers the high vowels to e and o, and in Anejoffi i and u occur only as conditioned reflexes of POc vowels; Proto Tanna, on the other hand, seems to have raised the mid vowels and (partly) merged them with the corresponding high vowels, and PTn *e and *o occur only as conditioned reflexes of POc *a. The development of the POc and PSV vowels is briefly outlined in Table 3.1, with the more important conditioned reflexes in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>e/i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>e/ɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ə</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*u, *ə</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>o/u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairly clear statements can be made about the development of four of the POc vowels in PSV and its daughter languages. The exception is POc *e: most occurrences of *e are word-final in POc, and a fair proportion of non-final occurrences were pretonic in (pre-)PSV; but most word-final and pretonic vowels are lost in PSV. There are thus very few etyma containing *e in which the vowel is actually retained, and this means that statements of its development are tentative.
3.1 Anejoffi

Anejoffi has the five vowels \(i, e, a, o, \) and \(u\), all of which occur both short and long. The unconditioned reflexes of the POc vowels in Anejoffi are:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{POc} & *i & *e & *a & *o & *u \\
\text{Anj} & e & e & a & e & o \\
\end{array}
\]

3.1.1 The POc high vowels

Both POc high vowels underwent lowering in Anejoffi. The unconditioned reflex of POc \( *i \) is \( e \):

\[
\begin{array}{l|l|l}
\text{POc} & \text{Anj} & \\
\text{\( *i \)} & \text{n/ep} & \text{‘k.o. mat’} \\
\text{\( *karis \)} & \text{a/kreθ} & \text{‘scratch (a person)’} \\
\text{\( *karis \)} & \text{a/yreθ} & \text{‘scrape’} \\
\text{\( *kita \)} & \text{e/yet} & \text{‘see’} \\
\text{\( *sipo \)} & \text{a/θe} & \text{‘go down’} \\
\text{\( *sipo \)} & \text{-se} & \text{‘down’} \\
\text{\( *ta-pine \)} & \text{na/taheñ} & \text{‘woman’} \\
\text{\( *[i]ko[e] \)} & \text{a/ek} & \text{‘you SG’} \\
\text{\( *bakiwa \)} & \text{ne/pyev} & \text{‘shark’} \\
\text{\( *siko \)} & \text{ne/θey} & \text{‘kingfisher’} \\
\text{\( *talise \)} & \text{n/tejeθ} & \text{‘Terminalia catappa’} \\
\text{\( *paliji \)} & \text{na/pjes} & \text{‘grass’} \\
\text{\( *pican \)} & \text{e/θeθ} & \text{‘how many?’} \\
\text{PSOc} & \text{\( *tikon \)} & \text{i/θey} & \text{‘walk w. stick’} \\
\end{array}
\]

and the unconditioned reflex of \( *u \) is \( o \):

\[
\begin{array}{l|l|l}
\text{POc} & \text{Anj} & \\
\text{\( *u \)} & \text{a/p"ol} & \text{‘sticky, stick to’} \\
\text{\( *ipu(t) \)} & \text{a/ho-i} & \text{‘blow’} \\
\text{\( *mutusi \)} & \text{a/m"ot} & \text{‘broken’} \\
\text{PSOc} & \text{\( *munim \)} & \text{a/m"oñ} & \text{‘drink (INTR)’} \\
\text{\( *tanum \)} & \text{a/tenom} & \text{‘bury’} \\
\text{\( *tubuq \)} & \text{a/top"} & \text{‘swell up’} \\
\text{\( *tubuq \)} & \text{e/θpo-} & \text{‘grandparent’} \\
\text{\( *makubu- \)} & \text{m"ap"o-} & \text{‘grandchild’} \\
\text{\( *butoñ- \)} & \text{no/p"o} & \text{‘navel’} \\
\text{\( *Rum"aq \)} & \text{n/iom"} & \text{‘house’} \\
\text{\( *kasupe \)} & \text{n/yeθo} & \text{‘rat’} \\
\text{\( *lumut \)} & \text{ne/iom"} & \text{‘moss’} \\
\text{\( *pudi \)} & \text{no/hos} & \text{‘banana’} \\
\end{array}
\]
POc *i has a number of conditioned reflexes. It appears to be reflected as o following *w or *u:

POc *i > Anjo / u,w __
*kawil n/yowoj ‘fish hook’
*suRi ne/θuo- ‘bone’
*kawit-i ni/yowos ‘breadfruit-picker’

There is a tendency for *i to be reflected as i rather than e in a couple of environments. One is morpheme-finall before a suffix (usually a possessive suffix or the transitive suffix -i):

POc *i > Anji / __-SUFFIX
*tina- ri/si- ‘mother’
*(s)juli(q)- n/sji- ‘shoot, of plant’
*wasi(n)- n/asi-ntal ‘taro stem’
*kali a/yi-i ‘dig’
*piri ai/hi-i ‘weave’
*mimiR a/mi-i ‘urinate’
PSOc *munim a/m*-ni-i ‘drink (TR)’

However, the following show the development of *i > e in this context:

POc *i > Anje
*qunap-i n/inehe- ‘scale’
*irip erere-i ‘fan’
*gansu aŋe-ı ‘spit (TR)’

Similarly, although there are some cases of POc morpheme-initial *i being reflected as e (like *irip > erere-i ‘to fan’ or *[i]ko[e] > a/ek ‘you SG’), there are other cases where morpheme-initial *i remains i: *ipu(t) > a/ıho-i ‘blow’, *ikuR- > n/iye- ‘tail’.

POc *u also has other reflexes, the conditioning of which is difficult to determine. It appears to be reflected as e adjacent to θ or following y, though there are counter-examples:

POc *u > Anje / θ, / y __
*susu e/θeθ ‘suck’
*susu- na/θe- ‘breast’
*susu ne/θeθ ‘breast’
*gansu elw-aŋeθ ‘spit (INTR)’
*paluca a/heleθ ‘to paddle’
*kutu ne/yet ‘louse’
*ikuR- ni/iye- ‘tail’

It seems to be reflected as u in two contexts:

(a) when it was morpheme-initial in POc (after loss of *g, *k or*R), and
(b) when it immediately preceded another vowel, u sometimes becoming w here:
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POc *u > Anj u ~ w

(a) *gumun nm"a-n/um" ‘oven’
*qupi n/u ‘yam’
*kupena no/up’on ‘fishing net’
*kuras no/uras ‘Morinda citrifolia’
*Ruqa- nawu/n/ua- ‘neck’

(b) *supa a/θua ‘spit in a spray’
*suRi- ne/θuo- ‘bone’
*tuqaka- e/twa- ‘same-sex sibling’
*sua a/θwu-i ‘to spear’

There is a residue of cases where *u > i, whose conditioning I cannot determine at this stage:

POc *u > Anj i

*punuq i/hni-i ‘finish’
*suRuq- ni/ði- ‘juice’
*quloc n/ija ‘maggot’
*qunap-i n/inehe- ‘scale (of fish)’
*nusa niθ ‘octopus’

There are also other etyma where *i and *u are reflected in some unexpected way; for example:

POc *i > Anj

*alito(n) n/ijis ‘torch’ [i for expected e]
*(q)ana-ñican i/ñθ ‘when?’ [i for expected e]
*tuk-i a/tya-ñi ‘pound’ [a for expected e]
*ðjira a/ar- ‘they, focal’ [a for expected e]
*pili huji/s ‘peel’ [u and i for expected e]
*pisiko- no/hoθye- ‘flesh’ [o for expected e]

POc *u > Anj

*baluR pela-ñ ‘mix’ [a for expected o]
*tuRi e/te ‘to string’ [e for expected o]
*nukwu a/iwu ‘be shady’ [u for expected o]
*nopu nahau ‘scorpion’ [au for expected o]

3.1.2 POc vowel sequences

Most vowel sequences involve one of the two high vowels. POc *ai sequences (some of which result from the loss of *q or *R between *a and *i) tend to be reflected as ai finally (but as i before a consonant?):

POc *ai > Anj ai / __#, i / __C

*[ka]jaRi n/aŋai ‘Canarium sp.’
*waiR n/wai ‘water’
*waRisa n/viθ ‘two days from today’
Note also however POc *sei > əi ‘who?’.

POc *ua (or maybe *uV) sequences are regularly reflected as ou finally and as ow before a following vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *ua</th>
<th>Anj ou, ow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*luaq</td>
<td>a/lou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rua</td>
<td>e/rou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puaq</td>
<td>o/hou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puaq-</td>
<td>no/howa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*matuqa</td>
<td>metou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *uV</th>
<th>Anj ou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*puRe</td>
<td>no/hou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tapuRi</td>
<td>n/tohou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *au sequences, however, are less predictable, with the reflexes au, o, a and u all being found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *au</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*qauR</td>
<td>n/au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paRu</td>
<td>n/hau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paus-i</td>
<td>a/həθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mataqu-</td>
<td>n/mata-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maqurip</td>
<td>u/mu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 **POc mid vowels**

The unconditioned reflex of POc *o is e:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *o</th>
<th>Anj e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*boŋi</td>
<td>a/peñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*boŋi</td>
<td>ne/peñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*boni</td>
<td>e/peñ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kona</td>
<td>a/yeŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kojom-i</td>
<td>a/yhem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*likos</td>
<td>a/jye-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mono</td>
<td>a/men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ronoR</td>
<td>e/jye-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toka</td>
<td>a/tey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toka</td>
<td>e/tey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*panoda</td>
<td>a/hanej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ropok</td>
<td>a/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lipon-</td>
<td>ne/jhe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em>alo</td>
<td>n/m*oje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pisiko-</td>
<td>no/hoðye-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are very few exceptions to this generalisation. There are some cases of \( *o > a \), which I cannot explain:

**POc \( *o \) > Anj a**

- \( *\text{quloc} \) nija 'maggot'
- \( *\text{ñoro} \) ya 'flow uncontrollably'
- \( *\text{legos} \) e/laθ 'look at' \([a \text{ may reflect } *eo]\)
- \( *\text{jojo}=a(n,\eta) \) a/θaθji-ǝn 'to plug'

Most other apparent exceptions, however, have a plausible explanation:

**POc \( *o \) > Anj**

- \( *\text{lipon} \) n/θjo- 'tooth' \([\text{but cf. also nejhe-}\])
- \( *\text{topu} \) n/θe- 'sugarcane' \([o \text{ may be } < *u]\)
- \( *\text{toqa} \) n/jaa 'fowl' \([*\text{toqa} > a?]\)
- \( *\text{bokasi} \) pikaθ 'pig'

As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, there are few secure reflexes of forms which contain \( *e \). Some comparisons suggest that the unconditioned reflex of \( *e \) may be \( e \):

**POc \( *e \) > Anj e**

- \( *\text{qe} \) n/θpa 'pandanus mat'
- \( *\text{e} \) e/sej 'three'
- \( *\text{ma-teli} \) a/mesej 'thick'
- \( *\text{ka} \) n/θaθ/leθ 'crab sp.' \([\text{Unexplained loss of } *k; \text{ cannot source the accretion -leθ; may not be cognate}]\)
- \( *\text{pe} \) n/θele- 'penis' \([\text{Expect } *l > j / __ *i; \text{ may not be cognate}]\)

though there are a couple of cases where the reflex is \( a \):

**POc \( *e \) > Anj a**

- \( *\text{bu} \) n/θpña 'fruit dove'
- \( *\text{le} \) e/laθ 'look at'

**POc \( *puRe \) > no/hou 'k.o. beach vine' shows the regular development of \( *\text{uV} \) as \( ou \). Two other forms apparently showing reflexes of \( *e \) are:**

**POc \( *e \) > Anj**

- \( *\text{kupen} \) n/θp/θn 'fishing net' \([\text{Rounding due to preceding } *p'\text{?}]\)
- \( *\text{age} \) n/ti, n/ti- 'excrement' \([*a(q)e > i?]\)

3.1.4 **POc \( *a \)**

POc \( *a \) is the most frequently occurring vowel. I have already dealt with sequences of vowels one of which is \( *a \). When not part of a vowel cluster, the unconditioned reflex of \( *a \) is Anjoñi \( a \):
There are, however, other reflexes of *a. Each appears to occur in a definable environment, though there are contradictory cases where the reflex is a in the same environment.

First, there is a strong tendency for *a > e / _-Ci,*Cu:

POc *a > Anj e / _-Ci,*Cu

*knRat-i a/yes ‘bite’ [but note also a/yas]
*tajim a/tes ‘sharpen’
*paRiu ne/hayo ‘cyclone’
*kapika n/yehey ‘Malay apple’ [*k > y irregular]
*qunap-i n/inhe-y ‘scale’
*talise n/tejeθ ‘Terminalia catappa’
*tanum a/tenom ‘bury’
*paluca a/heleθ ‘to paddle’
*matuq a/metou ‘ripe’
*kasupe n/yeθo ‘rat’
*balur pela-ñ ‘mix’

This e < *a was sometimes further raised to i when immediately preceding an Anejom palatal consonant:

POc *a > Anj i / _-PALATAL

*kanj yiñ ‘eat (TR)’
*talijna- n/tijna- ‘ear’
*alito(n) n/ijis ‘torch’
However, there are a number of other examples of *a > a in the same environment, like *maqati > mas 'low tide' or *manuk > n/maa 'bird'.

POc *a seems to have sometimes become i when preceded by a consonant cluster and followed by the transitive suffix -i:

POc *a >  Anj i / CC__-i
*konä  e/yni-i  'make s.o. drunk'
*tapa  a/thi-i  'cut off'
*tapa  i/thi-i  'cut into strips'

There is also a tendency for *a > o in the environment of labials:

POc *a >  Anj o / LABIAL
*gapu(l)  n/yop/ða  'rain'
*kawil  n/yowoj  'fish hook'
*m*alo  n/m*oje  'reef'
*tapuRi  n/tohau  'conch'
*kawit-i  ni/yowos  'breadfruit-picker'

Finally, some words show *a > e (occasionally i) / _Ca, though there are exceptions:

POc a >  Anj e / _*Ca
*paŋan  heŋaŋ  'eat (a lot)'
*maya  nalau-me  'flame'
*(q)aŋa(n,ŋ)-  n/θa-  'name'
*sapa  n/ŋe  'what?'

3.1.5 Summary

These facts are summarised in Table 3.2. Conditioned reflexes are in square brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*ai</th>
<th>*au</th>
<th>*uV</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*a</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>i?</td>
<td>ai?</td>
<td>au [a, o, u]</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>e [i, o]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a [i, e, o]</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Proto Erromango

Although both Erromangan languages have five surface vowels, there is a sixth underlying vowel in Sye. In this section, I will show that PEr needs to be reconstructed with six vowel phonemes – *i, *e, *a, *o and *u – and I will also discuss their development from the POc vowels. Many more than six frequently attested vowel correspondence sets can be found, however: while the conditioning of some of these is clear, for others it is not. There is a considerable amount of 'unpredictability' about the vowels across the Southern Vanuatu family generally and, in addition, the sociolinguistic situation on Erromango may well have led to considerable borrowing, thus further complicating the situation. In what follows, I will be concerned with regular correspondences and with clearly statable tendencies.
The unconditioned correspondences of the Proto Erromango vowels are as follows; the conditioning of the reflexes of *ə will be explained below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*ə</th>
<th>*a</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>iə</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These reflect Proto Oceanic vowels as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*a</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for *ə, numerous examples of the Sye:Ura vowel correspondence sets can be found in the previous chapter, and I will give just a few here (with reconstructed PEr lexical items):¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>S Ye i</th>
<th>Ura i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ayup</td>
<td>ayup</td>
<td>ayup</td>
<td>‘cloudy, about to rain’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*etni</td>
<td>etni</td>
<td>ehni</td>
<td>‘cook, burn’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*iriri</td>
<td>iriri</td>
<td>iriri</td>
<td>‘climb to end of branch’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ofwaki</td>
<td>owwaki</td>
<td>ofwaki</td>
<td>‘pray’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*unoras</td>
<td>unorah</td>
<td>unoras</td>
<td>‘stone at river mouth’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*neiteve-</td>
<td>neiteve-</td>
<td>neiteve-</td>
<td>‘shin’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*netuyo</td>
<td>netuyo</td>
<td>netuyo</td>
<td>‘reef’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ninvo</td>
<td>ninvo</td>
<td>ninvo</td>
<td>‘driftwood’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*suju</td>
<td>suju</td>
<td>suju</td>
<td>‘kiss’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*itim</td>
<td>itim</td>
<td>ihnom</td>
<td>‘quick’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ita</td>
<td>ita</td>
<td>ita</td>
<td>‘OK, alright’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 The POC and PEr high vowels

I leave discussion of the reflexes of the high vowels in vowel sequences until the next section. The unconditioned reflexes of POC *i and *u are PEr *i and *u – i.e. *i > i and *u > u in both Sye and Ura. (When adjacent to another vowel, the reflexes are frequently y and w.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POC *i &gt; PEr *i (~ *y)</th>
<th>Sye i (~ y)</th>
<th>Ura i (~ y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*sii</td>
<td>a/sis</td>
<td>a/sis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kamiu</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>ŋimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[i]ko[e]</td>
<td>k/ık</td>
<td>{ga}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(k)ira</td>
<td>ir/or</td>
<td>le’il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pitik</td>
<td>tor/pis</td>
<td>dor/pis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[ka]ŋari</td>
<td>n/aŋai</td>
<td>n/aŋai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bokasi</td>
<td>no/mpyahi</td>
<td>{umyas}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*molis</td>
<td>ne/mli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Reconstructions given for Proto Erromango (and, later in this section, Proto Tanna) are given in their post-vowel deletion form. It is likely that many of these forms may have had an additional final vowel – see Chapter 4.
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*qunap{-ni} *ve- *vei- 'scale'
*lisag *ul* *isi- 'nit'
*piRaq *nta*-*e*-*ve* *da*-*li*- *ya* 'k.o. taro'

POc *u > PEr *u (~ *w)
Sye u (~ w) Ura (u ~ w)
*gumun -*n-um -*n-um 'oven'
*qupe *n*-*up* *n*-*up* 'yam'
*buto*-*j* yo-*mp* yo-*but* 'navel'
*natu-* nitu-* neru-* 'child'
*kuri*-*ta* noy-*wo* *wis 'squid, octopus'
*rakum*-*a* *n*-*roy*-*um* 'k.o. crab'
*taku* 'back' *n*-*toy*- *nta-* 'shoulder-blade'
*manuk* meny-* {man-*} 'bird'

There are, however, a number of etyma in which *i is lowered to e in one or both of the Erromangan languages. There appears to be reasonably clear conditioning of this change in the development of Proto Erromangan *i: lowering occurred in Sye when *i was adjacent to (*s plus) a labial obstruent:

POc *i > PEr *i/ *(s)b, *(s)v
POc Sye e Ura i
*tapine* na-*h*-*ve*-*en* ya-*r*-*ve*-*in* 'woman'
*pisa* a-*ve*-*h*-*e* a-*v*-*is* 'squeeze'
*papine* veve-*n* vin-* 'sister of man'
*sipo* -sep ~ -hep -yip 'down'
*ehpi* isbi 'count'
*evivat* ivivat 'thick'
*evram* ivram '{(fish) stir up water'
*ehvi* *isvi* 'bury'
*nempyo-* nimye-*n* 'buttocks'
*nevlo*-* yivle*-*k* 'bed, shelf'
*nevram* nivram 'starting-point in weaving a wall'
*nevri* nivri 'roofing-style'

There are other cases which are less clear:

POc *i > Sye i Ura e
*mimiR* evla-*mi* evil-*me* 'urinate'
*lima* suk-*rim* suwo-*rem* 'five'
*talise* n-*te*-*le* dire 'Terminalia catappa'

POc *i > Sye e Ura e, a
*kuliti-* no-*yle*-*h* no-*yle*-*s* 'skin'
*pican* nr-*ve* gi-*va* 'how many?'

Just as *i showed sporadic lowering to e in one or both languages, so *u shows sporadic lowering to o, most commonly adjacent to a labial:
There is also a tendency for PEr word-final *uy to be reflected as Ura e (‘y being regularly lost in this position in Ura):

POc *u > /__*y#

POC *i >

POC *u >

‘fruit dove’

‘banana’

‘mosquito’

‘conch’

‘grow’

‘alive’

‘torch’

‘blow’

‘dive’

‘grandparent’

‘grandchild’

‘sacred’

‘steam’

‘earthquake’

‘swim, bathe’

‘wet’

‘soft’

‘chief’

‘know’

‘sea’

‘when?’

‘bone’

‘gums’

‘alive’

‘stand’

‘Burckella obovata’

‘sticky, stick to’

‘fear’

‘broken’
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*`m`arugen > nuv-mori `nuv-mori` 'k.o. yam'
*(p,b)ikuR > -mpyo- `-mpyo-` 'tail'
*`g`u`l`oc `n`ilah `ila` 'maggot'
*`q`unap-i > n/i`e`vi- `n/i`e`vi-` 'scale'
*`m`unim > o/mon/ki `o/mon` 'drink'
*`t`anum > ten/m `ten/m` 'bury'
*ku`R`ita > noy/woh `wis` 'squid, octopus'
*`m`atuqa- > meta- `mara-` 'mother’s brother'

3.2.2 POe vowel sequences

Unlike in Anejoﬁ, where the reflexes of some vowel sequences are different from the reflexes of both component vowels (e.g. *ua > ou), the reflexes of vowels in a sequence in the Erromangan languages do not seem to differ from the reflexes of those same vowels in other environments. For example:

POe *Vi, *iV > Sye Ura
*i*au yau yau 'I'
*sei ‘who?’ se ‘what?’

POe *Vu, *uV > Sye Ura
*i*au yau yau ‘I’
*paRu n/vau -n’vau ‘Hibiscus tiliaceus’
*r*ua nru/ru ge/lu ‘two’
*p*aqoRu it-vau ar-vau ‘new’
*q*aR nau le/nau ‘bamboo’
*p*uaq o/vwo ‘bear fruit’
*p*uaq- no/vwa- na/va- ‘seed’
*l*uqa e/lwo e/lwa ‘vomit’
*R*uqa- no/wa- n/a- ‘neck’
*ta`b`a`u tevayau devayau ‘k.o. mat’

3.2.3 The POc and PEr mid vowels

As in Anejoﬁ, the reflexes of the fairly rare phoneme *e are confused, though there is a tendency for *e to be reflected as e in both languages. Note the following:

POc *e > PEr *e

*(w,v)ele > vel/ŋah nù/ver/ŋi ‘Barringtonia edulis’
*papine- > vevne- {vin-} ‘sister of man’
*p`ekas > {e/vyah} i/vek ‘defecate’
*sei ‘who?’ se ‘what?’
PSOc *`t`e`l`i > nre/hel {ge/hli} ‘three’
There are some cases of POc *e, however, which show irregular developments in at least one Erromangan language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *e</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bakewa</td>
<td>ne/mpou</td>
<td>u/beu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*keli</td>
<td>o/yəl</td>
<td>o/yli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taqe-</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>si-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*legos</td>
<td>e/la-</td>
<td>e/l-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kup</em>ena</td>
<td>no/ypon</td>
<td>‘fishing net’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m”aqane-</td>
<td>mano-</td>
<td>‘brother of woman’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following also suggest Proto Erromangan *e:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *e</th>
<th>Sye e</th>
<th>Ura e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>empyu</td>
<td>emyu</td>
<td>‘dance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empahiwoji</td>
<td>ebasiwoji</td>
<td>‘send on errand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ehpe</td>
<td>espe</td>
<td>‘reflexive verb’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evorwar</td>
<td>evorwar</td>
<td>‘braid (hair)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nevyarep</td>
<td>nevyarep</td>
<td>‘boy, youth’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a general tendency for PEr *e to be reflected as o in Sye but to remain e in Ura (i) adjacent to a velar consonant and (ii) (verb-)initially before *r:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr *e / Velar</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oryone</td>
<td>eɾyen</td>
<td>‘mixed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oryoki</td>
<td>eleyi</td>
<td>‘pick up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntoy</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>‘sea’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nempon</td>
<td>nimgen</td>
<td>‘time, when’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nevloŋko-</td>
<td>nevlege/n</td>
<td>‘piece, part’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neitanroyroy</td>
<td>nitàdeyrek</td>
<td>‘chafing between legs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tevayoy</td>
<td>tavayek</td>
<td>‘crawl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uleyeloŋ</td>
<td>uleyelen</td>
<td>‘k.o. tree’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are both assigned to PEr *e since they contrast with an o:o set in the same environment, reflecting PEr *o.

There is a reasonably strong tendency for POc *o to be reflected as a in Ura and as either e or a in Sye, suggesting PEr *a:
POc *o > Sye e, a  
Sye Ura a  
*mono 'stay' na/men e/ra  
*toka e/te  
*lipon- ne/lve-  
*kona a/y an  
*quloc n/ilah ila  
*tanoq dena  
*[i]ko[e] {k/ik} ga  
'stay'  
'tooth'  
'bitter'  
'maggot'  
'land'  
'you SG'

However, note also:

POc *o > Sye  
Sye Ura  
*rogoR o/roŋ-i e/rni  
*paqoRu it-vau ar-vau  
*ioqa ne/two u/rwa  
*boni e/mpen i/bin  
*bo- e/mpu i/bu  
'hear'  
'new'  
'fowl'  
'smell'  
'smell'

3.2.4 POc and PEr *a

I exclude discussion of the sources of PEr *a from this section. The unconditioned reflex of *a is a in both Sye and Ura. There are many examples of this, and only a few are listed below:

POc *a > PEr *a

POc *a > Sye a  
Sye Ura a  
*mamaq e/ma-i a/m a-i  
*taRaq-i e/ta i a/rai  
*(ŋ)awan ov an av an  
*[i]au yau yau  
*[m]asi ne/mah na/mas  
*[t]awan n/tau dau  
*[k]nara R n/ŋ a i  
*nasu(q) nahwo-num naswo-num  
*saqat sat ar-w/at  
*pat nr/vat sin i/vat 'nine'  
*paqoRu it-vau ar-vau  
*paqan- n/va- ni/va-  
*paRi u/var u/var  
*patu n/vat ni/vat  
*paRu n/vau -n/vau  
*qapat(a,o) n/avat n/avat  
*bokasi no/mpyahi u/myas  
*puaq 'fruit' no/vwa- na/va-  
*maRi n/mar ni/mal  
*ta los n/tal dal  
'chew'  
'cut, write'  
'open, agape'  
'I'  
'cloth(es)'  
'lychee'  
'Canarium sp.'  
'steam'  
'bad'  
'nine'  
'four'  
'new'  
'thig h'  
'st ingray'  
'stone'  
'Hibiscus tiliaceus'  
'edible wood-grub'  
'pig'  
'seed'  
'breadfruit'  
'taro'
There is a tendency for Sye to reflect *a as o especially after w, m or u:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *a</th>
<th>PEr *a / w, m, u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye o</td>
<td>Ura a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*luaq</td>
<td>e/lwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pānān</td>
<td>a/v'jon-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puaq</td>
<td>o/vwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*matuqa</td>
<td>etwo erwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toqa</td>
<td>ne/two u/rwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lawaq</td>
<td>yari/lwo yari/lwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahwo</td>
<td>aswa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monoywo</td>
<td>noywa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nijromo</td>
<td>nijama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ituqo</td>
<td>tija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nauqo</td>
<td>nawituja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a reasonably frequent trend for final POc *a after other consonants to become e in Sye (though there are exceptions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *a</th>
<th>PEr *a / _#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye e</td>
<td>Ura a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mataq</td>
<td>e/mte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mataq</td>
<td>tele/mte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paraq</td>
<td>ne/vre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*piRaq</td>
<td>ntal-e/vye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of cases where POc *a is reflected as PEr *e. Many of these involve a high vowel in the next syllable (though there are other cases of *aCi or *aCu in which POc *a is reflected as PEr *a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>a / _</em>Ci, *Cu</th>
<th>PEr *e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye e</td>
<td>Ura e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*matakut</td>
<td>e/metet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tajim</td>
<td>tesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
<td>e/tenom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
<td>tenom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kani</td>
<td>eni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qunap-i</td>
<td>n/i'nevi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nantu(q)</td>
<td>yetu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taliŋa</td>
<td>n/teŋo-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also a few cases where POc *a is reflected as PEr *e before *Ca:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>a / _</em>Ca</th>
<th>PEr *e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye e</td>
<td>Ura e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tabakau</td>
<td>tevayau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maya-</td>
<td>nelwa/me-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapak</td>
<td>o/yep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.5 *a in Proto Erromango

There is no surface schwa in the Erromangan languages. Terry Crowley (1998:7-9), however, has posited an underlying schwa in Sye to account for Ø-○ alternations like the following:

POc > PEr *a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
<td>etenm-or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kali</td>
<td>oyl-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of synchronic phonological considerations, initial n or nr and a following heterorganic consonant could also be reconstructed in Pre-Sye as having been separated by schwa (e.g. surface nvat 'stone' and nrve 'how many?' are underlying nwat and nrve). Only a few such forms have cognates in Ura, and here Ura i corresponds with Sye a:

POc *a > PEr *a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye /ə/ = Ø</th>
<th>Ura i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na maRi</td>
<td>/namar/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na bou</td>
<td>/napau/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na patu</td>
<td>/navat/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na paqan-</td>
<td>/nva-/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nwampun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that *a needs to be reconstructed for Proto Erromango.

One of the sources of PEr *a is the Low Vowel Dissimilation and Article Reduction rules (see §4.3), by which the a of the fused article POc *na became PEr (and PSV) *a when the initial syllable of the noun root began with *Ca, and where many other occurrences of POc *aCa (like the first three examples below) become PEr *aCa. For example:

POc *aCa > PEr *aCe(V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye Ø (=ə?)</th>
<th>Ura Ø (i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*qalawa</td>
<td>alwo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qasawa</td>
<td>ahwo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tama-</td>
<td>e/tme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other examples, however, it is not clear under what conditions PEr *a developed. The reflexes of *kita suggest metathesis (Pre-PEr *kati), not only because of the *a reflex of the first vowel but also because of the palatalisation of *t.

POc *? > PEr *a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye a</th>
<th>Ura Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kita</td>
<td>/oyəh/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*roŋoR</td>
<td>/orəŋ/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kali</td>
<td>/oyəl/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/sentəv/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/avər/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a third set of words in which Sye 0 corresponds with Ura i, and this correspondence set also, I suggest, reflects *a, since 0 is the only surface manifestation of *a in Sye. The following are some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>*a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gasa-wa-</td>
<td>ahi-</td>
<td>awi/n</td>
<td>‘husband’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSoC</td>
<td>*gida</td>
<td>koh</td>
<td>gis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*=ra</td>
<td>-o/r</td>
<td>-i/l</td>
<td>‘3PL object suffix’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talonj</td>
<td>talinj</td>
<td>‘kill’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telwoh</td>
<td>delwis</td>
<td>‘k.o. yam’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etayor</td>
<td>arail</td>
<td>‘sweep’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also (a) the pair Sye /nrawe/, Ura giva ‘how much/many?’, where the initial nr or g is an historical prefix, and (b) the pair Sye mah, Ura imis ‘die, be dead’, which may point to initial a.

It therefore appears that POc *aCa sequences became *aC(a) in Proto Erromango, but that *a in some other contexts, as well as other POc vowels, also occasionally became *a.

### 3.2.6 Summary

This discussion is summarised in Table 3.3, with conditioned reflexes enclosed within square brackets. (Utaha data are insufficient to make any firm conclusions.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3: Erromango reflexes of POc vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Proto Tanna

As in Erromango, there is considerable fluctuation between vowels in Tanna: that is, although there are some regular sets of sound correspondences, there are also many examples of irregular correspondence sets. Once again, then, I will speak here of ‘general tendencies’ rather than strictly regular correspondences.

A detailed examination of the vowel correspondences in the Tanna languages strongly supports the view that Proto Tanna had six phonemic vowels: *i, *e, *a, *o and *u. The unconditioned reflexes of these six vowel phonemes are as follows:
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The unconditioned reflexes of the POc vowels in Proto Tanna are:

POc  *i  *e  *a  *o  *u  
PTn  *i  *e  *a  *o  *u  

The examples below show words containing these vowels, together with Proto Tanna reconstructed forms. (Note that in some cases an unstressed vowel may be reflected as ə – see §3.3.1 below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*vi</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>'pull'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nim&quot;a</td>
<td>nim&quot;a</td>
<td>nissiu</td>
<td>nissiu</td>
<td>nissiu</td>
<td>'house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*siu(i)</td>
<td>nissiu</td>
<td>isiiu</td>
<td>isiiu</td>
<td>isiiu</td>
<td>'lake'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*or</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>'do'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tma-</td>
<td>tma-</td>
<td>tma-</td>
<td>tma-</td>
<td>tma-</td>
<td>'father'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*awməan</td>
<td>awməan</td>
<td>awməan</td>
<td>awməan</td>
<td>awməan</td>
<td>'eat (INTR)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na-(p,b)ək</td>
<td>napək</td>
<td>napək</td>
<td>napək</td>
<td>napək</td>
<td>'banyan'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*n-der</td>
<td>nərei</td>
<td>nate</td>
<td>nate</td>
<td>nate</td>
<td>'taro'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ami</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>'urinate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ayab&quot;an</td>
<td>ayaban</td>
<td>akap&quot;an</td>
<td>ap&quot;an</td>
<td>ap&quot;an</td>
<td>'hot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m&quot;adikaro</td>
<td>matikalo</td>
<td>m&quot;atikalo</td>
<td>m&quot;atikalo</td>
<td>m&quot;atikalo</td>
<td>'worm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kauna</td>
<td>-kauna</td>
<td>-kauna</td>
<td>-kauna</td>
<td>kauna</td>
<td>'chin'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Some preliminary issues

Before looking in detail at the reflexes of individual POc vowels in the Tanna languages, however, a couple of more general issues need to be examined. Tanna languages have a phonemic central vowel /ə/, phonetically [i] after a coronal consonant and [ə] elsewhere. This appears to have at least two historical sources (as I will show in more detail in §3.3.5). One is dissimilation of POc *a before *Ca, though Kwamera alone among Tanna languages seems to have subsequently fronted this to e. The other is related to the fact that unstressed vowels – especially but by no means only /a/ – often weaken to schwa, at least optionally, and this weakening may have been frequent enough to bring about phonemic changes in some words. For example, PTn *ab"om"ah 'long' > NTn a'bonah, Wsn a"pom"ah, shows the expected a:a correspondence in both pretonic and posttonic position; PTn *amnahay 'sweat' > NTn am nahaIJ, Wsn am nahaIJ, however, shows an a:a correspondence in pretonic position. Although both of these words were presumably *a-initial originally, the phonetic weakening of pretonic a brought about a phonemic change in some words in some languages (as in *amnahay in Whitesands) but not in others (like *ab"om"ah in Whitesands and both of these forms in North Tanna).
Schwa also occurs as an epenthetic vowel in Tanna languages, to break up underlying initial or final clusters of two consonants and medial clusters of three consonants. This epenthetic schwa is not simply an open transition, but may carry stress. For example:

**Lenakel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>trans</th>
<th>POc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/-r-ol/</td>
<td>[tirɔl]</td>
<td>*malaso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-ə-ən-ən/</td>
<td>[ʼəsin'na:n]</td>
<td>*maqati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-r-əm-ən/</td>
<td>[ri'man]</td>
<td>*man-a-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nu</td>
<td>[niɾu]</td>
<td>*nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nm*ə-a-nu</td>
<td>[ni'm*onru]</td>
<td>*nu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is possible in cases like that of *nu* ‘sugarcane’ above to show that the schwa is epenthetic, since it only occurs when the root is unprefixed, it is not always possible to identify if other occurrences of morpheme-internal schwa are epenthetic or phonemic.

A second issue concerns h. There are two phonotactic problems relating to the phoneme h in the Tanna languages which need to be raised here. First, h seems to move to the left of its expected position in at least some words, particularly in Lenakel (and also to some extent in Southwest Tanna). Look first at the following examples for which we have fairly unambiguous POc reconstructions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*malaso</td>
<td>mhal</td>
<td>S smla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maqati</td>
<td>mha</td>
<td>K maha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examine also the following cognates:

**Lenakel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alhaau</td>
<td>W alshu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am*ha</td>
<td>W am*ah, K amas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapel</td>
<td>K apəri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hal</td>
<td>K erhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho</td>
<td>W, S uh, K osi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avhe</td>
<td>K aviaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiuan</td>
<td>K kusan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiau</td>
<td>W iahuuei, K iasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahinəl</td>
<td>N anuəhəl, W aŋəshi, K erəhara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given this kind of movement, I take the more leftward occurrence of h as being a recent development, and reconstruct the phoneme which gives rise to it more to the right – for example, the first four sets of forms in the list immediately above would suggest the Proto Tanna reconstructions *arəhu ‘put down’, *am*ah ‘suck’, *aperh(-i) ‘clean’ and *arh(-i) ‘send’.

In addition to these changes brought about by h – and of more relevance to the topic of this chapter – there is another strong tendency, particularly in the northern Tanna languages, for some form of vowel-copying to occur in the environment of h, even when the vowels adjacent to h were non-identical in POc (and presumably PTn). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*susu- naha-</td>
<td>naha-</td>
<td>naha-</td>
<td>nahi-</td>
<td>nanha-</td>
<td>‘breast’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kasupe kahap</td>
<td>kahau</td>
<td>kahau</td>
<td>iahuk</td>
<td>tesuk</td>
<td>‘rat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taci- taha-</td>
<td>noua-taha-</td>
<td>norh-</td>
<td>nou-lahi-</td>
<td>p/rsisi</td>
<td>‘younger same-sex sibling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gusan nuhuan</td>
<td>nuhuan</td>
<td>nihin</td>
<td>nehen</td>
<td>nesən</td>
<td>‘rain (n.)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In such cases, I take the southern Tanna languages as more accurately reflecting the original PTn vowels. The following rule appears to have applied in northern Tanna: \( *V_jhV_j > V_jhV_i \).

In the sections which follow, therefore, when I say that (for example) POc \(*i\) is regularly reflected as \(i\) in all five languages, I will treat as regular correspondences both cases where some languages have \(i\) and others \(a\), and also cases where northern languages may have some vowel other than \(i\) when adjacent to \(h\).

### 3.3.2 The POc high vowels

POc \(*i\) is reflected as PTn \(*i\) and appears to have no other conditioned reflexes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc (*i)</th>
<th>PTn (*i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(*tasik)</td>
<td>(nt)/(tehi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((p,b)ikuR)-</td>
<td>(na)/(bika)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*likos)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(liis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*mimiR)</td>
<td>{(a/\alpha)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*taci-)</td>
<td>(taha)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*uit(n))-</td>
<td>(n)/(usi)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*pine)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(vna)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PSOC\ *[i]go)</td>
<td>(ik)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc \(*u\) is generally reflected as \(u\) in all Tanna languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc (*u)</th>
<th>PTn (*u)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(*tanum)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(tam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*tubu-)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(tap)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*suRi-)</td>
<td>(-\alpha)/(-n)/(ul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*uRat)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(buto)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*buta-)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(pata)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*kasupe)</td>
<td>(kahap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*mataqu)</td>
<td>(\alpha)/(adap)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there are some cases where POc \(*u > e\) in Southwest Tanna and Kwamera. This appears to occur (i) as dissimilation of the first \(u\) in a \(*uCu\) sequence, and (ii) adjacent to \(*q.\)

---

2 In a couple of cases, one of the southern languages has \(e\) but the other has \(u\); comparisons like \(*qutok > SWT\ -kula, Kwm k'era 'brain' suggest that the rounding of the consonant has been transferred to the vowel – i.e. that Pre-SWT \(k\'ela\) became \(-kula.\)
**POc *u > PTn *u / * _ Cu, / * q**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mutusi</em></td>
<td>mutah</td>
<td>mutah</td>
<td>murh</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{e}r\textsuperscript{e}s</td>
<td>'broken off'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tuqur</em></td>
<td>a/tul</td>
<td>e/tuul</td>
<td>a/lel</td>
<td>a/rer</td>
<td>'stand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kuu</em></td>
<td>ka/\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>ka/\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>kel</td>
<td>ur</td>
<td>'louse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qasu</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)ha}-</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)ha}-</td>
<td>n/he-</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)se}-</td>
<td>'smoke'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qusan</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)huhan}</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)huhan}</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)thin}</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)ehen}</td>
<td>'rain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qupi</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)up}</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)w}</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)ek}-</td>
<td>'yam'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qutok</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)uha}-</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)uha}-</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)l}a-</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)l}a-</td>
<td>'brain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qumun</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)um}\textsuperscript{(\nu)}an</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)um}\textsuperscript{(\nu)}an</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)l}a-</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)l}a-</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)l}a-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a few cases where e might be expected as the reflex of *u we find i instead; the two SWT and Kwm forms in the second item below represent different dialects.

**POc *u > PTn * u / * _ Cu, / * q**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>suRuq-</em></td>
<td>na/ha-</td>
<td>na/ha-</td>
<td>ni/hi-</td>
<td>na\textsuperscript{(\nu)hi}-</td>
<td>'juice, fluid'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quma</em></td>
<td>as/um</td>
<td>as/um</td>
<td>as/um\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>as\textsuperscript{(\nu)iim}, as/im,</td>
<td>'garden (v.)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manuk</em></td>
<td>men\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>men\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>menu</td>
<td>menu</td>
<td>'bird'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>makubu-</em></td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{(\nu)}ip\textsuperscript{(\nu)}\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{(\nu)}ip\textsuperscript{(\nu)}\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{(\nu)}ip\textsuperscript{(\nu)}\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{(\nu)}ip\textsuperscript{(\nu)}\textsuperscript{(\nu)}</td>
<td>'grandchild'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uti(n)-</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)us(\nu)-}</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)us(\nu)-}</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{(\nu)usi-}</td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{(\nu)a-n/ihi-}</td>
<td>'penis'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And note also:

**POc *u > NTn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>luaq</em></td>
<td>eoa</td>
<td>eua</td>
<td>eua</td>
<td>lua</td>
<td>{eua}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>panua</em></td>
<td>lat/u\textsuperscript{anu}</td>
<td>lah/u\textsuperscript{anu}</td>
<td>na/u\textsuperscript{anu}</td>
<td>lw/k\textsuperscript{(\nu)anu}</td>
<td>ru/k\textsuperscript{(\nu)anu}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gauR</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)}o</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)au}</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)au}</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)au}</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)au}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ruqa-</em></td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}-</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}-</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}-</td>
<td>n/\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}-</td>
<td>'neck'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rua</em></td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}/iu</td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}/iu</td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}/iu</td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}/lu</td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{(\nu)a}/ru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is occasional raising of *a to e in *ai and *ia sequences:

---

\textsuperscript{3} The Kwamera form is probably a loan from Lenakel or, more likely, Whitesands: the expected reflex is (V)r<u. 
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POc *iV, *Vi > NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm
  *piRaq  nu/via  nu/via  ‘k.o. taro’
  *waRisa  n/iav  n/iav  ‘2 days away’
  *(q)ana-jican  n/a/nhav  n/a/nhav  ‘when?’
  *waiR  n/av  n/av  ‘water’

3.3.4 The POc mid vowels

POc *e appears to be reflected as PTn *i, with widespread reduction to a in all languages except Kwamera:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*m”aqane-</td>
<td>na/m”ana-</td>
<td>na/m”ana-</td>
<td>pu/mani-i</td>
<td>‘woman’s brother’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kape</td>
<td>na/si-</td>
<td>na/si-</td>
<td>na/si-</td>
<td>‘excrement’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taqe-</td>
<td>na/uni-</td>
<td>na/uni-</td>
<td>na/uni-</td>
<td>‘man’s sister’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sei</td>
<td>na/uni-</td>
<td>na/uni-</td>
<td>na/uni-</td>
<td>‘who?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *o appears to become PTn *u in some cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PTn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bokasi</td>
<td>pukas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*topu</td>
<td>na/tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gomo</td>
<td>a/kum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *o > PTn *u

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ro1)oR</td>
<td>a/la</td>
<td>a/ra</td>
<td>a/la</td>
<td>‘perceive’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*butoT}</td>
<td>na/butw</td>
<td>na/wa/ptæ-</td>
<td>na/præwa-</td>
<td>na/purenjia-</td>
<td>‘navel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ropok</td>
<td>i/viga</td>
<td>i/viga</td>
<td>i/vaga</td>
<td>i/vaga</td>
<td>‘fly, jump’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toka</td>
<td>a/tau</td>
<td>a/tau</td>
<td>a/tau</td>
<td>a/tau</td>
<td>‘stay’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some cases, however, where Kwamera e < *a has further weakened to a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*boni</td>
<td>l-a/avan</td>
<td>l-a/avan</td>
<td>ie-n/pan</td>
<td>na/pan</td>
<td>‘night’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tob</em></td>
<td>na/apæ-</td>
<td>ne/apæ-</td>
<td>tanu-</td>
<td>tanu-</td>
<td>‘belly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*molis</td>
<td>na/mælah</td>
<td>k”a-n/mælah</td>
<td>na/mæhli</td>
<td>‘citrus’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOC</td>
<td>a/sken</td>
<td>a/sken</td>
<td>a/sken</td>
<td>a/sken</td>
<td>‘walk w. stick’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 This form appears to be a compound: note also Sye nevlah, Ura wavis, Anejom nahelee, which suggest a PSV form something like *-(y)avi-lV si.

5 With *boni ‘smell’ > NTn a/bien, Wsn, Len, SWT a/pien, Kwm a/pein, there appears to have been metathesis (i.e. *boni > bien), and it may be that earlier a became e adjacent to i.

6 The NTn and Wsn forms appear to show assimilation of expected a to the initial i.
No mention has been made so far of PTn *o. We can reconstruct this protophoneme based on data like those given below. There is some evidence to suggest that it derives from POc *a adjacent to a labial/labialised consonant and/or *u.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*paRu</td>
<td>*0</td>
<td>oan</td>
<td>nu/vo</td>
<td>ok*aj</td>
<td>ne/vo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/tout-in</td>
<td>oan</td>
<td>awaj</td>
<td>ak*aj</td>
<td>ak*aj</td>
<td>'open'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pokpauk</td>
<td>papauj</td>
<td>p<em>ap</em>auk</td>
<td>p<em>op</em>auk</td>
<td>pupauk</td>
<td>'wear lavalava'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun*us</td>
<td>naum*us</td>
<td>nuk*umus</td>
<td>nukumha</td>
<td>ikou</td>
<td>'hunger'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aliuok</td>
<td>aliuok</td>
<td>aliuok</td>
<td>leiuok</td>
<td>'bend, crooked'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etou</td>
<td>etou</td>
<td>arou</td>
<td>'walk'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ol</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>'do'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matikalo</td>
<td>m*atikalo</td>
<td>m*atikalo</td>
<td>m*atikalo</td>
<td>m*stikaro</td>
<td>'worm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asol</td>
<td>asol</td>
<td>asul</td>
<td>asori</td>
<td>'large'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abomah</td>
<td>apom*ah</td>
<td>apomh</td>
<td>apomus</td>
<td>'long, loud'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.5 POc *a and PTn *a and *a

Although the unconditioned reflex of POc *a is PTn *a, a high or low vowel in the following consonant-initial syllable often causes a change to some vowel other than PTn *a. However, if that consonant was *q, these changes seem not to have taken place.

POc *a is often reflected as PTn *e (occasionally shifting to i) when the next syllable contained *i:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>a / _</em>Ci &gt; PTn *e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bayani</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maRi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nasik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*talise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*talina-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next example there has been further raising to i in some Tanna languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc <em>a / _</em>Ci &gt; PTn *a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>kali</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maqati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*masakit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Possibly from POc *ma-tolu, PSO *ma-teli 'thick'.
8 The Lenakel form means 'reef'.

Similarly, while there are some cases of POc *a > PTn *e when the next syllable contained *
*u:

POc *a / _*Cu > PTn *e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(m,m&quot;)atue</td>
<td>a/m&quot;ta</td>
<td>a/m&quot;ta</td>
<td>'sneeze'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
<td>təm</td>
<td>tənəm</td>
<td>renəm</td>
<td>{num}</td>
<td>{num*-i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*manuk</td>
<td>menəŋ</td>
<td>menəŋ</td>
<td>menuk</td>
<td>mana</td>
<td>menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qasu</td>
<td>n/aəh-</td>
<td>n/aəh-</td>
<td>n/ha-</td>
<td>n/he-</td>
<td>nəse-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

there are other cases where *a remained *a:

POc *a / _*Cu > PTn *a or some other vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ganusi</td>
<td>aŋah</td>
<td>aŋah</td>
<td>aŋh</td>
<td>'spit'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*panua</td>
<td>lau/uanu</td>
<td>lau/uanu</td>
<td>lu/k&quot;anu</td>
<td>rw/k&quot;anu</td>
<td>'village'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*matuqa-</td>
<td>məra-</td>
<td>məla-</td>
<td>mare-</td>
<td>'mother’s brother'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td>m&quot;ip&quot;ə-</td>
<td>m&quot;ip&quot;ə-</td>
<td>mukpu-</td>
<td>m&quot;ip&quot;u-</td>
<td>'grandchild'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison *asu 'bail' > Len os-n/ies, Kwm ias shows fronting in Lenakel but not in Kwamera.

The dissimilation that I noted in the other SV languages is even more pervasive in Tanna, with most POc *aCa sequences becoming PTn *əC(V). (The last comparison below shows further raising of Kwamera e to i.)

POc *a / _*Ca > PTn *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mataq</td>
<td>ami/mta</td>
<td>ame/mta</td>
<td>a/mra</td>
<td>a/mra</td>
<td>amra/mera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*marama</td>
<td>a/məl</td>
<td>a/məl</td>
<td>mer</td>
<td>'raw'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tana-</td>
<td>təmə-</td>
<td>təmə-</td>
<td>rəma-</td>
<td>ləma-</td>
<td>remu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*draRaq</td>
<td>n/tə-</td>
<td>n/rə-</td>
<td>nə/təa-</td>
<td>nə/təu-</td>
<td>nə/te-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mata-</td>
<td>nəŋə/mtə-</td>
<td>nə/məta-</td>
<td>nə/məɾə-</td>
<td>nə/mələ-</td>
<td>nəni/me-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*baga</td>
<td>na/pak</td>
<td>ne/pak</td>
<td>na/pek</td>
<td>'eye'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paraq</td>
<td>nən-ə/viə</td>
<td>nən-ə/viə</td>
<td>nu/vera</td>
<td>'banyan'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paŋan</td>
<td>a/ŋəŋ</td>
<td>a/ŋəŋ</td>
<td>a/ŋəŋ</td>
<td>a/ŋəŋ</td>
<td>a/ŋəŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*masakit</td>
<td>a/mha</td>
<td>a/mha</td>
<td>a/mha</td>
<td>a/mha</td>
<td>a/misə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other environments, POc *a became PTn *a (with the usual caveats about œ n unstressed position):
Vowels

POc *a > PTn *a elsewhere

POC | NTn a | Wsn a | Len a | SWT a | Kwm a
---|---|---|---|---|---
*qusan | n/uuhan | n/uuhan | n/ihin | n/ehen | n/esen
*luaq | eoa | eua | lua | {eua} | ‘vomit’
*gauR | n/no | n/au | n/au | n/au | ‘bamboo’
*Ruqa- | n/ua- | n/ua- | n/ua- | n/ua- | ‘neck’
*piRaq | n/enua | n/enua | nu/via | nu/via | ‘k.o. taro’
*m*aqane- | m*ana- | n*/m*ana- | na/m*ana- | pu/mani- | ‘woman’s brother’
*kape | n/nu/ka | n/nu/ka | kav/la | i/avira | ‘k.o. crab’
*tinaqe- | n*/s*/na- | n*/sana- | ns/sinau | nan/ina | ‘intestines’
*lisaq | n/lisaq | n/lisaq | ki/la | k’a-resa | ‘nit’
*saqat | n/rnaat | n/raha | taat | era/ha | ‘bad’
*paqan- | n/ua- | n/ua- | n/ua- | n/ua- | ‘thigh’

3.3.6 Summary

The reflexes of the POc and PTn vowels are shown in Table 3.4; again, square brackets enclose conditioned reflexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*a</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e-e-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e-e-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Proto Southern Vanuatu

Table 3.5 below shows the reflexes of the POc vowels in PSV and its three subgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*a</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*a [e/_ *Ci,*Cu; *a/_ *Ca]</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*i ~ *y</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*a [e, *a]</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*u ~ *w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*a [e, *a, *o]</td>
<td>*a [u]</td>
<td>*u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>e [i,o]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a [i,e, o]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o [e,u]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The PSV vowels *i, *e, *a and *u fairly clearly derive from POc *i, *e, *a and *u respectively. PSV *e also occurs as a conditioned reflex of POc *a, and PSV *a occurs as a conditioned reflex of *a. In each of these cases, the reflexes in the daughter languages are reasonably transparent: i.e. PSV *i (or *u), for example, is reflected as i (or u) in most SV languages.

There is a problem with what I have reconstructed as PSV *o, however, whose reflexes are rather 'messy' – PEr *a, PTn *o (occasionally *u), and Anejom *e. To look at it another way, it merges with POc *a in Erromango, with one reflex of POc *a (or *e?) in Tanna, and with POc *i and *e in Anejom. I have labelled this correspondence set PSV *o, because it derives from POc *o and because it fills a gap in the system. However, its reflexes suggest that *o may not have been phonetically [o]. Further, recall (i) that POc *l in Anejom and *l and *r in Tanna undergo palatalisation before POc *o as well as before *i and *e, which suggests fairly strongly that PSV *o was not a back rounded vowel (§2.4.3, §2.4.4), and (ii) that certain cases of *o have become *e in Proto Southern Oceanic (§2.5.3.1).

POc *o derives from Proto Malayo-Polynesian *e, which is reasonably interpreted as a central vowel. It may be that in the dialect of POc from which PSV derives, *o was also central (and see in this connection Lynch 1976). PSV *o may thus have been somewhat more front (and high?) than its POc source, possibly phonetically [o'] or [i']; with the development of PSV *a, it got pushed lower in Erromango, more front in Anejom, and possibly both lower and more front in Tanna.
The last chapter discussed the reflexes of the Proto Oceanic vowels in lexical roots, where these vowels are retained. Two factors which complicate the analysis of Proto Southern Vanuatu phonology, however, are the loss of vowels in a number of environments, and the accretion of initial elements to most Proto Oceanic roots. In this chapter, I will discuss the regular loss of vowels in certain environments, accretions to verbs and nouns, other changes in the shapes of POc inherited morphemes, and PSV stress. I will also show that, although POc *q is not regularly reflected as a segment in any modern SV language, it must have been present in PSV.

4.1 Changes in canonical forms

In this section I look at the fate of final consonants and vowels, and also in a preliminary way at the loss of certain word-medial vowels. This latter discussion is preliminary at this stage because medial vowel deletion is closely related to the accretion of verb-initial vowels and noun-initial articles, which I will discuss in §4.2 and §4.3, returning to medial vowel deletion in §4.4.

4.1.1 Final consonants

POc final consonants are lost in a wide range of Oceanic languages. Indeed, there is a number of POc forms which have been reconstructed with a final consonant in parentheses, indicating a certain amount of doubt as to whether the original Proto Austronesian consonant was or was not retained in POc. Final consonants, however, were generally retained in PSV. (I ignore here *q and *R, but will return to them in §4.1.2 below.) Transitive verbs were probably marked by a suffix *-i, and directly possessed nouns were followed by a possessive or construct suffix. In such cases, the root-final consonant was not in absolute word-final position, and so was protected from loss. The only exception here appears to be that root-final *n in directly possessed nouns was lost; since the 3SG possessive suffix is also -n, root-final *n could easily have been lost before -n and, by paradigmatic analogy, before other possessive suffixes. That is, since *lipon-na
his/her tooth’ could easily have become *lipona, this may have been reinterpreted as *lipo-na, with loss of root-final *n. Some examples:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{POc} & \text{Sye} & \text{Lenakel} & \text{Anejofī} \\
*\text{lipon-} & \text{ne/ve-} & \text{ne/lu-} & \text{ne/jhe-} \quad \text{‘tooth’} \\
*\text{paqan-} & \text{n/va-} & \text{nə/va-} & \text{nə/ha-} \quad \text{‘thigh’} \\
\end{array}
\]

Compare:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{POc} & \text{Sye} & \text{Lenakel} & \text{Anejofī} \\
*\text{buton-} & \{\text{yo/mput}\} & \text{nə/prəŋ-} & \{\text{no/p*o}\} \quad \text{‘navel’} \\
*\text{icuŋ-} & \text{−n/həŋ-} & & \quad \text{‘nose’} \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus a root-final consonant occurred in absolute final position mainly in intransitive verbs and in nouns which are not directly possessed. Table 4.1 lists cases of POc etyma with final consonants which are reflected in at least two SV subgroups. The data show fairly regular retention of the final consonant in the Tanna languages, less regular retention in Erromango, and fairly regular loss in Anejofī. In Anejofī particularly, when the final consonant was lost the vowel immediately preceding it was also often lost.

### Table 4.1: POc final consonants in SV languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejofī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retained in all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kurat</em></td>
<td>no/yrat</td>
<td>na/uías</td>
<td>no/uras \quad ‘Morinda citrifolia’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tanum</em></td>
<td>tenəm</td>
<td>renəm</td>
<td>a/tenom \quad ‘bury’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>saqat</em></td>
<td>sat</td>
<td>taat</td>
<td>has \quad ‘bad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lab</em>at</td>
<td>ip*ər</td>
<td>kəs</td>
<td>a/lp*as \quad ‘big’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kaRat</em></td>
<td>e/Æm/Æn</td>
<td>e/metet, e/miti/oŋi</td>
<td>a/yhem \quad ‘bite’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kojom</em></td>
<td>e/Æm/Æn</td>
<td>e/metet, e/miti/oŋi</td>
<td>a/yhem \quad ‘bite’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>matakut</em></td>
<td>e/Æm/Æn</td>
<td>e/metet, e/miti/oŋi</td>
<td>a/yhem \quad ‘bite’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manuk</em></td>
<td>menuy</td>
<td>menuk</td>
<td>n/man \quad ‘bird’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paŋan</em></td>
<td>a/ŋən-i</td>
<td>a/ŋən</td>
<td>haŋ, heŋa-ŋi \quad ‘Erythrina sp.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rarap</em></td>
<td>n/arap</td>
<td>n/aiəv</td>
<td>n/ara \quad ‘maggot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quloc</em></td>
<td>n/ilah</td>
<td>S n/ilah</td>
<td>n/i̇ja \quad ‘sea’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tasik</em></td>
<td>n/toy</td>
<td>S tahi k</td>
<td>ap*ol \quad ‘sticky, stick to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bulut</em></td>
<td>a/mplet</td>
<td>a/p*ii</td>
<td>n/yam* \quad ‘defecate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pekas</em></td>
<td>e/vyah</td>
<td>a/vhe</td>
<td>n/yam* \quad ‘mosquito’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ŋamuk</em></td>
<td>yomoy</td>
<td>mumuk</td>
<td>n/yam* \quad ‘gums’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ŋinjis</em></td>
<td>nŋoŋo/iwo</td>
<td>nŋoŋo/iwo</td>
<td>nŋoŋo/iwo \quad ‘stand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tuqur</em></td>
<td>e/tur</td>
<td>S a/lel</td>
<td>owəŋ \quad ‘be open’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(ŋ)awani</em></td>
<td>ovəŋ</td>
<td>owəŋ</td>
<td>owəŋ \quad ‘be open’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since POc final consonants were generally retained in Proto Tanna, we can presume that they were also generally retained in Proto Southern Vanuatu. In Proto Erromango there is a marked tendency for final stops to be retained but for final nasals to be lost. In Anejofü, final *t was retained (and also *s?), but almost all other final consonants were lost.

### 4.1.2 Final vowels

POc final vowels, on the other hand, were generally lost in Southern Vanuatu languages. The following will exemplify this general rule:
There are, however, a number of contexts in which Final Vowel Deletion did not operate.

First, when the vowel was not in absolute word-final position it was usually retained. Thus if a vowel-final root was a directly possessed noun, a transitive verb taking a suffix, or the first element of a compound, then the vowel would not have been word-final and would thus not have been deleted. A simple example will illustrate this. POc *kita 'look, see' has two reflexes in Anejôm: e/yet (transitive with definite human object), with deletion of a word-final vowel; and e/ya-i (transitive with indefinite or non-human object), where the transitive suffix -i protects the root-final *a from deletion. Some other examples of retention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejôm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*pano</td>
<td>a/\van</td>
<td>v\an</td>
<td>han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*baga</td>
<td>n/\pa\n</td>
<td>ne/\pa\k</td>
<td>n/pak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-m'aqane</td>
<td>na/\im\an</td>
<td>ie/\ra\m'\aan</td>
<td>na/\im\a\n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kutu</td>
<td>n/\y\u\t</td>
<td>kur</td>
<td>ne/yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kup'ena</td>
<td>n/\ya\p\o\n</td>
<td>na/\ka\p\u\n</td>
<td>n/\u\p'\o\n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mate</td>
<td>mah</td>
<td>m\a\s</td>
<td>m\a\s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*la\n</td>
<td>w/la\n</td>
<td>k/ia\n</td>
<td>n/la\n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, POc *q and *R were generally lost in PSV (though there are some situations in which they were retained – cf. Chapters 2 and 3). However, final *q (and *R, where it was lost) must have been lost after the Final Vowel Deletion rule ceased to operate, since the preceding vowel is not lost in SV languages. A simple comparison will illustrate this: *topu 'sugarcane' > Kwamera na/\rup\u, with loss of final *u, but *tubuq 'grow' > Kwamera rupu, with retention of the *u. Some other examples are given below. Recall that Anejôm generally loses any final consonant, including *q and *R, and thus I give no Anejôm examples here.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Kwamera</th>
<th>Anejôm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tama-</td>
<td>e/tma-</td>
<td>re/\t\p\o- 'wife'</td>
<td>e/tma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tubu-</td>
<td>re/\t\p\o- 'wife'</td>
<td>repu-</td>
<td>e/tma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td>moypo-</td>
<td>m\t\p'\u-</td>
<td>m\t\p'\o-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Kwamera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mataq</td>
<td>e/m\te</td>
<td>a/\m\ra</td>
<td>a/\m\ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*luaq</td>
<td>e/\l\w\o</td>
<td>e\u\a</td>
<td>e\u\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puaq</td>
<td>o/\v\w\o</td>
<td>o/\u\a</td>
<td>k\u\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qua\R</td>
<td>n/\au</td>
<td>n/\au</td>
<td>n/\au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lawaq</td>
<td>yatri/\l\w\o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rum'aq</td>
<td>n/\i\m\o</td>
<td>n/\i\m'\a</td>
<td>n/\i\m'\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lisaw</td>
<td>{ne/\li\s}</td>
<td>ki/\h\a</td>
<td>k&quot;a-r\a\s\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanoq</td>
<td>Ud\a\n</td>
<td>{t\a\n}</td>
<td>t\a\n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paraq</td>
<td>ne/\v\r\e</td>
<td>n\en-\w/\v\i\a</td>
<td>n\w/\v\e\r\a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*\na\t(q)</td>
<td>ye\tu</td>
<td>{n\i\e\r}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 In the data below, Sye ne/\li\s < *lisaw 'nit', and Lenakel tan < *tanoq 'earth' and n/\i\e\r < *\na\t\(q) 'Burckella obovata'. show unexpected loss of the vowel preceding final *q.
Third, the behaviour of word-final vowel clusters — including clusters which developed after loss of intervocalic \(*q\) or \(*R\) — is inconsistent. Anjom seems to regularly retain both vowels in these clusters (note that \(*ua, *ue > Anjom\ ou\)). The other languages lose the final vowel in this first set of words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Kwamera</th>
<th>Anjom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *gamiu</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>kami-</td>
<td>na/uanu</td>
<td>ru/k&quot;anu</td>
<td>n/henou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*panua</td>
<td>k/iu</td>
<td>ka/ru</td>
<td>e/rou</td>
<td>(\theta\i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rua</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>si</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but appear to retain it in this set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Kwamera</th>
<th>Anjom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*matuqa</td>
<td>e/two</td>
<td>mare</td>
<td>metou</td>
<td>'ripe'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*puRe</td>
<td>ne/two</td>
<td>na/fua</td>
<td>no/hou</td>
<td>'beach creeper'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tabakau</td>
<td>tevayau</td>
<td>ni/jip-akau</td>
<td>n/jaa</td>
<td>'k.o. coconut mat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toRa</td>
<td>n/vau</td>
<td>ne/vo</td>
<td>n/hau</td>
<td>'fowl'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[i]au</td>
<td>yau</td>
<td>io</td>
<td>iou</td>
<td>'Hibiscus tiliaceus'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 Medial vowel deletion: a first approximation

There was also a rule which deleted the vowel in the syllable preceding the stressed syllable, as long as this pretonic syllable was not the first syllable in the word. I assume that, at least with vowel-final words, primary stress was penultimate (but see §4.4); final long vowels (most commonly verb-final i followed by transitive suffix -i) were treated as two syllables for the purpose of this rule.

The operation of this rule and also the Final Vowel Deletion rule are illustrated below with separate examples from Sye, Lenakel and Anjom. Accreted initial material will be discussed in more detail later. ‘Other Rules’ are rules whose ordering with respect to the vowel deletion rules is not significant.

1. Sye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Pre-PSV</th>
<th>(PRE-DELETION RULES)</th>
<th>MEDIAL V DELETION</th>
<th>FINAL V DELETION</th>
<th>(OTHER RULES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*kona</td>
<td>a-\kon</td>
<td>e-ta'ma-na</td>
<td>e-i'ta-na</td>
<td>'a-kon</td>
<td>'bitter'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*e tama-\na</td>
<td>e-i'\na</td>
<td>na-ku'\li</td>
<td>e-i-ta'na</td>
<td>'e-tma-n</td>
<td>'his father'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*kuliti</td>
<td>*kuliti</td>
<td>*kuliti</td>
<td>*kuliti</td>
<td>no-\k'li</td>
<td>no-\k'li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*makuru-\na</td>
<td>*makuru-na</td>
<td>maku'bu-na</td>
<td>maku'bu-na</td>
<td>mokbu-na</td>
<td>mokbu-na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anejom \(\text{nhenou}\) means 'taro swamp', but derives from *panua, among whose meanings are 'territory, (cultivated) land'.

\footnote{Anejom \text{nhenou} means 'taro swamp', but derives from *panua, among whose meanings are 'territory, (cultivated) land'.}
2. Lenakel

POc  
Pre-PSV (PRE-DELETION RULES)  
MEDIAL V DELETION  
FINAL V DELETION (OTHER RULES)  

- *komu  
- *panako  
- *na líma-ña  
- *na bayani  
- a-’gómú  
- a-pa’nako  
- na-li’ma-ña  
- na-bá’yáni  
- a-’góm’u  
- a-p’hako  
- ne-li’ma-ña  
- na-b’yáni  
- ‘l’a-gom’  
- ‘a-pnak  
- ‘he-li’ma-n  
- ‘ha-byan  
- ‘a-kum’  
- ‘bvnak  
- ‘helms-n  
- ‘npien  

3. Anejoff

POc  
Pre-PSV (PRE-DELETION RULES)  
MEDIAL V DELETION  
FINAL V DELETION (OTHER RULES)  

- *boñi  
- *keli  
- *na líma-ña  
- *na bayani  
- a-’boñi  
- a-ke’li-i  
- na-li’ma-ña  
- na-bá’yáni  
- a-’beñi  
- a-ke’ji-i  
- ne-ji’ma-na  
- ne-bá’yañi  
- a-keñi  
- a-ke’ji-i  
- ne-ji’ma-na  
- ne-bá’yañi  
- ‘a-’peñi  
- ay’ji-i  
- ‘he-ja’ma-n  
- ‘he-byañ  
- ‘a-darck’  
- ‘di-g (TR)’  
- ‘hí’s hand’  
- ‘bait’  

These two rules must have been ordered as set out above. If the reverse ordering applied, then medial vowel deletion must have applied to the primary-stressed vowel – an unlikely event. I will have more to say about the order in which these and other rules applied in §4.4. In addition, the process of medial vowel deletion is more complex than I have described it here, and I will return to those complexities later as well. First, however, I want to look at initial accretions to verbs and nouns, since these have some bearing on these complexities.

4.2 Verb-initial vowels

Most verbs in SV languages begin with a vowel, due to the historical accretion of a vowel onto a POc root. With one or two extremely minor exceptions,3 the vowel is no longer removable from the root; and in no modern SV language does it seem to perform any function. Its origin will be discussed in §6.1.

The following examples illustrate this particular accretion:

POc  
Sye  
Lenakel  
Anejoff

*bulut  ‘stick to’  
a/mplet  
/a/p*iit  
/a/p’ol
*legos  ‘look at’  
/e/la  
/e/i-  
/e/laθ
*likos  ‘hang’  
/e/ki  
/e/liis  
/a/jye-i
*toka  ‘stay’  
/e/te  
/a/rok  
/a/tey, e/teγ
*taRaq-i  ‘cut’  
/e/taï  
/a/rai  
/a/taï
*tuRi  ‘sew, string’  
/e/tri  
/a/lel  
/e/te

Most POc verbs are consonant-initial. The few vowel-initial verbs which have reflexes in the SV languages often show coalescence of initial *a plus the vowel: e.g. *ipu(t)  ‘blow’ > North Tanna ep (< *a-ip). However, note Anejoff a/iho-i < *ipu(t).

3 In Lenakel, for example, the vowel is lost following certain number-of-subject prefixes, but in no other environment.
Morpheme structure, stress and rule order

4.2.1 Productivity of accretion

Many verbs which have been recently borrowed from some other language also show this accretion. Anejoffi verbs borrowed from Futuna, for example, take a fused initial vowel, usually a but sometimes e or o:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>Futuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>afakamana</td>
<td></td>
<td>fakamana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apuu</td>
<td></td>
<td>putu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arapakau</td>
<td></td>
<td>rapakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efana</td>
<td></td>
<td>fana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofono</td>
<td></td>
<td>fono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Bislama verbs borrowed into Anejoffi come in essentially unchanged (like taanes ‘dance’, vot ‘vote’ or win ‘win’, from Bislama danis, vot and win), but many others take an initial e-:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>Bislama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ekomplen</td>
<td></td>
<td>komplen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekonfiusim</td>
<td></td>
<td>konfiusim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eplei</td>
<td></td>
<td>plei, pleplei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etron</td>
<td></td>
<td>drong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But despite the apparent productivity of this process, not all verbs show an accreted initial vowel: 40% of Sye verbs, 21.5% of Lenakel verbs and 13% of Anejoffi verbs begin with consonants (Crowley 1998:2; Lynch 1992a; Lynch & Tepahae 2001). The following examples show the same POc verb with an accreted vowel in one or two of these three languages but not in the other(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mataq</td>
<td>‘raw’</td>
<td>e/mte</td>
<td>a/mra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mutusi</td>
<td>‘broken’</td>
<td>o/mti</td>
<td>murh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanum</td>
<td>‘bury’</td>
<td>tanom</td>
<td>renom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tabuR</td>
<td>‘sacred’</td>
<td>tomor</td>
<td>-a/rpul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also cases where the same POc verb has been reflected in the same language with and without the accretion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*pavan</td>
<td>‘eat, feed’</td>
<td>van</td>
<td>van ‘eat (INTR)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pau</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
<td>Lenakel</td>
<td>vøn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mate</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
<td>Anejoffi</td>
<td>mas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Anejoffi, there are also some pairs of verbs which are semantically identical (or very similar) and differ only in the initial vowel, or in whether there is an initial vowel or not:4

---

4 Translations of both forms are given only when there is sufficient semantic difference to warrant this.
4.2.2 The accreted vowel

Table 4.2 shows the proportion of initial vowels among the vowel-initial verbs in Sye, Lenakel and Anejon. Lenakel and Anejon data would suggest that the vowel was probably PSV *a, and that other verb-initial vowels are regular conditioned variants of *a. Sye, however, presents a more complex situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2: Verb-initial vowels (percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Erromangan languages, there is variation in the initial segments of some verbs. Although this will be discussed in more detail in §6.2.3, a brief summary is necessary here. All Sye verbs occur in both a ‘basic’ and a ‘modified’ form, each form being used with certain tense-aspects. For the majority of verbs, the modified form is marked simply by prefixing n-. For the remaining verbs, however, the modified form is marked by a change in the initial vowel and/or a change in the consonant which follows it; for example:

**Sye**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>etponr</td>
<td>antponr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evyah</td>
<td>ampyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oryai</td>
<td>anryai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oyhi</td>
<td>anhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus although Table 4.2 shows a higher proportion of e- and o-initial ‘basic form’ verbs in Sye than in the other SV languages, many of these alternate with an a-initial modified form.

In addition, there is comparative evidence within Erromango showing at least some cases of Sye verb-initial e and o corresponding to a in Ura:
PEr *a > Sye o, Ura a / # *v, *r
Sye   Ura
orari  arare    ‘flow’
oryai  alyai    ‘swim to’
orvi   arvi      ‘cut’
avan   avan      ‘agape, open’
ohovli avli      ‘rub’

PEr *a > Sye e, Ura a / # *t
Sye   Ura
etai  arai      ‘sharpen, cut’
etayor arail     ‘sweep’
etehep arap      ‘sit’
etvani arvani    ‘spit’

Finally, in all SV languages there are sporadic cases of initial *a becoming *e before *Ci or *Cu, *o before *Cu or a labial, and *ə before *Ca:

POc
*likos   > Sye e/lki, Ura e/lei   ‘hang’
*tuRī   > Ura e/hli     ‘sew’
*drudru  > Kwm e/rur    ‘shake’
*mutusi  > Ura o/mde    ‘break, be broken’
*puaq   > Anj o/hou    ‘bear fruit’
*mate   > Ura i/mis, Kwm e/mha ‘die’

Thus I assume that the accreted initial vowel was PSV *a-.

4.3 Article accretion and reduction

Most noun roots also show evidence of an historical prefix, and the most frequent of these derives from the POc common article *na. This initial accreted article is usually inseparable from the noun except in certain very specific contexts (for example when the noun is the second element of a compound and, in Anejom only, when the noun is non-singular and non-specific). Some examples:

5 Indeed, there seems to have been some reanalysis involved here in Anejom, since it is only the n of the accreted article which is dropped in the non-specific non-singular. For example, nepyeve ‘shark’ derives from *na bakiwa, and initial ne- reflects the article. However, the non-specific non-singular form is epyeu, which retains the vowel of the article. This even applies in loanwords which are n-initial: Anejom naifi ‘introduced/metal knife’ (< Samoan naifi < English knife) has the non-specific non-singular form aifi.
Some nouns with animate reference appear to have taken no prefix. However, there is variation between languages here, with the same animate noun apparently accreting *na in some languages but not in others. Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejoñ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mata-</td>
<td>'eye'</td>
<td>ni/mtu-</td>
<td>na/mr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*paqan-</td>
<td>'thigh'</td>
<td>n/va-</td>
<td>na/va-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lipon-</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
<td>ne/lve-</td>
<td>ne/lu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qaR</td>
<td>'bamboo'</td>
<td>n/au</td>
<td>n/au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rum'aq</td>
<td>'house'</td>
<td>n/imo</td>
<td>n/im'a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other initial accretions appear on nouns, but I will discuss these in §5.2.1.

4.3.1 Dissimilation and the Article Reduction rule

When the article *na was accreted on to a noun beginning with *Ca (but not *qa), then there was dissimilation and in some cases total loss of the *a of the article. I will look at each of the subgroups in turn, since there are slight differences between them. (There are also cases of the *a being retained in this context; since this has to do with stress patterns, I will leave it until §4.4.)

In Anejoffi, we find total loss of the *a of the article in this environment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na waiR</td>
<td>nwai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na kawil</td>
<td>nyowoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na m&quot;alo</td>
<td>nm&quot;oje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na tapuRi</td>
<td>ntohou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na patu</td>
<td>nhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na yaRu</td>
<td>nya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na namuk</td>
<td>nyam&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na lajo</td>
<td>nlaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na baga</td>
<td>npak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ragan</td>
<td>nra-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Erromango, when the noun began with a non-coronal consonant + *a, the vowel underwent dissimilation to PEr *a, which is reflected as Ø (underlying a) in Sye and as i in Ura.6

6 I write Sye underlying a only in those forms in which it has so been identified by Crowley; however, other cases of Sye Ø may also in fact have underlying a.
Morpheme structure, stress and rule order

When the noun began with a coronal consonant + *a, the vowel of the article was lost, and in Ura resulting nt becomes d:

PÔc  Sye  Ura
*na paqan-  nva-  niva-  ‘thigh’
*na patu  novat  nivat  ‘stone’
*na marī  namar  nimal  ‘breadfruit’
*na niau(q)  {yetu}  niyere  ‘Burckella obovata’
*na yaRu  nyar  {bogu}  ‘casuarina’
*na baga  npaŋ  ‘banyan’
*na madraR  {morei}  nimorei  ‘fermented breadfruit’

When the noun began with a coronal consonant + *a, the vowel of the article was lost, and in Ura resulting nt becomes d:

PÔc  Sye  Ura
*na tawan  ntau  tau  ‘lychee’
*na talos  nel  dal  ‘taro’
*na talinqa  nelpel  delpel  ‘ear’
*na talise  nedi  dire  ‘Terminalia catappa’
*na dra Raq  nre  ‘blood’
*na rakumu  nroym  ‘k.o. crab’

In Tanna, the situation is slightly more confused, and slightly more complex. It appears that, when the noun was of the form *CaCa..., the first *a of the root dissimilated to *e (Kwamera e), and the *a of the article subsequently reduced to schwa:

PÔc  NTn  Len  Kwm
*na dra Raq  da-  neta-  nate-  ‘blood [possessed]’
*na baga  nepak  npe-  ‘banyan’
*na kapak  nẹpẹẹ  nẹẹ  ‘wing’
*na mata-  nẹẹmta-  nẹẹma-  ‘eye’
*na bayani  nẹẹni  ‘bait’

When the first segment of the root was v (< *p, *w) or u (< *w), the schwa of the article assimilated in rounding and generally became u; while before *y, which becomes PTn *i, it seems to have been lost altogether:

PÔc  NTn  Len  Kwm
*na waiR  nau-  ru  nui  ‘water’
*na wakaR  noke-  nuka-  ‘root’
*na wasa  nua-  ‘edible greens’
*na paraq  {nien-uvia}  nu vera  ‘sprouting coconut’
*na paqan-  nua-  ‘thigh’
*na paRu  nuvo  nevo  ‘Hibiscus tiliaceus’
*na paliji  m*a-nvohl  nenvaal  nurhi  ‘grass’
*na yaRu  niel  nier  ‘casuarina’

Otherwise, the vowel of the article dissimilated to *e when the noun was *Ca-initial but, when the initial consonant was a coronal stop, North Tanna generally fused this with *n, as d:
4.3.2 Retention of the vowel of the article

When the article *na was accreted on to a noun whose first vowel was not *a, then (i) the vowel of the article was normally retained, but (ii) there seems to have been fairly regular assimilation of that vowel to the following vowel.

In Anejoñi, *na became no- when the root began with a labial consonant followed by *u, or when it began with *ku and *k was lost. For example:

POc *na- > Anj no- / __ *LABIAL + u
*na puaq  nohowa-  ‘fruit’
*na butiñ-  nɔp*ɔ  ‘navel’
*na bûne  nɔpįna  ‘fruit dove’
*na pudi  nɔhos  ‘banana’
*na puRe  nɔhou  ‘k.o. beach vine’
*na kup*ena  nɔup*ɔn  ‘net’
*na kurat  nɔuras  ‘Morinda citrifolia’

Otherwise, *na became ne- when the first vowel of the root was *i, *u or *o; for example:

POc *na- > Anj ne- elsewhere
*na siko  neɓey  ‘kingfisher’
*na b*ilo  nepje-  ‘container’
*na kutu  neyet  ‘louse’
*na tinaq*e-  nesŋa-  ‘intestines’
*na lumut  nelom*”  ‘moss’
*na suRi-  neɓuo-  ‘bone’
*na boŋi  nepeñ  ‘night’
*na topu  neto  ‘sugarcane’

There was a tendency for this e to raise further to i preceding a palatal consonant:7

---

7 *na tabakau > nijipakau ‘special k.o. mat’ shows a similar development, though I cannot account for the retention of the vowel of the article in this case.
Morpheme structure, stress and rule order

POc *na- > Anj ni- / __ PALATAL
*na lima- nijma- ‘hand’
*na lipon- nijho- ‘tooth’

There is (of course!) a residue of cases which do not fit these rules, like:

POc *na- > Anj
*na suRuq- niti- ‘juice’
*na (sj)uilaq- nisi- ‘shoot’
*na susu- nate- ‘breast’

In Erromango, POc *na > PEr *ne- if the first vowel of the root was *i, and *na > *no- if the first vowel of the root was *u; for example:

POc *na- > PEr *ne- / __*Ci

POc *na- > PEr *no- / __*Cu

Two cases I have where the first vowel was *o are contradictory: *na molis > Sye nemli ‘citrus’, but *na bokasi > Sye nompyahi ‘pig’ (Ura umyas ‘pig’ has accreted initial u-.)

In Tanna, there was often rounding assimilation to a following labial, and there is also evidence of fronting of the vowel to e when the first vowel of the root was *i:

POc *na > PTn *no-, *nu- / __ LABIAL

POc *na > PTn *ne- / __*Ci

Elsewhere, however, *na- appears to have either remained na- or weakened to na-, where the source of a could be any PTn vowel:
POc *na > PTn *na- elsewhere (often > na-)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>POc *na-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na kūp'ena</td>
<td>nakapun</td>
<td>nāpun</td>
<td><em>fishing net</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na suRaq-</td>
<td>naha-</td>
<td>nīhi-</td>
<td><em>juice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na susu-</td>
<td>naha-</td>
<td>nāha-</td>
<td><em>breast</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na kuimi-</td>
<td>nākma-</td>
<td>nēkmu-</td>
<td><em>chin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na suRi-</td>
<td>naha-</td>
<td>nāsu-</td>
<td><em>bone</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na butoŋ-</td>
<td>nābuŋ-</td>
<td>nāpraŋ-</td>
<td><em>navel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na tinage-</td>
<td>nāsŋa-</td>
<td>nāninha-</td>
<td><em>intestines</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na tobiŋ-</td>
<td>nēpē-</td>
<td>{tēpē-}</td>
<td><em>stomach</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na molis-</td>
<td>nēmālh</td>
<td>nēmārh</td>
<td><em>citrus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na tōpu</td>
<td>nētōp</td>
<td>nētōw</td>
<td>nērūk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seems, then, to have been a strong tendency for the vowel of POc *na* to assimilate to some feature of the initial syllable of the root, and we could suggest that a following labial consonant and/or *u* in the first syllable was likely to cause a change from POc *na* to PSV *no-*, while *na* frequently became PSV *ne-* when the following syllable contained *i.*

4.3.3 *q-initial nouns

The comments made so far apply to noun roots whose first consonant was not *q*. With *q-initial nouns, there seems to have been a general tendency for the *a* of the article and the *q* of the root to both be lost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc *na qV &gt; PSV *nV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qaRa(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qauR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qebal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na quin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qumun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na quson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qupi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, however, the following cases where there has been a change in the vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
<th>Anejofm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na quloc</td>
<td>nilah</td>
<td>Snīlah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na qunap-i</td>
<td>nīnevi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na (q)aca(n,ŋ)</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>L netŋa-, K nahanj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Medial vowel deletion, article reduction and stress

The Medial Vowel Deletion rule deleted an antepenultimate unstressed vowel providing it was not the first vowel in the word. However, the rule appears to have applied differently in verbs and nouns. In addition, there is evidence that the position of stress depended on the
nature of the final syllable in the PSV form: if it was open, stress was penultimate; if it was closed, stress was final. (I suggest in Lynch 2000b that this was also the Proto Oceanic stress pattern.)

4.4.1 Medial vowel deletion in verbs

Medial pretonic vowels were regularly deleted: see §4.1.3 and numerous examples elsewhere. When a verb took an accreted *a-, the first vowel following the accretion in a trisyllabic verb whose final syllable was open was normally deleted. Given that stress was penultimate, this vowel would have been in pretonic position. Some examples are given below; POc forms are given with initial *a- and with the stress marked.

POc

* *a*-bu'ut-i > Sye amplehi 'stick to'
* *a*-pa'yan-i > Sye avponi 'feed'
* *a*-pa'nako > Len øvnak 'steal'
* *a*-pu'nuq-i > Anj ihni-i 'finish'
* *a*-ba'lapu > Anj opra 'long'9
* *a*-ki'ta-i > Anj eyta-i 'see'
* *a*-ka'raka > Anj ayray 'creep, crawl'

There is another quite regular pattern, however, involving deletion of the first vowel in a disyllabic verb root whose final syllable was closed. Kwamera reflexes suggest that, when the first vowel of the root was *a, dissimilation to *a took place first, and this *a was then deleted in all languages except Kwamera, where it became e. The following is a fairly complete list. I have marked stress on the final syllable in anticipation of the discussion below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Erromango</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
<th>Anejoñ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*a-bu'ut</td>
<td>Samplet</td>
<td>L ap&quot;ui</td>
<td>{ap&quot;ol}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-ti'kon</td>
<td>L asken</td>
<td></td>
<td>{isey}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-su'luq</td>
<td>Silwo</td>
<td>L asi</td>
<td>akreθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-ka'ris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ayeθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*a-ko'jom</td>
<td>ayhem</td>
<td>'husk (coconut)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a-la'b</em>a</td>
<td>Selki</td>
<td>L ip&quot;ar</td>
<td>alp&quot;as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-li'kos</td>
<td>S ølks</td>
<td></td>
<td>ajyei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-ma'taq</td>
<td>S emte</td>
<td>L amra, K amera</td>
<td>{mat}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *mu'nim</td>
<td>U o/mni</td>
<td>L amnuum&quot;</td>
<td>{am&quot;oñ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-jo'han</td>
<td>S isñin</td>
<td></td>
<td>{aθaθni-ñ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-tu'buq</td>
<td>S øtu</td>
<td>{K rupu}</td>
<td>{aθop&quot;}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-pa'yan</td>
<td>{S vanj}</td>
<td>S øvñ, K avøñ</td>
<td>{haŋ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a-pee'kas</td>
<td>S evyah</td>
<td>S øvkaa</td>
<td>'defecate'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is only one apparent exception: *a-ta'num > Sye etenom, Anejoñ atenom 'bury'.

8 Such a trisyllabic verb may have been either a trisyllabic root or a disyllabic root + a transitive suffix.
9 Recall that POc *p is lost in word-final position in Anejoñ.
Now Medial Vowel Deletion seems to have operated to delete an unstressed vowel which occurred before the primary stressed vowel in the word. The obvious deduction to make from these two sets of data is that, although stress was penultimate if the final syllable was open, it must have occurred on the final syllable if that syllable was closed.10 (And, indeed, very similar comments can be made for nouns.) So words ending in open syllables had the stress pattern \ldots CV'CVC', but words ending in closed syllables had the stress pattern \ldots CV'CVC#. I will defer further comment on this until I have discussed Medial Vowel Deletion in nouns.

4.4.2 Medial vowel deletion in nouns

With nouns, the interaction of the Article Reduction and Medial Vowel Deletion rules makes for slightly more descriptive complexity. (In this section, I will occasionally also give examples of nouns which were prefixed with markers other than \*na if these are relevant to elucidating the operation of Medial Vowel Deletion.)

I will deal first with POc nouns ending in open syllables (in many cases this is a possessive suffix), which presumably were stressed on the penultimate syllable. In the case of nouns whose first vowel was not \*a, the same patterns occur as in verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anjeom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na li'ma-na</td>
<td>nelman 'outrigger'</td>
<td>nelman</td>
<td>njiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na to'b'-a-na</td>
<td>netpo/lu</td>
<td>netpa</td>
<td>'his stomach/belly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na bu'joj-na</td>
<td>{yo/mput}</td>
<td>naprapa</td>
<td>{nop'o}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*e ta'ma-na</td>
<td>etmen</td>
<td>reman</td>
<td>'his father'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Article Reduction occurred if the first syllable of the root was stressed and contained \*a. (Only Sye and Anjeom data are given here; Tanna data are inconclusive, since initial \*n may reflect either retention of \*a or an epenthetic \*a.)

POc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Anjeom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na patu</td>
<td>nват</td>
<td>nhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na baga</td>
<td>npa\n</td>
<td>npak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na tal'ja-na</td>
<td>ntel\n</td>
<td>njijan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent that the Medial Vowel Deletion rule must have preceded Article Reduction, since the \*a of the article did not reduce when followed by root-initial \*Ca if that \*Ca was the pretonic syllable, which would have led to an unacceptable word-initial three-consonant cluster. Instead, it appears that in this case the vowel of the article became e (occasionally i in Sye).11

POc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Anjeom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na ma'ta-gu</td>
<td>nmit\n</td>
<td>nemtak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ba'ya\n</td>
<td>np\n \n</td>
<td>nepya\n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ba'kiwa</td>
<td>nempou</td>
<td>nepyev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ka'na-se</td>
<td>n\n</td>
<td>neyn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 And presumably, \*tanum must have been an exception to this general rule; either it was stressed as a-\*lanum rather than as a-ta'num, or else the first vowel of the root had already undergone a change.

11 There are, however, a couple of exceptions to this statement: POc *na talise > Sye ntel\n, Anj nteja\n 'Terminalia catappa', and POc *na rakumu > Sye nroyum, \{Anj nray\} 'k.o. crab'.
This can be illustrated with the development of Anejom nepyevo ‘shark’ < *na bakiwa in comparison with n/hat ‘stone’ < *na patu.

Pre-PSV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule Type</th>
<th>Pre-PSV</th>
<th>Low V DISSIMILATION</th>
<th>MEDIAL V DELETION</th>
<th>ARTICLE REDUCTION</th>
<th>0 &gt; e</th>
<th>FINAL V DELETION</th>
<th>OTHER RULES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na-ba’kiwa</td>
<td>*na-ba’kiwa</td>
<td>na-b’kiwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na-patu</td>
<td>*na-patu</td>
<td>na-patu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now let us examine noun roots with final closed syllables. (I omit from consideration here *q-initial nouns, since as we have seen a slightly different set of rules appears to apply to these.) The data below again suggest that stress was final, and that the unstressed vowel – which was the first vowel of the root – was lost, possibly via *ə, as Kwamera nuvera < *na po’araq ‘sprouting coconut’ suggests.

POc        | Sye       | Tanna    | Anejom    | English |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na mo’lis</td>
<td>nemli</td>
<td>L nəməlθ</td>
<td>nepjeθ</td>
<td>‘citrus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ta’wan</td>
<td>{ntau}</td>
<td>nilva</td>
<td>nəvə</td>
<td>‘lychee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na la’waq</td>
<td>{yatri/wo}</td>
<td>W nəʧən</td>
<td>{i/ʔiθ}</td>
<td>‘spider(web)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ni’can</td>
<td>{niŋoʃ}</td>
<td>(L na’uaʃ)</td>
<td>{nouas}</td>
<td>‘Mo’inda cirrifolia’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ku’raq</td>
<td>nevra</td>
<td>K nuvera</td>
<td>(k.o.)</td>
<td>‘sprouting coconut’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na ba’qun</td>
<td>nimpa</td>
<td>L nəpən</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘(k.o.) banana’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, *na kawil > Anj nyowoj ‘fish hook’ and *na kawit > Anj niyowos ‘breadfruit-picker’ are exceptions (of different kinds) to this generalisation.

4.4.3 Proto Southern Vanuatu stress

The pattern of medial vowel deletion lends strong support to the hypothesis that, in Proto Southern Vanuatu, primary stress occurred on the penultimate syllable if the final syllable was open, but on the final syllable if that syllable was closed. Secondary stress apparently occurred two syllables to the left of the primary-stressed syllable. Although this appears to be a well motivated conclusion – and, indeed, I have suggested elsewhere (Lynch 2000b) that this is the POc stress system – it does not match the facts of the daughter languages, all of which have regular penultimate stress, irrespective of whether the final syllable was open or closed. The exceptions to this general statement are not relevant to the issue under discussion. Long vowels in final syllables attract stress, and there are a couple of restricted environments in some SV languages which require antepenultimate stress; however, there is nothing in the phonologies of modern SV languages paralleling the proposed final stress in words ending in closed syllables.

A comparison with the SV family’s nearest relative, however, is instructive. Thieberger (1997) says that, in South Efate, ‘stress is usually on the last syllable in two-syllable words, and on the penultimate in words of three syllables’. Although this is not identical to what I am proposing, it does suggest that in the language ancestral to the South Efate and Southern Vanuatu languages, stress did occur on final (short) syllables in some contexts.
4.5 Rule ordering and ‘incipient vowel deletion’

The discussion in the preceding section has established that all Southern Vanuatu languages shared the following rules, which must have applied in the order given:

1. Low Vowel Dissimilation
2. Medial Vowel Deletion
3. Article Reduction
4. Final Vowel Deletion

Not only do all SV languages share these four rules, in this order, but so does the South Efate language (Lynch 1999b), the only significant difference being that non-final $a$ was not subject to deletion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-South Efate</th>
<th>*nasunu’ma</th>
<th>*nasunu’sama</th>
<th>*napa’tigu</th>
<th>*naki’ni-gu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW V DISSIMILATION</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>nipa’tigu</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAL V DELETION</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>nak’ni-gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE REDUCTION</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>n’sema</td>
<td>nipa’tigu</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL V DELETION</td>
<td>nasu’m</td>
<td>nsem</td>
<td>npatik</td>
<td>naknik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OTHER RULES)</td>
<td>nasu’m</td>
<td>nsem</td>
<td>npatik</td>
<td>naknik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the surface, this looks like very strong evidence in support of a subgrouping hypothesis which assigned the SV languages and South Efate to a single subgroup.

However, there is clear evidence that this is not the case – at least not in this form. There are, as we have seen, a number of palatalisation rules in the Southern Vanuatu languages:

(i) palatalisation of POc *$t$ (and *$d$) as PSV *$c$;
(ii) palatalisation of POc *$l$, *$r$ and *$R$ as PNT *$r$;
(iii) palatalisation of POc *$l$ (but not *$r$ or *$R$) as $j$ in Anejoffi, and
(iv) palatalisation of POc *$n$ and *$ŋ$ as $ñ$ in Anejoffi.

All of these must have preceded the vowel loss rules, since a deleted vowel conditions palatalisation. However, South Efate shows no palatalisation at all. For example:

(i) POc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syc</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
<th>S. Efate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mate</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
<td>mah</td>
<td>mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mataq</td>
<td>‘raw’</td>
<td>e/mte</td>
<td>a/mra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) POc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syc</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>S. Efate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*lanjo</td>
<td>‘a fly’</td>
<td>k/iaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lima-</td>
<td>‘hand, five’</td>
<td>ne/lmo- ‘hand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) POc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syc</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
<th>S. Efate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*lanjo</td>
<td>‘a fly’</td>
<td>n/lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lima-</td>
<td>‘hand, five’</td>
<td>ni/jma- ‘hand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) POc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syc</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
<th>S. Efate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSOC *munim</td>
<td>‘drink’</td>
<td>a/m$’oñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanoq</td>
<td>‘ground’</td>
<td>n/lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lanjo</td>
<td>‘a fly’</td>
<td>n/lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*boni</td>
<td>‘night’</td>
<td>ne/peñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So on the one hand we have a complex sequence of dissimilation, reduction and vowel loss rules shared by South Efate and the Southern Vanuatu languages. On the other hand, apparently preceding these rules, we have:

(i) palatalisation of coronal stops, shared by all SV languages but not South Efate;
(ii) palatalisation of *l, *r and *R, shared only by the northern Tanna languages;
(iii) a different *l-palatalisation rule, found only in Anejoffi; and
(iv) palatalisation of *n and *ŋ, also only in Anejoffi.

At first glance, these suggest that the dissimilation-reduction-vowel loss process must have occurred very late, and operated independently in each low-level subgroup.

However, I believe that this is not correct. What I suggest in fact took place was this. The language ancestral to South Efate and the Southern Vanuatu family had underlying pretonic and word-final vowels, which may well have occurred on the surface as well in that language. There may well have been a difference between casual and careful speech, with the former showing vowel deletion while in the latter the vowels were retained. That is:

\[
\text{POc } ^*\text{na} \text{-ta} \text{-li} \text{-} \text{ŋa}\text{-gu} > \text{Careful: na} \text{'} \text{ta} \text{-li} \text{'} \text{ŋagu} \\
\text{Casual: n} \text{'} \text{alŋag}
\]

Indeed, there is evidence from at least the Erakor dialect of South Efate that parts of this process are still at work. Thieberger (1997), in discussing Clark’s (1985) posited vowel deletion rule for South Efate, says that ‘this rule is still productive in current usage in Erakor. The following are examples of words which have an extra syllable when pronounced carefully’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Efate</th>
<th>Careful</th>
<th>Casual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natokon</td>
<td>natkon</td>
<td>’village’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tili</td>
<td>tii</td>
<td>’tell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selat</td>
<td>slat</td>
<td>’take, carry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melanr</td>
<td>mlanr</td>
<td>’cold’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I thus treat the two vowel deletion rules and the Article Reduction rule as ‘incipient’ in the language ancestral to South Efate and the SV languages. That is, the process had begun in that language, but was not completed in the Southern Vanuatu languages until much later (and seems still not absolutely complete in South Efate). As far as Southern Vanuatu itself is concerned, the careful speech forms remained the underlying forms until at least the time when Anejoffi separated from the other SV languages and the northern and southern Tanna languages diverged from each other. However, since there is no evidence in any modern SV language of the kind of alternation found in South Efate, we have to assume that the vowel deletion process was completed, and that the underlying forms in these languages are now the casual speech forms.

This would imply that changes as a result of palatalisation, for example, were ‘transferred’ from the underlying to the casual forms. That is, I propose the following derivation for Anejoffi nitiŋak from POc *na-taliŋa-gu ‘my ear’, which illustrates the point I am making here:
Chapter 4

Proto Oceanic  Underlying/Careful  Casual
Pre-PSV
LOW V DISSIMILATION  *na-"tali'ŋa-gu  *na-"tali'ŋa-gu
MEDIAL V DELETION  *na-"tali'ŋa-gu  *na-"tali'ŋa-gu
ARTICLE REDUCTION  ——  n-‘tali'ŋa-gu
FINAL V DELETION  ——  n-‘tali'ŋa-gu
VOWEL RAISING I  *na-"teji'ŋa-gu  n-tejŋa-g
*I-PALATALISATION  *na-"teji'ŋa-gu  n-tejŋa-g
VOWEL RAISING II  *na-"iji'ŋa-gu  n-‘ijŋa-g
CASUAL → UNDERLYING  LOST  n-‘ijŋa-g = Underlying
Anjomi  ntiŋa-ŋ

4.6 Retention of POc *q

Proto Oceanic *q is not regularly reflected as a phonemic segment in any Southern Vanuatu language. However, there are a couple of etyma which suggest that POc *q may have been irregularly reflected as PSV *v:

POc  NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm  Anj
*mataqu  m"adap  maru  m"atu  matuk*  m"atu  (*mata-)  ‘right hand’
*qutok  no/uta-  no/uhia-  nen-oursk  -kula  k*era  n/hutu/ma  ‘brain’

However, there is fairly strong evidence that POc *q was lost in SV languages only after it had affected the shape of PSV morphemes and brought about some changes in PSV consonants; and thus the phoneme *q needs to be reconstructed for PSV.

First, there are two environments where *q has an effect on a neighbouring consonant. As I showed in §2.5.1.3, POc *n is often reflected as η, not as n, if the adjacent syllable contained POc *q. Examples are given below, with braces surrounding items which reflect *n as n, and square brackets surrounding cognates in which the *n is not reflected.

POc  Sye  NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm  Anj
*ganusi  aŋah  aŋah  anh  aŋθi  ‘spit’
*tinaqe-  nσ/σa-  nσ/σaas-  nσ/σaas-  {nσ/sinau-}  {nσ/ninha-}  ne/σa-  ‘guts’
*qnap-i  n/inehi-  {r/inehe-;}scale’

And as I showed in §2.5.3.3, POc *s and *c are reflected as PNT *z, not as *h, if the adjacent syllable contained POc *q. For example:

POc  Sye  NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm  Anj
*(q)aca(n,ŋ)-  [n/i-]  n/ŋerη-  n/ŋerη-  n/ŋerη-  n/ŋerη-  n/ŋerη-  n/ŋerη-  {n/iθa-}  ‘name’
*saqat  sat  a/raat  ora  taat  ha  era/ha  has  ‘bad’

There is, however, an exception to this:

POc  Sye  NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm  Anj
*qusan  n/uθuən  n/uθuən  n/iθin  n/θen  n/θən  nyop/θa  ‘rain’
I also showed in §4.1.2 that word-final vowels were regularly lost in PSV, but that a vowel preceding word-final *q was retained. I briefly illustrate this with Kwamera data.

POc *V# > Kwm Ø
*rua  \(kə/ru\) 'two'
*mate  \(mas\) 'die'
*kulu  \(ur\) 'louse'

POc *Vq# > Kwm V
*tanoq  \(təna\) 'ground'
*mataq  \(a/mera\) 'raw'
*tubuq  \(rupu\) 'grow'

The reconstruction of Proto Southern Vanuatu lexical and grammatical morphemes must therefore take into account (i) the difference between underlying and casual-speech forms and (ii) the retention of *q, and the former especially poses a number of problems regarding the form of such reconstructions.
This chapter will deal with various aspects of nominal and pronominal morphology, with closed classes of words which occur in noun phrases, and with the structure of nominal phrases in Proto Southern Vanuatu. All POc reconstructions come from Lynch, Ross and Crowley (f/c).

5.1 Pronominal forms

Under the heading of pronominal forms I will deal with focal, objective and possessive pronouns; preverbal markers of the person of the subject will be dealt with in §6.2 and interrogative pronouns in §7.3. All of the SV languages distinguish inclusive and exclusive first person in the non-singular, and all except those of Erromango distinguish singular, dual, trial and plural number. The non-singular pronouns in the Tanna languages and Anejɔfn are historically (but not synchronically) bi-morphemic, consisting of a pronominal root and a number suffix, neither of which can occur alone. Thus the Lenakel first person exclusive forms are dual kamlau, trial kamhel and plural kamar, while the corresponding second person forms are kamilau, kamhiel (with metathesis) and kamiar, suggesting the underlying pronominal roots kam- 1EXCNONSG and kami- 2NONSG and the number suffixes -lau 'dual', -hel 'trial' and -ar 'plural'. However, none of these morphemes can occur alone.1

Focal pronouns occur (i) as subjects in Anejɔfn and as emphatic subjects in the other languages,2 (ii) as answers to questions in verbless sentences, and (iii) in Ura (except for the third person plural) and in all Tanna languages except Southwest Tanna, as objects of verbs and verbal prepositions. Objective pronouns occur as verbal suffixes in Sye3 (and in 3PL only

---

1 In addition to the metathesis in the 2TL form kamhel > /kamhiel/, there are various other morphophonemic changes in other persons and numbers in most languages – e.g. Lenakel underlying kai-
lau 1INC:DL and il-lau 3DL surface respectively as /kalaul/ and /ilaul/. The comparisons here, and in the rest of this chapter, will be with underlying forms, morphophonemic changes being referred to only when they are reconstructible at some level: cf. §5.1.4 below.

2 Since all SV languages have a set of preverbal markers of the person and number of the subject, a pronominal subject does not normally occur except in cases of contrast or emphasis. The only exception is Anejɔfn, which requires an overt pronoun subject.

3 Some Sye verbs take focal pronominal objects.
in Ura) and as postposed free morphemes in Southwest Tanna and Anejom (which, however, has suffixed allomorphs of the 2SG and 3SG pronouns). Possessive pronouns occur as suffixes to nouns in direct constructions and to possessive markers in indirect constructions.

The development of Proto Oceanic pronouns in the SV languages will be discussed in detail in §5.1.5 below. However, I will need to make reference to some of those forms in the intervening discussion, and thus list the POc pronouns here for convenience.

Proto Oceanic pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>1INC:NONSG</th>
<th>1EXC:NONSG</th>
<th>2NONSG</th>
<th>3NONSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*[i]au</td>
<td>*[i]ko[e]</td>
<td>*ia</td>
<td>*kiita</td>
<td>*ka[m]i, *ka[mami</td>
<td>*ka[m]u, *kamiu</td>
<td>*(k)ira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1 Focal pronouns

All focal pronouns in Anejom are a-initial: it is likely that this is the animate subject marker a which occurs before all animate subjects except for pronouns; for example:

Anejom

Et amjen a etma-k.
3SG:AOR sleep SM father-1SG:POSS
My father is sleeping.

Et amjen (*a) aen.
3SG:AOR sleep (*SM) he/she
He/she is sleeping.

I thus treat Anejom pronoun-initial a as an accretion. It is also likely that some pronouns in the Tanna languages have accreted an initial i (which may derive from a POc personal article *i), though this is more sporadic.

The following singular focal pronouns are reconstructed for Proto Southern Vanuatu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*[i]au</td>
<td>*iau</td>
<td>*yau</td>
<td>*iou {añak}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*[i]ko[e]</td>
<td>*igo(e)</td>
<td>*(i)go(e)</td>
<td>*ik a/ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*ia</td>
<td>*in</td>
<td>{*iyi}</td>
<td>*in a/en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proto Erromangan and Proto Tanna reconstructions are based on the following pronouns in the daughter languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Uth</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*yau</td>
<td>yau</td>
<td>yau</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td>*iou</td>
<td>iio</td>
<td>iiou</td>
<td>io</td>
<td>iou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*(i)go(e)</td>
<td>k/ik</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>*ik</td>
<td>ik</td>
<td>iik</td>
<td>iik</td>
<td>ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*iyi</td>
<td>iyi</td>
<td>iyi</td>
<td>iyi</td>
<td>*in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the 2SG form, Ura and Utaha apparently retain *o which has been lost in all other SV languages; final *(e) is reconstructed since it would have protected *o from deletion in these two languages. Sye, the Tanna languages and Anejōm show the initial *i, which is lost in Ura and Utaha. And Sye has accreted an initial k onto this pronoun.

While the non-singular pronouns in the Erromangan languages are free forms, in the other SV languages they consist of a root plus a number-marker. I will leave until §5.1.4 a discussion of the antiquity of this marker, and concentrate here on the pronominal roots. I reconstruct the following non-singular focal pronouns for Proto Southern Vanuatu, and will comment on the two first exclusive and second person forms later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1INC:NONSG</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kita</td>
<td>*gadi</td>
<td>*gas</td>
<td>*k(a,i)dV-</td>
<td>a/kaj-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC:NONSG</td>
<td>*ka[m]ji, *kamami</td>
<td>*gam(i)</td>
<td>*g(a,i)m</td>
<td>*kam(i)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>*ka[m]u, *kamiu</td>
<td>*(i)damV</td>
<td>*i(t,d)mV-</td>
<td>a/jam-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NONSG</td>
<td>*(k)ira</td>
<td>*ira</td>
<td>*iLeL</td>
<td>*iri-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forms in the Erromangan languages are free forms. The Proto Erromangan reconstructions are based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Uth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*g3s</td>
<td>gis</td>
<td>gis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*g(a,i)m</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>gim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gami(u)</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>kimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*iLeL</td>
<td>leil</td>
<td>yoril</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were obviously some sporadic changes taking place in the initial consonant of the first and second person forms, with the velar nasal in the Ura 2PL form particularly unexpected. I reconstruct initial *g in all three forms.

The Proto Tanna forms are based on the following cognate sets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*k(a,i)dV-</td>
<td>kit-</td>
<td>kit-</td>
<td>kat-</td>
<td>kət-</td>
<td>kət-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kami-</td>
<td>*i(t,d)mV-</td>
<td>*i(t,d)mV-</td>
<td>*i(t,d)m&quot;V-</td>
<td>*i(t,d)m&quot;V-</td>
<td>*i(t,d)m&quot;V-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The innovative Proto Tanna 1EXC and 2 non-singular forms *i(t,d)mV- and *i(t,d)m"V- are reconstructed on a top-down basis, since they are cognate with the Anejōm forms ajam- and ajou-; I will discuss these innovative forms in more detail in §5.1.5.

**5.1.2 Objective pronouns**

Objective pronouns which are formally distinct from focal pronouns occur only in Sye and Ura (and then only with some verbs), Southwest Tanna and Anejōm. In Sye and Ura they are suffixed to verbs; in Anejōm, they are generally postposed free forms, but the second and
third singular forms have suffixed allomorphs which may occur after vowel-final verbs; while in Southwest Tanna there is no formal distinction between focal and objective pronouns in the singular. Southwest Tanna and Anejoffi non-singular objective pronouns take the same number suffixes as do the focal (and possessive) pronouns.

The following reconstructions can be made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=iau</td>
<td>*-yau</td>
<td>*-yau</td>
<td></td>
<td>{ nak }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*=ko</td>
<td>*=yo</td>
<td>*=oy, {-kik}</td>
<td>*=ka</td>
<td></td>
<td>yiy, -y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*=a</td>
<td></td>
<td>*=a</td>
<td>*=ra</td>
<td></td>
<td>yin, -n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC:PL</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC:PL</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>*=yam(iu)</td>
<td>*=yam(iu)</td>
<td>*=yam(iu)</td>
<td>*=yam(iu)</td>
<td>*=yam(iu)</td>
<td>*=yam(iu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>*=ra</td>
<td>*=ara</td>
<td>*=ara</td>
<td>*=ara</td>
<td>*=ara</td>
<td>*=ara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I reconstruct these forms as enclitics, for two reasons: (i) because they were enclitics in POc, and (ii) because their behaviour in the languages which have them (suffixes in some, postposed free morphemes in others) suggest that they probably were enclitics in PSV.

The 1SG form is reconstructed on a top-down basis, with Sye and Ura -yau reflecting POc *=au. For the 2SG form, I treat the Sye vowel o as epenthetic (and the alternative form -kik as being the focal pronoun). No reconstruction for the 3SG form can be made; and note specifically that there is no reflex of the POc 3SG form *=a.

In comparison with the focal forms, the non-singular objective pronouns show lenition of the initial consonant (*g > *y) in the first and second persons. Of particular interest here are the Anejoffi forms. The Anejoffi focal 1EXC and 2NONSG pronouns are innovative, with initial *g being replaced by *d. However, the corresponding objective forms have initial *y which, as I have just suggested, represents lenition from an initial velar stop. (Both 2NONSG forms, however, show unexpected loss of medial *m.)

### 5.1.3 Possessive pronouns

The following singular possessive suffixes are reconstructed for Proto Southern Vanuatu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*=gu</td>
<td>*=g(u)</td>
<td>*=g</td>
<td>*=k</td>
<td>*=k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=mu</td>
<td>*=m(u)</td>
<td>*=m</td>
<td>*=m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*=ña</td>
<td>*=n[i]</td>
<td>*=m</td>
<td>*=n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PEr and PTn forms are based on the forms below. Note that Ura has largely lost the possessive pronouns, employing a construction with free pronouns; however, there are vestiges of the earlier system, and these forms are listed here.

---

4 The Anejoffi 2SG and 3SG suffixed forms -y and -n are optional variants of yiy and yin after a vowel.
The 2SG form is reconstructed as *-mu. The Erromangan and Tanna languages regularly lose the final vowel. However, although the most frequent Sye 2SG form is -m, there is an allomorph -mu, which occurs following a labial consonant in some morphemes; compare:

**Sye**

nompuŋ 'my head'  
nompum 'your (SG) head'

retpuŋ 'my wife'  
retpmu 'your (SG) wife'

The 3SG form *-n[i] is reconstructed ambiguously. The southern Tanna languages have two forms, one with and one without final i. In Kwamera, for example, -ni occurs after kin terms and possessive markers, and -n occurs elsewhere. In Sye, although the most frequent form is -n, there are some morphophonemic contexts in which a final i appears. Again compare:

**Sye**

nompuŋ 'my head'  
nompun 'his/her head'

niŋ 'my child'  
niŋi 'his/her child'

However, Anejoffi -n must reflect *-n, not *-ni, since the nasal does not undergo palatalisation.

The following non-singular possessive suffixes can be reconstructed:

**POc**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**PSV**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**PER**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**PTn**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**NTn**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**Wsn**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**Len**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**SWT**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**Kwm**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

The first three Proto Erromangan forms are based entirely on the Sye forms (-t - -nt, -mam, and -mi), since there are no data from the other language. The 3NONSG form is based on Sye -nr, Utaha -ira. The Proto Tanna forms are reconstructed on the basis of the following:

**PTn**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**NTn**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**Wsn**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**Len**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**SWT**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

**Kwm**  
1INC:NONSG  
1EXC:NONSG  
2NONSG  
3NONSG

Note that North Tanna and Whitesands continue the innovative 1EXC and 2NONSG forms into the possessive system, but Anejoffi does not.
5.1.4 Number suffixes and morphophonemics

The Tanna languages and Anejoffi mark the number of non-singular pronouns by a suffix. These suffixes can be reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUAL</td>
<td>*-rau</td>
<td>*-rau</td>
<td>-lao</td>
<td>-lau</td>
<td>-lau</td>
<td>-lau</td>
<td>-rau</td>
<td>-rau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIAL</td>
<td>*(t,s)ali</td>
<td>*-ahari</td>
<td>-ahal</td>
<td>-hel</td>
<td>-asal</td>
<td>-sul</td>
<td>-r/ahar</td>
<td>-taj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td>*-at</td>
<td>*-at</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>-ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-a  ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before discussing the forms of these number suffixes, it is worth looking briefly at the forms of the numerals ‘two’ and ‘three’ and the two forms for ‘four’ which I reconstruct in §5.1.5 below (each of which has the numeral prefix *ga- ~ *gα-):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>*rua</td>
<td>*ga-rua</td>
<td>*ga-Lua</td>
<td>*kα-ru(a)</td>
<td>e-rou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>*tel</td>
<td>*ga-sili</td>
<td>*ga-heli</td>
<td>*ka-sir</td>
<td>e-sej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*pat</td>
<td>*ga-vat</td>
<td>*ga-vat</td>
<td>*kα-vat</td>
<td>{e-manohowan}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*pati</td>
<td>*ga-vac</td>
<td>*kα-vas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen from a comparison of the numerals and the number suffixes that there are distinct similarities, but that the forms are certainly not identical. Note also that the ambiguity in the final consonant in the Proto Tanna plural suffix is also found in the form meaning ‘four’. Now since the Tanna and Anejoffi number-markers are cognate, and since they are not formally identical to the corresponding numerals (and therefore since the non-singular pronouns are not transparently ‘you + two’, ‘they + three’, etc., as they are in many other Oceanic languages), I suggest that PSV had the same system as the Tanna languages and Anejoffi, and that this has subsequently been simplified in Erromango. The fact that Erromangan languages mark dual in subject prefixes (see §6.2.5) lends support to the hypothesis that those languages have simplified a system which was originally more like that of Tanna and Anejoffi.

The dual suffix PSV *-rau shows *r > PNT *l where *i would be expected. This may be due to the fact that some pronominal roots are *i-final, and this preceding *i would condition palatalisation of *r as *l.

The combination of coronal consonants across the morpheme boundary in non-singular pronouns leads to deletion of one of these. Examine the following forms in Lenakel (representing the process as it operates in Tanna) and Anejoffi; underlying forms are within slashes, surface forms are unmarked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1INC:DL</td>
<td>/kat-lau/</td>
<td>/akaj-rua/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC:TL</td>
<td>/kalau</td>
<td>/akaj-rua/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:DL</td>
<td>/il-lau/</td>
<td>/akaj-taj/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TL</td>
<td>/ilau</td>
<td>/akaj-taj/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lenakel shows deletion of a root-final coronal consonant before a suffix-initial coronal. Anejoffi also shows a dislike for the combination of two coronals, but the patterns of deletion (and in one case gemination) are more complex. From all of this, I assume that PSV probably
did not tolerate the coronal-coronal sequence in non-singular pronouns, but I cannot be precise as to what deletion rules were involved.

5.1.5 POc and PSV pronominal forms

This section briefly looks at the development of the POc pronouns in the SV languages. The POc and PSV focal pronouns are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*[i]au</td>
<td>*iau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*[i]ko[e]</td>
<td>*igo(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*ia</td>
<td>{*in}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC.NONSG</td>
<td>*kita</td>
<td>*gadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.NONSG</td>
<td>*ka[m]ji, *kamami</td>
<td>*gam(i), *(i)damV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>*ka[m]ju, *kamiu</td>
<td>*gami(u), *(i)da[m]ju(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NONSG</td>
<td>*(k)ira</td>
<td>*ira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither the PSV 3SG form *in nor the PEr form *iyi directly reflect POc *ia. PSV *in has the accreted *i and also looks as if it may be related to PNCV reconstruction *naia (which seems to incorporate POc *ia). The *y in the PEr form could derive from POc *ñ, suggesting *i-ñi(a). Obviously, these forms are similar, and may ultimately have the same source.

As I have mentioned earlier, PSV, like the North-Central Vanuatu languages, has changed the *t of the 1INC.NONSG form to *d and the initial *k in the 1EXC and 2NONSG forms to *g. PSV has gone further and generalised this latter change to the 1INC form (thus POc *kita > PNCV *kida, PSV *gadi).

The innovative 1EXC and 2NONSG forms *(i)damV and *(i)da[m]ju(V) are reflected in Anejoffi and two of the three northern Tanna languages. This suggests that some kind of change may have been in process at some early stage, but that it did not find acceptance in some of the dialects. (It may have, however, in at least some New Caledonian languages: see Lynch 2000c.)

The POc and PSV objective pronouns are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*=au</td>
<td>*=iau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*=ko</td>
<td>*=yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*=a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC.NONSG</td>
<td>*=yad(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.NONSG</td>
<td>*=yam(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>*=yamiu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NONSG</td>
<td>*=ra</td>
<td>*=ara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is little to comment on here, apart from the loss of the POc 3SG form *=a. The Sye 3SG suffix -i is probably the transitive suffix reinterpreted as an object marker, while the Anejoffi 3SG *yin ~ -n may derive either from the focal or the possessive pronoun. Note also the lenition of the initial velar in the non-singular pronouns.
The POc and PSV possessive pronouns are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*-gu</td>
<td>*-g(u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*-mu</td>
<td>*-mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*-ña</td>
<td>*-n[iJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC.NONSG</td>
<td>*-da</td>
<td>*-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.NONSG</td>
<td>*-ma[m]i</td>
<td>*-mami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>*-m[i]u</td>
<td>*-mi(u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NONSG</td>
<td>*-dra</td>
<td>*-nira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, there is very little to comment on here. As is common in Oceanic, the *n in POc *-ña '3SG' is not reflected in the same way as *n in other morphemes, while the 3NONSG form has accreted initial *ni in some languages (which may derive from the 3SG form, or which may involve a reinterpretation of POc *dr as a cluster – i.e. *dra > nra > nira).

5.2 Nominal morphology

This section covers historical accretions to nouns, as well as productive affixation. I exclude, however, possessive morphology, which I will cover separately in §5.3. There is a problem in drawing the line between historical and productive affixation, since in some cases what was originally the same morpheme is found both as a fossilised accretion and as a productive affix. For example, the POc common article *na has been accreted onto many nouns, and is an integral part of those nouns. At the same time, there is a productive prefix PSV *n- which nominalised verbs, and this presumably also derives from POc *na. I will separate these two categories for discussion purposes, but will note any overlap.

5.2.1 Accretions to nouns

I discussed in some detail in previous chapters the accretion of the POc article *na to many nouns in the Southern Vanuatu languages, and this needs little further discussion here. The distribution of the accreted article roughly parallels that found more generally for the common article in Oceanic by Crowley (1985) – i.e. it is found on most inanimate nouns, some non-human animate nouns, but few human nouns.

Although most kin terms show no initial accretion, some kin terms in the Erromangan languages and Anejoñ have a reflex of initial *e- (deriving from POc *e ‘personal article’ – cf. Ross 1988:99-100); and there is also evidence for a feminine kin prefix *ri-. PSV *e-probably marked senior male kin of the same moiety, while PSV *ri- probably marked senior female kin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Kwamera</th>
<th>Anejoñ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tama- ‘father’</td>
<td>e/tme-</td>
<td>{rimi/n}</td>
<td>{remu-}</td>
<td>e/tma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tuqaka ‘same-sex sibling’</td>
<td>re/tpo- ‘wife’</td>
<td>{reu-}</td>
<td>{repu-}</td>
<td>e/twa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tubu- ‘grandparent’</td>
<td>re/tpo- ‘wife’</td>
<td>{reu-}</td>
<td>{repu-}</td>
<td>e/tpo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tina- ‘mother’</td>
<td>nr/in/me-</td>
<td>e/hne/n</td>
<td>r/inh-</td>
<td>ri/si-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible that PSV *ri- reflects a putative POc feminine article or prefix *dri, with reflexes in some New Ireland and northern Vanuatu languages. As far as the New Ireland languages are concerned, Beaumont (1979: 58) says that Tigak ri is an honorific article used ‘before proper nouns which…refer to a person who is, or has been, a mother’. Tungag ri has similar functions (Malcolm Ross, pers. comm.). In northern Vanuatu, reflexes of putative *drV- occur prefixed to a number of female kin terms (for further details, see Lynch 1996: 70-76):

(a) Mosina (Banks) re/tno-, Northeast Ambae (Lolsiow dialect) ri/si- and Tolomako (Santo) ra/tina- ‘mother’ all reflect POc *tina- ‘mother’ with an r-initial prefix;
(b) Northeast Ambae (Wailengi and Lolomatau dialects) re/tahi-, Duidui (Ambae) re/tahi- and Raga (Pentecost) ra/tahi- ‘mother’ all reflect POc *taci- ‘younger same-sex sibling’ with an r-initial prefix;
(c) Mores (or Roria) (Santo) rie/tpu- ‘mother’ reflects POc *tubu- ‘grandparent’ with an r-initial prefix.

It thus appears that there may have been a form *dri of some antiquity which applied to mothers and wives – perhaps to senior female kin. POc *tubu- ‘grandparent’ and *tuqaka- ‘older same-sex sibling’ would be excluded, since they refers to both males and females, and one assumes that the male interpretation would be the default one.

In some SV languages, especially Ura and the Tanna languages, many human (or animate) nouns seem to have taken a prefix *ia-, which is obviously cognate with a productive agentive prefix in the Tanna languages (e.g. Lenakel ia- before consonants, i- before vowels). There is no evidence of this prefix as a productive morpheme elsewhere in the SV languages, and indeed Sye and Anejofii usually have *na- with the same items. Some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Anejofii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ta-m</em>aqane</td>
<td>ya/rmon</td>
<td>ie/ram*aan</td>
<td>na/man</td>
<td>na/tam*añ ‘man’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-pine</td>
<td>ya/rvin</td>
<td>{pe/rav*n}</td>
<td>na/hiven</td>
<td>na/taheñ ‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-mate</td>
<td>ye/rema</td>
<td>ie/ramim</td>
<td>ne/teme</td>
<td>‘person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ta-rmis</td>
<td>ya/rmis</td>
<td>ia/rmas</td>
<td>na/mah</td>
<td>na/tmas ‘evil spirit, devil’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also evidence supporting the reconstruction of an accreted locative/temporal prefix PSV *i-, probably deriving from the POc locative/temporal preposition *i, which is found (i) in many place names (especially in Tanna); (ii) in alternations like Lenakel nelukö- ‘middle’, iluka- ‘between’, or Lenakel tehe ‘sea’, irhe ‘to/in the sea’; and (iii) also in forms like the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejofii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *marani</td>
<td>{man}</td>
<td>i/mrañ</td>
<td>‘tomorrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc *tuai</td>
<td>e/twai</td>
<td>i/tuwu</td>
<td>‘long ago’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toŋa ‘south’</td>
<td>i/tuŋo</td>
<td>i/tuŋa</td>
<td>i/tooŋa ‘foreign’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form is reconstructed with *dr since Tigak and Tungag r reflect POc *dr (not *r, *l or *R) (Ross 1988: 267).
Two lower-level nominal affixes can also be reconstructed. A form which can be reconstructed as PTo *pi- (or perhaps *(p)p"j") is found prefixed to a number of kin terms in Tanna languages. It is found in all Tanna languages on two kin/personal terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tapine</td>
<td>pe/tan</td>
<td>pa/tan</td>
<td>pe/rav\text{\textendash}</td>
<td>p\text{\textendash}/lav\text{\textendash}</td>
<td>p/ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*av\text{\textendash}V-</td>
<td>p*v/a-</td>
<td>p*v/a-</td>
<td>p\text{\textendash}/a-</td>
<td>p\text{\textendash}/av\text{\textendash}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also found in a number of other, usually female, kin terms in Kwamera:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tuqaka</td>
<td>p/re\text{\textendash}a-</td>
<td>‘older same-sex sibling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taci-</td>
<td>p/rasi-</td>
<td>‘younger same-sex sibling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-pine</td>
<td>p/ini-</td>
<td>‘(man) sister’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m\text{\textendash}a\text{\textendash}qane</td>
<td>pu/mani-</td>
<td>‘(woman) brother’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proto Erromango appears to have accreted a marker *u- (*w- before a vowel) on to many animate non-human nouns (i.e. animals, birds, insects, fish and other marine life), with Ura showing more occurrences of this prefix than Sye. Some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*lano</td>
<td>u/la\text{\textendash}n</td>
<td>u/le\text{\textendash}n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*\text{\textendash}namuk</td>
<td>(u/y)\text{\textendash}yomoy</td>
<td>u/youmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pa\text{\textendash}Ri</td>
<td>u/var</td>
<td>u/var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kanase</td>
<td>w/\text{\textendash}ane</td>
<td>w/ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*matara(n)</td>
<td>(u/y)m\text{\textendash}itar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc</td>
<td>*garai</td>
<td>na\text{\textendash}n\text{\textendash}krai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bokasi</td>
<td>no/m\text{\textendash}pyahi</td>
<td>u/my\text{\textendash}as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*manuk</td>
<td>menuy</td>
<td>u/\text{\textendash}man-at ‘Cardinal honeyeater’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2.2 Nominal affixation

I examine now productive nominal affixation in Southern Vanuatu languages.

In Erromango and Anejoffi, verbs are nominalised by prefixing n-, which clearly derives from the POc common article *na. A few verbs in Tanna languages are also nominalised in this way, but most take a discontinuous affix which is n-...-an in North Tanna, n-...-aan in Lenakel and n-...-ien in the other Tanna languages. A number of North-Central Vanuatu languages also show a similar discontinuous morpheme. For example:

Lewo na-...-ena
Namakir na-...-ean
Nakanamanga na-...-ana
South Efate na-...-ien ≈ na-...-wen.

Others, however, just use a suffix:
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Paamese *-ene
Big Nambas *-ien6
Port Sandwich *-ian.

This suggests that PSV (and PSOc) had a nominaliser *-iana, deriving from POc *-an, and that nominalised verbs also took the article *na-.

Although the SV languages all have a number of other nominal affixes, relatively few can be reconstructed for PSV. These are:

1. PSV *un- ‘locative’. PEr *u- (Sye u- before n, un- elsewhere, Ura u-) adds a locative or goal meaning to a closed set of locational nouns (e.g. Sye veli ‘cave’, un-veli ‘to/in the cave’). Anjoño has a locative preposition u, which behaves morphologically like the general possessive marker, but which is used in a restricted range of locative constructions; and in addition, a considerable number of place names in Aneityum are u-initial.

2. PSV *(a,u)- ‘non-singular kin’: PEr *(a)r- (Sye ro-,...-me, Ura ri-) ‘plural kin’, Anjoño o- ‘dual kin’.

3. PSV *(human) non-singular’: Sye has the suffix -me ‘human plural’, with Ura -mila presumably cognate, suggesting PEr *(mi)lala. The Tanna languages have the following postnominal particles marking non-singular number of (human and non-human) nouns; the morpheme break is historical, not synchronic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mi-r</td>
<td>mi-l</td>
<td>mi-l</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘dual’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mi-(ra)hel</td>
<td>mi-hel</td>
<td>mi-sol</td>
<td>mi-rahari</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘trial’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mi-na</td>
<td>mi-n</td>
<td>mi-in</td>
<td>ma-na</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>‘plural’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also the following interesting comparison. Sye has a vestigial prefix it- which converts nouns to adjectives; e.g. natman ‘man’, it-natman ‘male’. Ura has the prefix aru-which converts stative verbs to adjectives: abas > aru-abas ‘heavy’. Tanna languages have a formally cognate prefix which, however, converts adjectives to nouns: Lenakel esuaas ‘small’, ir-esuaas ‘a/the small one’.

5.3 Possessive marking

Ura seems to have undergone fairly radical simplification in the area of possession: direct constructions (in which inalienable nouns take pronominal suffixes) have been almost completely replaced by constructions where the noun has a fused final n (the former 3SG suffix) and is followed by the focal pronoun. Similar reductions have taken place in the indirect constructions. These may have been fairly recent changes, but so little data is available on pre-contact Ura that we cannot be sure when these changes took place.7

---

6 Port Sandwich *-ian forms abstract nouns, while the prefix na- forms concrete nouns.
7 For a fuller discussion, see Crowley (f/c/a).
5.3.1 Direct constructions and the construct suffix

PSV, like POc, had a number of nouns, most of which refer to concepts that are inalienable in some way, which occur in what are known as direct possessive constructions. When the possessor is a pronoun, the possessive pronoun (§5.1.3) is suffixed to the noun. When the possessor is a noun, in most SV languages the noun takes a construct suffix (cs). For example, in Anejom:

Anejom

niθa-k niθa-i risi-k
name-1SG.POSS name-CS mother-1SG.POSS
‘my name’ ‘my mother’s name’

We can reconstruct a PSV construct suffix *-i on the basis of the suffix -i in Southwest Tanna, Kwamera and Anejom. The northern Tanna languages have lost the suffix completely;8 compare:

Lenakel

rama Nau remu-i Nau
father Nau father-CS Nau
‘Nau’s father’ ‘Nau’s father’

Kwamera

noru-n itais noru-n ovn-itais
hand-3SG hand-CS old:man hand-CS PL-old:man
‘his/her hand’ ‘the old man’s hand’ ‘the old men’s hands’

5.3.2 Indirect constructions

In indirect constructions in PSV (where the possessed noun is usually alienable), the possessed noun was followed by a possessive marker, to which was suffixed either a pronominal possessor or the construct suffix (which was then followed by a nominal possessor).9 The following Anejom examples illustrate this:

8 In previous analyses of these languages, I treated forms like Lenakel /rama/ ‘his father’ as consisting of a root /rama/ + suffix /ai/, with obligatory schwa-insertion; and I thus treated phrases like /rama nau/ ‘Nau’s father’ as consisting of root /rama/ + construct suffix /ai/ + noun. I do not now believe that this is justified, since (following the discussion in Chapter 4) there is no historical motivation for deleting the second vowel of POc *tama·ai, from which /rama/ derives. I therefore treat the root as being /rama/, which means that there is no construct suffix.

9 The Tanna languages allow the possessive marker + pronom suffix constituent to either precede or follow the possessed noun, as in Lenakel taha-k nimwa (POSS:GEN-1SG.POSS house) or nimwa taha-k ‘my house’. However, since this option does not appear to be used in other SV languages, I take it to be a later development.
Anejom

ntal nya-k

taro POSS:FOOD-1SG:POSS 'my taro (as food)'

ntal nya-i

taro POSS:FOOD-CS who 'whose taro (as food),'

There is a small number of possessive markers used in indirect constructions. In Anejom, the possessive markers are:

**Anejom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD</th>
<th>nya-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRINK</td>
<td>lum&quot;a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>um&quot;a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUICE</td>
<td>liθa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>a, era-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>u, uwu-, u-, uŋu-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The passive marker (in all SV languages, not just Anejom) is in fact the general oblique preposition, which will receive fuller discussion in §5.4.1. Before noun possessors in Anejom, neither the passive marker when it has the form a nor the general marker u take the construct suffix.

The following possessive phrases will exemplify the semantics of these markers (and similar markers in Tanna):

**Anejom**

neaŋ nya-n 'his/her coconut (as food)'
neaŋ lum"a-n 'his/her coconut (as drink)'

nemnem um"a-n 'his/her village (on his/her traditional land)'

neto liθa-n 'his/her sugarcane (to suck the juice from)'

nyip"al era-n 'his/her story (told about him/her)'

nyip"al uwu-n 'his/her story (told by him/her)'

Possessive markers in the Tanna languages mark an almost identical set of categories; however, they lack the juice category, but have a plant category (referring to things which one has planted). We can make the following reconstructions on a bottom-up basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOOD</td>
<td>*na-ya-</td>
<td>naŋ-</td>
<td>nŋŋ-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>sa/na-, sa/nŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nηŋ-m&quot;a-</td>
<td>nŋm&quot;a-</td>
<td>nŋm&quot;a-</td>
<td>{ni-}</td>
<td>sa/nm&quot;u-, sa/nm&quot;ŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRINK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{sap&quot;ŋ-, sapwasaŋ-}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT</td>
<td>*n-ai-</td>
<td>nai-</td>
<td>ne-</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>ia, ira-, ian(i)ra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>*i-im&quot;a-</td>
<td>iim&quot;a-</td>
<td>iim&quot;a-</td>
<td>iim&quot;a-</td>
<td>sava-, sa-, se-, sei-, save-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>*ira, *ira-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>iel-</td>
<td>iel-</td>
<td>ia, ira-, ian(i)ra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>raha-</td>
<td>raha-</td>
<td>tə-</td>
<td>kapə-, kafa-, kapaha-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Erromangan languages have lost all markers except general and passive, and indeed passive is only attested in Sye (Crowley’s ‘removed inalienable possession’), where it is ra before nouns and ira- with pronouns. However, we can still reconstruct the following non-general markers for Proto Southern Vanuatu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOOD</td>
<td>*na-ya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRINK</td>
<td>*na-mʷa-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>*iumʷa-</td>
<td>*i-imʷa-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>*(i)ra, *ira-</td>
<td>*ra-, *ira-</td>
<td>*ira, *ira-</td>
<td>a, era-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The food and drink markers derive from the POc possessive markers *ka- and *(m,mʷ)a- with an accreted article. The place marker clearly derives from PSV *n-iumʷaq ‘house’ (< POc *Rumʷaq), minus the accreted article and *q.

I turn now to the general marker. Unlike POc *ka- food and *(m,mʷ)a- drink, which have been retained in PSV, the most common of the POc general markers, *na- (often no- in North-Central Vanuatu languages), has been completely lost in Southern Vanuatu. The Anjeoffi general marker u has no cognates in SV languages (though it may derive from PSV *un- locative).

Sye has two general forms, and there is apparently no semantic difference between them:

1. horV- before first and second person pronouns, ihe- before third person pronouns, ihen before nouns. The pronouns are possessive suffixes. The full paradigm is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1INC.PL</th>
<th>1EXC.PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hore-t</td>
<td>horu-ŋ</td>
<td>horo-m</td>
<td>ihe-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hor-m</td>
<td>ihe-nr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. (h)en- (becoming (h)enŋ before k-initial pronouns), (h)en before nouns. The pronouns are the same in form as the focal forms except that they occur here as suffixes. Some examples:

   nimo horu-ŋ = nimo (h)en-yau 'my house'
   nimo ihe-nr = nimo (h)en-iror 'their house'
   nimo hore-t = nimo (h)enŋ-koh 'our (INC) house'
   nimo ihen ov-atmonuy = nimo (h)en ov-atmonuy 'the chiefs' houses'

Given that the (h)en- form is used with focal pronouns, I suspect that this construction is a later development, and will treat it as such here. Indeed, it looks as if it may have originated from ihe- + n construct suffix.

Ura has a single possessive marker ar- and Utaha the form eti- - ete-, both of which are followed by forms which either are, or are very similar to, the focal pronouns. Ura ar is also used with noun possessors, though there is no data for Utaha in this area. These appear not to be cognate with the Sye form, though I will show shortly that they may be partly cognate.

The Tanna general markers all show a certain amount of morphophonemic alternation; for example, Lenakel raha- > ta- before non-singular pronoun suffixes, Kwamera sa- > sava- before third person pronoun suffixes. However, we are unable to reconstruct a single Proto Tanna form.
There is, however, evidence that the markers in Erromango and Tanna — and thus presumably PSV — are (a) bi-morphemic, and (b) include as one of these morphemes one of the POc general markers — *sa-, which I reconstructed as marking indefinite general possession (Lynch 1996c). Assuming POc *sa- > PSV *sa- > PEr *ha-, PTn *ha- (PNT *za- in the environment of *q), then we could posit the following developments (where those parts of the forms which are cognate are underlined):

PEr *ha- > Sye ho/rV-, i/he- Ura a/r-
PTn *ha- > NTn, Wsn ra/ha- Len ra/ha- SWT kapa/ha- Kwm sa/(va)-
PNT *za- > NTn, Wsn ra/ha- Len la/ha-

In addition, note from the data above that Kwamera seems to have accreted sa- onto a number of other possessive markers. It thus appears that POe *sa- was inherited in PSV as *sa-, but that this form then combined with another morpheme (though this additional morpheme cannot be reconstructed for PSV, PEr or PTn).

5.4 Prepositions

Following Crowley (1998a), I classify prepositions in the Southern Vanuatu languages as being of three types. FREE PREPOSITIONS are followed by nouns or focal pronouns. NOMINAL PREPOSITIONS behave morphosyntactically as directly possessed nouns, taking pronominal suffixes or the construct suffix when followed by a noun phrase. And VERBAL PREPOSITIONS behave morphosyntactically as verbs, taking pronominal objects.

The Erromangan languages have a large number of prepositions — Crowley (1998a) lists over twenty in Sye — but Anejoffi (with seven) and the Tanna languages (with about five) have more modest inventories. It is likely that Proto Southern Vanuatu had just a small number of prepositions, and that the Erromangan languages have developed new ones. For example, the Sye nominal preposition rampo- ‘inside (a place)’ fairly obviously derives from the general oblique preposition ra + rampo- ‘trace, place, perch’, while the relationship between the Sye verbal preposition pon- ‘dative’ and the verb ovon-i ‘give’ is also quite obvious.

5.4.1 The general oblique preposition

We can reconstruct a general oblique preposition for Proto Southern Vanuatu, which had two allomorphs — one free, the other nominal. The preposition has a wide range of functions, including location, goal, source, time, comparison, and content of locution; in Anejoffi and Tanna, it also marks instrument, and in Erromango it marks cause and purpose. In addition, as I mentioned above, it marks passive possession in all SV languages. I will deal with the two forms first, and then the distribution of the allomorphs. The forms are:\n
\[\text{The Ura form aran is presumably ara- + -n construct suffix.}\]
The nominal form suggests a PSV reconstruction *ira-, with the northern Tanna languages irregularly losing *i, but only after it had conditioned palatalisation of *r as PNT *l. The free form was probably either *ra or *ira – i.e. *(i)ra – which experienced a certain amount of erosion and/or reanalysis.

The distribution of the allomorphs is as follows:

(i) In Erromango, *ira-/ara- governs a pronominal object, *ira-n/ara-n (with the construct suffix) governs a human noun, *ra governs other nouns.

(ii) In Southwest Tanna (the only Tanna language which has formally distinct objective pronouns), *ila- governs pronominal objects and is used with possessive pronouns in the singular but objective pronouns in the non-singular (where it has the form il-), while *ie is used with nouns.

(iii) In the other Tanna languages, the suffixed form is used with singular pronouns only, the free form with nouns and non-singular pronouns.

(iv) In Anejofii, *era- governs pronouns, *a governs n-initial nouns, and *era-i (with the construct suffix) governs nouns not beginning with n.

We can probably assume, therefore, that in PSV *ira- governed pronouns (and possibly human nouns) and *(i)ra governed other nouns.

5.4.2 Other prepositions

Because of the large number of prepositions in the Erromangan languages, I will not detail them all here, but will only cite those which are relevant to reconstructions. I will begin by listing the remaining prepositions in Anejofii and Tanna. The Anejofii prepositions are:

- ehele- personal locative/directional Nominal
- imta- benefactive Nominal
- u locative (in certain restricted contexts) Nominal (= GENERAL possessive)
- va- causal Verbal
- imi dative/benefactive Verbal

In Tanna, we find the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kam</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>kəmi</td>
<td>mə, məne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o, on</td>
<td>o, on</td>
<td>to, ton</td>
<td>tukʷ</td>
<td>tukʷ, tə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| dative, benefactive | Verbal |
| dative, cause, purpose | Verbal |

12 With the dative/causative/purposive preposition, the second form in each case (e.g. NTn, Wsn on) is used before singular pronouns, the first form elsewhere. With 3SG objects, there are some unpredictable forms: on in > on, ton in > ton, Kwamera tukʷ in > tukʷe.
The first set suggests Proto Tanna *(ka)mi ‘dative, benefactive’, while for the second I reconstruct both *o and *dukw ‘dative, cause, purpose’. This latter preposition is interesting in that it occurs in exactly these two forms (i) as a future tense marker (see §6.2.1) and (ii) as a future prefix to certain temporal nouns (e.g. Whitesands *nafjhan ‘when (past)?’, o-*nafjhan ‘when (future)?’). I reconstruct PTn *o on the basis of cognation with the Erromangan future marker.

The following PSV reconstructions can be made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*wa-ŋi</td>
<td>woŋ-</td>
<td>va, va-ŋ</td>
<td>*(ka)mi</td>
<td>*(ka)mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mative, benefactive</td>
<td>dative, benefactive</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also that Sye mavel-, Ura mafeli, mefeli, Anj *ehele appear to be cognate on formal grounds, suggesting *mavel-. However, the Erromangan forms mean ‘until’, while Anj *ehele- is a personal locative or directional.

5.5 Demonstratives and other modifiers

5.5.1 Demonstratives

All SV languages have a set of spatial demonstratives and another set of discourse-tracking demonstratives. With both sets of demonstratives, the Erromangan languages distinguish only proximate and distant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>iyih, yihi, ihi</td>
<td>ima, yima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>*mori</td>
<td>mori</td>
<td>mori, morima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>*ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tanna languages distinguish proximate, intermediate and distant; they also have a category I label ‘indicated’, often used when pointing to a specific place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>*uy</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>uk</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>u, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>*una</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>ikonu</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>nah, naha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>*ahan</td>
<td>aha</td>
<td>aha</td>
<td>aan</td>
<td>aan</td>
<td>aha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicated</td>
<td>*kuusa[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k&quot;use</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>*ika(i)</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ikonu</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>{te}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>*(e)b&quot;c,p&quot;a</td>
<td>iko</td>
<td>ap&quot;a</td>
<td>ap&quot;ar</td>
<td></td>
<td>{fa, ha}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Anejoffi demonstratives vary for number. The demonstrative pronouns are as listed below; demonstrative modifiers are formed by prefixing e- (i- in some phonological contexts) to these bases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial:</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>niñki</td>
<td>rañki</td>
<td>jiñki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>naanai</td>
<td>raña</td>
<td>jeknaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>naikou</td>
<td>rañkou</td>
<td>jeknaikou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse:</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>yiiki</td>
<td>raaki</td>
<td>jiiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jekeñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to segment these forms historically. However, we can probably suggest that the forms are composed of a marker of number plus the following:

- Spatial: Proximate: -ki
- Intermediate: -naa
- Distant: -kou

Now the probable POc forms (Lynch, Ross & Crowley f/c) are:

- Proximate: *(n)i ~ *(n)e
- Intermediate: *(n)a *ri
- Distant: *(n)o ~ *(n)u *rai

The only apparent points of comparison are:

POc *i ‘proximate’ > PSV *i > Sye i/yih, yi/hi
POc *na ‘intermediate’ > PSV *na > PTn *u/na, Anj -naa

### 5.5.2 Numerals

Some of the numeral systems in the SV languages have undergone unexpected changes. Ura, for example, seems to have replaced the inherited word for ‘four’ with a ‘two + two’ form, while in modern Anejfoñ, numerals above ‘three’ are remembered only by the oldest speakers, with Bislama loans being used by most speakers (Lynch & Spriggs 1995). However, there is enough data to allow us to reconstruct the PSV numeral system, including the interrogative numeral.

The PSV system was basically quinary. In Tanna and Anejfoñ, numerals above five were formed by compounding on the base five (e.g. Lenakel *katilum-katilum-karena 5-5-1 = ‘eleven’), and there was no word for ‘ten’. In Erromango, the form for six seems to derive from a compound ‘and-five’; the forms for seven to nine are compounds on the base five in Sye but on a different base in Ura (see below); and there is a word for ten, but it appears to derive from ‘two-fives’. I reconstruct the PSV system as follows; note that numerals appear to have taken a prefix PSV *ga- ~ *gə- (presumably from the POc counting prefix *ka-; I will have more to say about this prefix below).
Proto Erromangan numerals are reconstructed with the prefix \( *ga- \) on the basis of PSV and Ura and Utaha forms. I reconstruct both \( *(s,h)ai \) and \( *(s,h)(i,e)kai \) for ‘one’, the former on the basis of the Sye and Ura forms for ‘one’ and the Ura form for ‘six’, the latter on the basis of the Utaha form for ‘one’ and the Sye and Utaha forms for ‘six’. The root \( *-vat \) ‘four’ is found in both Ura and Utaha in the compounds meaning ‘nine’, though the meaning ‘four’ is conveyed by a compound meaning ‘two-and-two’ in these languages. PEr \( *suk-rem \) ‘five’ is probably bi-morphemic, with the second element occurring again in the form for ‘ten’ (= two-five).\(^\text{13}\)

The Proto Tanna forms are based on the following:

---

\(^\text{13}\) Whether this may have been \( *su-ga-rem \), with the numeral prefix \( *ga- \), I am unable to say; in any case, I can not track down the origin of the first syllable.
Nominal morphosyntax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ka-tia(na)</td>
<td>kätia</td>
<td>kätia</td>
<td>karenia</td>
<td>kélkiana</td>
<td>̈i, k*aiia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka-ru(a)</td>
<td>kaiu</td>
<td>kaiu</td>
<td>kiu</td>
<td>kélalu</td>
<td>kuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka-sir</td>
<td>käsöl</td>
<td>käsöl</td>
<td>kasil</td>
<td>käsisöl</td>
<td>kahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka-vat</td>
<td>kuvøt</td>
<td>kuvøt</td>
<td>kuvør</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka-(z)ri-rum</td>
<td>karilöm</td>
<td>karilöm</td>
<td>katilum</td>
<td>{kalkalop}</td>
<td>karirum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka-vah</td>
<td>kuah</td>
<td>kuah</td>
<td>kuuh</td>
<td>keva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two forms for ‘four’ are reconstructed, reflecting two POc reconstructions – POc *pat and *pati.

The numeral prefix PSV*ga- regularly dissimilates to *ga- in the form for ‘four’ because the first vowel of the root is *a. The Proto Tanna reflex *ka- is similar in form to the 3NONSG subject prefix to verbs. Sye has replaced PSV *ga- with nrV-, which is one of the 3PL subject prefixes, while *ga- has also been lost in Anejomi and replaced by e- (i- in ithii ‘one’), possibly the verb-initial accreted vowel (since numerals are stative verbs in Anejomi).

5.6 Noun phrase structure

The structure of the noun phrase in PSV was:

(PREMODIFIER) + NOUN + (\{ADJECTIVE\}) + (QUANTIFIER) + (DEMONSTRATIVE)

Tanna languages allow no premodification of a noun phrase head, and Sye and Anejomi have only a handful of premodifiers – usually markers of indefiniteness or plurality. None appear to be reconstructible at the PSV level.

The class of ADJECTIVES includes words which may take verbal morphology and function as the head of a verb phrase, and may also function as a postmodifier to nouns without such morphology. For example:

**Lenakel**

Nim*”a taha-m r-vøt.  
house POSS:GEN-2SG 3SG-good  
‘Your house is good.’

nim*”a vøt nøvin  
house good some  
‘some good houses’

**Anejomi**

Et upnii niom*” uunu-m*.  
3SG.AOR good house POSS:GEN-2SG  
‘Your house is good.’

hal niom*” upnii  
some house good  
‘some good houses’

The class of MODIFIERS, on the other hand, may not take verbal morphology: for example, Lenakel nim*”a vi ‘a new house’ but not *nim*”a r-vi (**the house is new**). Under this definition, Erromangan languages have no adjectives, and what Crowley (1998a) calls adjectives in Sye are, in this terminology, modifiers. Thus the adjective/modifier distinction is supported only by Tanna and Anejomi data.
The class of QUANTIFIERS includes the numerals and other non-numeral forms like Lenakel *petəm*, Anejom *asŋa* ‘all’, or Sye *nokon*, Lenakel *nəvin* ‘some’. In Anejom, however, numerals always occur in a relative clause following the noun phrase; compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lenakel</th>
<th>Anejom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>pukas kasil</em></td>
<td><em>pikaθ et esej</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pig three</td>
<td>pig 3SG.AOR three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘three pigs’</td>
<td>‘three pigs’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The class of DEMONSTRATIVES was discussed in §5.5.1.
6 Verbal morphosyntax

In the Erromangan and Tanna languages, verbs consist of a root and a number of affixes marking, inter alia, person and number of the subject, tense/aspect/mood (TAM), polarity, transitivity, direction, and other categories. Verb phrases (indeed, clauses as well) thus very often consist simply of an inflected verb. There is a small category of postverbal modifiers, and certain noun phrase modifiers may also occur in verb phrases. Anejoñ, on the other hand, marks most of the grammatical categories mentioned above by preverbal particles. I will argue below that PSV was probably more like Anejoñ, in that it had preverbal and postverbal clitics or particles which have become prefixes in Tanna and Erromango.

6.1 Verbal derivation

This section will look at the form of verbs and at various derivational affixes found on verbs.

6.1.1 Verb-initial *a-

As I noted at some length in Chapter 4, verb roots in the SV languages have accreted an initial *a-. Most, but not all, verbs in all SV languages take this accretion, suggesting that it was a productive process. This innovation seems to be unique to Proto Southern Vanuatu. However, it is difficult to identify a function for this morpheme: it has no function in the modern languages (indeed, it is an integral part of the root), and there is no apparent synchronic syntactic, morphological, phonological or semantic basis for its presence or absence on particular verbs or in particular languages.

In previous analyses, I have suggested that *a- simply marked a root as being a verb. Indeed, there are few cases of what were POC noun roots being converted to verbs in this way (e.g. POC *ta-m°aqane > Anejoñ atam°añ ‘be male’), and there are (as pointed out in §4.2.1) cases of verbs borrowed from other languages being prefixed with a vowel. This would tend to support the idea that initial *a- marked, or has come to mark, a root as a verb. But it does not explain why, although many verbs reflect *a-, a considerable number do not.
I now believe that the process of verb-initial vowel accretion was quite different from what I outlined above, at least historically. I believe that the vowel is in fact the *a of the accreted article/nominalising prefix *na-, which has been reanalysed as part of the root. Consider first nouns like the following in Anejoffi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>Anejoffi</th>
<th>Specific (SG or NON-SG)</th>
<th>Non-specific NON-SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na kayu</td>
<td>*na kayu</td>
<td>nyai</td>
<td>yai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na patu</td>
<td>*na patu</td>
<td>nhat</td>
<td>hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na maRi</td>
<td>*na maRi</td>
<td>nma</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na bakiwa</td>
<td>*na bakiwa</td>
<td>nepyev</td>
<td>epyeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na pudi</td>
<td>*na pudi</td>
<td>nohos</td>
<td>ohos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na kutu</td>
<td>*na kutu</td>
<td>neyet</td>
<td>eyet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-specific non-singular is formed by deleting noun-initial n. In the first three examples above, where the vowel of the article is regularly lost, this leaves the bare root. In the other three, however, where the vowel of the article is regularly retained, this process leaves the root preceded by what was the vowel of the article. In other words, *na-CVCV... has been reinterpreted as n-aCVCV...

I suggest that the same process occurred with verbs. Crowley (1998: 116-117) says that, for most Erromangan verbs, there is a ‘citation’ form which is the same as the nominalised form – i.e. with initial n-; and in all SV languages, nominalisations are frequent. Southern Tanna languages, for example, negate a verb with the negative verb apwah followed by the nominalised form of the root (see §6.2.1 below), which means that nominalisations occur with high frequency; while in Erromango, many auxiliaries are followed by the nominalised form of verbs. A de-nominalised form, following the process outlined above for Anejoffi, would then have deleted only initial n (and any suffixed nominalisers in the Tanna languages). Where the vowel of the article/nominaliser had been deleted, this would leave a bare consonant-initial root; but where the vowel of the article was retained, this would leave a vowel-initial root. I illustrate this general process with some Sye verbs; the first three rules below are Low Vowel Dissimilation, Medial Vowel Deletion and Article Reduction; OTHER includes the proposed morphological reanalysis. The first three examples show consonant-initial roots, the next four show the accretion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>aCa &gt; sCa</th>
<th>-V- &gt; Ø</th>
<th>n- &gt; n-</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>DENOMINALISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*na mate</td>
<td>*na-‘mase</td>
<td>nə-‘mase</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-mas</td>
<td>n-mah</td>
<td>mah ‘die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na-tanum</td>
<td>*na-‘tanum</td>
<td>nə-‘tanum</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-tanum</td>
<td>n-tenəm</td>
<td>tenəm ‘bury’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na sake</td>
<td>*na-‘sake</td>
<td>nə-‘sake</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-sak</td>
<td>n-say</td>
<td>say ‘ascend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na luaq</td>
<td>*na-lu’aq</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-elwo</td>
<td>elwo</td>
<td>‘vomit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na mataq</td>
<td>*na-ma’taq</td>
<td>na-mə-‘taq</td>
<td>na-mtaq</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-emte</td>
<td>emte ‘raw’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na pekas</td>
<td>*na-pe’kas</td>
<td>na-pkas</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-evyah</td>
<td>evyah</td>
<td>‘defecate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*na keli</td>
<td>*na-‘keli</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>n-oysəl-i</td>
<td>oysəl-i</td>
<td>‘dig’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is somewhat unusual typologically. However, it does seem to be the logical analysis.
2 Recall from Chapter 4 that *tanum seems to have been irregularly stressed on the penultimate syllable.
This, as I said, appears to have been the general process. There are numerous exceptions, however – either where the same root is reflected differently (as far as the accreted vowel is concerned) in different languages, or where forms do not ‘follow’ these rules. And it may be that the initial vowel was subsequently reinterpreted as some kind of verb marker, which would explain its presence on borrowed verbs and might also explain many of these exceptions.

6.1.2 Other derivational prefixes

Proto Oceanic had a number of derivational prefixes, including *pa[ka]- ‘causative’, *pa[R]i- ‘reciprocal, collective action’, *ta- ‘spontaneous, anti-causative intransitive’ and possibly *ma- ‘dynamic anti-causative intransitive’. All of these have been lost in the languages of Erromango and Tanna, which do not have derivational prefixes to verbs. In Tanna, for example, the causative is expressed by the fully inflected verb PTn *or ‘do, make’ + complement clause, the reciprocal (and reflexive) by the verbal suffix PTn *-aduk”, and collective action by the verbal suffix PTn *-kW(a,i)s (see §6.3.3 for a discussion of these suffixes). In Erromango, the causative is expressed by (i) a compound of the bound verb PEr *ovyu- plus a following verb and (ii) by the verb PEr *om- + pronoun object + uninflected root; reflexive is also expressed by an auxiliary verb PEr *espe. Some examples of some of these constructions are:

**Kwamera**

\[ I \text{ Fut.1-make} \text{ Nirua} \text{ Fut.3SG-drink-TR kava} \]
\[ I \text{ made Nirua drink kava.} \]

\[ R \text{-maki-atuk”} \]
\[ 3SG \text{-hate-REFL} \]
\[ ‘He hates himself/she hates herself.’ \]

**Sye**

\[ Yam-ovu-oruy \text{ nalau.} \]
\[ 1SG \text{.DIST.PAST-cause-bathe} \text{ child} \]
\[ ‘I bathed the child.’ \]

\[ Yesu yi-mah \text{ m-om-koh omurep.} \]
\[ Jesus 3SG.DIST.PAST-die ECHO-cause-us:INC live \]
\[ ‘Jesus died and he made us live.’ \]

**Ura**

\[ K-espe \text{ n-lelei ga.} \]
\[ 2SG.RECPAST-do.reflexively NOM-scratch you.SG \]
\[ ‘You scratched yourself.’ \]

Two of these POc prefixes, however, seem to have been retained in Anejomi (and thus PSV). Earlier studies (e.g. Capell’s manuscript grammar) record these as ehy- and ehr-, with \( h < *p \); but in the modern forms there is now some phonological irregularity:
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POc *pa[ka]-  >  Anj ey- multiplicative
POc *pa[R]i-  >  Anj eri- mutual action, multiple subject

Both of these show loss of *p, but otherwise appear phonologically regular enough. One of the functions of the POc causative prefix was to mark multiplicatives when attached to numerals (e.g. *pa[ka]-tolu > Anj ec-esej 'three times'). The other functions of the POc causative have been taken over by a new causative prefix *awo-. We therefore need to reconstruct PSV *a(va)y- causative (or perhaps just multiplicative) and PSV *a(va)r- mutual action/multiple subject, noting that these were lost in PEr and PTn.

6.2 Subject, tense-aspect and negation

As I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the Erromango and Tanna languages mark person and number of the subject, tense-aspect, negation, and a few other adverbial meanings by a series of prefixes to the verb. For example:

**Sye**

Yam-um-etu-tovop.
1SG.DIST.PAST-ITER.SG-NEG-laugh
'I didn't laugh again.'

**Lenakel**

K-am-am-u-aamh.
3NONSG-PAST-CONT-DL-see
'They two saw.'

Anejoffi, on the other hand, marks these same categories by a series of preverbal particles:

**Anejoffi**

Et m'an lep idim apan.
3SG.AOR PERF again really go
'He/she has really gone.'

In modern Anejoffi, there is a tendency for some markers, especially those of tense-aspect and negation, to become cliticised to a following vowel-initial particle or to the root:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ek} & \quad \text{it} \text{ity} \quad \text{at} \text{ou} \quad > \quad k=\text{it} \text{ity}=\text{at} \text{ou} \\
1\text{SG.AOR} & \quad \text{NEG know} & 1\text{SG.AOR}=\text{NEG}=\text{know} \\
\text{'I don't know'} & \\
\text{is} & \quad \text{apan} \quad > \quad s=\text{apan} \\
3\text{SG.PAST} & \quad \text{go} & 3\text{SG.PAST}=\text{go} \\
\text{'he/she went'} &
\end{align*}
\]

This suggests that what are now prefixes in the other languages may have developed from clitics or free particles in the same way as is happening in Anejoffi (and as is widely distributed in Oceanic). I will make this assumption for PSV.
6.2.1 Proto Tanna

Prefixes to the root in Proto Tanna were as follows:

\[
(\text{INTENTION}) + (\text{FUT}) + \text{PERSON} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{TENSE-ASPECT} \\
\text{NEGATIVE}
\end{array} \right\} + (\text{CONTINUOUS}) + (\text{INTERROG})
\]

This order is found in all Tanna languages. In addition, there is a prefix of NUMBER, which occurs (i) between Person and Tense-Aspect in Kwamera, (ii) between Continuous and Interrogative in Southwest Tanna, and (iii) between Interrogative and the root in Northern Tanna languages. On the basis of the discussion below, I will suggest that Proto Tanna had the same order as Kwamera – i.e. the obligatory category of NUMBER came between PERSON and TENSE-ASPECT/NEGATIVE, and that other languages have moved this further to the right.

Proto Tanna verbal prefixes and their reflexes are listed in Table 6.1. Some comments on some of these reconstructions are necessary.

**Future.** I reconstruct two prefixes here: \*duk" - on purely internal evidence, and \*o - on the basis of cognacy with the Erramangan forms (see §6.2.3). Note also the virtually exact formal parallels between these prefixes and the dative/causal/purposive prepositions reconstructed in §5.4.2.

**Person.** Note the formal identity of the 1INC and 3NONSG prefixes. I reconstruct PTn \*iak - first person as well as \*ak - concurrent tense. In Lenakel and Kwamera at least, 1SG.CONCURRENT is frequently iakak-, but also frequently iak-. However, it appears that this reduced form has been reanalysed as i-ak- in languages like Lenakel but as iak-O- in Kwamera. The Kwamera second person prefix ik- appears to be derived from the focal pronoun ik, and Kwamera has also developed grammatically conditioned allomorphs of the 1INC and 3NONSG prefixes.

**Number.** The reconstructions here are underlying forms. In many cases, these have allomorphs conditioned by the initial segment of the root; e.g. the Lenakel dual marker is u- before mid and low vowels and ia- before consonants and high vowels; and the Southwest Tanna plural marker is s- before low and mid vowels and h- and ha- before high vowels and consonants. In the plural (which is formally related to the numeral ‘four’), we have two forms, paralleling the two forms of the numeral and the number suffix to pronouns and ultimately related to the fact that both *pat and *pata ‘four’ were inherited from POc.

**Tense-Aspect.** I have reconstructed two distinct perfective markers, \*aku- and \*an-. These seem to have combined to form the single perfective marker akuan- in Southwest Tanna. The sequential prefix also looks as if it may have been a compound of two different morphemes; but though I can identify \*eb" - as the first, there is no consistency about the second.

**Negative.** The northern Tanna languages suggest a negative prefix \*as- and a suffix which is, or is formally identical to, the nominalising suffix (§5.2.2) \*iana. Kwamera has a fairly rare negative suffix -mha. The commonest form of negation in Kwamera, and the only one in Southwest Tanna, is to use the negative verb ap"ah followed by the nominalised form of the verb being negated. Thus:
Kwamera

Iak-ap"ah n-arai-iien nei.

IEXC-negative NOM-cut-NOM wood

'I didn't cut the wood.'

The verb ap"ah is cognate with northern Tanna forms like Lenakel kap"a which is the free form negative 'no'.

Table 6.1: Tanna verbal prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentional</strong></td>
<td>*na-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td>*o-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*duk&quot;-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC</td>
<td>*k-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1IEXC</td>
<td>*iak-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*n-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*t-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NONSG</td>
<td>*k-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>*m-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual</td>
<td>*rau-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trial</td>
<td>*hal-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>*at-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*ha-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tense-Aspect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concurrent</td>
<td>*ak-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>*am&quot;(n)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective¹</td>
<td>*aku-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective²</td>
<td>*an-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequential</td>
<td>*eb&quot;[ ]-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>*as-..-iana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>*am-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>*azu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb ap"ah is cognate with northern Tanna forms like Lenakel kap"a which is the free form negative 'no'.
6.2.2 Anejom

Anejom has a number of portmanteau preverbal particles which mark person and number of the subject and tense. The system has been showing signs of collapse and reorganisation into a much simpler system (Lynch 1995). The modern system 'pre-collapse' is given in Table 6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2: Anejom subject-TAM markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aorist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These modern portmanteau morphemes seem to derive from a sequence of particles, which were probably as listed below. I assume that the non-singular forms in fact marked plural (i.e. there was no plural marker as such), although they are all a-final, which suggests that a may have been a yet earlier plural marker. The dual and trial markers seem to have been added to these plural forms.

Person + Number + Tense
1SG    ek  Ø SG  Ø aorist
2SG    (a)na  u  DL  is past
3SG    et (AOR), y  taj  TL  i inceptive
1INC.PL  ta  Ø (a ?)  PL
1EXC.PL  ekra
2PL    eka (AOR), aka
3PL    era
ECHO  m=

Following these markers are a number of sets of preverbal particles, as follows:
6.2.3 Proto Erromango

Erromangan verbs are extraordinarily complex morphologically and morphophonemically. I will first outline with very little modification (but with rather less detail) Crowley's description of Sye and Ura (Crowley 1998a, 1999), and comment later on possible reanalyses and developments from Proto Erromango.

Verb roots occur in two forms, 'basic' and 'modified'. Modified roots occur in the future, present, past habitual and, in Sye, in the realis and irrealis conditional (categories not recorded for Ura); basic roots occur elsewhere – i.e. in the imperative, recent past, distant past, dependent past, past continuous and optative (and also the counterassertive in Sye), as well as with derivational prefixes, in reduplications, and as the second member of a compound. The only disagreement appears to be that the subjunctive takes the modified root in Ura but the basic root in Sye. It is difficult to give a single characterisation of the grammatical environment in which modified roots are used.

As far as the actual modification is concerned, Crowley classifies Erromangan verbs as being 'weak' or 'strong'.3 Weak verbs consist of all verbs beginning with glides (y and w) and alveolars (t, s, l, r). In Sye, verbs beginning with non-mid vowels (a, i, u), and about one-third of verbs beginning with e and o, are also weak; whereas in Ura, most e- and o-initial verbs are weak, but so also are about one-third of i- and u-initial verbs, and a handful of a-initial verbs. Strong verbs consist of the remaining vowel-initial verbs in each language and all verbs beginning with labials (p, v, m). (Note that no verbs begin with k, y, η, h or n.)

Weak verbs form their modified root by adding underlying n to the root; n > Ø before y, w, s and l. Thus in Sye:

Sye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect-mood</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pu</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>iðim</td>
<td>isp&quot;a-</td>
<td>iiyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu</td>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>lep</td>
<td>lop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p&quot;ar</td>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>top&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m&quot;an</td>
<td>PERF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jim</td>
<td>PROHIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFLEXIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>esomsay</td>
<td>nesomsay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong verbs add n- to the first consonant of the verb (whether or not this is preceded by a vowel). This n- then undergoes assimilation to the point of articulation of the consonant (except that n > Ø before m), which may also change in manner of articulation. Consonant-initial verbs add initial a, and e- and o-initial verbs (and also Ura u-initial verbs) change the initial vowel to a. Examples:

3 The only verb-initial consonants in Ura are w, y, s, t and v. Other consonants discussed in what follows therefore refer only to Sye.
Preceding the root is a set of prefixes marking subject, tense-aspect and polarity. These prefixes are:

**SUBJECT/TAM** + *(PRIOR PAST)* + *(ITERATIVE)* + *(NEG)* + *(am-)* + *(ROOT-MODIFICATION)*

The prefix *am-*(Sye eme- before a modified root, em- elsewhere, Ura am- – em-) presents ‘a serious analytical difficulty in that it is not possible to assign any particular meaning’ to it (Crowley 1998a:107). It combines with various sets of subject prefixes and with the basic or modified form of the verb root ‘to express a number of morphologically discontinuous inflectional categories’, but there is no element of predictability involved. In both Ura and Sye:

- **Distant past** + *am- -* Basic root = Dependent past
- **Distant past** + *am-* + Modified root = Past habitual
- **Recent past** + *am-* + Basic root = Past continuous
- **Recent past** + *am-* + Modified root = Present

and in Sye:

- **Optative** + *am-* + Modified root = Realis conditional
- **Counterassertive** + *am-* + Modified root = Irrealis conditional

I will follow Crowley in treating it as a meaningless morpheme in Sye and Ura, but will suggest that it may have marked continuous aspect in Proto Erromangan.

Ura subject prefixes distinguish only singular and plural. Apart from the imperative, about which I will say more below, Crowley lists five sets of Ura prefixes marking subject, whose underlying forms are shown in Table 6.3.4 Under the markers are the various forms of the root (basic or modified) plus whether the prefix *em- ~ am-* is present or not, and the tense-aspect(s) marked by the combination of each of sets I-V with form of root plus *em- ~ am-*.  

---

4 This is a slight reinterpretation of Crowley's analysis.
### Table 6.3: Ura subject-TAM markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set I</th>
<th>Set II</th>
<th>Set III</th>
<th>Set IV</th>
<th>Set V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yau-</td>
<td>ya(u)-</td>
<td>ya-</td>
<td>yaumi-</td>
<td>yaupi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>ke-</td>
<td>(y)e-</td>
<td>kami-</td>
<td>kapi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(y)i-</td>
<td>(y)i-</td>
<td>(y)i-</td>
<td>(y)i-</td>
<td>pi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INC</td>
<td>(g)ur-</td>
<td>(g)ura-</td>
<td>(g)ure-</td>
<td>(g)ur-</td>
<td>gispir-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 EXC</td>
<td>gimir-</td>
<td>gimra-</td>
<td>gimire-</td>
<td>gimir-</td>
<td>gipir-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gir-</td>
<td>gire-</td>
<td>gir-</td>
<td>gir-</td>
<td>pir-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(y)ir-</td>
<td>(y)ira-</td>
<td>(y)ire-</td>
<td>(y)ir-</td>
<td>pir-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |        |        |         |        |       |
| **BASIC** | Recent past | Distant past | Optative |
| `em-` | Past continuous | Dependent past |       |
| **MODIFIED** | Future | Present | Past habitual |       |

| **NOTES** |       |       |       |       |
| Final i | Ø / _ V. | 1. Final V > Ø / _ V. | 1. Final a > e / (C)e | Final V > Ø / _ V. |
|         |       | 2. Final V harmonises with V / _ CV. | (C)i. |       |
|         |       | 2. `em-` > Ø / n. |       |       |

Now the imperative is marked by a zero prefix in the singular and _ir_- in the plural; this, plus a comparison of the plural forms in Table 6.3, suggests that _ir_- probably marked plural number. The echo-subject marker is _m_- before vowels, with _mV_- in various preconsonantal environments. (This is often _mi-_, but Ura _i_ is often excrescent, deriving as it does from *œ.)

I suggest that the following were the Pre-Ura subject/TAM-marking prefixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Tense-aspect₁</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Tense-aspect₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>yau-</td>
<td>Ø-</td>
<td>a- present/future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>k-</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>ir- PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>y- (&gt; Ø-)</td>
<td>p-</td>
<td>optative/subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NC.PL</td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.PL</td>
<td>gim-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>g(i)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>y- (&gt; Ø-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I suggest also that the _i_ following many of the modern markers is epenthetic, and is inserted between a consonant-final morpheme and a following consonant-initial morpheme. The
Verbal morphosyntax

Prefix *m-* marking distant past is now only used in the singular; Sets I and IV are identical in the plural, but this may have been a recent development.

Root-modification may have had the function of marking some kind of irrealis: it is used with future, subjunctive, present, and past habitual (which I suppose could be considered as irrealis, in that the action is no longer practised). The prefix *am-* - *em-* may have marked continuous aspect: its presence distinguishes present from future, past continuous from recent past, and dependent and habitual past from distant past.

Although Erromangan pronouns distinguish only singular and plural, Sye subject prefixes distinguish a dual as well, though only in first person. Table 6.4 shows the subject prefixes in Sye, as analysed by Crowley.

The imperative is marked by Ø- in the singular and *u-* in the plural, suggesting that these (as in Ura) are number markers. However, in the first person non-singular, *u-* marks dual and *li-* marks plural. It appears that this may have been the original state of affairs, with the dual/plural distinction subsequently being lost in non-first person, and the dual marker taking on the more general role as a marker of non-singular.

Crowley describes the form of the Sye echo subject prefixes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4: Sye Subject-TAM markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set I</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | yap- | yap- | yam- | yapi- | yaki- | yakin-
| 2 | ko- | ko- | kim- | kipi- | kipi- | kin-
| 3 | yo- | yo- | yi- | pi- | pi- | n-
| **Dual** | | | | | |
| 1NC | kok- | kok- | komu- | kopu- | kopu- | konu-
| 1EXC | kak- | kak- | kamu- | kapu- | kapu- | kan-
| **Plural** | | | | | |
| 1NC | kokli- | koke- | komli- | kopli- | kopli- | konli-
| 1EXC | kakli- | kake- | kamli- | kapli- | kapli- | kanli-
| 2 | ku- | kwo- | kimu- | kipu- | kipu- | kinu-
| 3 | yu- | ywo- | nru- | pu- | pu- | nu-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recent past</strong></th>
<th><strong>Distant past</strong></th>
<th><strong>Optative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Subjunctive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Counter-assertive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>em-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODIFIED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realis conditional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrealis conditional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Interestingly, this is also true of South Efate.
Before modified root | Elsewhere
---|---
SG | me- | m-
DL | mo- | mu-
PL | mle- | mli-

This suggests *m- echo subject + number markers as above, with an excrescent vowel occurring before a modified root. This vowel may have been PER *a.

There is further evidence that the number-markers were separate morphemes. With the morphemes following the subject, dual and plural markers often occur more distant from the subject, and in some cases occur twice: for example, komli-um-li-tovop (1INC.PL.DISTPAST-ITER-PL-laugh) ‘we kept on laughing’. This suggests that number was a separate category. The commonest form of a verb would have been SUBJECT/TAM + NUMBER + ROOT. When other morphemes intervened, the propinquity of both SUBJECT/TAM + NUMBER and NUMBER + ROOT may have caused number to be marked either twice or variably; that is:

SUBJECT/TAM + OTHER MORPHEMES + NUMBER + ROOT, or
SUBJECT/TAM + NUMBER + OTHER MORPHMES + ROOT, or
SUBJECT/TAM + NUMBER + OTHER MORPHMES + NUMBER + ROOT

The variability in the position of the Tanna number markers referred to in §6.2.1 above may have a similar explanation.

Now although synchronically these prefixes have to be analysed as single portmanteau morphemes, historical analysis suggests that they were probably composed of the following discrete elements.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Tense-aspect₁</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Tense-aspect₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>ya-</td>
<td>k- immediate</td>
<td>Ø- SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>m- distant past</td>
<td>u- DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>y- (Ø-)</td>
<td>p(i)- optative/subjunctive</td>
<td>li- PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC.NONSG</td>
<td>ko-</td>
<td>n- counterassertive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.NONSG</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NONSG</td>
<td>y- (Ø-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clearly some problems still to be solved, among them the excrescent o in the singular in Set I, the 3NONSG form nr- in Set III, the relationship between Sets IV and V which differ only in the 1SG form, the intrusive k in the 1SG form in Set VI, and the conditions under which y- 3SG is lost.

Bearing these in mind, however, I propose that the subject markers in the modern Erromangan languages derive from the Proto Erromangan prefixes/particles given in Table 6.5.

---

*This analysis relies partly on Crowley (n.d.).
Table 6.5: Proto Erromango subject-TAM markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*ya-</td>
<td>ya-</td>
<td>yau-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*ki-</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>k-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (SG + NONSG)</td>
<td>*y- (&gt; 0-)</td>
<td>y- (&gt; 0-)</td>
<td>y- (&gt; 0-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INC.NONSG</td>
<td>*g(o,u)-</td>
<td>ko-</td>
<td>gu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.NONSG</td>
<td>*ga-</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>gim-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NONSG</td>
<td>*gi-</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>gi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>*m-</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>m-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tense-Aspect, | immediate | | distant past | | optative/subjunctive | | counterassertive |
|---------------|------------|-----|--------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
|               | *k-        | k- | m-           | m- | p(i)-               | n-  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>ir-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense-Aspect,</th>
<th>Future (+ present?)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Iterative</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th></th>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th></th>
<th>Irrealis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*a-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>etu-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>em(e)-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>etu-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>em-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1EXC.NONSG prefix is reconstructed as *gi-. Ura has gim-, but this (unlike other non-singular prefixes) seems simply to be the focal pronoun. I reconstruct the immediate tense-aspect marker *k- on the basis of Sye data and similar data in other SV languages (e.g. Proto Tanna *ak- concurrent). The counterassertive prefix *n- may or may not have been in Proto Erromango: Terry Crowley (pers. comm.) says that he has not elicited any counterassertive forms in Ura as yet, and there are no data from anywhere else in SV to confirm this.

This complex of subject-tense-number markers was optionally followed by the following prefixes (with a parenthesised vowel occurring before a modified root). Note, however, that the behaviour of future iteratives and negatives in Sye suggests that Tense-aspect₂ came quite late in the series of prefixes.

Prior past + Iterative + Negative + Continuous + Irrealis

Sye: epm(e)- um(e)- etu-, etwo- em(e)- n-
Ura: ehm- oum- etu- em- ~ am- n-

Sye medial r corresponds regularly to Ura medial r, so the Ura negative form is suspicious. Nevertheless, I tentatively reconstruct the following:

Prior past + Iterative + Negative + Continuous + Irrealis

PEr: *epm- *[ jum- *etu- *am- *n-
6.2.4 *Proto Southern Vanuatu*

The order of preverbal elements in *Proto Erromango*, *Proto Tanna* and *Anejoffi* is given below. Note that although in the Erromangan and Tanna languages number markers are fairly flexibly ordered, that flexibility is, as I mentioned above, a later development; and in both *Proto Erromango* and *Proto Tanna* the prefix marking number had a fixed ordering relative to the other preverbal elements.

**PEr** PERSON + TAM + NUMBER + PRIOR PAST + ITERATIVE + TAM2 + NEG + CONT + IRREALIS

**PTn** INTENT + FUT + PERSON + NUMBER + TENSE/NEG + CONT + INTERROGATIVE

**Anj** PERSON + NUMBER + TENSE + ASPECT + ADV + REFLEXIVE + NEG + ADV

The fluidity of at least some items in the list above suggests that the forms were particles rather than prefixes; I suggest this because it seems more likely for free particles to change ordering than for prefixes to do so. An examination of the orders above suggests that the following was the likely order in *Proto Southern Vanuatu*:

PERSON + NUMBER + TENSE + [ASPECT/ADVERBIAL CATEGORIES] + NEGATIVE + CONTINUOUS

*Proto Oceanic* had the following three sets of subject proclitics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set I</th>
<th>Set II</th>
<th>Set III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*au=</td>
<td>*(y)a=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*ko=</td>
<td>*o=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*(y)a=, *ñã=</td>
<td>*e=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EXC.PL</td>
<td>*ta=</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>*ð= (?)</td>
<td>*ka[i]=, *mi=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>*ra=</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following appear to prototype *Southern Vanuatu* person markers and their *Proto Oceanic* antecedents:

**POc** > **PSV** > **PEr** > **PTn** > **Anj**

- *ya=*, *ku=*
- *iak-*
- *ya-*
- *iak-*
- *ek-*
- 1SG
- *ko=
- *ki-
- *n(a)-
- *n-
- *(a)/na-
- 2SG
- *(y)a=*
- *y (variant)*
- *t-
- *e/t-
- 3SG
- *ta=
- *ta-
- *gV-
- *g(o,u)-
- *k-
- 1INC.NONSG
- *ka[i]=
- *ga-
- *ga-
- {ekra-}
- 1EXC.NONSG
- *kau=
- *gia-
- *gi-
- *e/ka-, a/ka-
- 2NONSG
- *ra=
- *ra-
- *(k,y)-
- *y-
- *k-
- 3NONSG
- *ma ‘and’*
- *m-
- *m-
- *m-
- *m=
- ECHO

---

7 These may have been competing forms in early *POc*. Lynch, Ross and Crowley (flc) suggest that Set I may have marked intransitive subject and Set II transitive subject in *Proto Malayo-Polynesian* (though there is no evidence that this distinction was maintained in POc). Set III may be reduced forms of focal pronouns.
The number markers can be reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0=</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[ra]u=</td>
<td>*u-</td>
<td>*rau-</td>
<td>u-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(t,s)ali=</td>
<td>*iLi- PL</td>
<td>*hal- taj-</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>*at-, *ha-</td>
<td>Ø- (a- ?)</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarity between these and the number suffixes to pronouns (see §5.1.4) should be obvious.

TAM markers of various kinds include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ak=</td>
<td>*k-</td>
<td>*iak-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(a)m”an=</td>
<td>*m-</td>
<td>*am”n- m”an</td>
<td>(distant) past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(e)b” [ ]</td>
<td>*am”</td>
<td>*eb” [ ] p”ar</td>
<td>sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*am=</td>
<td>*am-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p(i,u)=</td>
<td>*p(i)- OPT</td>
<td>Kp- COND pu FUT</td>
<td>future/optative/irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*n(a)=</td>
<td>*n- IRR</td>
<td>*na- INTEN</td>
<td>intentional/irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a=</td>
<td>*a-</td>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as negation is concerned, PTn *as- may derive from either Proto Malayo-Polynesian *(q)ati (thus suggesting POc *(q)ati), or else from the first syllable (morpheme?) of the POc negative marker *tikai. In either case, PSV *aci= is suggested. There may be a relationship between PEr *etu- and Anj itiyi, but it is hard to see what it was, and also to see whether either or both of these forms have any connection with POc *tabu.

Finally, the Anejoffi reflexive verb isp”a- is clearly cognate with the PEr reflexive verb *espe (Sye ehpe, Ura espe). They derive from POc *tibo, and suggest PSV *a-c(p”b”)a.

6.3 Other verbal affixes and particles

Other affixes to be discussed include transitive and directional suffixes. In addition, PSV seems to have had a few other suffixes or particles.

6.3.1 Transitive suffixes

Proto Oceanic appears to have obligatorily marked transitive verbs as being transitive, except when a verb was disyllabic and ended in *i (or perhaps some other vowel – see Ross 1998:23). It had pronominal object enclitics (see §5.1) and also had two transitive suffixes: the ‘close’ transitive suffix *-i and the ‘remote’ transitive suffix *-aki(ni) (sometimes called the ‘applicative’). An object enclitic was added directly to vowel-final verbs, but consonant-final verbs took *-i + object enclitic.

In Southern Vanuatu languages, however, there are quite a number of verbs which take no transitive suffix when used transitively, and indeed there are pairs of verbs like Lenakel aunjən ‘eat (INTR)’ and kan ‘eat (TR)’, or Anejoffi ayil ‘tell lies (INTR)’ and ayik ‘lie to (TR)’
which distinguish transitivity lexically and have no overt morphological marking. There are also verbs which end in /i/ which, though it probably derives from the close transitive suffix, is no longer functioning as such. However, many other verbs do mark transitivity morphologically.

The Tanna languages have only one transitive suffix: NTn, Len -in, Wsn -i, SWT -kan, Kwm -ia (with allomorphs -i and -ian). These suggest PTn *-yin, which derives fairly regularly from POc *-aki(ni), and which suggests that the final syllable was present in PSV (and thus I write the POc form as *-akini from now on). The Kwamera form looks as if it may reflect the POc close transitive suffix *-i + the POc 3SG object enclitic *=a (which, as I mentioned earlier, is not found in any SV language).

Anejo'm and the Erromangan languages, however, have two transitive suffixes. In Sye, the 3SG object suffix is -i. Crowley says that verbs with nominal objects are also marked by the suffix -i, irrespective of whether the noun is singular or plural. This suggests that -i was a transitive suffix; and in morpheme glosses of Erromangan examples I will gloss -i as being the transitive suffix, even though Crowley analyses it differently. For example:

**Sye**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>y-ohro'-i</th>
<th>ovn-kuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG.RECPAST-look.for-TR</td>
<td>PL-dog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

's/he looked for the dogs'

A number of transitive verbs are also derived by suffixing -n (sometimes -on). Crowley notes the formal and functional parallels between this suffix and the instrumental preposition *(o)j/, and this suggests that the Pre-Sye form was a remote transitive suffix:

**Sye**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ø-emener'oni</th>
<th>nevar horo-m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2SG.IMP-rest-TR</td>
<td>load POSS-2SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'have a break from (carrying) your load'

Ura also has -i and -n, suggesting PEr *-i 'close transitive' and *-n 'remote transitive'.

Anejo'm has the transitive suffixes -i and -n. Some verbs take -i with both animate and inanimate objects; other verbs take -i with animate objects and -n with inanimate objects. Any earlier morphosyntactic distinction between these two suffixes seems to have become lexicalised, since there appears to be no semantic basis for deciding which verb will take which suffix; for example:

**Anejo’m**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ati-i-se</th>
<th>napelm”ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>put-TR-down</td>
<td>clothes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'put the clothes down'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>etha-n-se</th>
<th>napelm”ai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>put.to.soak-TR-down</td>
<td>clothes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'put the clothes down (in the water) to soak'

---

8 Ross (1998:30) says that the POc pair *paIJan and *kani – from which Lenakel augan and kan derive – “is evidence that some relic of the [Proto Malayo-Polynesian] focus system may have continued to exist until shortly before the break-up of POc, *paIJan reflecting the actor focus in this system, *kani the patient focus”.

Anejoffi -n̄i could derive from either PSV *-ni or *-mi. The obvious source, though, is the final syllable of POc *-akini.

There are no cognates outside Erromango of the instrumental preposition *mi. It is likely, though typologically unusual, that *mi was originally the remote transitive suffix in Erromango, and that it has been reanalysed as a preposition, although it still occurs with some verbs as a suffix. Again, the most likely source of PEr *-mi is POc *-akini, but there is a problem with the consonant correspondence. I did note in §2.5.1.3 that POc *n became PSV *mi when an adjacent syllable contained *q, and the only thing I can suggest is that this occurred irregularly in this morpheme as well adjacent to the velar *k. If this is the case, then we have the following developments:

POc *-i 'close transitive' > PSV *-i > PEr *-i, Kwm -u, Anj -i
POc *-akini 'remote transitive' > PSV *-yini > PEr *-mi, PTn *-yin, Anj -n̄i

6.3.2 Directional suffixes

The Tanna languages and Anejoffi have quite a number of directional suffixes to verbs, while the Erromangan languages have a smaller number. Deictic directionals mark proximate, intermediate (in some languages) and distant direction/location. In all SV languages, these seem to be related to verbs meaning ‘come’ and ‘go’. These directionals, which are listed in Table 6.6, are true suffixes in at least the Tanna languages and Anejoffi. However, the Erromangan data suggest that Proto Southern Vanuatu probably had a serial-type construction, with the second member being m- ‘echo subject’ + the verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’, with the initial *b in what is now the suffix deriving from Pre-PSV *m-v.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proximate</th>
<th>‘come’</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>‘go towards hearer’</th>
<th>Distant</th>
<th>‘go’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*-ba[ ]</td>
<td>*va</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*-ban</td>
<td>*van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*-be(l,n)Vm</td>
<td>*ve(l,n)Vm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*-ba</td>
<td>*va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>-mpelom</td>
<td>velom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-mpe</td>
<td>ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>-mesi/benim</td>
<td>venim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-mesi/ba</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>-*pa</td>
<td>*va</td>
<td>*-pəna</td>
<td>*vəna ?</td>
<td>-pən</td>
<td>*vən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>-*pa</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>*-pəna</td>
<td></td>
<td>-pən</td>
<td>vən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>-*pa</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>*-pəna</td>
<td>vəna</td>
<td>-pən</td>
<td>vən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>-*pa</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>*-pəna</td>
<td></td>
<td>-pən</td>
<td>vən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>-*pa</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>*-pəna</td>
<td></td>
<td>-pən</td>
<td>vən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>*pehe</td>
<td>vehe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-pen</td>
<td>vən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>-pam</td>
<td>ham, apam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-pan</td>
<td>han, apan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This hypothesis is supported by another set of directional suffixes. Note first PEr *-belak (Sye -pelay, Ura -belek) 'outwards', PEr *velak (Sye velay, Ura velek) 'go ahead'. Now examine the following Tanna directionals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inland</td>
<td>*-paqasi</td>
<td>-paaar</td>
<td>-pari</td>
<td>-paat</td>
<td>-pihiaq</td>
<td>{-arei ?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seawards</td>
<td>*p[i]r[aha]</td>
<td>-pah</td>
<td>-pah</td>
<td>-paha</td>
<td>-vila</td>
<td>-eraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clockwise</td>
<td>*-pahu</td>
<td>-pahau</td>
<td>-hiu</td>
<td>-pihiau</td>
<td>-esu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-clockwise</td>
<td>*-prasi</td>
<td>-pesis</td>
<td>-pis</td>
<td>-plaaah</td>
<td>-rahi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have no data on corresponding verbs in North Tanna or Whitesands, and only the verb vhiaak 'go inland' in Southwest Tanna. However, corresponding to the Lenakel suffixes are the verbs vaat 'go inland', vaha 'go seawards' and viis 'go southwards'. These again suggest earlier *m-v, with subsequent loss of the stop in Kwamera.

Of those listed above, Anejoffi -pahai 'inland' may be cognate with PTn *paqasi, suggesting PSV *-baqasi. Anejoffi -p'ok 'seawards', however, does not seem to have a Tanna cognate.

The remaining directional suffixes in Tanna languages are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upwards</td>
<td>*-(u,i)da</td>
<td>-ad</td>
<td>-at,</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-hak/ta</td>
<td>-uta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downwards</td>
<td>*-iahav</td>
<td>-hap</td>
<td>-iahau</td>
<td>-hiaahu</td>
<td>-iehou</td>
<td>{-irap*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>*-hie</td>
<td>-hie</td>
<td>-hie</td>
<td>-hie</td>
<td>-hie</td>
<td>{-aku}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Proto Erromangan, we can reconstruct the following additional directional suffixes which also have verbal connections; the Ura forms seem to have taken a locative element y-.

PEr *-sak 'upwards' > Sye -say (cf. say 'ascend'), Ura -y/ek (cf.erek 'ascend')
PEr *-sev 'downwards' > Sye -sep (cf. yep descend'), Ura -y/ip (cf. ip 'descend')

The following PSV reconstructions can be made:

POc *uta > PSV *(u,i)dai 'upwards' > PTn *(u,i)da, Anj -jai
POc *sake > PSV *sa(k,y) 'upwards' > PEr *-sak, SWT -hak/ta
POc *sipo > PSV *-jev 'downwards' > PEr *-sev, PTn *ia/hav, Anj -se(h)
PSV */-[ Jdavua 'outwards' > Len iatov, Anj -(pu)jhou

### 6.3.3 Other postposed particles

The following postverbal morphemes can be reconstructed for Proto Erromangan:

---

9 The forms meaning 'clockwise' and 'anti-clockwise' were glossed 'northwards' and 'southwards' respectively in my earlier work on Lenakel, and indeed these meanings coincide in Lenakel. However, Lindstrom noted in Kwamera (which is spoken on both the east and west coasts of South Tanna) that the form meaning 'northwards' on one coast meant 'southwards' on the other coast. His glosses, then, are 'clockwise = when facing the sea, to one's right' and 'anti-clockwise = when facing the sea, to one's left'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-sV</td>
<td>-su</td>
<td>-ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-lav</td>
<td>-lap</td>
<td>-lap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-wi</td>
<td>-wi</td>
<td>-wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ŋǝ</td>
<td>-ŋo</td>
<td>-ŋi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ves</td>
<td>-veh</td>
<td>-ves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-nri</td>
<td>-nri</td>
<td>-di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following forms can be reconstructed for Proto Tanna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-adukʷ</td>
<td>-aru</td>
<td>-atu</td>
<td>-atukʷ</td>
<td>-atukʷ</td>
<td>reciprocal, reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-kʷ(a,i)s</td>
<td>-uас</td>
<td>-kʷis</td>
<td>{peri}</td>
<td>comitative, associative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ro</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>facilitative, politeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mʷin</td>
<td>mun</td>
<td>mun</td>
<td>mʷi</td>
<td>'again'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ida</td>
<td>ita</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>{raka}</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ama</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>ǝma</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>'only, just'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anejoffi seems to show no cognates with any of these. About the only PSV reconstruction that might be made is *-lav 'facilitative' (PEr *-lav, PTn *ro).
7 Clause and sentence-level morphosyntax

In this chapter I deal with the structure of the clause, and with coordination, relativisation and subordination. In addition, §7.3 will discuss interrogation.

7.1 Basic clause structure

Clauses may be verbal or verbless. This section deals mainly with verbal clauses, and looks at the basic order of core arguments, at peripheral phrases, and at marking of subject and object. In §7.1.4 I look briefly at imperative causes, and in §7.1.5 at verbless clauses, affirmative and negative.

7.1.1 Verbal clauses: core arguments

The Erromangan and Tanna languages have basic SV(O) order in verbal clauses:\n
**Sye**

_Hai nemetaŋi oroŋ yi-ta-i nur Vila._

INDEF:SG cyclone big 3SG.DIST.PAST-strike-TR place Vila

'A great cyclone struck Vila.'

**Lenakel**

_Kuri ker r-am-kən menuk taha-k._

dog INDEF:SG 3SG-PAST-eat chicken POSS:GEN-1SG

'A dog ate my chicken(s).'

---

1 I will generally use Sye and Lenakel examples to represent Erromango and Tanna languages in this chapter. However, examples from other languages will be used when necessary. The morpheme glosses under Sye verbs basically follow Crowley's synchronic analysis (with a few exceptions, notably the glossing of _-i_ as a transitive suffix), and not the diachronic reanalysis of Chapter 6.
Because transitivity is marked on the verb (either morphologically or lexically), and because person and number of the subject (and in some SV languages the object as well) are also indexed on the verb, a clause very often consists of an affixed verb alone. Focal pronoun subjects are usually not used unless the pronoun is in focus as in the second Lenakel example below, and NP subjects and objects can be omitted in context. (Non-3SG pronoun objects, however, are normally not omitted.) Examples:

**Sye**

*Yi-ta-i.*

3SG.DIST.PAST-strike-TR

‘He/she hit him/her/it.’

**Lenakel**

*R-am-aŋ-in.*

3SG-PAST-fear-TR

‘He/she/it was afraid of him/her/it.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In</th>
<th>r-am-aŋ-in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG-PAST-fear-TR</td>
<td>he/she/it 3SG-PAST-fear-TR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘It was he/she/it who was afraid of him/her/it.’

There are two major variations on this SVO order in Erromango, and one in Tanna. First, in both subgroups, an object (or indeed any peripheral phrase) may be promoted to sentence-initial position to give it higher pragmatic salience – the same kind of salience that passivisation would provide in languages with passives. Thus we find cases of OSV order like the following (with the object underlined); in such clauses, there is often a phonological pause between the object and the rest of the clause.

**Sye**

*Nayave ma yi-vai nromo.*

kava that 3SG.DIST.PAST-get strong

‘The kava he got was strong.’

**Lenakel**

*Menuk taha-k kuri ker r-am-kan.*

chicken POSS:GEN-1SG dog INDEF.SG 3SG-PAST-eat

‘My chicken(s), a dog has eaten it/them.’

Second, there are cases of V(O)S order in Sye. Crowley (1998a:241) says that ‘while clauses of this type are reasonably frequently attested in the corpus, there is a preference for postposed noun phrases to be structurally complex’. The subject is underlined in the following examples.

**Sye**

*Kam-avan yau m-iyi.*

1EXCL.DIST.PAST-walk I and-he/she

‘He/she and I walked.’

---

2 The unspecific nature of these translations would, of course, be clarified in context.

3 Ura data are insufficient to decide whether this is a feature of Proto Erromango or simply of Sye; I will assume the former here. I have no evidence of such constructions in any Tanna language.
Kaml-omonki makas kam-nral Nelayan.
1EXC.PL.DIST.PAST-drink leftovers we.EXC-COMIT Nelayan
‘Nelayan and us drank the leftovers (of kava).’

There are, however, cases of structurally simple NP subjects also being postposed (underlined in the example below), with V(O)S here encoding subjects or topics that could be seen as afterthoughts:

Sye
Yi-velom retpo-n nayem.
3SG.DIST.PAST-become wife-3SG emerald.dove
‘The emerald dove became his wife.’

Anejom presents a quite different picture. First, basic phrase order is V(O)S, and second, focal pronoun subjects may not be deleted:

Anejom
Et awoθ yin a Tanipe.
3SG.AOR hit 3SG.OBJ SM Tagipe
‘Tagipe hit him.’

Ek ayreθ ntl enai añak.
1SG.AOR scrape taro DEM I
‘I’m scraping this taro.’

When the object is structurally complex and the subject is not, VSO order is common. The object in the example below (which includes a relative clause) is underlined.

Anejom
Is itiyi atou aen intas kis aseñ añak.
3SG.PAST NEG know he/she word 1SG.PAST say I
‘He/she didn’t understand what I said.’

Indefinite subjects (marked as such by indefinite premodifiers, and underlined here) often occur preverbally, however:

Anejom
Tah nitial enaa et iji.
INDEF thing DEM 3SG.AOR stand
‘There’s something standing (there).’

Objects (though apparently not subjects) may be promoted to sentence-initial position to give greater salience; the object is underlined in the example below.

Anejom
Ntal enai ek ayreθ añak.
taro DEM 1SG.AOR scrape I
‘This taro, I’m scraping it now.’

---

4 This is true even in imperative clauses (§7.1.4), where deletion of a second person pronoun subject is a very widespread phenomenon among the world’s languages.
We can summarise this discussion as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Preferred order</th>
<th>Object topicalisation</th>
<th>Other orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erromango</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>VOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>VOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anejōm</td>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>VSO, SVO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This, however, presents us with a reconstructional puzzle. "The basic clause structure of POc was probably verb-initial, with the possibility of topicalisation of an argument or adjunct to pre-verbal position" (Lynch, Ross & Crowley f/c). If this was all that had to be dealt with, then we could assume that Anejōm (and the non-preferred VOS order in Sye) continue the original verb-initial structures, with Tanna completely and Erromango fairly completely making the perfectly natural change from VOS to SVO.

\[\text{Figure 7.1: Southern Oceanic subgrouping}\]
However, there is more to the problem than this. Proto Southern Vanuatu, as I have shown elsewhere (Lynch 2000c) and will show in Chapter 8, is a branch of Proto Southern Oceanic. One of Proto Southern Oceanic’s sister-languages, Proto Southeast Solomons, has been reconstructed as being verb-initial (Simons 1980, quoted in Ross 1988:384-385). Another intermediate protolanguage, Proto Central Pacific, may have been either a sister-language or a high-order daughter-language of Proto Southern Oceanic, and it too has been reconstructed as having been verb-initial. While Proto New Caledonian can probably be reconstructed as having been verb-initial (Moyse-Faurie & Ozanne-Rivierre 1983), neither South Efate nor any of the languages in any of the linkages in Northern or Central Vanuatu show verb-initial ordering, unless we consider Proto Central Pacific to be one of the Northern Vanuatu linkages.

We thus have the following three possible hypotheses:

1. **Proto Southern Oceanic was SVO, and so was Proto Southern Melanesian.** This would imply:
   - (a) that Anejoni and Proto New Caledonian changed SVO to VOS – either as a single shared innovation or as parallel developments; and
   - (b) that all other Vanuatu languages, including Proto Erromango and Proto Tanna, have made no change to the preferred order.

   There is no particularly strong link between Anejoni (as opposed to other SV subgroups) and New Caledonia. This would thus imply two separate changes of SVO > VOS, one in Anejoni and one in New Caledonia (plus also a partial change in Erromango). This seems the weakest of the three hypotheses.

2. **Proto Southern Oceanic was SVO, but Proto Southern Melanesian changed this to VOS.** This would imply:
   - (a) that Anejoni and Proto New Caledonian retain the VOS order from Southern Melanesian; and
   - (b) that Proto Erromango and Proto Tanna changed VOS to SVO.

   Under this hypothesis, there would have been only one change from SVO to VOS, and only two occurrences of the natural change from VOS to SVO. Further, VOS structures in Erromango could well be explained as residues from an earlier stage where VOS was the preferred order. On the other hand, under this hypothesis (as in the previous one), we have to explain the change from POc VOS order to SVO order at the Proto Southern Oceanic level, and this becomes more problematic if Proto Central Pacific was a ‘Northern Vanuatu linkage’.

---

5 A skeleton family tree of Proto Southern Oceanic and some of its relatives is given in Figure 7.1. The dotted line connecting Proto Central Pacific (PCP) with the Northern Vanuatu languages reflects the possibility that PCP may be one of the northern Vanuatu linkages. The grouping labelled ‘Erakor-Kwenyii’ is named after the two extremes of this putative subgroup: Erakor is the largest South Efate speaking village, and Kwenyii is the name of the language spoken on the Isle of Pines, the southernmost language in New Caledonia.
3. Proto Southern Oceanic was verb-initial (let us say VOS). This would imply:

(a) that Proto Southern Melanesian, Proto New Caledonian and Proto Southern Vanuatu were all verb-initial, with Proto Erromango and Proto Tanna (or, possibly, Erromango and Tanna languages on a more individual basis) later changing from VOS to SVO; and

(b) that South Efate and all the various northern and central linkages also changed VOS to SVO.

Although there is a large number of individual cases of VOS > SVO involved in this hypothesis, it does explain verb-initial order in the Southern Melanesian languages. We would, of course, expect to find some northern and central languages retaining this order, or at least some cases of residual verb-initial order (as in Erromango), and we don’t, or at least not to my knowledge. This is a problem with the hypothesis – unless it can be shown that Proto Central Pacific was part of Southern Oceanic.

I tentatively reconstruct PSV (and by implication Proto Southern Melanesian) as having had VOS preferred clause structure, since I believe that hypothesis 3 best describes the facts of wider Oceanic clause order.

7.1.2 Verbal clauses: peripheral arguments

Peripheral phrases consist of (i) noun phrases marked with a preceding preposition (§5.4), (ii) unmarked temporal and locative phrases, and (iii) a small number of adverbial modifiers which may occur outside the verb phrase.

As a general rule, peripheral phrases follow the core arguments. Thus in Erromango and Tanna, peripheral phrases normally follow the verb in an intransitive clause and the object in a transitive clause. Each peripheral phrase is underlined in the examples in this section.

Sye

*Kole-ntorilki u-ntemne marima.*

1INC.PL.FUT-return LOC-village now

‘We will return to the village now.’

Lenakel

*I-sm-araι nuk ka le nakinhamra le kopaas taha-m.*

1EXC-PAST-cut tree DEM OBL.bush OBL. axe POSS:GEN-2SG

‘I cut down the tree in the bush with your axe.’

In Anejoffi there is more variability, with peripheral phrases seeming to occur either before or after the subject. About the only general rule which can be stated is that peripheral phrases consisting of just a preposition plus pronominal suffix are much more likely to precede the subject (and, in the case of indirect objects, the object as well). Examples:

Anejoffi

*Top* atε-i pikaθ aek a neko[r]

just kill-TR pig you.SG OBL club

‘Just kill the pig with a club!’
Et asan tas-aktit-pan ehele-n a etwa-m*.
3SG.AOR tell talk-tie-there DAT-3SG SM brother-2SG
‘Your brother made an agreement with him/her.’

Et estë imta-i nupu-toona nas Anjom* a Tepahai.. 
3SG.AOR teach DAT-CS person-foreign language Aneityum SM Tepahae
‘Tepahae is teaching the foreigner the Aneityumese language.’

Thus the preferred order in Proto Southern Vanuatu probably was:

\[
\text{VERB} + (\text{OBJECT}) + \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{(PERIPHERAL PHRASES)} + \text{SUBJECT} \\
\text{SUBJECT} + \text{(PERIPHERAL PHRASES)}
\end{array} \right\}
\]

Temporal and locative phrases occur post-core, as some of the examples above will illustrate. However, temporal phrases frequently occur clause-initially, and locative phrases sometimes do as well. For example:

Anejom

A noup"an iniñ eris eyohos-pan aarau a nteptaI.. 
OBL time DEM 3DL.PAST come.up-there they.DL OBL nakamal...
‘At this time, the two of them came upon a nakamal…’

Sye

Pumroy nru-vai-pelay.
night 3PL.DIST.PAST take-out
‘At night, they removed it.’

Ra navlutni-n yi-velom armai.
OBL end-3SG 3SG.DIST.PAST come good
‘In the end, things came good.’

7.1.3 Subject and object marking

Subject and object are marked by strict order relations: SVO in Erromango and Tanna, VOS in Anejom. In addition, (i) there is person and number concord between the subject and the verb, and (ii) PSV focal, subject and object pronouns were all formally distinct.

There is no formal morphological marking of non-pronominal object NPs in any SV language, nor any such marking of subject NPs (within the NP) in Erromango or Tanna. In Anejom, however, animate subjects (whether of transitive or intransitive verbs) are marked by a preposed \(a\),\(^6\) though inanimate subjects are unmarked. Compare:

Anejom

Et apam a kuri.
3SG.AOR come SM dog
‘The dog is coming.’

\(^6\) ‘Animate’ refers to humans and higher-level animates. Recall from §5.1.1 that Anejom focal pronouns are not preceded by a separate subject-marker \(a\), but appear to have accreted this \(a\) as part of the root.
Proto Oceanic is reconstructed as having had two common articles, *na and *a. Whether they were allomorphs of a single morpheme, or whether they had contrasting functions, is not clear. However, Proto Malayo-Polynesian apparently had three common articles, as follows:7

(1) *a marked subject of a verb, whether transitive or intransitive, active or passive;
(2) *na marked agent of a passive verb; and
(3) *ta marked object of an active transitive verb.

Whether the Anejofii subject-marker derives from POc *a and/or from Proto Malayo-Polynesian *a is also not clear, but it is a possibility worth further investigation.

7.1.4 Imperative clauses

Verbs in imperative clauses contain no person or tense-aspect markers. In Erromango and Tanna, they do take a number-prefix, this being further evidence that number is marked by a separate affix from person in Erromango (see §6.2.3). In Anejofii, number markers are inseparable from person markers, and imperative verbs have no preverbal particles marking subject/TAM, though adverbials may occur. Focal second person pronouns are optional in Erromango and Tanna, obligatory in Anejofii.

Sye Lenakel Anejofii
U-yevi! Ar-ken! Lep awoθ ajowa!
PL-pull PL-eat again hit you.PL
‘Pull (all of you)!’ ‘Eat it (all of you)!’ ‘Hit (it) again (all of you)!’

I reconstruct PSV as marking number but not person in verbs in imperative clauses.

In Erromango and Tanna, prohibitions or negative imperatives simply use the negative prefix to the verb (with number-marking), and this appears to have been the PSV system. Kwamera and Southwest Tanna use the imperative form of the negative verb apwah followed by a nominalisation:

Sye Lenakel Kwamera
U-etu-tapmi! Ar--esque-aan! 0-apwah n-o-ien!
PL-NEG-try PL-NEG-eat-NOM SG-negative NOM-do-NOM
‘Don’t you all try!’ ‘Don’t you all eat it!’ ‘Don’t do it!’

Anejofii, however, has apparently innovated a prohibitive particle jim:

Anejofii
Jim aθia aek!
PROHIB go.away you.SG
‘Don’t go away!’

---

7 For a fuller discussion of this system see Chapter 4 in Lynch, Ross and Crowley (f/c).
7.1.5 Verbless clauses

The core of a verbless clause in Erromango and Tanna languages consists of a nominal topic (sometimes with a pronominal copy) and a non-verbal comment. Anejomī appears to allow both topic-comment and comment-topic orders. This core can, of course, be followed by peripheral phrases. Comments are underlined in all examples below.

Sye
Natmah ma natmah it-nahiven.
devil DEM devil ADJ-woman
'That devil is/was a she-devil.'

Morei iyi hai nvao nra-n nemetagi.
fermented.breadfruit it INDEF food PURP-CS cyclone
'Fermented breadfruit is a food for times of cyclone.'

Lenakel
Norha-milau ihie?
younger.brother-2DL where
'Where is your younger brother?'

Nēpōn miin nsvin nenav.
banana PL some yesterday
'There were some bananas yesterday.'

Anejomī
Ni8a-i natahen iyiiki Inmohoy.
name-CS sister DEM Inmohoc
'The sister's name was Inmohoc.'

Nyip"al Anejom" niñki.
story Aneityum this.one
'This is an Aneityumese story.'

It appears that the PSV preferred order was Topic-Comment, given the frequency of this order in Anejomī. Anejomī Comment-Topic clauses may result from the influence of VOS preferred order in verbal clauses.

Negation of verbless clauses takes various forms. Erromangan languages use the free form negative (e.g. Sye tawi 'no', which is ta- before the indefinite premodifier hai):

Sye
Yau tawi nahiven. Ta-hai nomu.
I no woman no-INDEF.SG fish
'I am not a woman.' 'There are no fish.'

Tanna languages use a negative existential verb to encode the fact that something does not exist or is not there. Other kinds verbless sentences use the negative of the verb PTn *or 'do, make' (in Kwamera, this takes the sequential prefix and the otherwise rare negative suffix -mha).
Lenakel

Nuwa r-eka.
yam 3SG-not.exist
'There are no yams.'

Wus ka r-3s-ol-aan remo-k.
fellow DEM 3SG-NEG-do-NOM father-1SG
'That fellow is not my father.'

Kwamera

Nuk r-ian.
yam 3SG-not.exist
'There are no yams.'

Iema fa r-pk-o-mha remu-k.
fellow DEM 3SG-SEQ-do-NEG father-1SG
'That fellow is not my father.'

Anejoffi has a negative existential verb tii. Other kinds of verbless sentences when negativised treat the comment as the head of a verb phrase preceded by subject/TAM markers and the negative particle itiyi:

Anejoffi

Et tii nu.
3SG.AOR not.be yam
'There are no yams.'

Et itiyi etma-k nat enaa.
3SG.AOR NEG father-1SG fellow DEM
'That fellow is not my father.'

Anejoffi tii and itiyi probably derive from the same source. Whether PEr *da(va)wi (Sye tawi, Ura davawi) also derives from this source is less clear.

7.2 Noun phrase expansions

Three kinds of NP expansions will be briefly examined here: coordination, NPs which include possessive phrases, and relative clauses.

7.2.1 Coordination

Proto Southern Vanuatu had the two NP-coordinating conjunctions *m (~ *im) 'and' and *gua 'or':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ma</td>
<td><em>m~</em>im</td>
<td><em>m~</em>im</td>
<td>*m-ne</td>
<td>*m-ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gu</td>
<td>*gu</td>
<td>*ua</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>'and'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proto Erromango forms are based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>m=~</em>im</td>
<td>m= (~ im, mi)</td>
<td>m(i)=, im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gu</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>gu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sye at least also allows the comitative prepositions nru ‘with one other’ and nral ‘with several others’ to occur as suffixes to a focal pronoun in a coordinate NP, that focal pronoun expressing the person and number of the whole NP.8

---

8 Final u and l in the markers nru and nral are reminiscent of the dual and plural verbal prefixes discussed in §6.2.3, suggesting that these forms may be compounds.
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Sye
koh-nral ave-nt-hai-me
we.INC-COMIT brother-1INC.PL-brother-PL
‘I and my brothers’

The basic forms of the Tanna coordinating conjunctions are as follows. I comment on details in Lenakel and Kwamera below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*m-ne</td>
<td>mone</td>
<td>mone</td>
<td>mone, m, ne</td>
<td>mone</td>
<td>mone, mə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ua</td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>‘and’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kwamera mone and mə are apparently in free variation. In Lenakel, however, the forms listed above have slightly different distributions: m is used to link nouns whose referents are seen as almost inseparable (e.g. Kati m Koukau, the names of twin brothers); ne is used when more than two NPs are coordinated, and in this case mone often follows the last (thus A ne B ne C ne D mone). This all suggests (a) that surface mone may in fact be, or have been, two morphemes, and (b) that the ə in the initial syllable is epenthetic, not part of the root.

7.2.2 NPs with possessive constituents

Possessive morphology is discussed in §5.1.3 and §5.3.

The structure of a noun phrase whose head is modified by a direct construction is:

\[
\text{(PREMODIFIER) + NOUN - \{ \text{POSS. PRON. + POSTMODIFIER} \ \{ \text{CONSTRUCT SUFFIX + NP} \} \}}
\]

When the head of the NP takes a pronominal suffix, then postmodifiers may follow this constituent:

Anejom
neri-n asŋa
leaf-3SG all
‘all its leaves’

When, however, it takes a construct suffix, the possessor NP must immediately follow. Postmodification to the head is thus ruled out, since any postmodifier is ambiguous as to whether it refers to the head of the whole NP or the head of the possessor NP (and indeed this is the preferred interpretation):

Anejom
neri-i nyai asŋa
leaf- CS tree all
‘the leaves of all the trees’ (*? ‘all the leaves of the tree’)

Instead, the unacceptable meaning above can only be expressed by a following appositional phrase consisting of the same head with a pronominal suffix followed by a postmodifier:
Anejofl
neri-i nyai, neri-n asŋa
leaf-CS tree leaf-3SG all
‘all the leaves of the tree’

The structure of an NP whose head is modified by an indirect construction is

{(PREMOD.) + NOUN + (POSTMOD.) + POSS. MARKER - CONSTRUCT SUFFIX + NP - POSS. PRON}

In the case of indirect constructions, because the head noun takes no suffix, then postmodifiers may intervene between that noun and the possessive marker:

Anejofl
pikaθ alp*as iyïki uŋa-k
pig big DEM POSS:GEN-1SG
‘that big pig of mine’

This order (possessed + possessor) is obligatory in Erromango and Anejofl, and I reconstruct it for PSV. Tanna languages, however, allow some flexibility in that the possessive marker + pronoun suffix constituent may also precede the possessed noun:

Lenakel
nim*a taha-k ~ taha-k nim*a
house POSS:GEN-1SG POSS:GEN-1SG house
‘my house’

7.2.3 Relative clauses

I suspect that relative clauses in PSV were unmarked, and that what overt marking strategies there are in some SV languages are more recent developments. (All relative clauses in the examples in this section are set off from the rest of the sentence by square brackets.)

The most common form of relativisation in Erromango is to use the relative-clause introducer PER *mori with a pronominal trace at the point of extraction. However, it is possible to omit it:

Sye
Kem-ŋkil-i neteme [mori yam-navan ra noyunŋo]?
2SG.PRES-know-TR person REL 3SG.PRES-walk LOC road
‘Do you know the person who is walking on the road?’

Kamli-tenem-i [ovoteme nru-ta-loŋ-ong].
1EXC.PL-DIST.PAST-bury-TR PL.person 3PL.DIST.PAST-hit-to.death-3PL.OBJ
‘We buried the people who they killed.’

Now PER *mori is a demonstrative postmodifier (§5.5.1). I suspect that what may have occurred in PER is that relative clauses were unmarked, but that (as is not uncommon) the head noun was marked with a demonstrative. This structure was thus reanalysed as follows:
I do not have adequate data on relativisation in North Tanna and Whitesands. Southwest Tanna and Anejom simply append the relative clause with no marking whatever:

**Southwest Tanna**

lí-tlm-aa' nek' na-I k'an ai [l-tlm-uh kafa-k pukah].

1 EXC-PAST-eat yam POSS.FOOD-CS man DEM 3SG-PAST-kill POSS-1SG pig

'I ate the yam(s) of the man who killed my pig.'

Anejom

Is itiyi ene-kiit nitini tin [is asa'n aen].

3SG.PAST NEG hear-badly something 3SG.PAST say he

'He didn't hear clearly what he said.'

Lenakel has a relative clause introducer ieram (cf. ieramim 'person') which seems to be totally optional, and whose use is not restricted to animate noun heads:

**Lenakel**

R-n-arai ita nek ka le kapaas [(ieram) i-tlm-ol].

3SG-PERF-cut already tree DEM OBL axe (REL) 1EXC-PAST-make

'He has cut down the tree with the axe I made.'

Kwamera, on the other hand, has a relative proclitic $sa$ which attaches to the first word in the clause, but appears to be totally optional:

**Kwamera**

T-ak-vahi teki-nari [(sa=) in r-tn-o].

FUT-1EXC-take skin-thing (REL=) he/she 3SG-PERF-make

'I will take the pot which he/she made.'

It appears that relative clauses in PSV may thus have been unmarked, though the head may have been (obligatorily?) followed by a demonstrative, and that different languages developed different relativisation strategies more recently.

### 7.3 Interrogative sentences

Polar questions are marked in all SV languages in two ways, and presumably were so marked in PSV. One is final rising intonation on a declarative clause. The other is postposing PSV *gua ‘or’ (with or without a following free-form negative) to a declarative clause:

**Anejom**

Et apam aen ka (a' o)?

3SG.AOR come s/he or no

'Did he/she come?'

**Lenakel**

N-ak-am-olkeikei m-amnum" nakava ua (kap*a)?

2-CONC-CONT-want ECHO-drink kava or (no)

'Do you (sg.) want to drink kava?'
The structure of content questions depends on the syntactic function of the interrogative morpheme in each case: e.g. forms meaning 'what?' function as noun phrases in the appropriate slot in the sentence, forms meaning 'when?' function as temporal adverbials, etc. The following interrogative morphemes present no reconstructional problems:

POc  PSV  PER  PTn  Anj
*pican  *ga-vis  *ga-va[ ]  *ka-vah  e/heθ  'how much/many?' (§5.5.2)
*(q)ana-ŋican  *na-ŋisan  *niŋai  *naŋhan  iŋiθ  'when?'
*i-sia  S iya  *i-hia  eθa  'where?' [Adverbial]
*sia  S =ya  *-hia  'where?' [Verbal clitic]
*ku(y)a  *-yu(v)a  *no/ywa  eyha  'how? be how?'

The PER and PTn reconstructions above are based on the following reflexes:

PER  Sye  Ura
*ga-va[ ]  nrə/ve  giva  'how much/many?'
*niŋai  niŋoi  niŋei  'when?'
*no/ywa  no/ywo  no/ywa  'how'

PTn  NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm
*ka-vah  kuah  kuvah  kuh  kuhu  keva  'how much/many'
*naŋhan  naŋhan  naŋhan  nahan  naŋhan  nesn  'when (past)?:10
*i-hia  ihia  ihia  ihie  ihia  isa  'which'  'where?'
*-hia  -hie  -hie  {-aku}  'where?' (§6.3.2)

A few other lower-level reconstructions can be made:

PER *vtoya  'which?'  >  Sye ito(y)o, Ura atu.
PTn *aqsu-  'how'  >  NTn arh-, Wsn arhu-, Len etu-, SWT hau- (§6.2.1).

Terms meaning 'who?' and 'what?', however, present a more confused picture. The following have been reconstructed for Proto Oceanic:

POc
*sai  'who?'
*sapa  'what?'
*pai, *pia  'which? where?'

Below are the terms for 'who?' and 'what?' in all SV languages:

Sye  Ura  NTn  Wsn  Len  SWT  Kwm  Anj
mei  wi  pa  pah  pehe  pa  si, sin  ti  'who?'
se  da  naka  nak  neta  naha  nafe  nhe  'what?'

On the basis of these data, I suggest the following:

9 Ura duwa 'where?' is not cognate, but it follows the same pattern as Sye in having a reduced form =wa as a verbal clitic.
10 A future temporal interrogative is formed by prefixing the dative preposition/future tense marker – PTn *o- in NTn and Wsn, PTn *duk- in the other languages (§5.4.2, 6.2.1).
1. Kwm *si and Anj *si ‘who?’ derive from POc *sai ‘who?’, and suggest PSV *si ‘who?’.
2. Sye *se and SWT *na/ha ‘what?’ probably derive from (the first syllable of) POc *sapa ‘what?’, and suggest PSV *sa ‘what?’.
3. All Tanna forms for ‘who?’ apart from Kwm suggest PTn *pahV, PSV *pasV. This may be *pa (unidentified) + POc *sai ‘who?’, or it may be a metathesis of the two syllables of POc *sapa ‘what?’.
4. The Kwm and Anj forms for ‘what?’ suggest PSV *na-va(s) ‘what?’, which may be related to *pasV.

In summary, we have evidence for the following PSV reconstructions:

- ‘who?’: *si, *pasV
- ‘what?’: *sa, *na-va(s), *na-da[ ]

### 7.4 Clause coordination

Southern Vanuatu languages have a few coordinating conjunctions. But they also have an unusual echo-subject/switch-reference construction, which I will discuss in §7.4.2.

#### 7.4.1 Coordinating conjunctions

The alternative conjunction PSV *gua ‘or’, which is used with noun phrases (cf. §7.2.1), is also used to coordinate alternative clauses.

The PSV conjunctive coordinators can be reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ma</td>
<td>*im</td>
<td>*im</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>‘and’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ka</td>
<td>*ka[ ]</td>
<td>*kou ‘but?’</td>
<td>*ka/ni</td>
<td>‘and’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proto Erromangan and Proto Tanna forms above, as well as reconstructed contrastive coordinators, are based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*im</td>
<td>im</td>
<td>im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kou</td>
<td>kou</td>
<td>kou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kani</td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>kani</td>
<td>kani</td>
<td>kani</td>
<td>kani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meto</td>
<td>metou</td>
<td>merou</td>
<td>melon</td>
<td>mata, mreji</td>
<td>‘but’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tanna forms for ‘but’ are interesting. They appear to consist of the echo-subject prefix plus a verb of perception: ‘know’ in Northern Tanna, ‘hear’ in Southwest Tanna, and two forms in Kwamera – *ata ‘see’ and *reji ‘hear’.

Anjófí has two contrastive coordinators: *jam when the subjects of the conjoined clauses are the same, and *ja(i) when they are different. The form *jam is likely historically *ja-m (but + echo-subject), but I know of no cognates within SV of *ja(i).
7.4.2 Echo-subject

One of the morphosyntactic features which defines the Southern Melanesian subgroup is the development of the echo-subject marker, which in Proto Southern Vanuatu was a verbal proclitic \(*m=\). This I presume derives from POc \(*ma\) ‘and’, and is reflected as \(m-\) (or \(m=\)) in all languages (with normal epenthesis before a consonant).\(^{11}\)

Common to all SV languages is the fact that \(*m=\) marks the verb to which it is attached as having the same subject as that of the previous verb. With third person subjects, therefore, the contrast between echo-subject and other subject markers operates like a switch-reference system:

**Sye**

\[
y-avan \quad m-\text{etvani}. \\
3\text{SG.REC.PAST-walk} \quad \text{ECHO-spit} \\
'He/she walked and spat.'
\]

\[
y-avan \quad im \quad yo-\text{etvani}. \\
3\text{SG.REC.PAST-walk} \quad 3\text{SG.REC.PAST-spit} \\
'He/she walked and he/she (somebody else) spat.'
\]

Note also the presence of the conjunction in the second sentence but not in the first.

Probably because they have an overt and easily segmentable marker of number-of-subject, the Tanna languages allow somewhat greater flexibility. When participants of different numbers occur in a clause, the verb of a following clause may be marked with \(*m-\) even if it refers to a noun phrase which is not the subject of the preceding clause. Thus the examples below show (i) a plural echo-subject referring to the plural object of the previous clause whose subject is singular, and (ii) a dual echo-subject referring to both the singular subject and the singular object of the previous clause.

**Lenakel**

\[
\text{Lomhan} \quad \text{r-om-ho} \quad kuri \quad \text{miin} \quad m-\text{om-ai-akom}”. \\
\] Lomhan 3SG-PAST-hit dog PL ECHO-PAST-PL-run.away

'\text{Lomhan hit the dogs and they ran away.}'

\[
\text{Lomhan} \quad \text{r-om-ho} \quad \text{latav} \quad m-\text{om-u-akom}”. \\
\] Lomhan 3SG-PAST-hit latev ECHO-PAST-DL-run.away

'\text{Lomhan hit Iatev and they both ran away.}'

In addition, even when the subject and object are of the same number, Tanna languages can use \(m-\) on a verb whose subject is the object of the preceding clause if it is the only semantically possible subject of the verb:

**Kwamera**

\[
\text{R-arup”-i} \quad \text{menu} \quad \text{ia} \quad \text{nitei} \quad m-\text{arouaraau}. \\
3\text{SG-throw-TR bird OBL spear ES-fly.away}
\]

'\text{He threw a spear at the bird and it flew away.}'

\(^{11}\) POc \(*ma\) thus appears to have undergone multiple developments in PSV: as the NP coordinator \(*m, *im\) (§7.2.1), as the clausal coordinator \(*im\), and as the echo-subject proclitic \(*m=\).
I take the Tanna structures to be more recent developments, and reconstruct a proclitic PSV *m= which marked a verb as having the same subject as that of the previous clause. These structures could thus be classed as 'coordinate-dependent' (Foley 1986:177ff.) – that is, the *m-marked clause is coordinate with the preceding clause but dependent on it for subject and TAM marking.

7.5 Complex clauses

7.5.1 The quotative verb and subordinating conjunctions

All SV languages have a quotative verb, which as a lexical verb introduces direct quotations. We find the following forms in the SV languages:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEr</th>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>PTn</th>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*oy(o,u)</td>
<td>oyu</td>
<td>oyo</td>
<td>*am&quot;ah</td>
<td>amah</td>
<td>am&quot;a</td>
<td>am&quot;a</td>
<td>amah</td>
<td>{ua}</td>
<td>ika</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the quotative verb in introducing a direct quotation can be seen as follows:

Sye

Niti yem-oyu: "Nate, hai nam yoyoy-vai nisyo-m namou son.3SG 3SG.DEP.PAST-say father INDEF talk 1SG.REC.PAST-take BENEF-2SG mother yo-enpo-yau.

3SG.REC.PAST-say.to-1SG

'His son said: “Father, I have got something for you that Mother said to me”.'

No single form can be reconstructed for PSV.

The quotative verb is widely attested with the echo-subject proclitic, and in this form – which I will refer to as *m=QUOTATIVE – it has become grammaticalised as the introducer of a range of subordinate clauses, with the functions listed below. (Note that in Tanna at least it has become so grammaticalised in this context that number-prefixes do not appear on it, and there are slight phonological changes – for example, Lenakel m-"ma ‘ECHO-say’ but mam"a ‘subordinator’.) In all languages of the subgroup for which we have adequate data, *m=QUOTATIVE introduces:

(a) reported speech;
(b) clausal complements after verbs of locution (e.g. ‘sing’, ‘call’, ‘shout’);
(c) clausal complements after verbs expressing mental processes (‘think’, ‘know’, ‘remember’, etc.);
(d) intentional clauses (after verbs like ‘want’, ‘persuade’, etc.); and
(e) purpose or result clauses.

A couple of examples are given below:

---

12 The PEr form is *agu (Sye aŋku, Ura aŋo) when the root is in modified form. In Sye and Anejoŋ at least, the quotative verb meaning ‘say’ also has a secondary meaning ‘want, intend’.
Lenakel

\[ \text{latev 3SG-PAST-see SUBORD son-3SG 3SG-PAST-CONT-swim} \]
‘latev saw that his son was swimming.’

\[ \text{Peravan taha-k 3SG-CONT-cook yam SUBORD FUT-1INC-PL-eat} \]
‘My wife is cooking yams for us to eat.’

In Erromango and Tanna, there are apparently further grammaticalised uses of this verb. PEr *nagu (Sye naŋku, Ura nago) marks a conditional clause. Crowley (1998a:270) suggests that this may derive from the 3SG counterassertive prefix \( n- \) plus the modified form of the root. Example:

Sye

\[ \text{Naŋku hai uvulyoru viroy yem-ampelom nrum-nahor.} \]
‘If a gust came, they would shout.’

In Tanna, the forms introducing conditional clauses are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>Wsn</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>Kwm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ōmah</td>
<td>okom’a</td>
<td>takam’a</td>
<td>tuk“mah</td>
<td>tuk”a ~ tuk”o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kapam”a</td>
<td>kipimah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘if’: real condition
[see below] ‘if’: unreal condition

Except in North Tanna, the form introducing a real condition looks like an impersonal form of the quotative verb with future morphology;\(^{13}\) the Lenakel and Southwest Tanna introducers of unreal conditions look like non-future sequential impersonal forms of the same verb. In addition to the form \( tuk”a ~ tuk”o \) above (which may derive from a future impersonal of the quotative verb \( ua \)), Kwamera also uses regularly inflected forms of \( ua \) to introduce both types of conditions:

Kwamera

\[ \text{R-p-ua 3SG-COND-say 1EXC-see Taim”eron, tuk”o iak-ni-pen tuk”e.} \]
‘If I see Taimweren, then I’ll tell him.’

\[ \text{R-ən-ua 3SG-PERF-say 1EXC-COND-PERF-see Taim”eron, ia-p-uv-ni-pen tuk”e.} \]
‘If I had seen Taimweren, I would have told him.’

7.5.2 Other subordinate constructions

In SV languages, some subordinate clauses are introduced by grammaticalised verbs with the echo-subject proclitic:

---

\(^{13}\) Impersonal verbs in Tanna languages take the 3NONSG subject prefix but no marker of number.
Some are introduced by prepositions, with the following clause being treated syntactically (and in Anejoffi morphologically also) as a nominalisation:

Sye

*Nimo y-omol ra nemetangi y-elim-s-i.*

house 3SG.DIST.PAST-fall OBL wind 3SG.DIST.PAST-blow-TR

'The house fell over because the wind blew it down.'

Anejoffi

*Et upni va n-amernjina-i atimi jii.*

3SG.AOR good CAUS NOM-look.after-TR people DEM

'It is useful for the purpose of taking care of these people.'

Still others can be considered as relative clauses based on head nouns meaning ‘day, time’ and ‘place’:

Sye

*Nran et-me-n yem-toriilki pruvyum m-velom mem-atau m-elaehep m-o-ya-h-i nini.*

time father-3SG 3SG.DEP.PAST-return morning ECHO-come ECHO-hang ECHO-look.down ECHO-see-TR son.3SG

'When his father came back in the afternoon and hung upside down he saw his son.'

Kwamera

*In r-a-ata-pui k-wopun ik-am-apri ikan.*

he 3SG-see-discover place 2-CONT-sleep LOC.REL

'He discovered where you were sleeping.'

The last example shows not only the noun *k-wopun* ‘place’ as head of the locative clause, but also the form *ikan*, which is a kind of locative relativiser and which in Kwamera occurs at the end of the clause. In other Tanna languages, locative clauses may be introduced and closed by *ikan*; both occurrences of *ikan* may occur, and one must occur. Thus:

Lenakel

*l-am-van ikan nam r-aka ikan.*

l-am-van nam r-aka ikan.

l-am-van ikan nam r-aka.

*l-am-van nam r-aka.*

1EXC-PAST-go LOC.REL fish 3SG-not.exist LOC.REL

'I went where there were no fish.'

Note, however, phrases like *ikan vat* ‘a good place’, *ikan taat* ‘a bad place’, showing that *ikan* also functions as a locative noun.

Of strict subordinating conjunctions which have no other function or derivation, then, there are none in Erromango and Tanna; Anejoffi has the following:
wut 'when': temporal irrealis
wat 'when': temporal realis
el 'if': conditional
wuri 'for, in order to': purposive

I am not aware of any POc or similar sources for any of these.
8 The history of the Southern Vanuatu languages

This chapter outlines the internal and external relationships of the Southern Vanuatu languages, looks at contact with Polynesian languages, and attempts to provide, on the basis of linguistic evidence, a possible history of settlement and dispersal of populations in the area.

8.1 The Southern Vanuatu family

The Southern Vanuatu family can be established on the basis of a number of shared innovations of different kinds. The following innovations are shared by all Southern Vanuatu languages, and constitute strong evidence for subgrouping. (I will comment in §8.3 below on which of these are exclusively shared innovations.) The column headed ‘Reference’ in these and similar lists in this chapter gives the section(s) in this work where aspects of the innovation are discussed.

The family shares the following phonological innovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Split of POc *m and *b, with the reflexes before *u merging with *m̪ and *b̪, but with *m &gt; PSV *m and *b &gt; PSV *b elsewhere.</td>
<td>§2.2.1, §2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Sporadic loss of *R, and merger of POc *r and retained cases of *R (as well as possibly *dr) as PSV *r.</td>
<td>§2.4.1, §2.4.5, §2.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Merger of POc *n and *y as PSV *y.</td>
<td>§2.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Frequent velarisation of POc *n as PSV *ŋ adjacent to POc *q.</td>
<td>§2.5.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Palatalisation of POc *r before *i and *e as PSV *c.</td>
<td>§2.5.2, §2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Merger of POc *s and *c as PSV *s.</td>
<td>§2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Development of a sixth vowel, PSV *a.</td>
<td>§3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) POc *a &gt; PSV *e when the following syllable contained a high vowel.</td>
<td>§3.1.4, §3.2.4, §3.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Low Vowel Dissimilation: POc *a &gt; PSV *ə before *Ca.</td>
<td>§4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) The ordered sequence of the Low Vowel Dissimilation, Medial Vowel Deletion, Article Reduction and Final Vowel Deletion rules.</td>
<td>§4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of these innovations – for example (1), (5), (6) and (8), and probably also (2) – are reasonably natural and/or frequent within Oceanic. Others, however, are much less natural or frequent; and in this category I would place (3), (4), (7), (9) and (10).

Languages of the family also share a number of morphosyntactic innovations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>Metathesis of POc *kia, PNCV *kida ‘we.INC’, as PSV *gadi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>Development of number suffixes to pronouns (and number prefixes to verbs) which are not full or abbreviated forms of the numerals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>POc *ia ‘he, she, it’ replaced by PSV *in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>PSV *ia- ‘human/animate prefix’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>PSV *=mi [j ‘human non-singular’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>Oblique preposition *(i)ra, *ira-, and its use to mark passive possession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>Development of a PLACE possessive marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>Accreted initial vowel on verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>Accreted article on common nouns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>Development of POc *ma ‘and’ as an echo-subject proclitic *m=.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>Combination of POc *ya= and *ku= as 1SG subject prefix PSV *iak-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>Development of *m=QUOTATIVE as a multifunctional subordinator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, while some of these may not be of great moment, others are sufficiently unusual to support the existence of the Southern Vanuatu subgroup – in particular (12), (16), (17), (18), (20) and (22).

In addition, there is a number of shared irregular developments in POc lexical items, among them the following (see Appendix II for further details):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>POc *puŋa ‘flower’ shows metathesis of vowels &gt; PSV *na-vŋu-. for example, Sye novŋu- ‘edible fruit of any tree except Tahitian chestnut’, NTn naŋu-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>Accretion of final velar obstruent on POc *paliji ‘grass’ &gt; PSV *na-(p,v)alijiy: for example, SWT navhilak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>Accretion of initial *s on POc *guma ‘garden (n.)’ &gt; PSV *a-su(m,m) ‘to garden’: for example, NTn asum, Len asumw, SWT asim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>Reinterpretation of consonants in POc *tono, *tolo ‘to swallow’ &gt; PSV *a-(i,d)Vŋol-i: for example, Sye etŋoli, Kwm atŋai, Anj atleŋ, etleŋ (with metathesis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>Accretion of final *r on POc *tabu ‘sacred, tabu’ &gt; PSV *tabur ‘sacred, tabu’: for example, Sye tompor, Len ho-a/rpul ‘put a tabu on’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the SV languages show loss of a number of POc etyma which are widespread in the family and retained in most POc subgroups. Among these are *niuR ‘coconut’, *ikan ‘fish’, *waga ‘canoe’, *layaR ‘a sail’, *pituqun ‘star’, and *qaqe ‘leg’.

---
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I have shown elsewhere (Lynch 2000c) that there is a case for a wider grouping involving the Southern Vanuatu and the New Caledonian families, as well as the South Efate language, and some of the innovations listed above – especially (9), (10), (11), (20) and (23) – are shared with one or both of these groups. I will discuss this hypothesis at a little more length in §8.3 below. However, there are sufficient exclusively shared phonological and morphosyntactic innovations to support the existence of the Southern Vanuatu family as a closed subgroup.

8.2 Internal subgrouping

The innovations detailed below support the subgrouping hypothesis outlined in Figure 8.1. The Northern Tanna grouping consists of North Tanna, Whitesands and Lenakel, while Southern Tanna consists of Southwest Tanna and Kwamera.

![Figure 8.1: Southern Vanuatu Subgrouping](image-url)
Developments in the PSV phonemes show strong phonological and morphosyntactic evidence for Anejōfī being treated as a separate subgroup of PSV and also for a Tanna subgroup (and, within that, Northern and Southern Tanna sub-subgroups). The phonological evidence supporting an Erromangan subgroup is not as strong, but there is strong morphosyntactic evidence for this subgroup.

8.2.1 Erromango subgroup

The Erromangan languages share the following phonological innovations exclusive of all other SV languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28) Merger of the velarised and simple bilabials, as simple bilabials: i.e., PSV <em>m</em> and <em>m</em> merge as PER <em>m</em>, <em>p</em> and <em>p</em> as <em>p</em>, and <em>b</em> and <em>b</em> as <em>b</em>.</td>
<td>§2.2.1, §2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) Apparent merger of PSV <em>a</em> and <em>o</em> as PER <em>a</em>.</td>
<td>§3.2.3, §3.2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They also share a number of morphosyntactic innovations, among them being:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30) POc <em>ia</em>, PSV <em>in</em> replaced by PER <em>iyi</em> ‘3SG focal pronoun’.</td>
<td>§5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Loss of the PSV dual/trial/plural distinction in pronouns.</td>
<td>§5.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Loss of the construct suffix PSV <em>-i</em>.</td>
<td>§5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Loss of the food and drink possessive markers.</td>
<td>§5.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) Development of root modification in verbs.</td>
<td>§6.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) A unique combination of pre- and post-verbal categories and morphemes within those categories.</td>
<td>§6.2.3, §6.2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Innovations (31), (32) and (33) are based on loss, and it might be argued that (31) itself is not an innovation at all, but rather a retention, since it is possible that Tanna and Anejōfī may have developed number distinctions in pronouns after PSV broke up.¹ However, (32) and (33) represent loss of a POc feature which has been retained in both Tanna and Anejōfī, and so these are reasonably solid innovations.

So too are (28) and (34). Although (28) is not particularly unusual in broad Oceanic terms, Erromangan languages are the only SV languages which lose the velarised/simple distinction in the bilabials. And innovation (34), the development of root modification in verbs, is strikingly unusual when compared with the rest of the SV family.²

¹ This seems highly unlikely, as the discussion above showed that these number-markers are not simply additions of the numerals ‘two’, ‘three’ etc. but involve quite radically modified forms of these numeral roots.

² Root-modification also occurs in Central Vanuatu languages (Crowley 1991). However, the root-modification in the Erromangan languages seems to be unrelated to the Central Vanuatu pattern – if indeed there is a single such pattern.
8.2.2 Tanna subgroup

The Tanna languages share the following phonological innovations exclusive of all other SV languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(36) Split of PSV *p, with the reflex adjacent to *u merging with</td>
<td>§2.2.2, §2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSV *w as PTn *k, but with *p &gt; *v elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) Merger of PSV *l and *r as PTn *r.</td>
<td>§2.4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They also share the following morphosyntactic innovations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(38) Loss of POc *e- 'personal marker'.</td>
<td>§5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39) Development of a PLANT possessive marker.</td>
<td>§5.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40) PTn *o and *duk&quot; as both a dative preposition and a future</td>
<td>§5.4.2, §6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense marker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41) A unique combination of pre- and post-verbal categories and</td>
<td>§6.2.1, §6.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphemes within those categories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42) Use of the echo-subject marker *m= to mark a verb whose</td>
<td>§7.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject is the same as some NP in the previous clause which is not the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject of that clause.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two phonological innovations constitute reasonably strong evidence in support of the Tanna subgroup. Of the morphosyntactic innovations, (39)–(42) are also reasonably strong evidence. Together with the evidence given below for the two subgroups of the Tanna family, they mark the Tanna languages off from the rest of the SV family quite clearly.

8.2.2.1 Northern Tanna sub-subgroup

Within Tanna, the Northern Tanna subgroup has made the following phonological innovations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43) Split of PTn *r, as PNT *l before *i, *e and *o and as PNT *i</td>
<td>§2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44) Split of PSV *s (and *c?), PTn h, with the reflex PNT *z when</td>
<td>§2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjacent to PSV *g. Merger of the other reflex of PSV *s, *c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with PSV *j as PTn, PNT *h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are quite unusual developments, and alone would establish the Northern Tanna subgroup reasonably convincingly. Proto Northern Tanna does not seem to have made any significant morphosyntactic developments from Proto Tanna. Within Northern Tanna, there is lexical and grammatical evidence suggesting that North Tanna and Whitesands form a linkage somewhat separate from Lenakel. One piece of phonological evidence supporting this is the velar nasal reflex of PSV *γ (POc *k).
8.2.2.2 Southern Tanna sub-subgroup

The Southern Tanna subgroup has made the following phonological innovations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(45) Loss of the voicing distinction in the stops: i.e. PTn <em>pʰ</em> and <em>bʰ</em></td>
<td>§2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merge as pʰ, *p and *b as p. [also Lenakel and Whitesands,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but not PTn; also Anejom].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46) Merger of PTn <em>t</em> (in non-palatalising environment) with PTn</td>
<td>§2.4.4, §2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*r as PST *r.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47) PTn *u &gt; PST *e adjacent to *q or before *Cu.</td>
<td>§3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These languages have also made the following morphosyntactic innovation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(48) Loss of PSV *as-...-iana as a negative marker, and development of PST</td>
<td>§6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ap</em>ah as a negative verb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the subgrouping hypothesis relies heavily on the phonological evidence, which appears quite strong.

8.2.3 Anejom subgroup

Anejom has made the following phonological innovations which do not occur in any other SV subgroup:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(49) Loss of the voicing distinction in the stops: i.e. PSV <em>pʰ</em> and <em>bʰ</em></td>
<td>§2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merge as pʰ, *p and *b as p. [also Tanna, but not PTn].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50) PSV *v reflected as h non-finally and lost finally.</td>
<td>§2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51) Palatalisation of PSV *n and *ŋ before *i and *e, and merger as ŋ.</td>
<td>§2.3.1, §2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) Palatalisation of PSV *l as j before *i and *e.</td>
<td>§2.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) Split of PSV <em>t</em> (in non-palatalising environment) into non-final t</td>
<td>§2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and final s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) Merger of PSV *c and *j as s.</td>
<td>§2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55) PSV *ua became ou.</td>
<td>§3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56) Regular lowering of PSV *i and *u as e and o.</td>
<td>§3.1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anejom also has a large number of grammatical morphemes and lexical items not found in the other two subgroups or in POc. Since it is a one-language subgroup, any morphological or lexical difference could be interpreted as an innovation. In any case, the phonological evidence in (49)–(56) above is particularly compelling.
8.2.4 Inter-subgroup relations

There are a few innovations apparently shared by two subgroups but not the third. These are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erromango and Tanna</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57) Loss of POc *pa[ka]- 'causative' and *pa[Rji- 'reciprocal'.</td>
<td>§6.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) Change from VOS to SVO basic clause order.</td>
<td>§7.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tanna and Anejom</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59) Merger of *i and *e.</td>
<td>§3.1.1, §3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60) Development of the innovative pronouns *(i)damV 'we.EXC' and *(i)da[m]ju(V) 'YOU.NONSG'.</td>
<td>§5.1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are apparently no innovations shared by Erromango and Anejom exclusive of Tanna.

Of the apparent shared innovations listed above, the only one of any real significance is (60) which, as will be seen below, may also be found in New Caledonia. This provides very weak evidence for subgrouping Tanna and Anejom as against Erromango. However, since this innovation itself has not spread through all of Tanna, it is difficult to evaluate.

8.3 External relationships

A detailed investigation of the external relationships of the Southern Vanuatu languages, and in particular their connections with the languages of New Caledonia, is to be the subject of a cooperative research project between Claire Moyse, Françoise Ozanne-Rivierre, Jean-Claude Rivierre and myself. It is hoped that the results of this research will become available in the next few years. What I have to say in this section, then, is fairly brief and preliminary, and is based largely on Lynch (1999a, 2000c).

8.3.1 Proto Southern Melanesian

There is some evidence that the Southern Vanuatu and New Caledonian (NC) languages form a subgroup which I refer to as SOUTHERN MELANESIAN. The evidence for this is as follows:

1. NC languages apparently share with SV languages innovation (20) – the development of POc *ma as a marker of 'same subject'. Drehu me and Ajej ma, for example, conjoin clauses but only clauses whose subjects are identical.

2. NC languages may share in the innovative phonological developments in the non-singular pronouns (see (11) and (60) above). There is evidence from at least some NC languages (a) for the metathesis of vowels in the 1INC form (POc *kita > *kati or *gadi), and (b) for the change from *k to *d in the 1EXC and 2 pronouns. Jawe, for example, has the forms listed below; PSV forms are given for comparison:
POc | Pre-Jawe | Jawe | PSV
---|---|---|---
*kita | *(dr,c)*aV | deye | *gadi
*ka[m]i | *(dr,c)*apV | deve | *(i)*damV [also *gam(i)]
*kamiu | *daa | jaa | *(i)*da[m]uV [also *gami(u)]

3. There are also a number of shared irregular phonological developments in individual lexical items (e.g. the metathesis of vowels in POc *puŋa* ‘flower’ – see (23) above).

### 8.3.2 The South Efate language

Just as New Caledonia and the Loyalty islands are the SV subgroup’s immediate neighbour to the southeast, so the island of Efate is their immediate neighbour to the north. The South Efate language appears to share a number of innovations with the SV languages (which it does not share with its northern neighbour Nakanamanga or North Efate); whether these are also shared with NC languages is not quite so clear.

1. South Efate and the SV language share in innovation (9) above, by which a low vowel dissimilated to a mid vowel when followed by *Ca – e.g. *na-saman* ‘outrigger’ > South Efate n-sem. (This innovation is not found in the North Efate language.) It is not clear whether NC languages also share this innovation.

2. As pointed out in §4.5, South Efate and the SV languages both have the following ordered sequence of rules: Low Vowel Dissimilation, Medial Vowel Deletion, Article Reduction and Final Vowel Deletion. This is a powerful subgrouping argument. NC data suggest that Proto New Caledonian may have also had this sequence of rules, but further investigation is needed to establish this.

There thus seems to be fairly strong evidence linking South Efate with Southern Vanuatu, and possibly also with New Caledonia. I suggested in Chapter 7 (see Figure 7.1) that this relationship was as shown in Figure 8.2(a), but it may well have been as shown in Figure 8.2(b). Further research is necessary – and, as I mentioned above, this is planned.

---

![Figure 8.2: External relatives of Proto Southern Vanuatu](image-url)
8.3.3 Proto Southern Oceanic

Some evidence was also adduced in Lynch (1999a, 2000c) supporting the view that all of the languages of Vanuatu and New Caledonia form a single family, which I referred to as SOUTHERN OCEANIC. I will not go into detail here. However, on geographic grounds the hypothesis makes sense, though a considerable amount of further research – both descriptive and comparative – is needed before we can be sure as to whether this hypothesis has some validity. The hypothesis in its present state is outlined in Figure 7.1 in the previous chapter.

In this context, it is worth pointing out that there is probably no North-Central Vanuatu subgroup per se, and thus no such language as Proto North-Central Vanuatu (PNCV). This subgroup was originally proposed by Pawley (1972), and a set of lexical reconstructions for PNCV has been proposed by Clark (n.d.). If the Southern Oceanic hypothesis is valid, then Clark's reconstructions which include northern Vanuatu evidence are actually attributable to PSOc.

8.4 The Polynesian connection

There has been considerable contact between speakers of Southern Vanuatu languages and speakers of Polynesian languages. Some of this has been quite recent: a number of religious and other terms, for example, were introduced into various SV languages by Samoan missionaries in the nineteenth century. Perhaps of more interest are terms which were introduced into these languages from a Polynesian source – West Futuna-Aniwa being the logical candidate – before European contact. In this section, I will focus on terms of this nature and, in general, will look only at Polynesian loans which occur in at least two SV subgroups. The reason for this is that widespread loans should tell us rather more about the nature of areal contact than would an isolated loan in a single language.

Winds, etc.

In Appendix II I reconstruct the PSV term *ne-ma(t,d)a'1i 'wind', with reflexes like Sye nemeta'1i 'cyclone', NTn metaŋ, Len nəmataŋ and Anj nemtaŋ-jap' 'direction of wind'. WFu has mta'1i – mataŋi, which derives from PPn *ma-ta'li. I know of no other Oceanic languages which reflect the form with initial *ma-; most Oceanic languages reflect either POc *a'1in or *ja'1i 'wind', while in others reflexes of the phonologically similar POc form *la'1it 'sky, weather' have come to mean 'wind'.

If what I have reconstructed as PSV *ne-ma(t,d)a'1i is a Polynesian loan, then it must be a very early one. The Anejoffi form, for example, shows palatalisation of *ŋ before *i (nemtaŋ-jap'), which is definitely not a feature of the modern language; and North Tanna and Lenakel have lost the final vowel, Lenakel with compensatory lengthening/irregular final stress.

Names of particular winds also show strong Polynesian – specifically West Futuna – influence. These are listed in Table 8.1. Forms in the SV languages are marked for direction in parentheses only if the direction they refer to is different from that referred to by the Futuna source. There are a number of comments that can be made on these terms:
Table 8.1: Terms for winds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Polynesian</th>
<th>Futuna</th>
<th>Erromango</th>
<th>Tanna</th>
<th>Anejofo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>ruetu (N)</td>
<td>Sye, Ura norwotu (E)</td>
<td>Len luatu, SWT luatu (NE), Kwm ruatu</td>
<td>narutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ?</td>
<td>retuamla (ENE)</td>
<td>Sye norwotamla (ESE)</td>
<td>Len luatuamlaai (NE), Kwm ruatu amrai (NE), SWT luatuamlaai (N)</td>
<td>narutuamlaai (NE), narutumatau a njap’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ?</td>
<td>retuarari (NW)</td>
<td>retmatua (NW)</td>
<td>Len SWT luatua (N)</td>
<td>narutuarani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ *matua 'full-grown'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>narutu-efatimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toke-lau 'northerly wind'</td>
<td></td>
<td>tokorau (WSW)</td>
<td>Sye natourau (SE)</td>
<td>natokorau (WNW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ tuq ‘stand’ ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>tokorau tu (W)</td>
<td>Len tokolau (S), SWT tokolau (SE), Kwm tak’arau (SSE)</td>
<td>natokorauto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>parapu (W)</td>
<td>Sye nonporau – nemporau (N), Ura noborau (N)</td>
<td>Len nəp’elaap” (S), SWT nəpelaap, Kwm nəparapu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(q)uli ‘steer’ ? + ?</td>
<td>urigaka (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Len uriphapua (SW)</td>
<td>nauritooya, nauritooya a nəvai (SW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(q)uli ‘steer’ ? + *toya (below)</td>
<td>uritooya (S)</td>
<td>Sye, Ura nauritooya (W)</td>
<td>Len uritooya (SE), Kwm uritooya</td>
<td>nauritooya-ataheiti (SW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ *fine ‘female’</td>
<td>uritooya fine (SSW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nauritooya-utam’tu (SSW), nauritooya-efatimi (SSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ *tane ‘male’</td>
<td>uritooya tane (SW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*toya ‘south(east) trade’</td>
<td>toya (SE)</td>
<td>Sye, Ura natorya (S)</td>
<td>Len SWT Kwm natorya (E)</td>
<td>natorya (E), natorya a nəvai, natoryoavummejap’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ?</td>
<td>toya rari (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>natoryaarei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Most terms for particular winds in all SV languages are borrowed from Futuna, and most of these have added the article *na.

2. Many Futuna terms which are transparently morphologically complex in Futuna are borrowed as single morphemes in SV languages: for example, WFu tokorau tu (WSW wind exactly) ‘west wind’ > Anj natoka oru; WFu to'la rari (SE wind exclusively) ‘southeast wind’ > Anj natoona rei.

3. Three Anejoffi forms are partial calques on Futuna forms, in that the basic root has been borrowed but the modifier has been translated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Futuna</th>
<th>Anj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ret-matua (N.wind-adult)</td>
<td>narutu-efatim (N.wind-big.man) ‘NW wind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urito'na fine (S.wind female)</td>
<td>naurito'na-atame (S.wind-female) ‘(S)SW wind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urito'na tane (S.wind male)</td>
<td>naurito'na-tam*ana (S.wind-male) ‘(S)SW wind’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. While the Tanna and Anejoffi forms are basically semantically identical with their Futuna sources, the Erromangan languages seem to have turned all wind directions clockwise about 90 degrees. This is exemplified in Figure 8.3, where Anejoffi represents the remaining SV languages.

This complex of wind terms suggests that speakers of Southern Vanuatu languages may well have lost what sailing and navigational skills they must have once possessed, and that they were reintroduced to these skills by speakers of West Futuna-Aniwa. This hypothesis is supported by the next set of terms. (See Lynch (1994b) for more detailed discussion of Polynesian loans within single SV subgroups.)

**Other maritime terms**

| PPn * [faqilawa > WFu feiava, Anw fiava Tanna: NTn na/feafa, Wsn SWT Kwm na/feafa, Len nu/feafa Anejoffi: na/fayava |
| PPn * malino > WFu marino Erromango: Sye e/morinu, o/morinu Tanna: NTn a/malinu, Wsn a/melinu, Len SWT a/melinu, Kwm a/morinu |
| PPn * peau > WFu, Anw peau Erromango: Sye n/puyau, n/morinu, Ura n/myau Tanna: NTn Wsn Len SWT Kwm peau Anejoffi: ne/peau |
| PPn * kiato > WFu kiato Tanna: NTn Len SWT Kwm (-)na/kiatu, Wsn -na/kiatu Anejoffi: na/kiato |
| PPn * sua > WFu sua Erromango: Sye a/wo, Ura a/swa Tanna: Len a/sua, Kwm a/sua |
Figure 8.3: Wind directions
'whale'  
PnP *tafuraga > WFu tafora, Anw tafara  
Errromango: Sye tovura, Ura tofora  
Tanna: NTn tapla, Wsn tafla, Kwm tafra, (Len SWT toulhaai ?)

'barracuda'  
WFu tatao  
Tanna: Len tetau, Kwm tataua  
Anejomi: tatau

**Kava**

I have shown elsewhere in some detail (Lynch 1996a) that kava and kava-drinking came into Tanna from a Polynesian source – probably West Futuna. The following selection of terms supports this view.

'kava'  
PnP *kawa > WFu kava  
Errromango: Sye na/yave, Ura na/yava  
Tanna: NTn na/ka, Wsn Len SWT Kwm na/kava  
Anejomi: kava

'strainer'  
WFu fao 'coconut branch (used as kava-strainer)'  
Errromango: Sye nevau  
Tanna: Len na/huau 'k.o. kava strainer', Kwm nafau 'k.o. kava-bowl'  
Anejomi: nafau 'kava-strainer'

'food eaten w. or after kava'  
PnP *fono > WFu fono  
Errromango: Sye o/vunu (v.), no/vunu (n.)  
Tanna: Len o/hunu, Kwm a/funu (v.); Len na/hunu, Kwm na/funu (n.)  
Anejomi: o'fono (v.), no/fono (n.)

Some other widespread Polynesian loans are noted below:

**Artefacts**

'platform'  
PnP *fata > WFu fata  
Errromango: Sye ne/vate 'yam storage bench, altar'  
Tanna: Len nöm*a-ti/vhata 'flat surface, shelf',  
Kwm na/fata 'bed, copra-bed'  
Anejomi: ne/fata 'platform, copra-bed'

'bow (weapon)'  
PnP *fana '(shoot w. a) bow' > WFu fana  
Errromango: Sye ne/vane, Ura ne/fena  
Tanna: Len na/vhaŋa, Kwm na/fana [ŋ unexpl.]  
Anejomi: ne/fana

**Other**

'volcano'  
PnP *soata 'pumice' > WFu soata 'volcano'  
Errromango: Sye ne/hwate, Ura ne/swate  
Anejomi: soata
The history of the Southern Vanuatu languages

8.5 Origin and dispersal of Southern Vanuatu languages

8.5.1 Settlement and dispersal

Linguistic evidence – in the form of the right-branching Southern Oceanic family tree in Figure 7.1 – would strongly suggest a general north-to-south settlement pattern for the whole of the Vanuatu archipelago, and thus that Southern Vanuatu was settled from the north. The fact that one of the Southern Vanuatu family’s closest relatives is its neighbour immediately to the north, South Efate, supports this view. Archaeological evidence suggests that this initial settlement probably occurred about three thousand years ago (Bedford, Spriggs, Wilson & Regenvanu 1998).

It is probable that this north-to-south pattern continued within the Tafea Province. That is, it is likely, on geographical grounds, that Erromango was settled first, then Tanna, and then Aneityum – although there is no linguistic (or archaeological?) evidence for this. The internal subgrouping of the Southern Vanuatu family (see Figure 8.1), however, would suggest a fairly rapid dispersal across the three main islands. If there was, for example, a pause in the settlement pattern after the Erromango-to-Tanna movement, with the settlement of Aneityum from Tanna being significantly later, then we would expect to find linguistic evidence in the form of shared innovations supporting the hypothesis that the Tanna languages and Anejoũ form a single subgroup coordinate with Erromango. However, there is no such evidence,3 and thus the rapid dispersal hypothesis seems the best on the basis of the available data.

The major boundary within Tanna is between the three northern and the two southern languages. This boundary coincides roughly with fairly rugged mountains across the centre of the island and, in the far east, with the volcanic ash plain. Given that settlement must have been from coastal to inland areas, this mountainous area would have been a deterrent to easy

---

3 Apart, that is, from innovation (60) above – the development of the non-singular pronouns – which provides a small piece of evidence in favour of a Tanna-Anejoũ subgroup.
north-south communication. (Something similar was probably true of Erromango; what evidence we have suggests that there may have been a north-south split in the original Erromangan language, though available data are insufficient to decide whether this was really the case.)

It is possible that Futuna and Aniwa were also settled at about the same time by the same people who settled the three main islands of the Tafea Province. Since there is no record of any pre-Polynesian languages on these islands, however, there is little that we can say about this settlement.

It is also likely that the Loyalty Islands and mainland New Caledonia were settled from Southern Vanuatu. Two possible hypotheses in this area might be as follows:

(a) Aneityum may have been the original source of these migrants, since it is geographically the closest; and

(b) the Loyalty Islands may have been the point of first arrival, for the same reason;

These are likely on geographical grounds, although in both cases I am not aware of any compelling linguistic evidence supporting these views. The available evidence again suggests that the fairly rapid dispersal of peoples continued, since there appears, at this stage of research at least, to be no particular link between New Caledonian languages and any one subgroup in Southern Vanuatu.

To complete the picture, we know that Polynesian speakers came into this area more recently, probably within the last thousand years. They settled on Futuna and Aniwa, and also on Ouvéa in the Loyalty Islands; and there has been considerable contact between their languages and cultures and those of neighbouring non-Polynesians.

8.5.2 Culture and contact

An examination of both the reconstructed lexicon (Appendix II) and the extent of Polynesian borrowing (§8.4) allows us to make a number of comments on cultural retention and changes between initial settlement and modern times.

8.5.2.1 Kinship system and social organisation

The SV languages appear to have retained the Oceanic kinship system relatively intact, suggesting that there were no major structural changes in the system over the past three millennia. However, there is little lexical evidence for any chiefly structure. (Reconstructions in §5.1 and §5.2 of Appendix II are relevant here.) POc kinship terms continued in PSV are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*tubu-</td>
<td>*e-t(p,b)u-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tama-</td>
<td>*e-toma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tina-</td>
<td>*ri-(t,c)inV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*matuqa-</td>
<td>*mata-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tuqaka-</td>
<td>*-tua-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taci-</td>
<td>*(na)-tasi-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘grandparent’  
‘father, father’s brother’  
‘mother’  
‘mother’s brother’  
‘older same-sex sibling’  
‘younger same-sex sibling’
Only two terms to do with social organisation can be reconstructed. PSV *na-layau is reconstructed with the meaning of both 'canoe' (see §8.5.2.3) and 'major social group'; in Tanna, this group is a moiety, though it is not clear if this is, or was, also the case in Erromango and Aneityum. There is also a term for 'chief' which seems (a) to be a compound and (b) not to continue any POc reconstruction. The term is PSV *(n,i)-at-manuy, apparently a compound of roots meaning 'person' and 'bird'. It appears that the traditional Oceanic chiefly system was transformed (though to different degrees on different islands): Matthew Spriggs (pers. comm.) notes that Aneityum maintained the strongest hierarchical chiefdoms, Tanna's systems were the most transformed and eroded from the original forms, while Erromango's chiefly system was intermediate between the two in terms of chiefly powers and responsibilities.

8.5.2.2 Food plants, etc.

Section 4 of Appendix II outlines a number of reconstructions for trees, root crops and other food items. The following conclusions can be made about what has been retained from Proto Oceanic and what seems to have been innovated.

Much of the usual array of Oceanic food crop terms were retained in the SV languages – among them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*papine</td>
<td>'man’s sister'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em>aqane-</td>
<td>'woman’s brother'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*natu-</td>
<td>'child'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qalawa-</td>
<td>'nephew'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td>'grandchild'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gasaga-</td>
<td>'spouse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*makubu-</td>
<td>'grandchild'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also retained are a number of names of fruit- or nut-bearing trees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*raqup</td>
<td>'dragon plum'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(w.v)ele</td>
<td>'Barringtonia edulis'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*talise</td>
<td>'Terminalia catappa'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kapika</td>
<td>'Malay apple'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*molis</td>
<td>'citrus'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

along with *paRu ‘Hibiscus tiliaceus’ and *baga ‘banyan’.

Conspicuous by its absence from the above list is POc *niuR ‘coconut’. No SV language reflects this term, all (except Kwamera) showing a reflex of PSV *na-yiani, for which I know of no POc source.4 There are coconuts in the Tafea islands, however! – and indeed other terms

4 Kwamera has napuei, napui, which might possibly derive from POc *puaq ‘fruit’. 
connected with coconuts have been retained, like POc *paraq ‘sprouting coconut and/or its pith’ and *(q)lab’aji ‘coconut fruit bud’. I have no explanation for the wholesale loss of *niuR, which is retained in South Efate and at least some New Caledonian languages.

### 8.5.2.3 Canoes, sailing and maritime technology

Proto Southern Vanuatu has lost much of the Proto Oceanic canoe and sailing terminology, and replaced these terms in the main with Polynesian loans (though in some cases with new creations). (See §6.2 and §8.1 of Appendix II for reconstructions in this semantic area.)

The POc term for ‘canoe’, *waga, is not reflected in any SV language, though *waga is reconstructible for PNCV and is also reflected in New Caledonia. POc *waga has been replaced by the PSV term *na-layau, for which I know of no POc source. The only POc term for a part of a canoe which seems to have been retained is POc *saman ‘outrigger, outrigger-float’. However, its reflexes are unusual:

(a) no SV language shows the expected accreted article *na-;
(b) NTn *raman and Kwm *teman have the ‘wrong’ initial consonant – the expected forms would be something like NTn **nahman, Kwm **naseaman.
(c) WSn, Len *ramar and SWT *lamal have the ‘wrong’ initial and final consonant – the expected forms would be WSn, Len **nahman, SWT **nheman.

It may well be that POc *saman was not inherited by PSV at all; rather, it is possible that one Tanna language borrowed this term from some language outside the family, and it was then re-borrowed by the other Tanna languages. (The term appears not to be reflected in Erromango or Anejoffi.)

Terms for parts of the canoe are either semantic expansions of existing terms (e.g. *lima- ‘hand, arm’ acquiring the additional meaning ‘outrigger’), or else Polynesian loans (e.g. PPN *kiato ‘outrigger’, *tila ‘mast’, etc.) On the other hand, PSV seems to have retained a couple of POc verbs to do with sailing: *paluca ‘to paddle’, and *asu ‘to bail water’.

It is not clear what conclusions can be drawn from this. Given the discussion in §8.4 about the range of terms for winds and other maritime terms which have been borrowed into SV languages – and the number is significantly greater than listed there if one takes into account Polynesian loans into individual languages – it seems logical to suggest that, some time after the settlement of the Tafea islands (and after the initial settlement of the New Caledonia-Loyalties area), speakers of SV languages pretty much abandoned large canoes, deep-sea fishing and ocean-going voyages. They may well have restricted themselves to riverine fishing and to exploiting the marine resources close to the shore. The fact that they retain terms like POc *pagoda ‘forage on the reef’, *suluq and *alito(n) ‘(make a) torch (for fishing)’, *kup’ena ‘fishing net’, and *kawil ‘fish-hook, to hook’ suggests that they did not abandon exploitation of the sea; but these terms are compatible with ‘paddling in the shallows’ rather than with deep-sea fishing.

---

5 POc *waga is reflected in the Anejoffi term tivakativaka, which is the name of ocean-going canoes which sail from north Aneityum to Futuna, but this is palpably a Futuna loan (note even the accretion of the article ti-).
The history of the Southern Vanuatu languages

Supporting this view is the fact that very few POc terms for marine life are retained – indeed, the generic term for ‘fish’, POc *ikan, is lost, and replaced by PSV *namu (possibly *na-mu). About all that are retained are the following:

(a) crabs: *kape ‘crab taxon’, *rakumu and *tubaRa ‘k.o. land-crab’, and *qum*an ‘hermit-crab’;
(b) molluscs: *tapuRi(q) ‘conch shell’, *kuRita ‘octopus’, *nus(a) ‘squid’, and *kawe-‘octopus tentacle’;
(c) marine vertebrates: *bak(i,e)wa ‘shark’, *paRi ‘stingray’, and *kanase ‘mullet’.

Many terms for marine life in SV languages appear to be either Polynesian loans or to have no known cognates elsewhere (see Lynch 1994b for more detailed discussion).

Non-linguistic evidence does not support this hypothesis as strongly, however: there is archaeological (i.e. artefactual) evidence of contact between New Caledonia and Efate/Tafea up until about 1500/1200 BP, leaving only a fairly small temporal gap to the time of the Polynesian arrival (Matthew Spriggs pers. comm.). It is, of course, possible that the Tafea people were passive recipients of this contact: i.e. that pre-Efate and New Caledonian people maintained their ocean-going traditions, during which they made contact with the more sedentary Tafea people.

8.5.2.4 Fauna

Only three terms for land animals can be reconstructed for PSV. Two of these continue POc reconstructions – *kasupe ‘rat’ and *bokasi ‘pig’ – while a third, PSV *na-girai ‘flying-fox’, is cognate with a PNCV reconstruction *garai.

No reconstruction can be made for ‘dog’. As noted in §8.4, all SV languages except Ura have a form kuri, which clearly has a Polynesian source. Nor can any reconstruction be made for ‘snake’ (or ‘sea-snake’); Erromangan languages and Anejoffi have innovative forms,6 while Tanna languages have borrowed nata ‘(land-)snake’ and tangaroa ‘(sea-)snake’ from Futuna. On the other hand, Futuna has a term pakasi for ‘pig’, which suggests a loan from some SV language rather than inheritance from PPn *puaka.

Quite a few POc bird terms are retained, and many more reconstructed PSV bird terms are cognate with PNCV reconstructions, suggesting retentions of forms of some antiquity. Similarly, POc terms for flies, lice, mosquitoes and other ‘bugs’ are retained in number.

8.5.2.5 Kava

Kava (Piper methysticum) seems to have been domesticated in northern Vanuatu, and Clark has reconstructed PNCV *maloku with this meaning. The plant and its use seem to have spread throughout the north and central parts of the archipelago (but not immediately into the south), and thence to Fiji and Polynesia (as well as other more northerly areas which are not relevant here).7

---

6 The forms in Sye are nehkil ‘land-snake’ and tugklah ‘sea-snake’, while in Anejoffi they are nimñiv and nispev respectively.
7 See Crowley (1994) for a summary of linguistic and botanical data relevant to this overview.
As noted in §8.4 above, terms for ‘kava’, ‘kava-strainer’ and ‘food eaten with or after kava’ in the SV languages have a Polynesian (probably Futuna) source. In addition, in Tanna at least there are terms relating to varieties of kava, to kava-bowls, and to ritual spitting after consumption of kava which also have a Futuna origin (Lynch 1996a). The conclusion is fairly inescapable that kava and kava-drinking were not introduced from the north as part of the general spread throughout Vanuatu, but rather were more recent introductions from a Polynesian source, almost certainly Futuna.

8.6 Summary

The Southern Vanuatu languages form a discrete family within Oceanic, and the family is composed of three subgroups, each occupying a single island. It is likely that the area their speakers occupy was settled from the north, probably from the southern part of Efate, and that settlement of all three islands (plus also Futuna and Aniwa?) took place with very little pause. It is also likely that this movement of peoples continued, again probably with little pause, into the Loyalty Islands and mainland New Caledonia. The closest external relatives of the Southern Vanuatu family appear to be the South Efate language to the north and the New Caledonian family to the southeast, though the exact nature of these relationships—and wider relationships with the remaining languages of Vanuatu—remain to be worked out.

The initial migration into the Tafea Province probably pre-dated the domestication of kava. Most other ‘standard’ Oceanic horticultural consumables were brought along with the initial immigrants, although the sweet potato was a late introduction (possibly from the Loyalty Islands—see Lynch 1999b), and the POc term for coconut, *niuR, was unaccountably lost—although there is no evidence that there was a period when the people of the area had no coconuts.

The traditional Oceanic kinship system seems to have been maintained, though it appears that the traditional Oceanic chiefly system was transformed (though to different degrees on different islands). Maritime skills may also have been eroded. There seems to be fairly strong linguistic evidence that, once settled on the islands, the Southern Vanuatu people became horticulturists and coastal fishermen, and seem to have lost the art of open-sea sailing—until re-introduced to this by speakers of Futuna and Aniwa, who arrived in the area perhaps seven hundred years ago—though, as noted above, non-linguistic evidence does not support this view so strongly. The early inhabitants of Futuna and Aniwa (or their Polynesian relatives) also introduced the dog, though there is evidence that they acquired the pig from one of the Southern Vanuatu communities.
## Appendix I
### Sound correspondences

#### 1 Consonant correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
<th><em>b</em>, <em>p</em></th>
<th><em>b</em></th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
<th><em>w</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>b</em></td>
<td><em>b</em></td>
<td><em>v</em></td>
<td><em>v</em></td>
<td><em>w</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td><em>p</em> (<em>f</em>)</td>
<td><em>b</em></td>
<td><em>v-v-p</em> (<em>f</em>)</td>
<td><em>w-w-u</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>p (v)</td>
<td>p (mp)</td>
<td>v-v-p</td>
<td>w-w-u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>p (b, f)</td>
<td>b (m)</td>
<td>v-v-p (f)</td>
<td>w-w-u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uth</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td><em>w</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th><em>t</em>/*i, e</th>
<th><em>s</em>, <em>c</em></th>
<th><em>j</em></th>
<th><em>t</em>/<em>n</em></th>
<th><em>d</em> else</th>
<th><em>t-t-t</em> else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td><em>c</em></td>
<td><em>s</em></td>
<td><em>j</em></td>
<td><em>nt</em></td>
<td><em>d</em></td>
<td><em>t</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td>s-h- (Ω)</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td>t-nt-nt</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td>s-h- (Ω, h)</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td>t-r-t (h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td>s-h- (Ω, h)</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uth</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td>s-h- (Ω, h)</td>
<td>s (h, Ω)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*k fortes?</td>
<td>*k lenis?</td>
<td>*g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>*g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>*g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>k-k-γ</td>
<td>γ (k)</td>
<td>k-ŋk-ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>γ-ŋ-Ø</td>
<td>g-g-ŋ (ŋ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uth</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td>g / ŋk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>*k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>*k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>η (Ø)</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>η (Ø)</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k (Ø)</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*γ</td>
<td>*k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k-ŋ-Ø</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwn</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*l/ *i, e, o</th>
<th>*l/else</th>
<th>*r/ *i, e, o</th>
<th>*r/else</th>
<th>*R/ *i, e, o</th>
<th>*R/else</th>
<th>*dr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td>Ø, *r</td>
<td>*d ~ *r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>*r *L</td>
<td>Ø, *r *L</td>
<td>*r *L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Ø, r</td>
<td>r, nr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>r (t, Ø)</td>
<td>Ø, r (t, Ø)</td>
<td>r?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uth</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>r-1</td>
<td>Ø, r-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø, *r</td>
<td>*d ~ *r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>Ø, *l</td>
<td>*d ~ *l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ø, i</td>
<td>t, l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ø, i</td>
<td>r, l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ø, i</td>
<td>t, l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>*r</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø, *r</td>
<td>*d ~ *r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø, l</td>
<td>t, l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwn</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø, r</td>
<td>t, r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>r-r-Ø</td>
<td>Ø, r-r-Ø</td>
<td>j, r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sound Correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>#m', #m/#u</th>
<th>#m else</th>
<th>#n/#i,e</th>
<th>#n else</th>
<th>#n, #y</th>
<th>##i,e</th>
<th>## else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*m'</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>#n</td>
<td>#y</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td><em>n (</em>#)</td>
<td>*#y</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n (#)</td>
<td>y - i</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uth</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*m'</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td><em>n (</em>#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT</td>
<td>*m'</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td><em>n (</em>#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>m'</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n (#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>m'</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n (#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>m'</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n (#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>*m'</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td><em>n (</em>#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>m'</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n (#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>m'</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n (#)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>m'</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>*n (#)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Vowel Correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc</th>
<th>*i</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*#</th>
<th>*#</th>
<th>*#</th>
<th>*#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>[*#]</td>
<td>[*#]</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEr</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>[*#]</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>i - y [e]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o,\Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>u - w [o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>i - y [e]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o,\Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>u - w [o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>[*#]</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNT</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>*#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>#-#-a</td>
<td>#-#-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e-e-a</td>
<td>e-e-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>[i,o]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i,e,o</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II
Proto Southern Vanuatu
lexical reconstructions

This appendix contains a fairly complete listing of lexical reconstructions for Proto Southern Vanuatu, organised by semantic categories. The listing is organised as follows:

1 Sky and weather
   1.1 The sky and planetary bodies
   1.2 Clouds and rain
   1.3 Winds and cyclones
   1.4 Day and night

2 The natural environment
   2.1 The earth
   2.2 Water
   2.3 The sea

3 Fauna
   3.1 Land animals
   3.2 Birds
   3.3 Insects, spiders, etc.
   3.4 Marine invertebrates
   3.5 Marine vertebrates

4 Trees and plants
   4.1 Trees – general
   4.2 Coconuts (Cocos nucifera)
   4.3 Breadfruit (Artocarpus spp.)
   4.4 Bananas (Musa cultivars)
   4.5 Yams (Dioscoreae)
   4.6 Taro (Araceae)
   4.7 Sugarcane, bamboo, etc.
   4.8 Vines
   4.9 Other trees and plants
5 Human beings
   5.1 Kinds of people
   5.2 Kinship terms
   5.3 Body parts
   5.4 Bodily fluids, exudations, etc.

6 Artefacts
   6.1 Village, house and household
   6.2 Sailing, fishing, hunting and gathering
   6.3 Fire and food
   6.4 Mats, baskets, rope
   6.5 Other

7 Spiritual and intellectual activity
   7.1 Living and dying
   7.2 Perception
   7.3 Locution

8 Human and animal physical activity
   8.1 Food gathering and preparation
   8.2 Eating and drinking
   8.3 Excretion, illness, sexual activity, etc.
   8.4 Motion and posture
   8.5 Weaving, sewing, etc.
   8.6 Cutting, splitting, etc.
   8.7 Forceful impact: hitting, breaking, etc.
   8.8 Carrying, throwing, taking, etc.
   8.9 Fastening and unfastening
   8.10 Setting down, covering, burying
   8.11 Cleaning, bathing, drying, etc.
   8.12 Other activities

9 States, qualities and attributes
   9.1 Colour and brightness
   9.2 Size and weight
   9.3 Taste, smell and quality
   9.4 Temperature
   9.5 Integrity
   9.6 Other

A form is treated as reconstructible for PSV either (a) if there are cognates in at least two first-order branches of PSV or (b) if a form in one first-order branch is cognate with a form
reconstructed for POc, PNCV, or some other protolanguage. 1 (A form given as PNCV is in all likelihood the same, phonologically and semantically, as a putative PSOc reconstruction.) A PSV form is reconstructed with an unambiguous phoneme if the SV data suggest one of two possibilities and the POc form is reconstructed with one of these – for example, if the data suggest PSV *(l,r) but the POc form is reconstructed unambiguously with *r, then I reconstruct PSV *r. Other conventions and abbreviations may be found in §1.6.

1 Sky and weather

1.1 The sky and planetary bodies

The following terms relating to the sky, the sun, the moon and stars can be reconstructed for PSV.

PSV *na-yai 'sky'

Sye neyai
Ura w/nayai 'above, on top'
Wsn neai
Len neai
SWT neai
Kwm neai

PSV *na-m"asan 'sky, open space, sleeping place'

NTn noa-nim"ahan 'sky'
Wsn nm"ahan 'mat'
Kwm k"a-nmahan 'bed, place to sleep, storage place, space, nothingness, an opening between the clouds'

POc, PNCV *masawa 'space, sky, open sea'. (Final *n might possibly be the 3SG possessive suffix.)

PSV *(a)-(c)l)a[ ] 'to shine'; (məta)-(a)(c)j]a[ ] 'sun'

NTn mətar
Wsn mət-ŋar
Len mət
Anj aŋesŋə '⟨sun⟩ shine'
naŋesŋa 'sun'

The form for 'sun' includes PSV *na-mta- 'eye, face'. POc *sinaŋ, PNCV *sina '⟨sun⟩ shine'. (Cf. Mota singa-r, Sak sønerg suggesting *ŋ rather than *n.)

1 Recall that PNCV – and also PEOc – forms are translated into standard POc orthography. Thus Clark's PNCV *q, *ʔ and *g are written here as *g, *q and *ŋ respectively.
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PSV *(nə)-mavuya ‘moon, month’
- Sye mov- ‘prefix to numerous month names’
- Ura mova
- NTn mounə
- Wsn mounə
- Len mouk
- SWT makua [expected mak’a]
- Kwm mak’a
- Anj nomohoy

PSV *a-mər ‘(moon) shine’
- Len aməl
- Kwm mer
- POc, PNCV *marama.

PSV *-m”a(s,j)au ‘star’
- Sye mosi
- Ura w/mse
- NTn m”ahao
- Wsn mahau
- Len mahau
- SWT kə/mhau
- Kwm ku/mhau

Cf. also Anj n/m”ojev, suggesting PSV *m”adawV. PNCV *m”azoe.

PSV *na-[l,n]umu- ‘shadow, reflection’
- Sye namoli- [metathesis?]
- Ura namoli/n [metathesis?]
- Len nanm”ə-
- SWT nanm”ə-
- Kwm nanumu-
- Anj nalmu-

1.2 Clouds and rain

PSV had a number of words for ‘cloud’, ‘rain’, and associated phenomena.

PSV *na-b”at ‘cloud’
- Anj nap”at
- POc *bata ‘rain cloud, raindrop’. Cf. also PSV *a-b”at ‘dark, deaf’.
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PSV *na-ya(p,b)(u) ‘raincloud’

Sye ayup ‘dark and cloudy as when about to rain’
Ura ayup ‘cloudy, dull’
Anj n/yop/θa ‘rain (n.)’

POC *gapu(l) ‘mist’, *kopu ‘low cloud, mist’? PNCV *govu ‘hazy, cloudy, obscure’. The element θa in the Anj form derives from POC *qusan ‘rain’ – see below under PSV *n-usan.

PSV *a-viv ‘to rain’

Sye evip
Anj ehe

Ura erevnip may also be cognate, though intrusive r and n are unexplained.

PSV *n-usan ‘rain (n.)’

NTn nuhuan
Wsn nihuan
Len nihin
SWT nehen
Kwm nesən
Anj nyop/θa

POC *qusan, PNCV *qusa. The element nyop in the Anj form derives from POC *kopu – see PSV *na-ya(p,b)u ‘raincloud’ above.

PSV *(k,g)arua(q)ruaq ‘thunder’

Sye yowar
Ura yawil
Wsn kalualua
Len kalvalva
SWT kalualua
Kwm karuarua

POC *kuru[ru], *guru[ru].

PSV *a-bi(t,c) [v.], *na-bi(t,c) [n.] ‘lightning’

Sye tor/pis [v.]
Ura dor/pis [n.]
NTn abot [v.]
Kwm oapər [v.]
Anj nowai-napet [n.]

POC *pitik.
PSV *matara(n) ‘rainbow’
  Sye mitar, umitar
  Ura umitar
  NTn mataamstaa
  Len maraimarai
  SWT melaimelai
  Kwm mararan

PSV *a-nVm*ani [v.], *na-nVm*ani [n.] ‘dew, be dewy; water on grass or leaves’
  Sye enman [v.]
  nenman [n.]
  NTn am"en-τ̩n [v.]
  Wsn erm"an [v.] [r unexpl.]
  Len nenm"an [n.]
  SWT emm"an [v.]
  Anj nim"añ [n.]
  POc *(n,ñ)amuR ?

1.3 Wind and cyclones

Two words for wind can be reconstructed:

PSV *ne-ma(t,d)aj* ‘wind’
  Sye nemetaj ‘cyclone’
  NTn metaj
  Wsn nemetaj
  Len nemataaj
  SWT nemataaj
  Kwm nemataj
  Anj nemtañ-jaj* ‘direction of wind’
  POc *anji, *jaji, PNCV *lanji ‘wind’; POc *lanji ‘sky, weather’.

PSV *na-vi- ‘wind (n.)’
  Len navi- ‘power, current, wind of s.t. passing’
  POc *upi, *ipi ‘blow’

The form *ne-ma(t,d)aj* may be an early Polynesian loan. Polynesian languages reflect POc *jaji ‘wind’ with a historical prefix *ma- (i.e. PPn *ma-taaj, Tongan, Samoan mataaj). WFu now has mataaj (with loss of the first vowel) alternating with mataaj. If the form is a loan, its antiquity can be established by, inter alia, the palatalisation of *ŋ in Anejomi. (Cf. §8.4 for further discussion.)

Other terms in this category include:
PSV *a-vayu [v.], *na-vayu [n.] 'cyclone'
Anj  eheyo [v.]
     neheyo [n.]
PAAn *baRiuS, POc *paRiu ?

PSV *na-nibar(ata) 'peace, calm'
Sye   nenparata
Ura   nenbarata
Anj   niñpa

1.4 Day and night

A number of terms for 'day' and for periods during the day can be reconstructed.

PSV *ran(i) 'be day, daylight; (day) break'
Sye  ran
Len  ian
Kwm  ran
POc *(d)ra(n,ŋ)i, PNCV *rani.

PSV *na-ran(i) 'day, daylight; time, occasion'
Sye   nran          + 'time of the clock'
Ura   nelin
NTn   nian
Wsn   nian
Len   nian
SWT   ielan      'day, daytime'
Kwm   iaran      'daytime'
POc *(d)ra(n,ŋ)i, PNCV *rani.

PSV *mrani 'tomorrow'
Sye   mran
Anj   i/mrañ
PNCV *marani.

The form meaning 'tomorrow' is presumably related to the POc root *(d)ra(n,ŋ)i 'be daily' plus a prefix *ma-. Final *i can be reconstructed here on the basis of Anjoñ final ŋ. However, since Anjoñ does not reflect PSV *ran(i) 'be day' or *na-ran(i) 'day' with these meanings (see above), there is no evidence for PSV final *i in those reconstructions.
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PSV *na-r(a,u)v[ar(a,u)v] ‘afternoon, evening’
   Sye pwa/rap
   Ura balwa/lip
   Wsn le-nhaiu [h unexpl.]
   Len le-nhaiu [h unexpl.]
   Kwm naruvavur
   Anj njup-ura (cf. njupki ‘early afternoon’)
   njup-ki ‘early afternoon’
 POc *Rapi, PNCV *ravi, raviravi.

PSV *na-bo(n,ŋ)i ‘night’
   NTn l-abor
   Wsn l-apən
   Len l-apən
   SWT iε/npoŋ ‘night’
   Kwm nəpən ‘night, measure of time (24 hours); point in time’
   Anj nepen
 POc, PNCV *boŋi. Cf. PSV *a-bo(n,ŋ)i ‘black’.

PSV *na-bo(n,ŋ)i-bo(n,ŋ)i ‘morning’
   Wsn l-aplapən
   Len l-akarpən
   SWT iε/npoŋenpoŋ
   Kwm nəpnəpən
 Reduplication of POc, PNCV *boŋi, PSV *na-bo(n,ŋ)i ‘night’.

No term for ‘today’ seems to be reconstructible, but a number of other terms for days before or after today can be reconstructed.

PSV *na-yan(a,u)v ‘yesterday’
   Sye ninu
   Ura ah/ninu
   NTn neniap
   Wsn neniv
   Len nenav
   SWT niv
   Kwm neiv
   Anj iyenev
 POc *ñoRap, *qana-napi, PNCV *nanovi.
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PSV *n(a, o)-w(a)jias 'two days from today (past or future)'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nowisas</td>
<td>'five days ago'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wisas</td>
<td>'five days hence'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>wisas</td>
<td>'five days hence'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>niah</td>
<td>[past]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-niah</td>
<td>[future]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nihin</td>
<td>[past]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to-nhi</td>
<td>[future]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>neis</td>
<td>[past]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t3-neis</td>
<td>[future]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nviθ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ho/νiθ</td>
<td>'three days from today'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc, PNCV *waRisa 'two days hence'.

PSV *na-(u)b*(η)an 'time'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nempqon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>nimqen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>nαp̣en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>noʊ/p̣an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also that in §1.1 above, the form PSV*(nə)-mavuya was reconstructed with the meanings of both 'moon' and 'month'.

2 The natural environment

2.1 The earth

Several terms relating to the earth and other geological phenomena are reconstructed for PSV. There are two PSV forms for 'earth, ground, land', one with a POc source and the other without; in many languages, the form is a compound of both roots.

PSV *nə-mapu(v) 'earth, ground, land'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nmap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>nαp̣-ταn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>nafwu-tαn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nαmop-ταn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>nαmop-ταnαn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>noʊ*p̣oh-ταn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *nə-tanaq 'earth, ground, land'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>dẹnα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>tən-mutah</td>
<td>'island'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nαp-ταn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>tən-mutah</td>
<td>'island'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nafwu-tαn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Len  tan  'Tanna; land, homeland, country, island'
Swift  tananop
Kwm  tana  'earth, ground, land, island, country'
Anj  nophoh-tan  nian  'red clay'
POc *tanoq. PNCV *tano.

Other terms in this semantic domain include:

PSV *na-tavuat 'mountain'
Sye  ntotat  'cliff'
NTn  ntoat
Wsn  ntotouat
Len  touar
Swift  tuk'as [s unexpl.]
Kwm  tak'sor

PNCV *tavua. Paul Geraghty (pers. comm.) notes that the PCP forms meaning 'volcano' seem to have been either *tavua or *tavugana (or both), obviously nominalisations of the PCP verb *tavu 'burn'. This hypothesis would not, however, account for the final *t in the PSV form.

PSV *na-vatu(q) 'stone'
Sye  nvat
Ura  nivat
Anj  nhat
POc *patu, PNCV *vatu. Len i/aruv 'k.o. large stone used in earth oven' may be cognate.

PSV *na-m(a,i)t 'quicksand'
Sye  nmit
Len  namat  'swamp'
Anj  neme

PSV *na-uvu(c,s,j) 'pumice'
Sye  nouvoh
Anj  nhu

PSV *na-m"iu(y,v) 'earthquake'
Sye  nomyuc
Ura  nomye
NTn  nmi"inj
Wsn  nmi"inj
Len  m"inj
Swift  m"inj
Kwm  emiuv [v.]
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Anj nom"oi
PEOc *ma\j\vuR(iu)ke, PNCV *muki. Final \(\eta\) in NTn and Wsn could derive either from *\(y\) or *\(\eta\); while Len and SWT have final \(\eta\), these forms have no accreted article, suggesting that they may be loans from a northern Tanna language and that the consonant is PSV *\(y\) < PEOc *\(k\).

PSV *na-p"anV- ‘hole’
NTn n\(\acute{a}\)p"a\(\acute{a}\)- [in compounds]
Wsn n\(\acute{a}\)p"a\(\acute{a}\)- [in compounds]
Len n\(\acute{a}\)p\(\acute{a}\) ‘hole (in s.t but not ground)’
n\(\acute{a}\)p\(\acute{a}\)-noua- ‘mouth’
SWT n\(\acute{a}\)p\(\acute{a}\)‘hole in s.t.’
Kwm n\(\acute{a}\)p\(\acute{a}\)p\(\acute{a}\)- ‘hole, cave, indentation, empty space in s.t.’
PNCV *b"a\(\acute{a}\) ‘face, mouth, front’.

PSV *na-vur(u)a- ‘hole, opening’
Sye na\(\acute{u}\)ra-
Ura na\(\acute{u}\)ra/n
Kwm k"arua, k"arue- ‘door(way), aperture, hole’
POC *buru ‘bore a hole’.

2.2 Water

The following terms relate to fresh water:

PSV *na-wai ‘(fresh) water, river’
Sye nu
Ura ne
NTn n\(\acute{u}\)i-n\(\acute{a}\)g\(\acute{a}\)mt\(\acute{a}\)- ‘tears’
Len nu
SWT nu
Kwm nu
Anj nwai
POC *wai\(\acute{u}\), PNCV *wai. Cf. also NTn nahou, Wsn nahu, which may be a compound whose first element derives from PSV *na-si- ‘juice, fluid’.

PSV *n-usya(q) ‘waterfall’
Sye nusye
Ura nusye
Len nuhia
PNCV *savu or *sevu ?

PSV *na-tVji ‘pool’
Kwm teni ‘water hole, puddle, container of water, bowl’
PNCV *tugu.
PSV *a-ras ‘(water) flow’
   NTn   aeh
   Wsn   aiah
   Len   aih
   Kwm   aras
   Anj   areθraθ

PSV *ya(r) ‘flow uncontrollably’
   Anj   ya
   POc  *ñoro ‘swift flowing’.

2.3 The sea

There is a number of terms referring to the sea, to tides, and to reefs:

PSV *nɔ-tasiy ‘sea’
   Sye   nɔy
   Ura   de
       a/tok
   NTn   ntehi
   Wsn   ntehɪ
   Len   tehe
       i/rhe
   SWT   tahik
   Kwm   tɔsi
       pe/raha
   POc  *tasik, PNCV *tasi.

PSV *a-ruvaruv ‘be high tide’
   Len   eluelu
   Kwm   arɔrɔk
   POc  *Ruap, PNCV *Rua.

PSV *(ɔ)-mac(a) ‘be low tide’
   Sye   mah
   NTn   as
   Wsn   amas
   Len   mha
   SWT   mas
   Kw   maha
   Anj   mas
   POc, PNCV *maqati ‘low tide, exposed reef’.
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3 Fauna

3.1 Land animals

Only a small number of terms for land animals can be reconstructed. (Note that the dog, for example, appears to be a Polynesian introduction, with the form kuli or kuri in most SV languages.)

**PSV *(k,y)asuv* ‘rat’**

- **Sye** nakihi, ulakihi
- **Ura** ulakis
- **NTn** kahap
- **Wsn** kahau
- **Len** kahau
- **SWT** iahuk`
- **Kwm** iesuk`
- **Anj** nyeθo
- **POc** *kasupe, PNCV *kasuwe.

**PSV *na-girai* ‘flying-fox’**

- **Sye** naŋkrai
- **Ura** uŋlai
- **NTn** kai
- **Wsn** kei
- **Len** kəl
- **SWT** kil/avən
- **Kwm** kiri
- **Anj** nekrai
- **PNCV *garai.**
The next three terms refer to parts of animals that have no human analogues. (Body parts which are similar in humans and animals – heads, teeth, feet, etc. – are listed in §5.3.)
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**PSV *(na)-bo(k,y)asi** 'pig'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nompyahi</td>
<td>'tusk, canine tooth, horn, pincer of crab'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>umyas</td>
<td>'tusk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>pukas</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>pukas</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>pukah</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>pikaθ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *bokasi 'sow?', PNCV *bukasi.

**PSV *nV-ba(iV,di)-** 'tusk (of pig), horn (of animal)'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nepati, nempati</td>
<td>'tusk, canine tooth, horn, pincer of crab'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>nabare</td>
<td>'tusk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>ta/napaat</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>napati-</td>
<td>'tusk, horn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nipat</td>
<td>'tusk, horn; tusked pig'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC, PNCV *bati 'upper canine tooth'.

**PSV *na-bi(k,y)u-** 'tail'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>novl(a)i/mpyo-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>nevli/mye/n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>nəbika-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>nəpika-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nəpika-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>nəpikou-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>nəpiki-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>niye-</td>
<td>'tail (of fish only)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *ikuR. This form appears to reflect POC *ikuR but with an initial labial stop, and I have suggested the modified POc reconstruction *(p,b)ikuR. Anejohm, however, does not reflect this labial stop.

**PSV *na-lub* 'base of tail'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nelop*</td>
<td>'base of fish tail where it joins the body'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PNCV *lab*e 'appendage (root, tail)'.

The last two forms in this section are verbs pertaining to exclusively animal activities:

**PSV *a-vuas-i** '(animal) bear young, give birth'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>øvah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>ahuə</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>uok&quot;us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>k&quot;ahi, sk&quot;ahi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>ahaθ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PNCV *vasusu. Cf. also Len vaih '(human or animal) give birth'.
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3.2 Birds

The generic term for bird is:

**PSV** *manu* 'bird'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>menuy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>w/man-at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>meniŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>menaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>menuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*manu, PNCV *manu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of specific terms can also be reconstructed, and these are listed alphabetically by genus.

**Accipitriformes**

**PSV** *na-mal(i,e) 'hawk, swamp harrier'*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anj</th>
<th>nmej/yap&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

'goshawk, swamp harrier, Accipiter sp., Circus approximans'

PNCV *mala 'hawk, bird of prey'. Note that the element yap" = 'red'.

**Apodiformes**

**PSV** *ka(p","b")' 'k.o. swiftlet'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwm</th>
<th>kiri/kapou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nohop*yap&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'white-bellied swiftlet, white-rumped swiftlet (Collocalia esculenta, Aerodramus spodiopygius)'

PNCV *kabakaba. Cf. also Sye nimpem, Ura nibem 'white-rumped swiftlet (A. spodiopygius)'.

**Ciconiiformes**

**PSV** *(na)-p"an(i,e) 'reef-bird'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>yay/pon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>yay/pon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>p&quot;an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>np&quot;añ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'egret'

'egret'

'crane [sic, probably 'heron']'

'heron'

'reef heron (Ardea sp.)'
Columbiformes

PSV *na-bune[ ] ‘fruit dove, Ptilinopus sp.’
Sye nompon, nompon/re ‘red-bellied fruit dove (P. greyii)’
Ura ubuda [=ubun/ia] ‘adult red-bellied fruit dove’
Len pun/huua ‘k.o. bird, blue w. red breast’
Kwm pan-uas, pan-harov ‘red-bellied fruit dove (P. sp.)’
Anj nopña ‘Vanuatu fruit dove (P. greyii, P. tannensis)’
POc, PNCV *bune.

Coraciiformes

PSV *(na)-siyo(q) ‘kingfisher, Halcyon sp.’
Sye uki ‘H. chloris’
Ura uce
Kwm kak*a/sia
Anj nefey
POc, PNCV *siko.

Galliformes

PSV *na-(d,t)uaq ‘fowl’
Sye netwo
Ura urwa
Anj njaa
POc, PNCV *toqa. Cf. also Kwm reia.

PSV *na-l(i,e)v ‘incubator bird, megapode, Megapodius freycinet’
Sye nilep
Len ialu
Anj nije

Gruiformes

PSV *na-bi(l,r)a(dV,li) ‘banded rail, Gallirallus philippensis’
Sye nempli
Kwm pire
Anj neprij
PNCV *bilake.

Passeriformes

PSV *na-(va)layav ‘white-eye, Zosterops flavifrons’
Sye ulyap, welyap, nelyap
Ura ulyap
Anj nhuley
PNCV *laka, *lakalaka.
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Psittaciformes

PSV *sivori 'rainbow lorikeet, Trichoglossus haemododus'
   Sye    ure
   Kwm    sivur
   PNCV  *siviri.

Strigiformes

PSV *na-(IV)sm*it 'barn owl, Tyto alba'
   Sye    nomit
   Ura    nemit
   Len    him*ir  'chicken hawk?'
   Anj    naleθmot

In §5.3 I reconstruct the term PSV *na-*[m*]a,m*u]rai with the meaning of both 'body hair' and 'feather'. The following terms also refer specifically to parts of birds:

PSV *(ta)tan* '(fowl) wattles'
   Kwm    ka/rərəŋ  'comb and wattle of fowl'
   PNCV  *danə.

PSV *(k,y)av(V) 'wing; to fly'
   Sye    oype  'to fly'
   Ura    erke [r unexpl.]  'to fly'
   Wsn    nəŋəŋəvə-  'wing'
   Len    nakavkava-  'wing'
   SWT    nakavkava-  'wing'
   POc *kapak, PNCV *kaba-u or *kabawa.

3.3 Insects, spiders, etc.

In this category, I include flying insects, spiders, ants, lice, and similar life-forms.

PSV *lan* 'a fly'
   Sye    u/lan
   Ura    u/len
   NTn    k/lan
   Wsn    k/lan
   Len    k/lan
   SWT    e/lan
   Anj    n/lan
   POc, PNCV *lanə. (Kwm ian is almost certainly a loan < Len or Wsn.)
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PSV *(ŋa)-yamuy 'mosquito'
- Sye (ŋ)’yomoy
- Ura ʊ’youmu
- NTn ㎏’maŋ
- Wsn mum*’aŋ
- Len mumuk
- SWT mumuk
- Kwm m*’i
- Anj nyam*

POc *namuk, PNCV *namu-ki. The Tanna languages have lost the first syllable of the root, and a number of them show reduplication of the CV of the second syllable.

PSV *makali ‘k.o. spider’
- NTn makɔl
- Wsn makali
- Len makal
- SWT m*’akal
- Kwm ka/mkɔri ‘wolf-spider’

POc *kalɔ ‘ant, cockroach’, PNCV *makala ‘ant, crawling sensation’.

Two forms for ‘spiderweb’ can be reconstructed. These apparently derive from different, though related, sources (as the PNCV cognates indicate).

PSV *na-lawaq ‘spiderweb’
- Anj nilva

POc *lawaq, PNCV *lawa ‘spider, spiderweb’. The Tanna languages have possible cognate forms: Wsn, Len, SWT lielie ‘spiderweb’; SWT iielia ‘spider’. These would, however, derive from something like *liaq, which shows considerable divergence from the POc and PNCV forms.

PSV *ia-†r)ilwaq ‘spiderweb’
- Sye yatrilwo
- Ura yarilwa ‘spider’

POc *lawaq, PNCV *talawa ‘spider, spiderweb’.

Other terms in this category include:

PSV *m”alaq-m”alaq ‘ant (generic?)’
- Sye ʊ/mole, mole
- Ura mola ‘sugar ant’
- NTn m*’alam*ala
- Wsn m*’alam*ala
- Len m*’em*’ea
- SWT m*’alam*ala
- Kwm m*’em*’era

Anj m*’aram*ara is acknowledged to be a loan from Kwm.
PSV *kacik 'black biting ant'
  Ura  w/asek  'small black stinging ant'
  Len  kasak  'soldier ant'
           kasak-louhia  'black ant'
  SWT  kasak  'k.o. large ant'
  Anj  nyas  'fire-ant'
PNCV *kadi 'black biting ant'.

PSV *na-yut 'louse'
  Sye  noyut
  Ura  wit
  NTn  kə/ŋət
  Wsn  kə/ŋət
  Len  kur
  SWT  kel
  Kwm  ur
  Anj  neyet
POc, PNCV *kutu.

PSV *na-lisaq 'nit, louse egg'
  Sye  nelis
  Ura  ilis
  Len  k/iilha
  Kwm  k"a-resa
  Anj  nalaθ [l for expected j].
POc *lisaq, PNCV *lisa.

PSV *n-avat 'edible wood-grub'
  Sye  navat
  Ura  navat
  Anj  nahat
POc *qapat(a,o), PNCV *avato.

PSV *navau 'scorpion'
  Anj  nahau
POc *nopu, PNCV *novu 'scorpion, venomous fish'.

PSV *n-ilol(s,c,j) 'maggot'
  Sye  nilah
  Ura  ila
  SWT  nilah
  Anj  nija [unexpl. loss of final sibilant]
POc *quloc, PNCV *qulo-si. (Note also Len silat, Kwm irər, hirər, suggesting PSV *cilò(t,d).)
PSV *na-vine(q) ‘cockroach’

Sye  w/avne, wav/nivne
Anj  neheñ

3.4 Marine invertebrates

Arthropoda (class Crustacea)

PSV *na-liwa[ni]-tasiy ‘crayfish, lobster’

Sye  nali-ntoy
Ura  y/ali-de
NTn  e-dehi
Wsn  i-e-rahi
Len  hile-the [h unexpl.]
SWT  luan-tahik ‘salt-water lobster’
Kwm  i/varen ‘fresh- and salt-water crayfish, rock lobster’
Anj  nijvan

Probably PSV *liwa[ni] + *tasiy ‘sea’. (May just possibly derive from POc *quraŋ, PNCV *qura.)

PSV *na-pmi(vi) ‘k.o. lobster’

Sye  napmi ‘slipper lobster (Parribaus caledonicus)’
Anj  nap ‘k.o. short lobster’
napmehe ‘k.o. lobster’

PSV *is-yara(u,v) ‘k.o. crab’

Sye  yoyou ‘small land crab’
Len  iieievaiev ‘k.o. land crab w. black shell’

PNCV *kaRuve ‘ghost crab’. The Len form is probably a reduplication. (Cf. also Anj nya ‘k.o. crab’.)

PSV *(y)avilas ‘k.o. crab’

Sye  nevlah ‘k.o. rock-crab’
Ura  wavlis
Len  kvilas ‘k.o. green reef crab’
Kwm  iavira
Anj  naheleθ ‘k.o. freshwater crab’

POc *kape ‘crab taxon’, PNCV *kave ‘crab’?

PSV *na-ra(k,y)um ‘k.o. land-crab’

Sye  nroyum ‘hermit crab’
Len  iakɔm
Anj  nray

POc *rakumu, PNCV *rakum(u).
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PSV *tupa/t 'k.o. large land-crab'
   Sye  tupo
   POc *tubaRa.

PSV *n-um"a(n,η) 'hermit-crab'
   Anj  num"an      'k.o. small hermit-crab'
   POc *qum"an.

PSV *-gut(V) 'k.o. freshwater crab'
   Sye  w/ŋkut
   Anj  ne/ket

Mollusca

PSV *nə-tavu(r,i)(a) 'conch shell, Charonia tritonis'
   Sye  ntovu
   Ura  urovo, rovo
   Wsn  toui
   Anj  ntohou
   POc *tavui.

PSV *na-bəg 'green-snail, Turbo sp.'
   Sye  nemponŋ
   Anj  nepek        'T. marmoratus'
   PNCV *baiga.

PSV *vusani 'k.o. green-snail, Turbo sp.'
   Len  hiuan
   Kwm  kusan
   Anj  nepek-huθən

   The Len form probably has the animate prefix i(a)- which metathesises regularly with h.

PSV *{(na)-γas}c 'octopus'
   Sye  noywoh
   Ura  wis
   POc *kuRita.

PSV *(n,i)(a)ji(i) 'octopus, squid'
   NTn  iiaθ
   Wsn  iah
   Len  ihi
   SWT  ihi
   Kwm  is
   Anj  niθ
   POc *nus, *nusa? Possibly reinterpreted as PSV *na-ij(i)?
And note also the following:
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**Echinodermata**

PSV *na-m"eni 'k.o. sea-urchin'

Sye  nömín

Anj  nim"añ

PSV *na-vën 'k.o. sea-urchin'

Anj  nahen  'k.o. sea-urchin w. small spikes'

PCP *vana 'Diadema sp.' (?).

PSV *(na)-cikavua(c,s) 'bêche-de-mer, sea-cucumber, Holothuria sp.'

NTn  sikou

Len  sõkou

SWT  sõkavh

Anj  nisyahou

### 3.5 Marine vertebrates

PSV *namu 'fish (generic)'

Sye  nömû

Ura  uh/nömû

NTn  nöm

Wsn  nâmû

Len  nâm

Kwm  nömû

Anj  nümû

Cf. also SWT kamaam. Possibly PSV *na-mû or *n-amû.

**Acanthuridae**

PSV *na-yeboy 'unicornfish, Naso sp.'

Sye  yempa

Kwm  íêpa

Anj  nyepey

**Anguillidae**

PSV *na-vini '(freshwater?) eel'

Sye  neven  'eel'

Len  vin  'eel'

Anj  neheñ  'freshwater eel'
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Balistidae

PSV *na-su(m",mu) 'triggerfish, Rhinecanthus sp.'
   Anj ne\text{\textom"}
   PEOc, PNCV *sumu.

Bothidae

PSV *n-ali-ali 'flatfish'
   Anj najaj
   PCP *(y)ali, PPn *ali

Carangidae?

PSV *mesen 'k.o. fish'
   Sye mehen 'kingfish (family Carangidae)'
   Ura tu/mesen 'k.o. fish'
   Len mihin 'rabbitfish'
   Kwm minhin 'rabbitfish'
   Anj nm"\text{\texteta}a 'k.o. fish' [may be cognate].

Carcharhinidae

*na-byaw 'shark'
   Sye nempou
   Ura u/beu
   Wsn pav/\text{\texteta}n
   Kwm pav/e\text{\texteta}n
   Anj nepyev
   POC *bak(i,e)wa, PNCV *bakewa.

Dasyatidae

*na-var 'stingray'
   Sye u/var
   Ura u/var
   Anj nhar [nher- in compounds]
   POC *paRi, PNCV *vaRi. (Note also NTn v\text{\textomraau, Wsn vilau, Len v\text{\textomraau, SWT v\text{\textomlaak}},
   Kwm v\text{\textomraaku} (w. confused liquid reflexes), suggesting PTn *v(\text{\textom}s,i)ra(qa)\text{\textom}vu.)

Diodontidae

PSV *(na)-b"yai 'porcupinefish, spiny puffer, Diodon hystrix'
   Kwm p"ei
   Anj nop"yai
   PNCV *b"akaRe. Cf. also Sye umpoiyu.
Exocoetidae

PSV *-vnis 'flying-fish'
  NTn  vənis
  Wsn  vənis
  Len  vənis
  SWT  vənis
  Kwm  vənis
  Anj  nohowan/heneθ 'Cypselurus opisthopus'

Kyphosidae

PSV *na-vulai 'rudderfish, Kyphosis cinerascens'
  Sye  novle
  Anj  noholai

PSV *na-vulai-mVb"u 'rudderfish, Kyphosis sp.'
  Sye  novle-mpou 'K. sp., long and white in colour'
  Anj  noholai-mup"u 'K. sp., short and dark in colour'

Mugilidae

PSV *na-yna[ ] 'mullet, Mugil sp.'
  Sye  w/ane  'freshwater mullet'
  Ura  w/ana  'freshwater mulllet'
  Kwm  i/anər
  Anj  neyna  'M. cephalus'
  POe, PNCV *kanase.

Scaridae

PSV *(nə)-magum 'parrotfish, Scaridae'
  Sye  məŋkum  '(family Scaridae)'
  Ura  mogum
  Len  makəm
  Kwm  məkəm  'a blue fish'
  Anj  nmokom  '(Scarus, Scarops spp.)'

Tetraodontidae

PSV *na-bubu(a,e) 'puffer fish'
  Anj  nupupou  'Arothon sp., Canthigaster sp.'
  PNCV *buebue. Anj p for expected p" unexpl.

Other related terms include the following:
PSV *(n,i)-avu(a) 'turtle'
Sye
Ura
NTn
Wsn
Len
SWT
Kwm
Anj
PNCV *qavua.

PSV *na-qnavi- 'scale (of fish)'
Sye
Ura
Anj
POc *qunap, *qunap-i.

4 Trees and plants

4.1 Trees – general

This section lists reconstructions for ‘tree’, parts of trees, fruit, and ripeness or ripening of fruit.

PSV *na-yai 'tree, wood'
Sye
Ura
NTn
Wsn
Len
SWT
Kwm
Anj
POc *kayu, *kai, *kau, PNCV *kayu.

PSV *na-rva- 'sapling'
Sye
Anj

Two terms for ‘branch’ can be reconstructed:

PSV *n2-ra- 'branch'
Anj
POc *raqan, PNCV *raa.
PSV *nə-ranV - ‘branch, hand’
Sye nño-
Ura leñe-, lonu-, deñe- ‘hand’
Kwm rəŋi-, rəɾəŋi-
POc *raqan, PNCV *raŋa.

These terms are formally similar, and may be ultimately related. It is possible that the *ŋ in the PSV form I have reconstructed as *nə-ranV- derives from *n in the environment of *q (i.e. from POc *raqan rather than PNCV *raŋa), and that the PSV reconstruction is *nə-raqnV-.

We can also reconstruct two PSV forms for ‘root’:

PSV *nə-w(a)(k,y)a- ‘root’
NTn nokə-
Wsn nua-
SWT nua-
Kwm nua-
Len nukə-
POc *wakaR. Wsn, SWT and Kwm nua- could derive from either this PSV form or the next.

PSV *na-ywa- ‘root’
Sye noycve- ‘branch’
Wsn nua-
SWT nua-
Kwm nua-
Anj nevya-
PNCV *kawa-ri (<POc *wakaR by metathesis?). Wsn, SWT and Kwm nua- could derive from this PSV form or the previous one.

Other reconstructions include:

PSV *nə-jVli- ‘shoot of plant’
Sye nelye- ‘sucker, shoot’
Len nel/hala- ‘offspring of animals, sapling, new shoot’
Anj nisji- ‘shoot of plant’
POc *(s,j)uli(q), PNCV *suli.

PSV *nə-ta[(c,j)i](c,j)ia- ‘a flower’
Sye tasisi
Ura dasisi
SWT tihi-
Kwm tihi-
Anj ntesia-
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PSV *na-vVju- ‘a flower’
Sye  novVju-  ‘edible fruit of any tree except Tahitian chestnut’
      ovVju  ‘(vine) to flower’
NTn  naqVju-
Wsn  nouqV-
Len  nouqV-
POc *puqV, PNCV *vVja.

PSV *na-vuaq ‘fruit’
Sye  novwa-  ‘seed’
      novwa/hay  ‘fruit of any tree’
Ura  nava/n  ‘seed, fruit’
NTn  noa-
Wsn  noua-
Len  noua-
SWT  nuk"a-, k"a-nk"a-
Kwm  k"a-, nak"a-, k"a-nk"a-
Anj  nohowa-
POc *puaq, PNCV *vua.

PSV *a-vuaq ‘bear fruit’
Sye  ovwo
Len  oua
Kwm  kua
Anj  ohou
POc *puaq, PNCV *vua.

PSV *na-(p,v)(cj)e- ‘seed’
Sye  novse-
Anj  nopsa-

PSV *na-javo- ‘bunch’
Sye  nijavo- (of bananas)
     nijapo-
     nijavo-
     neqV-
     nipto-
     neqV-
     nipto-
     nipto-
Anj (of fruit)

Two forms for ‘fork, crotch’ can be reconstructed:

PSV *na-msaj ‘fork, crotch’
Sye  nemsoj
Anj  nemhaj
POc, PNCV *saqV.
There may have been doublets of the form *saŋa and *pʷaŋa, with the second form above combining both forms.

Note also (i) the term PSV *na-si- ‘juice, fluid’ reconstructed in §5.4 below, and (ii) the following terms to do with the ripeness or ripening of fruits:

**4.2 Coconuts (Cocos nucifera)**

PSV *nɔŋyanj ‘coconut (generic)’

Almost certainly not cognate with POc *niuR, PNCV *niu, though it might just possibly derive from POc *na-kai-niuR (ART-tree-coconut).
PSV *\textit{na-(u)cilop} ‘young/drinking coconut’

- **Sye** nehrop ‘green drinking coconut w. soft edible flesh’
- **Ura** nesrop ‘drinking coconut’
- **Len** nausilu ‘coconut w. firm flesh’
  - **nausilu-p\textsubscript{kom}** ‘coconut whose flesh is softer than nausilu and whose water is drinkable’

PSV *\textit{na-varaq} ‘sprouting coconut and/or its pith’

- **Sye** nevre
- **Ura** nevla
- **Len** nien-uvia
- **Kwm** nuvera
- **POc** *paraq, PNCV *vara.

PSV *\textit{na-(n,\text{\text{	ext{-}}}(t,c)} ‘sheath of coconut leaf, used as kava-strainer’

- **Sye** nun\text{\text{-}}at
- **Len** n\text{\text{-}}n\text{\text{-}}g\text{\text{-}}as
- **Kwm** nen\text{\text{-}}ha
- **Anj** nen\text{\text{-}}es

PSV *\textit{i-ab”aj} ‘coconut fruit bud’

- **Kwm** iap”as
- **POc** *(q)ab\text{\text{-}}aji.

### 4.3 Breadfruit \textit{(Artocarpus spp.)}

PSV *\textit{na-mar} ‘breadfruit (generic), \textit{Artocarpus} sp.’

- **Sye** nmar
  - \textit{mel-}, \textit{mor-} [used in compounds]
- **Ura** nimal
  - \textit{mor-} [used in compounds]
- **NTn** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}e
- **Wsn** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}ei
- **Len** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}
- **SWT** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}el
- **Kwm** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}\text{\text{-}}er
- **Anj** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}
  - \textit{nm\text{\text{-}}ar-}, \textit{n\text{\text{-}}mer-} [used in compounds]
- **POc** *maRi.

PSV *\textit{na-mar-ab(ia,ai)} ‘k.o. breadfruit’

- **Sye** mel-ampei ‘k.o. breadfruit w. large fruit and distinctive leaf’
- **Anj** n\text{\text{-}}m\text{\text{-}}er\text{\text{-}}apia
PSV *na-mar-uyiq ‘k.o. breadfruit’
Sye mor-uki ‘k.o. breadfruit, small w. yellow fruit’
Ura mor-uce
Anj nmer-u

4.4 Bananas (*Musa cultivars*)

PSV *na-vuc ‘banana (generic)’
Sye novoh
Ura novus
Anj nohos
POc *pudi, PNCV *vudi.

PSV *na-ban ‘k.o. banana’
Sye nimpa ‘k.o. banana w. long fruit’
NTn naban
Wsn napan
Len napan
SWT nap’an
POc *ba(q,k)un ‘k.o. banana’.

PSV *na-ri(v)ram ‘k.o. banana’
Sye narevram
Ura narivram
Kwm nariram
Anj nariram
Cf. also Sye naram ‘banana’. Len nariram ‘k.o. banana’ is probably a Kwm loan, since the expected form would be **nali(v)am.

PSV *na-taiki ‘k.o. banana’
Sye naiiki ‘banana (generic)’
Kwm taik
POc *tawai ‘k.o. banana’?

4.5 Yams (*Dioscoreae*)

PSV *n-uv ‘yam, Dioscorea sp. (generic)’
Sye nup
Ura nup
NTn nup
Wsn nu
Len nuw
SWT nek’
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Kwm nuk
Anj nu
POc *qupi, PNCV *quvi 'Dioscorea alata'.

PSV *na-ra [(k,g)au]η 'k.o. (wild?) yam'
Sye naranj 'k.o. wild yam'
NTn lakaunj 'k.o. wild yam'
Len nelakaunj 'k.o. wild yam'
Anj naranj 'k.o. yam'

PSV *m"arioq 'k.o. yam'
Sye nuv-mori
Ura nup-mori
POc *m"arugen 'k.o. greater yam'.

PSV *na-tai-b"atYV- 'k.o. yam'
Sye taipotyo-nei
Ura daiborye-ni
POC *p"atik 'potato, aerial yam, Dioscorea bulbifera'.

4.6 Taro (Araceae)

PSV *na-talV 'taro (generic), Colocasia esculenta'
Sye ntal
Ura dal
NTn nte
Wsn narei
Len nate
SWT natel
Kwm nere [loan from Wsn?]
Anj ntal
POC *talos.

PSV *nasi- 'taro-stem for planting'
Anj nasi-ntal
POC *wasi(n).

PSV *na-b"et 'k.o. taro'
Anj nap"at
PNCV *b"eta 'taro'.
PSV *na-viaq ‘k.o. taro – wild?’
Sye        ntal/evye      ‘Fiji taro’
Ura        dal nivya      ‘k.o. taro’
Len        nuvia          ‘k.o. taro’
Kwm        nuvia          ‘wild taro, Crytosperma sp.’
Anj        nehei          ‘wild taro’
POc *piRaq ‘giant taro, Alocasia macrorrhiza’, PNCV *via ‘wild taro (Alocasia)’.

4.7 Sugarcane, bamboo, etc.

PSV *na-tuv ‘sugarcane’
Sye        net- [only in compounds]
NTn        nostep
Wsn        nau
Len        naruw
SWT        nastuk”
Kwm        naruuk
Anj        neto
POc *topu, PNCV *tovu.

PSV *n-au ‘bamboo; bamboo knife or s.t. made from bamboo’
Sye        nau          ‘bamboo’
            nau/tujo     ‘knife’
Ura        le/nau      ‘knife’
NTn        naut          ‘knife’
Wsn        nau
Len        nau
SWT        nau          ‘knife’
            toki/nau     ‘bamboo’
Kwm        nau
Anj        nau
POc *qauR, PNCV *qau.

PSV *n-au-vat ‘k.o. (strong?) bamboo’
Sye        nauvat        ‘k.o. bamboo’
Anj        nauhat        ‘k.o. strong bamboo’

Cf. PSV *nu-vatu(q) ‘stone’.

PSV *n-i(u,w)au ‘river cane, Poeaceae sp.’
Sye        niwau
Ura        niwau
Anj        nauwau        ‘bulrush’
            niuau         ‘reed, rushes’
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PSV *na-b*(io,oi)r 'lawyer-cane, Flagellaria sp.'

Sye nompyor 'k.o. lawyer-cane, Flagellaria indica'
Anj nop'oi 'lawyer-cane, Flagellaria sp.'

PSV *na-(v)iun 'wild cane, Poeaceae sp.'

Sye nre/nyug
Ura la/nyeg
Len nuviq
Kwm niq
Anj niyeg

4.8 Vines

PSV *na-(p,b)V]lwa-'vine (generic?)

Sye nalwo- 'vine (of yam, sweet potato, etc.)'
Anj nepelva- 'vine, climbing plant, tip of tree or plant'

PSV *na-lima(q) 'k.o. vine w. medicinal properties'

Sye nalim 'k.o. vine'
Anj najima 'k.o. vine whose sap is used to treat sore eyes'
Cf. also Sye nalim mohpau, nalim movsi, two kinds of vine whose sap staunches bleeding.

PSV *na-vua(c,s,J) 'k.o. vine or creeper which grows on the beach'

Kwm nafua 'k.o. beach vine w. yellow trumpet-shaped flowers'
Anj nohou 'k.o. vine on beach w. purple flower'
POe *puRe, PNCV *vue. (Final PSV *(c,s)j) conditions *v > f in Kwm.)

PSV *na-vup 'k.o. vine'

Sye navup
Anj nohop/yev

4.9 Other trees and plants

Acanthaceae

PSV *na-bel 'k.o. tree, Pseuderanthemum sp.'

Sye nempel 'P. carruthersii'
Len nepe?
Anj nepel
Agavaceae

PSV *na-rawus 'ti plant, Cordyline sp.'
Sye (u)lo/reh 'C. terminalis'
Len naravh/tuvh
Kwm tuk/rōs
Anj nrowoθ

Anacardiaceae

PSV *na-yilas 'poisonwood, Semecarpus sp. (vitiensis?)'
Sye noule
Len nilha [l for expected i]
Kwm kərha, nurha 'k.o. tree'
Anj neylθ

Annonaceae

PSV *na-ray (i) 'dragon plum, Dracontomelon sp. (vitiensis?)'
Sye naray 'D. vitiensis'
Kwm narai 'k.o. tree w. sticky fruit'
Anj nhu/ri 'D. vitiensis'?
Possibly from POc *raqu(p), PNCV *raqu, though POc *q > PSV *γ is not a regular development.

Annonaceae

PSV *na-viwi(s) 'k.o. tree, Spondias dulcis'
Sye neviwi
POc *quRis, PNCV *uri-si.

Araliaceae

PSV *na-tVjri 'k.o. tree (Cananga odorata?)'
Kwm nurəŋri 'k.o. tree, wood used for pierced ear and septum ornaments'

PNCV *digiRi 'perfume tree'.
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Araucariaceae

PSV *na-dVw 'kauri, Agathis sp.'
  Sye      nenru
  Anj      nejev   'A. macrophylla'

Barringtoniaceae

PSV *na-velV(c,s,j) 'k.o. tree, Barringtonia edulis'
  Sye      velnah
  Ura      niverŋi
  POc *(w,v)ele, PNCV *vele.

Berseraceae

PSV *n-ança 'almond, Canarium sp.'
  Sye      nança
  Ura      nança
  NTn      nanga
  Wsn      nange
  Len      nage
  SWT      nage
  Kwm      nage
  Anj      nança
  POc */kaŋaRi, PNCV *qapaRi.

Caricaceae

PSV *neci[ ] 'pawpaw, Carica papaya'
  Sye      nesi
  Ura      nesi
  Len      kesi
  Kwm      kesi
  Anj      nese
  Probably an early loan.

Casuarinaceae

PSV *na-yar 'k.o. tree, Casuarina sp. (equisetifolia?)'
  Sye      nel/yar, nyaryar  'C. equisetifolia'
  Len      niel
  Kwm      nier
  Anj      nya
  POc *yaRu, PNCV *yaru.
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Combretaceae

PSV *na-talis ‘sea almond, Terminalia catappa’
Sye ntel
Ura dire ‘Tahitian chestnut, Inocarpus sp.’
Len telh
Anj njejeθ
POc, PNCV *talise.

Cunoniaceae

PSV *na-gVraV ‘k.o. tree, Geissois denhamii’
Sye nojkrop
Len nakaiu
Anj nekro

Cycadaceae

PSV *na-m(e,o)le ‘cycad, Cycas circinnalis’
Sye nomol
Len namel
Kwm namur
Anj nom*oj
PNCV *m*e.

Dilleniaceae

PSV *na-δy(o,u)l ‘k.o. tree, Dillenia biflora’
Sye netyul
Anj nejyel

Elaeocarpaceae

PSV *na-(s,j)u(v,w)as ‘k.o. tree, Elaeocarpus augustifolia’
Sye neyoh
Kwm nesuvas ‘k.o. tree w. edible seeds in a hairy pod’
Anj nawoθ

PSV *na-(va)tau ‘k.o. tree, Aceratium sp.’
Sye nevatau
Anj ntoutau ‘A. oppositifolium’
Euphorbiaceae

PSV *na-vayan ‘Java cedar, Bischofia javanica’
Sye nouyo
Kwm navan ‘k.o. tree used for house posts’
Anj nhay

PSV *na-mel(p)au ‘k.o. tree, Glochidion sp.’
Sye namelpau ‘G. ramiflorum’
Anj namlau ‘G. perakense’
Paul Geraghty suggests PEOc *m(e,o)la(q)u on the basis of this reconstruction plus Fijian molau.

PSV *na-teta(q) ‘k.o. tree, Exoecaria agallocha’
Sye ya/te
Len tara
Anj netet

Goodeniaceae

PSV *nanas ‘k.o. tree, Scaevola sp.’
Sye naninani
Kwm nanes ‘k.o. tree’
Anj nanaθ ‘S. cylindrica’

Guttifereae

PSV *(na)-mab*(o,u)l ‘Garcinia sp.’
Sye mompol ‘G. sessitis’
Anj nmop*ol-hat ‘G. platyphylla’
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**Heliconiaceae**

PSV *(nɔ)-(p,b)ayur* ‘k.o. tree, *Calophyllum* sp.’

- *pojyu* – ‘C. *neo-ebudicum*’
- *pojyu orta* – ‘C. *inophyllum*’

**Sye**

- *pojyu* – ‘C. *neo-ebudicum*’
- *pojyu orta* – ‘C. *inophyllum*’

**Anj**

- *npeye-lelyai* – ‘C. *neo-ebudicum*’
- *npeye/peke* – ‘C. *inophyllum*’

PEOC *bakuRa*, PNCV *bakura*. The Anej form is probably a compound of npeye < *bakuRa* + npeke ‘island’.

**PsV** *(nɔ)-mavu* ‘*Heliconia* sp.’

- *mevoy* – ‘k.o. *Heliconia* w. large leaf’
- *nimovu* – ‘*Heliconia* w. very large leaf’
- *nmehei* – ‘*Heliconia indica*’

**Leguminosae**

**PsV** *(nɔ)-m* “ab*’ Tahitian chestnut, *Inocarpus* sp.’

- *nm* “ab*’
- *nm* “ab* e.

**PsV** *(nɔ)-mari(u)* ‘k.o. tree, *Acacia* sp.’

- *mori* – ‘*Acacia* spp., *Racosperna spirorbe*’
- *nimli* – ‘barrel tree’
- *nmori* – ‘*Acacia spirorbis*’
- *nmerei* – ‘*Acacia spirorbis*’

**PNCV** *mariu* ‘*Acacia spirorbis*’.

**PsV** *(nɔ)-rap* ‘Indian coral tree, *Erythrina* sp.’

- *narap* – ‘k.o. flame tree’
- *nara* – Possibly *n-ara*. POc *rarap*, PNCV *raa-vi*.

**Malvaceae**

**PsV** *(nɔ)-vau* ‘burao, *Hibiscus tiliaceus*’

- *nva/, (o)re/nvau* – ‘k.o. flame tree’
- *novli/nvau* – ‘k.o. flame tree’
- *nuvo* – ‘k.o. flame tree’
- *nevo* – ‘k.o. flame tree’
- *nhau* – ‘k.o. flame tree’

POC *paRu*, PNCV *vaRu*. 
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PSV *na-b°al 'Hibiscus sp.'
   Anj  np°al
   PNCV *b°akala.

PSV *na-(v,w)as 'Abelmoschus manihot'
   Len  nuhua
   Kwm  nuvas
   POc *wasa.

Meliaceae

PSV *na-mtaw[an] 'k.o. tree, Dysoxylum sp.'
   Sye  nimtu   'D. aneityense'
   Len  netuan  'D. gaudichaudianum'.
   Kwm  nötuan  'D. gaudichaudianum'.
   Anj  nemtav  'D. gaudichaudianum'.

Moraceae

PSV *na-bag(u) 'banyan, Ficus sp.'
   Sye  npan   'F. proxima'
        ponju  'F. subcordata'
   Ura  bogu, nobogu
   Wsn  napok
   Len  nepok
   Kwm  napok
   SWT  napon [n unexpl.]
   Anj  npak
   POc, PNCV *baga.

PSV *na-riviriv 'k.o. tree, Ficus obliqua'
   Sye  narevrep, nrivrip
   Kwm  ruviru
   Anj  nerere

PSV *na-tønj 'k.o. tree, Ficus sp.'
   Sye  natoñ   'F. granatum'
   Len  nareñ   'F. granatum'
   Kwm  neronj  'k.o. tree w. stinging leaves'
   Anj  natenn  'F. adenosperma'

PSV *na-bVbas 'k.o. tree, Ficus sp.'
   Anj  neppat°
   POc */b(a,o)Jos(i).
Myristicaceae

PSV *na-dani ‘wild nutmeg, Myristica fatua’
    Sye nanre
    Len netan
    Kwm nətan
    Anj najeñ

Myrtaceae

PSV *nə-yaviy ‘Malay apple, Syzygium malaccense’
    Len nəkəvək
    Kwm nova
    Anj nyehy [y unexpl.]
POc *kapika, PNCV *kavika. Cf. also Sye weve.

PSV *na-m’anu ‘k.o. tree, Syzygium sp.’
    Sye nimonu
    Anj nm’an/pas ‘S. nomoa’

Nyctaginaceae

PSV *na-byai ‘k.o. tree, Pisonia sp. (umbelliflora?)’
    Sye nampyai ‘P. umbelliflora’
    PNCV *buka.

PSV *na-(p,b)ia(q) ‘k.o. tree, Pisonia sp. (grandis?)’
    Len npio-tuan ‘P. grandis’ [tuan = ‘white’]
    Anj nepia ‘P. grandis’

Pandanaceae

?PSV *na-via(q) ‘k.o. pandanus’
    Len nuvie
    PNCV *vaiva.

Piperaceae

PSV *lu(b,v)u(b,v)a(m,p”) ‘wild kava, Piper wichmannii’
    Sye (u)lompumpam
    Len nakivam
    Anj nouhap’
Proteaceae
PSV *na-igam 'k.o. tree, Finschia cloroxantha'
  Sye  neijkom
  Anj  nikam

Rhamnaceae
PSV *na-b*us(Vn) 'whitewood, Alphitonia zizyphoides'
  Sye  nampo
  Kwm  nap'esen
  Anj  nap'oth

Rhizophoraceae
PSV *na-don(q) 'mangrove, Rhizophora sp.'
  Sye  netuŋo
  Anj  nejen
  POc *tonq.

Rubiaceae
PSV *na-(γ)ura(t,c) 'Indian mulberry, Morinda citrifolia'
  Sye  noyrat
  Len  nauias
  Kwm  noueis
  Anj  nouras
  POc *kurat, PNCV *kura-ti.

PSV *na-bi(n,η)i 'k.o. tree, Neonauclea forsteri'
  Sye  nempe
  Len  napa?
  Anj  nepen

Rutaceae
PSV *ne-molis 'citrus, Citrus sp.'
  Sye  nemli
  Len  nəməlh
  SWT  k*a-nəməlh
  Kwm  nəmərhi
  Anj  nepjeθ [p unexpl.]
  POc *molis, PNCV *moli.
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PSV *ne-(s,t)naŋi 'k.o. tree, Euodia sp.'
  Sye      nitnaŋ
  Anj      neθnaŋ

PSV *na-γ(u)(c,j)a(m,p) 'k.o. tree, Halfordia kendack'
  Sye      noysam
  Anj      noysap

*Sapindaceae*

PSV *nɔ-tawa[ ]‘lychee, Pometia pinnata’
  Sye      ntau
  Ura      dau
  Anj      netva
POc *tawan*, PNCV *dau* (though Mota *tawan* might suggest PNCV *dawan*?).
Note also Len *natum*, Kwm *natum*.

*Sapotaceae*

PSV *nɔ-yatug ‘k.o. tree, Burckella obovata’
  Sye      yetu
  Ura      niyere
  Len      nier
  Anj      nyat
POc *ŋatu(q)*, PNCV *natu*.

*Sterculiaceae*

PSV *nɔ-mlav ‘k.o. tree, Melochia odorata’
  Sye      nemlap
  Len      nɔmhiav [h unexpl.]
  Anj      nemlah

PSV *nɔ-(n)mɔ' ai ‘k.o. tree, Pipturus sp.’
  Sye      nanrmai ‘P. argentus’
  Anj      nelm"ai

*Urticaceae*

PSV *n-alyat ‘nettle tree, Dendrocnide sp.’
  Sye      nelyat
  Anj      nelyat
POc *jalatoŋ*, PNCV *galato*.

PSV *uosuaŋ ‘Sterculia sp.’
  Sye      wowo
  Anj      woθwaθ
Zingiberaceae

PSV *na-li(c,j)ei 'ginger, Zingiber sp.'

Sye lesei, ulesei
Kwm nüre
Anj niijisei ‘k.o. ginger’

Other reconstructions in this semantic domain are the following:

PSV *(na)-l(i,u)muc 'moss, algae'

Wsn lomäs
Len lomüs
SWT lomüs
Kwm iamha
Anj nelom*

POc *limut, PNCV *lumu. The Tanna forms suggest initial *li (since *l before *u would be reflected as i in the North Tanna languages), while the Anj form suggests initial *lu (since *l before *i is reflected as j). The Kwm form may be a borrowing from a northern Tanna language in which, however, *l was reflected as i.

PSV *na-(p,v)alijiy 'grass'

Sye novlovsi 'buffalo grass'
NTn m"a-nvöhl
Wsn nöm*a-nvöhl
Len nöm*a-nvhaal
SWT növhilëk
Kwm nurhi
Anj napjes 'k.o. grass'
POc *palijji, PNCV *valisi.

5 Human beings

5.1 Kinds of people

PSV *n-at 'person'

Anj nat
POc, PNCV *qata.

PSV *(n,i)a-tamVmaq 'person'

Sye neteme
Ura yerema
NTn ietemim
Wsn ietamimi
Len ieramim
SWT ielmama
Kwm iermama
PSV *n-atavine ‘woman, female’
  Sye nahiven
  Ura yarvin
  NTn p/etan
  Wsn p/etan
  Len p/eravén
  SWT p/îlavén
  Kwm p/ran
  Anj atahëñ ‘be female’
             natahëñ ‘girl, female; (man) sister’
POc *ta-pine, PNCV *qata + *vavine.

PSV *(n,i)a-tam’añe ‘man, male’
  Sye namman
  Ura yarmon
  NTn ietemaan
  Wsn iermaan [r unexpl.]
  Len ieram’aan
  SWT ielmaan
  Kwm ierman
  Anj atam’añ ‘be male’
             natam’añ ‘man, male, (woman) brother’
POC *ta-m’aqane, PNCV *qata-m’aqane.

PSV *nə-v(u)alawV ‘child (young person, not offspring)’
  Sye nalau
  Ura y’alu
  SWT pu/k’oria-kaskah ‘small child’
  Anj nhalav
Possibly POc *galawa ‘uncle, nephew’.

PSV *nə-m”al ‘twins’
  Sye (u)mal/me
  Ura w’mal/me
  Len m”ilm”il
  Kwm m”irm”ir
  Anj nm”al
POC *malava. If these derive from a form like *malawa, then Len l is unexpl.

PSV *(n,i)-at-manuy ‘chief’
  Sye namnonuy
  Ura yarumne
  Kwm iermanu
This appears to be a compound of the forms for ‘person’ + ‘bird’.
The following reconstructions pertain to the spirit world:

PSV *(n,i)-at-mac 'spirit, ghost'
Sye natmah
Ura yarmis
Len iarmas 'malevolent spirit'
Kwm ieremha
Anj natmas

PNCV *qatamate (= *qata-mate). Cf. PSV *n-at 'person' + *(a)-mac 'die'.

PSV *na-b*asVs 'evil) bush spirit'
Sye nompo 'evil spirit inhabiting a forbidden place'
Ura nobo 'spirit that inhabits a taboo place'
Anj n*p*oθeθ 'bush spirit'

5.2 Kinship terms

PSV *e-t(p,b)u- 'grandparent'
Sye r/etpo- 'wife'
Wsn təp'ə-
Len rapa-
SWT ləpu-
Kwm rapu-
Anj etpo-
POc, PNCV *tubu-.

PSV *e-ōma- 'father, father’s brother'
Sye etme-
Ura rimi/n
NTn təma-
Wsn təma-
Len rəma-
SWT ləma-
Kwm remu-
Anj etma-
POc, PNCV *tama-.

PSV *ri-(t,c)inV- 'mother, mother’s sister'
Sye nrinme-
Ura ehne/n
NTn ita-
Wsn ita-
Len ina-
SWT nasana-
Kwm  
Anj  
POc, PNCV *tina-

PSV *(p)*iavV  'older same-sex sibling'
  Sye  
  Ura  
  NTn  
  Wsn  
  Kwm  
  Anj  
  POc, PNCV *matuqa.

PSV *tua-  'older same-sex sibling'
  SWT  
  Kwm  
  Anj  
  POc *tuqaka-, PNCV *tuka-

PSV *{(n)a}-tasi-  'younger same-sex sibling'
  NTn  
  Wsn  
  Len  
  SWT  
  Kwm  
  POc *taci-, PNCV *tasi-

PSV *na-{(v)ai}vine-  'man’s sister'
  Sye  
  Ura  
  NTn  
  Wsn  
  Len  
  SWT  
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Kwm  pini-  + ‘woman, female’
Anj  nataheị  POc *papine, PNCV *vavine ‘woman, female; male’s sister’.

PSV *na-m‘ane- ‘woman’s brother’
Sye  mano-  PSV *na-m‘ane, PNCV *m‘ane.
NTn  m‘ane-
Wsn  nəm‘anə-
Len  nəm‘anə-
SWT  nam‘anə-
Kwm  pu/mani-
Anj  natam‘añ  ‘man, (woman) brother’
POc *m‘aqane, PNCV *m‘ane.

PSV *aswa[-] ‘spouse’
Sye  ahwo-, asu-  ‘husband’
Ura  awi/n  ‘husband’
Kwm  sueru  POc *qasawa, PNCV *asoa.

PSV *natu- ‘child, son, daughter’
Sye  nitu-  [3SG nitni]  PSV *aiwə-
Ura  neru/k  [3SG nehni]  ‘my child’
NTn  nətə-
Wsn  nətə-
Len  nətə-
SWT  nətə-
Kwm  neru-

POC, PNCV *natu. The ti- forms in SWT and Kwm suggest that *nau- was reanalysed as *na-tu-, and that *na (homophonous with the article) was then deleted.

PSV *alwo- ‘nephew’
Sye  alwo-  ‘(man) nephew, niece’
Ura  alwi/n  ‘(man) nephew’
POC *qalawa, PNCV *aloa ‘uncle, nephew’.

PSV *mayub’u- ‘grandchild’
Sye  moypo-
Ura  boybo/n [unexpl. initial b]
Wsn  m’ip’ə-
Len  m’ip’ə-
5.3 Body parts

The body – general

This first set of forms deals with the body generally.

**PSV** *na-b*’ataya- ‘body’
- **NTn** *nəb*’ətə-
- **Wsn** *nəp*’ətə-
- **Len** *nup*’elaka-
- **SWT** *nəplaa-
- **Kwm** *napra-, napri-

POc, PNCV *abe* (but note Namakira batoko-, Nguna nap*’atoko).

**PSV** *na-γ(u)lic* ‘skin’
- **Sye** noyleh/ntan
- **Ura** noyles dan

POc *kuliti, PNCV *kuli.*

**PSV** *na-vVsayo- ‘meat, flesh’
- **Len** nuvhakə-
- **Kwm** nosa-
- **Anj** nohobye-

POc *pisiko, PNCV *visiko.*

**PSV** *na-vali- ‘side, other side’
- **Wsn** nəve-
- **Anj** nahaje-

PNCV *tavala ‘side, other side’, *tavalu ‘side, moiety’; Fijian tavale- ‘cross-cousin’.

The head

The next set of reconstructions are forms referring to the head or parts of the head (except for the mouth, which is dealt with separately below).

**PSV** *na-(k,g)abʷa[ ] ‘head’
- **Sye** nompu-
- **Ura** nompu/n
- **NTn** -kaba
- **Wsn** -kap’ə
Len -kap"a
SWT -kap"a
Kwm kap"a

POc, PNCV *b"atu. While the Erromangan forms suggest that this was a regular directly possessed noun (*na-(k,g)ab"a-), the Tanna forms take prefixed possessives (e.g. Len ta-k-kap"a (POSS-my-head) 'my head').

PSV *n=ν(a)utoy 'brain'
NTn nouia-
Wsn nouhta-
Len nenourok
SWT -kula
Kwm k"era
Anj nhutw/ma

POc *qutok. Sye uvrh, Ura uvras might be cognate.

PSV *na-(v,b"a)Vnaya- 'forehead'
Sye navine-
Ura navune/n
NTn naboneya-
Wsn napol"anaj
Len napol"ananak-
SWT napol"ana-
Kwm napol"ana-

PSV *na-m(ə)ta- 'eye, face'
Sye nimtu- [3SG nipmi]
Ura nihmi
NTn nəŋə/mta- [cf. məŋər 'sun']
Wsn nəmtə- [cf. məŋər 'sun']
Len nəmrə- [cf. mər 'sun']
SWT nəmtə- [cf. məl 'sun']
Kwm nə/nime-, nəmrhi- [h unexpl.; cf. meri 'sun']
Anj nesŋa-nemta-

POc, PNCV *mata-.

PSV *n-ulə-m(ə)ta- 'part of eye'
Sye nulimte- 'eyebrow, eyelash'
Anj nalimta- 'eyelid'

Cf. PSV *n-Vli-m(ə)ta- 'tear(s)'.
PSV *n-Vli-m(a)ta- 'tear(s)'
  Sye       nulimte-
  Anj       najimta-
  Cf. PSV *n-ul-a-m(a)ta- 'part of eye'

PSV *nə-taliŋa- 'ear'
  Sye       netelŋa-
  Ura       delŋe/n
  NTn       nəm"a-ntelŋa-
  Wsn       nəm"a-telŋa-
  Len       nəm"a-telŋa-
             'outside of ear'
  SWT       m"a-telŋa-
  Kwm       nafreŋi- [unexpl.]
             'outside of ear'
  Anj       ntiŋa-
  POc *taliŋa, PNCV *daliŋa.

PSV *na-(s)jijV- 'nose'
  NTn       nəp"an-nahŋə-
  Wsn       nəp"on-nahŋə-
  Len       -nhaŋə- [second element in various compounds]
  SWT       nəp"an-nhiŋa-
  Kwm       napa-senji-
  POc *icuŋ, PNCV *ganisu.

PSV *na-(k.g)u(mu,m"V)- 'chin'
  NTN       nou-nəkmə-
  Wsn       nakm"ə-
  Len       nəkm"ə-
  Kwm       nəkmum-
             'chin and upper throat'
  POc *kumi, PNCV *kum"i 'beard'.

PSV *n(a)-ua- 'neck'
  Sye       nowa-
  Ura       na/n
  NTn       nua-
             'back of neck'
  Len       nua-
             'top of neck'
             nemulke/nua-
             'neck'
  SWT       nua-
             'shoulder and part of the neck near the shoulder'
             nəp"atak/nua-
             'neck (front and back)'
  Kwm       nua-
  Anj       nawunua-
  POc *Ruqa, PNCV *noqa.
The mouth

The next set of forms are reconstructions to do with parts of the mouth. The first two are related forms for 'tongue' (also with the meaning 'flame'); both derive from POc *maya, though in the first this root is the second element of a compound.

PSV *na-luame- 'tongue, flame'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nelwame</td>
<td>'tongue, flame'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>nalwame/n</td>
<td>'tongue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>nelame-</td>
<td>'tongue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>narama-</td>
<td>'tongue, flame'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nalaume</td>
<td>'flame'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*maya, PNCV *mea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *na-ma- 'tongue, flame'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>nama-</td>
<td>'tongue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>nama-</td>
<td>'tongue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nama-</td>
<td>'tongue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>namnama-</td>
<td>'flame'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nama-</td>
<td>'tongue (archaic)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*maya, PNCV *mea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *na-livo- '(incisor) tooth'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nelve-</td>
<td>'incisor tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>nelva-</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>nelu-</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nelu-</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>k*alu-</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>revu-, k'a-revu-</td>
<td>'incisor tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nejhe-, nijho-</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*lipon, PNCV *livo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *na-nasV- 'gums'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nornosi/wo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>nornosi/wo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nijha-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>nijaha-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*nijis, PNCV *nisa 'smile'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trunk

In addition to the forms PSV *na-msay and *(s,)*ap*an(e,i)- 'fork, crotch' listed in §4.1, a number of forms referring to the trunk and parts of the trunk can be reconstructed. The first two are probably related terms meaning 'back'.
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PSV *(na)-taa- ‘back’
- Sye nta-
- NTn nəmʷadəa-
- Wsn nəmʷantaa-
- Len taa-, nəmʷa-ta-
- SWT nəmʷei-ta-
- Kwm taku/taa-

POC *taku, PNCV *takuRu.

PSV *(na)-ta(k, y)u- ‘back’
- Sye nτoy-noki ‘back of skull’
- nτoyu-nə-
- Kwm taku/taa- ‘back, backside’
- Anj i/tay ‘behind, far, beyond’

POC *taku, PNCV *takuRu.

PSV *na-tpu- ‘stomach, belly’
- Sye netpolu ‘stomach, gizzard’
- NTn nəpə-
- Wsn nəfwa-
- Len nəpə-
- SWT təpu-
- Kwm təpu-

POC *təbʷa, PNCV *tabʷa-i.

PSV *na-butoji- ‘navel’
- Sye yomput
- Ura yobut
- NTn nəbutə-
- Wsn nəpəta-
- Len nəpətə-
- SWT nəpləŋə-
- Kwm nəpreji, nəpurenji-
- Anj nəpʷo ‘umbilical cord’

POC *butoŋ, PNCV *buto (however, cf. Raga butongi).

PSV *botni- ‘bottom, buttocks, base’
- Sye potni- ‘base, bottom’
- Ura bohni/n ‘base’

POC *bʷoto, PNCV *boto.
PSV *n-uci- 'penis'
   NTn        nusa-
   SWT        nusı- (Nəvai dial.)
   Kwm        k"a-nihi-
   POe        *quti(n), PNCV *quti.

PSV *na-valu- 'penis'
   Sye        nelu- [loss of *v unexpl.]
   Anj        nhele-
   Possibly from POv *peliR.

PSV *na-(m"a,mu)rai 'body hair, feather'
   NTn        nam"a-m"ei-
   Wsn        nam"o-m"ei-
   Len        namo-m")i-
   SWT        numlo-
   Kwm        num"heri-
   Anj        numri-

Internal organs

The following terms refer to internal organs:

PSV *lolo- 'heart = seat of emotions'
   Kwm        reri- 'internal portion, insides, heart, mind, feeling, emotion'
   Anj        lele- 'heart, seat of emotions'
   PNCV       *lolo.

PSV *na-ur 'vein, artery, sinew'
   NTn        noa-noul
   Len        noua-nul
   SWT        naur (Nəvai dialect)
   POe        *uRat, PNCV *uRa-ti 'vein'.

PSV *ne-rauc 'sinew, rope'
   Wsn        nelous 'rope'
               noua-nelous 'sinew'
   SWT        nelaus 'rope'
               k"a-nelaus 'sinew'
   Possibly from POe *uRat, PNCV *uRa-ti 'vein'.
PSV *na-cin(V)qa- 'intestines'
Sye nouse/nsi-
Ura nesow/sin
NTn nesŋa-
Wsn nesŋaa-
Len nesŋaa-
SWT nesinau-
Kwm naninha-
Anj nesŋa- 'nucleus, focal part, soul, spirit'
POc, PNCV *tinaqe. The second element in the Sye and Ura forms is the word for 'excrement'.

PSV *mab*V- 'liver'
NTn nanan/mampa-
Wsn nanan/mopǝ-
Len nakan/mopǝ-
SWT nakan/mopu-
Kwm nakan/mapwu-
Anj n/mopʷo-
PNCV *mʷabʷe. Cf also Sye mou.

**Limbs**

In addition to PSV *na-rayV- 'branch, hand', listed above in §4.1, the following terms for limbs can be reconstructed:

PSV *na-lima- 'hand, arm'
NTn nelma-
Wsn nelma-
Len nelma-
SWT kʷa/lma-
Anj nijma-
POc, PNCV *lima-.

PSV *(n)шедш-antuv 'right hand(ed)'
NTn mʷadǝp
Wsn maru
Len mʷatu
SWT matukʷ
Kwm mʷatuk
Anj nmata-
POc *mataqu, PNCV *matuqa.
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PSV *(nə)-(m,m′)a尿 'left hand(eds)'
   Sye  mor
   NTn  maul
   Wsn  moul
   Len  mul
   SWT  maul
   Kwm  mour
   Anj  nm′awu-  'left hand'
        m′au  'left-handed'
POc *ma-wiRi, PNCV *mawiri.

PSV *na-su(r)V-  'bone, foot, leg'
   Sye  noura-
   Ura  nowira-
   SWT  nuhu-
   Kwm  nsu-
   Anj  neθuo-
POC, PNCV *suRi.

PSV *nə-va-  'thigh'
   Sye  nva-
   Ura  niva/n
   NTn  nua-
   Wsn  nəva-
   Len  nəva-
   SWT  nəp′atak/nəva-
   Kwm  nuvə-
   Anj  nha-
POC *paqan.

PSV *(nə)-pisV-  'finger, toe'
   NTn  pis-akaku  'little finger'
   Wsn  pəs/iuul  'fingernail, toenail'
   Len  pəspəs
   SWT  pəspəs-
   Kwm  pəs- [used in compounds referring to 'finger', 'fingernail']
   Anj  nəpse-
        nəpse-jma-  'finger'
        nəpse-θuo-  'toe'
POC *bisu 'finger, toe, nail'.
5.4 Bodily fluids, exudations, etc.

PSV had two terms for both ‘blood’ and ‘excrement’, one of which involves a specific possessor (e.g. Len nataa-k ‘my blood’), while the other refers to the substance in isolation without being linked to any possessor (e.g. Len nata ‘blood’).

PSV *nu-da(a)– ‘blood (specific possessor)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTn</th>
<th>nta-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>nra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nataa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>natau-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>nte-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *draRaq, PNCV *daRa.

PSV *nu-da(q,V) ‘blood (no specific possessor)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sye</th>
<th>nre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>neta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *draRaq, PNCV *daRa.
PSV *na-(c,t)i(V): 'excrement (specific possessor)'
  Sye    si-
  Ura    si/n
  NTn    nasi-
  Wsn    nasi-
  Len    nasii-
  SWT    nasi-
  Kwm    nihi-
  Anj    nti-
  POc, PNCV *taqe.

PSV *na-(c,t)i(V,q) 'excrement (no specific possessor)'
  Wsn    nasi
  Len    nas
  Kwm    nihi
  Anj    nti
  POc, PNCV *taqe.

Other terms in this semantic domain are:

PSV *no-vsar 'pus'
  Sye    novsar
  Ura    novsar
  Anj    nọta

PSV *na-maya(p*,b*) 'a sore'
  SWT    nam*ap*
  Kwm    nam*ap*
  Anj    nmoyop*

PSV *na-si- 'juice, fluid'
  NTn    naha-
  Wsn    naha-
  Len    nihi-
  SWT    nahi-
  Kwm    nēse-
  Anj    nīdi-
  POc *suRuq, PNCV *suRu.

6 Artefacts

6.1 Village, house and household

   The first set of terms below refer to the village and its surrounds.
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PSV *\(n-u\)vanua 'village'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>la/tuanu [t unexpl.]</td>
<td>'to/at/in the village'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>la/huanu [h unexpl.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nauanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>(l/)uk’anu</td>
<td>'home, residence, house, village, hamlet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nhenou</td>
<td>'taro-swamp'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*panua</td>
<td>'inhabited area or territory, community and its land', PNCV *vanua 'land, village, place'. The initial IV or rV in Tanna languages is probably an historical locative prefix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *n-alan(i,e) 'road, path'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nef-alañ</td>
<td>'a single row in weaving'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*salan, *jalan, PNCV *sala. Loss of the proto-sibilant unexpl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *n-ar 'boundary-marker'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>nar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*qaRa(r), PNCV *ara 'fence, wall'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *n-wari- 'a place'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nwore-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *na-sag 'dirt, rubbish'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>nahák</td>
<td>'dirt, mote, scrap, food scrap'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nom’i-nahák</td>
<td>'dirt, rubbish'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>nhowok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*sago</td>
<td>'rubbish, spoil'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also in this context PSV *na-layau (see §6.2 below), reconstructed with the meaning of 'canoe' but also 'major social group'.

The next set of terms refers to the house and parts of houses.

PSV *n-im”aq 'house'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>nimo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntn</td>
<td>nim”a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>nim”a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>nim”a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>nim”a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>nim”a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>niom”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*Rum”aq, PNCV *yum”a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PSV *i-im\textquotesingle arum\textquotesingle ‘men\textquotesingle s house, nakamal\textquotesingle

NTn iim\textquotesingle aim\textquotesingle
Wsn iim\textquotesingle aim\textquotesingle
Len iim\textquotesingle aim\textquotesingle
SWT iim\textquotesingle aləm
Kwm im\textquotesingle arəm
POc *Rum\textquotesingle aq, PNCV *yum\textquotesingle a ‘house\textquotesingle.

PSV *na-livin\textquotesingle tr\textquotesingle i- ‘top, roof’

Sye (u)nelvinri, livinlivin ‘top, brink’
Anj nijhinti- ‘top, roof’

PSV *na-ta(p,b)ina(c,j) ‘door, doorway’

Wsn tapan
Len tapan
SWT tapan [ŋ unexpl.]
Kwm tapinha
Anj ntapnes

PSV *na-var ‘wall’

Sye novar ‘close-woven meeting-house wall’
POc *paRa.

The final set of terms in this section contains things found in houses. This includes PSV *na-m\textquotesingle asan (see §1.1 above), among whose meanings is ‘sleeping place’, and also the following:

PSV *na-t(a)i ‘thing’

NTn nat
Wsn nati
Len nar
SWT nal
Kwm nari
Anj nitai

PSV *n-alu\textquotesingle ‘pillow, headrest’

Anj nilañ
POc *qulun\textquotesingle an, PNCV *ulu-\textquotesingle a. NTn k\textquotesingle oulo\textquotesingle no, Len k\textquotesingle alu\textquotesingle na may be Polynesian loans, suggested both by retention of the final vowel and failure of *l to become i before *u.

PSV *na-ma(c,j) ‘cloth, clothes; tapa’

Sye nemah ‘cloth, clothes’
Ura namas ‘clothes, clothing’
Anj namas ‘tapa’
POc *masi ‘Broussonetia papyrifera, loincloth’.
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**Proto Southern Vanuatu lexical reconstructions**

PSV *nɔ- (vu)(p,b)ilo 'coconut shell used as liquid container'
- Len *uwpel* 'flask made from coconut, bottle'
- Anj *nkupej* ‘coconut shell, water container’
- POC *b”ilo.

6.2 Sailing, fishing, hunting and gathering

The first set of terms in this section deals with the canoe and other artefacts associated with sailing and fishing.

PSV *na-layau ‘canoe, major social group’
- Sye *lou* ‘canoe, ship; nation, country, kingdom’
- Ura *nelou* ‘canoe, ship’
- Wsn *nɛŋo* ‘canoe, ship; politico-military division of society’
- Len *niko* ‘canoe, ship; politico-military division of society’
- SWT *lau* ‘canoe, ship; politico-military division of society’
- Anj *nelayau* ‘canoe, chiefdom’

PSV *na-liman(i,e) ‘outrigger, outrigger-float’
- Sye *nelman*
- Ura *nelman*
- Anj *nijmañ*
- POC, PNCV *lima-* ‘hand’. Cf. PSV *na-lima* ‘hand, arm’.

PSV *[ ]aman ‘outrigger, outrigger-float’
- NTn *remən*
- Wsn *remər [final r unexpl.]*
- Len *remər [final r unexpl.]*
- SWT *leməl [final l unexpl.]*
- Kwm *temən*
- POC *saman, PNCV *zama. Initial consonant shows extreme variability, suggesting PSV *sVq or *qVs, or *t, or possibly *l or *r; possibly contamination from PSV *na-lima- ‘hand, arm’ and/or PSV *na-liman(i,e) ‘outrigger, outrigger-float’.

PSV *n-i(p,v)an ‘a sail’
- NTn *nivən*
- Wsn *nivən*
- Len *nivən*
- SWT *nivən*
- Kwm *nivən*
- Anj *nipan*
- PNCV *kabani ?
PSV *nə-vai(w)a ‘a paddle’
NTn nəvea
Wsn nəvea
Len nəvea
SWT nəvea
Kwm nəveia
Anj nehev

PSV *n-ias ‘bailer’
Len nies
Kwm nias
Anj niad
POc *asu, PNCV *asu-vi, *rasu. Cf. PSV *ias ‘bail (water)’.

PSV *na-kup”(e,u)n ‘net, fish-net’
Sye noypon
Wsn nkap”ən
Len nkapun
SWT nkapun
Kwm nəpən
Anj noup”on
POc *kup”ena.

PSV *(a)-kil-i ‘hook (n. and v.), fish-hook’
Sye kilkil ‘fish hook (esp. store-bought)’
Ura kilkil
Kwm akiri ‘hook down (coconuts)’
ko-kir ‘a hook’
POc *kawil, PNCV *gau.

PSV *nə-(k,g)awil ‘hook (n.), fish-hook’
Sye naŋkau
nriv/kau ‘k.o. vine w. hooks that used to be used for fishing’
Anj nyowoj
POc *kawil, PNCV *gau.

PSV *n-alic ‘torch’
Anj nijis
POc *alito(n) ‘firebrand’.

The next set of terms deals with hunting and gathering.
PSV *na-yawVc ‘fruit-picker’
  Anj   niyowos
  POc *kawit-i ‘fruit crook’.

PSV *nə-(s)au ‘a spear’
  Sye   sau
  SWT   k’a-nhau
  POc *sao(t). Ura nau may be cognate, but cf. PSV *n-au ‘bamboo’.

PSV *-pac(V) ‘axe’
  NTn   kəpaas
  Wsn   kəpaas
  Len   kəpaas
  SWT   kəpas
  Kwm   paha
  Anj   npas
  POc, PNCV *bati ‘(upper canine) tooth’?

PSV *na-taliv ‘a sling’
  Sye   telip
  Len   teliv
  Kwm   toriv

6.3 Fire and food

Terms dealing with fire and ovens include the following:

PSV *nə-yabʷ ‘fire’
  Ura   nab/avenj ‘fire, firewood’
  SWT   napʷ
  Kwm   napʷ
  Anj   nyapʷ
  POc, PNCV *kabu.

PSV *nə-yam ‘fire’
  Sye   nom
       tel/yam ‘warm self by fire’
  Ura   tel/yam ‘warm self by fire’
  NTn   nəŋam
  Wsn   nəŋom
  Len   nəkom
  POc, PNCV *kabu, possibly via *kampu?
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PSV *n-as(r)a- 'smoke (n.)'
   NTn naha-nenam
   Wsn nah-nrom
   Len nha-nkom
   SWT nhe-nap'
   Kwm nase-nap'
   Anj nathra-
   POc, PNCV *qasu.

PSV *nə-(m)jau 'ashes'
   Sye pe/ntop
   Ura be/dop
   NTn namtap
   Wsn namtaau
   Len namraau
   SWT namlak'
   Kwm namrak'
   POc *qapu(k), *rapu(R), PNCV *avu. Elsewhere I suggest the POc modified reconstruction *tapuR. Cf. also Anj nop"p"a.

PSV *nə-sua- 'steam (n.)'
   Sye nahwo-num
   Ura naswo-num
   POc *nasu(q) 'boil, steam (v.i.). The second element is the root for 'earth oven' (see immediately below).

PSV *n-u(mu,m)a)n 'earth oven'
   Sye nompompw/num
   Ura niveri/num
   NTn noa-num’an
   Wsn noa-num’an
   Len noa-num’an
   SWT k”a-nem’en
   Kwm nak”a-numun
   Anj nm”a-num”
   POc *qumun, PNCV *qumu.

   And note also PSV *na-luame-, *na-ma- 'tongue, flame', listed in 5.3.

   Below are two terms referring to kinds of food:

PSV *na-marai 'fermented breadfruit'
   Sye morei
   Ura mori, nimorei
   Anj namarai [possible Pn loan?]
   POc *madraR, PNCV *mara.
PSV *(na)-up*\textacuted {\textsuperscript{at}} 'k.o. laplap or tuber pudding'

Sye yo/upat ‘k.o. laplap w. no added filling’

Anj nup\textsuperscript{ut} ‘k.o. laplap made from mashed taro’

6.4 Mats, baskets, rope

PSV *n-eba( ] 'pandanus mat'

Anj nepa ‘pandanus mat for carrying a child’

POc *gebal 'pandanus mat’, PNCV *eba. Cf. also Anj nap 'pandanus mat'.

PSV *(na)-de(p,v)a(k, y)au 'k.o. mat'

Sye tevayau ‘single-sided coconut mat’

Ura devayau ‘k.o. coconut leaf mat’

Anj nijip ‘single thickness coconut mat’

nijipakau ‘chief’s single thickness coconut mat w. large spine’

POc, PNCV *tabakau.

PSV *na-to(p,v)i 'basket'

Sye (w)or/tovi ‘small pandanus basket’

SWT natap

Kwm ta/n\textsuperscript{er}up

PSV *(n)\textsuperscript{a}-(k, y)atVm 'basket'

NTn kat\textsuperscript{om}

Wsn kat\textsuperscript{om}

Len k\textsuperscript{ar}m

Anj nyat ‘pandanus; basket’

POc *katu(m,g), PNCV *kato.

PSV *-del 'rope'

Len k\textsuperscript{o/}tel ‘rope on a woman’s skirt’

POc, PNCV *tali.

And note also PSV *ne-lauc ‘sinew, rope’ (see §5.3).

7 Spiritual and intellectual activity

7.1 Living and dying

PSV *a-muru(p,v) 'be alive'

Sye omurep

Ura omorop

Kwm muru

Anj umu

POc *maqurip, PNCV *maquri.
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PSV *a-mraŋ(s,j) 'be alive'

NTn aməŋəh
Wsn əmianəŋ
Len amiuq
SWT mlaŋh
Anj omraŋ  '(person) be old, live a long time'

PSV*(ə)-mac 'die, be dead'

Sye məh
Ura imis
NTn mas
Wsn mas
Len mas
SWT mha
Kwm emha
Anj mas
POc, PNCV *mate.

7.2 Perception

PSV *a-raŋV-i 'hear, perceive'

Sye orəŋi
Ura erəŋi
SWT a desarroll
Kwm areŋ, reni- 'feel, hear, smell, taste, perceive'
Anj eŋeigen
POc *rogoR, PNCV *roño.

PSV *a-tou 'hear, perceive'

NTn etou
Wsn etou
Len arou
Anj atou  'know'

PSV *(a-ta)va(n)doŋ 'listen'

Sye vanroŋ
Anj atahajen

PSV *a-yita-i 'see'

Sye oyhi [underlying oyəh-i]
Ura oysi
Kwm ata, ati
Anj eyet, eyta-i
Proto Southern Vanuatu lexical reconstructions

POc, PNCV *kiia. The Sye and Ura forms suggest either metathesis (*a-yita-i > *a-yati-i > *a-yac-i) or loss of root-final *a and palatalisation of *t as *c before the suffix *-i.

PSV *e-laqVs 'look at, look for'

Sye  elasac  'look up'
Ura  elmpya  'look away'

NTn  air/anji
Len  eit/anji  'look away'
SWT  elhat-kon  'look for'
Anj  elath  'look in certain direction'

POc *leqo, *liqo(s), *liqo-si, PNCV *leqo-si 'see, look at'. Sye has a number of other verbs w. initial ela- involving looking in addition to those cited here.

PSV *a-(k, y)il-i 'know'

Sye  okili
Ura  oyori

POc *kilala; PNCV *kila-la 'know, see'. Cf. also Kwm kuren 'know, understand'.

Two forms meaning 'fear', one intransitive, the other transitive, reflect POc *ma-takut, though with quite different sound changes:

PSV *a-met(ay)et 'to fear (v.i.), be afraid'

Sye  emetet
Ura  emetet
Anj  emtay

POc *ma-takut, PNCV *mataku.

PSV *a-mita-qi 'to fear (v.t.), be afraid of'

Sye  emitogii
Anj  emitaa-n

POc *ma-takut, PNCV *mataku.

7.3 Locution

PSV *a-nwiw-i 'say, identify'

Sye  enwi  'say, tell'
Anj  anev  'identify'

anvi  'to name'
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PSV *a-sai(n) ‘ask (for)’

Sye  esen  ‘ask for’
SWT  haio
    aiahua (Nəvai dialect)
Kwm  esi  ‘request, ask for (substantial gift)’
Anj  aho/θa-ŋ

May possibly be related to POc, PNCV *usi.

PSV *a-tam[(c,s,j)i] ‘to answer, reply’

Sye  tamsi
Ura  tamsi
Wsn  atam
Len  aram∗

Possibly PNCV *tαRam[anJi] ‘allow, accept, agree’; cf. PEOc *tαRama, *tαRa-mi
‘answer call’.

PSV *a-s(b,v)i- ‘count’

Sye  ephi
Ura  isbi
NTn  afi-in
Wsn  afi-in
Len  avhín [= avhi-in]
SWT  avhe-kən
Kwm  avsi-ni
Anj  isvi-i

PNCV *eve ? Metathesis of *s and the labial in Tanna?

PSV *a-ca(k,g) ‘cry, call out’

NTn  asək  ‘cry’
Wsn  asək  ‘cry’
Len  asək  ‘make a sound, (animal) call’
SWT  asək  ‘cry’
Kwm  asək  ‘make a sound, (animal) call’

PNCV *oso ?

PSV *auni-auni ‘call out’

NTn  aun-in
Wsn  aun-i
Len  aun-in
Kwm  ak∗a-in
Anj  auñawoŋ
PSV *(a)-tangi ‘weep, cry’
   Sye  toni  ‘cry for’
   Ura  ereŋ
   Anj  taŋ
POc *tangis, PNCV *tangi-si.

PSV *a-l(i,e)(s,j) ‘laugh’
   NTn  alah
   Wsn  alah
   Len  ølhielh
   SWT  aalh
   Kwm  aras
   PNCV *uru ?

PSV *a-v(u)(s,j)aki ‘pray’
   Sye  owwaki
   Ura  ofwaki
   Len  ahuaak
   Kwm  afaki

PSV *a-səra(by)an ‘snore, grunt’
   Sye  somponj
   Ura  aban
   Len  asierap
   Anj  aθrahan  ‘(pig) grunt loudly’
POc *siwa ? PNCV *soro-vi ‘snort, grunt (at)’.

PSV *a-vaseli(p) ‘to whistle’
   Sye  savel [metathesis?]
   Ura  afel [metathesis?]
   Len  aθhol
   Kwm  averhap
   Anj  aθetej

PSV *a-gal(i,e) ‘tease’
   Anj  imy-akijkij
PNCV *kale ‘tease, joke, deceive’.

Two exclamations can also be reconstructed:

PSV *i(t,d)a ‘OK, goodbye’
   Sye  ita, inta
   Ura  ita
   Len  ita  + ‘already’
   Kwm  ita
PSV *ga(i) ‘is that so?’
   Sye       kai
   Anj       ka

8 Human and animal physical activity
8.1 Food gathering and preparation

   Gardening terms which can be reconstructed include the following:

PSV *a-su(m,m"w) ‘to garden’
   NTn       asum
   Wsn       asum
   Len       asum*
   SWT       asim (Navai dialect esum")
   Kwm       asiim, amhu
   POC *quma ‘garden (n.)’, PNCV *qum*a.

PSV *a-yali(-i) ‘dig’
   Sye       oyol [v.i], oyli [v.t] (i.e. underlying oy{l})
   Ura       oyli
   NTn       il
   Wsn       el
   Len       il
   SWT       kal
   Kwm       eri
   Anj       ayji-i
   POC *kali, *keli, PNCV *keli, *kili.

PSV *-rovo(c,j) ‘clear undergrowth’
   Sye       rovoh, orovoh
   Anj       awo-rohos

PSV *a-(r)uw-i ‘to plant’
   Sye       owi
   Ura       owi
   Kwm       ruk"i ‘plant (seed)’
   PNCV *ruvi.

PSV *a-vwi(-i) ‘to water, pour water on’
   Sye       avwi ‘wet, pour water over’
   Len       vi
   SWT       vi-pen
   Kwm       vi
   Anj       ahwi-i ‘water (plants)’
   PEOC *vuRi, PNCV *vui.
The next set of reconstructions consists of terms to do with sailing, fishing and hunting.

**PSV** *a-valus* ‘to paddle’
- **Anj** aheleθ
- **POc** *paluca, PNCV* *valuse.*

**PSV** *ias* ‘bail (water)’
- **Len** os-n/ies
- **Kwm** ias
- **Anj** iaθ
- **POc** *asu, PNCV* *asu-vi, *rasu. I am unable to explain the initial *i in the PSV form.

**PSV** *a-vanəd* ‘forage on reef’
- **Anj** ahanəj
- **POc** *panəda, PNCV* *vanəda.*

**PSV** *a-clua* ‘torch; make a torch’
- **Sye** ilwo ‘make a torch’
- **NTn** asia ‘make a torch’
- **Len** asia ‘make a torch’
- **Kwm** nouasia ‘torch’
- **POc** *suluq, PNCV* *sulu.*

**PSV** *a-sua-i* ‘to spear’
- **Sye** sei
- **Ura** ai
- **Anj** aθwu-i
- **POc** *sua.*

**PSV** *nə-(p,b)Vyanı* ‘bait’
- **Len** napıen
- **Kwm** nɔpiien
- **Anj** nepyanı
- **POc** *bani, *bayan, PNCV* *bea. In Appendix IV I suggest the POc reconstruction *bayani.*

Note that the PSV term *(a)-kil-i* ‘hook (n. and v.), fish-hook’ is listed in §6.2.

There is also a number of terms concerned with food preparation which can be reconstructed for PSV:
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PSV *a-y(s,j)omi(nJ 'to husk (coconuts)'
Sye ehmin
Anj ayhem
POc *kojom[-i], PNCV *koso-mi. Note Anj h occasionally < *s.

PSV *a-ras-i 'scrape, grate'
Sye orei
Ura elei
Kwm arasi
POc *(r,R)asik, PNCV *rasa. Cf. *a-(k,y)ris 'scrape', *a-gris 'scratch'.

PSV *a-reno-i 'singe, dry over a fire'
Sye orogi 'singe on a fire, heat over fire to dry'
Kwm arøgi 'singe, burn (hair off pig), warm, dry by fire'
POC *rana 'roast over fire, singe'.

PSV *a-vis(a)q-i 'squeeze (liquid from)'
Sye aveh [v.i.], avsi [v.t.]
Ura avis [v.i.], avsi [v.t.]
NTn evnr
Wsn avnr
Len avet
SWT avet/etlakən
POC *pisa, *pipo(t) ?

PSV *a-t(u)nu-i 'draw or collect water'
Len aru nu (nu = 'water')
Anj atho-i
POC *qutup, PNCV *qutu-vi.

And note also PSV *na-(n,j)o(t.c) 'sheath of coconut leaf, used as kava-strainer' in §4.2.

Reconstructed terms for cooking include:

PSV*a-cor 'remove hot stones from fire'
Sye sor/vat
Ura sor/vat
Len asul

PSV *a-tVn-i 'cook'
Sye etni 'cook, burn, boil, heat'
Ura ehni
Anj itiñ 'put hot stones on leaves in earth oven'

POC, PNCV *tunu.
PSV *a-uavu 'burn (v.i.), cooked'
    Sye   au    'cooked'
    NTn   auop  'burn'
    Wsn   uou   'burn'
    Len   auou  'burn'
    SWT   uok*  'burn'
    Kwm   auak* 'burn'

PSV *a-van 'burn (v.t.), roast, cook'
    NTn   van   'roast'
    Wsn   vaan  'roast'
    Len   vaan  'burn, roast, cook over open fire'
    SWT   vaan  'roast'
    Kwm   van-i 'cook (boil, roast, broil)'
               avan  'cook (except in earth-oven)'
    Anj    ahen  'roast'
               yap"-ahan 'cook, roast'

PNCV *vani.

PSV *(a)-tovom 'cook'
    Sye   tovom  'cook food'
    Anj   atho   'cook in oven'

    Two other terms in this general semantic category are:

PSV *a-(ya)bWa(c) '(food) be cooked, ready'
    NTn   aba    
    Wsn   ap"a   
    SWT   ap"a   
    Kwm   afa    
    Anj    yap" 

    Final *c would account for *b" > Kwm.f.

PSV *a-las '(food) be left over'
    Anj    eleθ   'be left over after equal division or distribution of food'

PNCV *malazi 'mouldy, leftover food'.

8.2 Eating and drinking

PSV *a-v(a,e)ηan(-i) 'eat (v.i.)'
    Sye   vanη  avηoni  'feed'
    Ura   even  
    NTn   aŋuən  
    Wsn   aŋuən  
    Len   aŋuən  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>ṣọṇịan</td>
<td>'eat'</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>aveniịn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>[v.i.]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ọnọha</td>
<td>[v.t., pl. obj.]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>ọma, PNCV *vọna- 'feed'.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSV *(a)-yi'ani 'eat (v.t.)'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>eni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>eni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>ọkọ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>ọan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>ani</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>ọyị</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc, PNCV</td>
<td>*kan.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSV *a-yac(-i) 'bite'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>ọkas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>ọyas, ayes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*karat, PNCV *karat-i.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSV *a-mai 'chew'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>emai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>amai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>amai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>amai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*mamaq, PNCV *mama-qi 'chew food for baby'.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSV *a-m"uni(m,m") 'drink'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>ọmon/ki</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>omni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>anọm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>amnọm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>amnuunu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>ọm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>amunu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>am*ọn</td>
<td>[v.i.]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>am*ńi-i</td>
<td>[v.t.]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*inum, PNCV *muni, *uni.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proto Southern Vanuatu lexical reconstructions**

PSV *a-s(u)mu-i* 'suck'

Anj aθmɔi

PNCV *zimi* 'suck', *zumi* 'kiss'. Len əm, Kwm tum‘i ‘suck on, savor’ suggest initial PTn *d.

PSV *a-gum*‘-i ‘put or hold in mouth, suck (on)’

Sye aŋkmi ‘suck'
Ura aŋmu ‘suck'
Len akum‘ ‘hold s.t. in the mouth'
Kwm ak‘m‘i ‘suck on, savor, keep in one's mouth'
Anj akum‘ ‘put in the mouth'

POc *komu, PNCV *gogo-mi.*

PSV *a-lVcik* ‘slurp, suck’

Sye alsik ‘slurp while chewing sugarcane to keep the juice in one's mouth'
Anj liθa- ‘possessive marker for nouns referring to things from which the juice is sucked'

PSV *a-(m*a)sis* ‘suck, feed at breast’

NTn əm‘ah
Wsn əm‘ah
Len am‘ha
SWT am‘ha
Kwm amas
Anj eθeθ
POc, PNCV *susu. Cf. *na-si-, *na-sis* 'breast, milk'.

PSV *a-(t,d)Vŋol-i* ‘to swallow’

Sye etŋcoli
Ura əŋje1
NTn əŋje
Wsn arŋa1
Len əŋjai
SWT əŋjai
Kwm atəŋai
Anj atəŋ, etəŋ

POc *tono, *tolo, PNCV *dolo-mi, *dono-mi. Erromangan languages suggest a root *tVŋol; Tanna languages suggest *dVŋai, with unexpl. loss of *l; Anejoffi may have metathesised this form, since the Anj forms suggest *tVŋol. In all cases, PSV has η where POc and PNCV have *n.
8.3 Excretion, illness, sexual activity, etc.

There are two reconstructed verbs with the meaning ‘urinate’; the second may have been transitive (with the suffix *-i), though there is no suffix in the modern languages.

PSV *a-mi ‘urinate’
Sye evl/ami
Ura evil/me
NTn am
Wsn ami
Len ami
SWT aam, ami
Kwm ami
Anj ami-i
POc *mimiR, PNCV *meme-re.

PSV *a-mia(m)riri ‘urinate’
Wsn amialili
Len amiamii
SWT amialil
POc *mimiR, PNCV *meme-re.
Similarly, there are also two reconstructions with the meaning 'defecate'. The first clearly derives from POc *pekas; although the second does not derive clearly from *pekas, there are phonological similarities:

**PSV ** *a-veyas* 'defecate'
- Sye  evyah
- Ura  ivek
- Len  avhe
- SWT  ovkaa
- POc *pekas.

**PSV ** *a-viqVs* 'defecate'
- NTn aier
- Wsn avier
- Len aviet
- Kwm ovviaha
- Anj ayiθ

Other verbs in the general area of expelling effluvia include:

**PSV ** *a-(si)sil* 'fart'
- Sye asis
- Ura asis
- Kwm asi
- Anj aθel
- POc *zii, PNCV *sii or *siRi.

**PSV ** *a-suaj / *a-suai* 'spit'
- Anj aθua
- POc *supa* 'spittle'.

**PSV ** *aqnVsi / *aqnVsi* 'spit'
- NTn aŋah
- Wsn aŋah
- Len aŋh
- Anj elw-angeθ [v.i.; cf. elwa 'vomit']
- aŋθe-i [v.t.]
- POc *qanusi.

**PSV ** *a-m"a(1,c)ua* 'sneeze'
- Sye amiswo
- Ura amiswa
- Len am"ia
- Kwm am"eta
- POc *(m,m")atue, PNCV *m"atue or *m"atuya.
There are a number of terms related to illness of some kind or another:

**PSV ** *a-misa* 'be sick, in pain'
- Wsn: amha
- Len: amha
- SWT: amha
- Kwm: amisa
- Anj: emθa

POC *masakit*, PNCV *masaki*. Cf. Sye, Ura amarat, which may show irregular development of the *s in *masakit.*

**PSV ** *a-mada/ ʃ ‘bleed’**
- Sye: omnre
- Len: emta
- Kwm: meta
- Anj: ja

PNCV *madaRa*; cf. POC *draRaq, PSV *nə-da-, *nə-da(q,V)* ‘blood’.

**PSV ** *a-luaq* ‘vomit’
- Sye: elwo [v.i.]
  - elwoʃi [v.t.]
- Ura: elwa [v.i.]
  - elwoʃi [v.t.]
- NTn: eoa
- Wsn: eua
- Len: eua
- SWT: lua
- Anj: alou

POC *luaq, PNCV *lua.*

**PSV ** *a-mav* ‘heal, be healed’
- Wsn: amǝv
- Len: amǝv
- SWT: amǝv
- Kwm: amǝv
- Anj: mah

POC *mapo, PNCV *mavo.* Unexpl. loss of *v in Kwm; unexpl. retention of *v in Anj.

Three verbs to do with sexual activity and its consequences are listed below; the first two are phonologically very similar, and may have a common origin.

**PSV ** *a-ivi(cj)* ‘copulate’
- Sye: evis
- Anj: iiihis
PSV*a-ic-i 'copulate'
  Sye  isi
  NTn  es
  Wsn  es
  Len  es
  SWT  eis
  Kwm  eh-i

PSV *a-cian[an] 'be pregnant'
  Sye  ehyan
  Ura  asyan
  Len  sinøn
  PNCV *tiana.

8.4 Motion and posture

The first set of verbs in this section refer to motion of one kind or another.

PSV *va 'come, go'
  Sye  ve  ‘go, arrive’
  Ura  va  ‘go’
  NTn  va  ‘come’
  Wsn  va  ‘come’
  Len  va  ‘come’
  SWT  ua  ‘come’
  Kwm  (V)ve/he  ‘come’
  Anj  ha/m  ‘come’
  PNCV *vaa ‘go’.

PSV *van 'go'
  Ntn  vøn
  Wsn  vøn
  Len  vøn
  SWT  vøn
  Kwm  vøn
  Anj  han
  POc *pano, PNCV *vano.

PSV*a-(v,p)an 'go, walk'
  Sye  avan  ‘walk’
  Len  avøn
  SWT  avøn
  Kwm  avøn, uvøn, evøn
  Anj  apan
  POc *pano, PNCV *vano.
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PSV *a-c(i,o)kon 'walk w. a stick'
- NTn  askən
- Wsn  askən
- Len  askən
- SWT  askən
- Anj  isey

POC *tokon, PNCV *tiko. Possibility of some borrowing between Tanna languages.

PSV *aliuok 'walk, walk about'
- NTn  aliuok
- Wsn  aliuok
- Len  aliuok
- SWT  eliuok
- PNCV *ali.

PSV *a-(k,g)Vl 'climb'
- Len  akilkil 'climb hand over hand'
- POC *kalo, PNCV *galo.

PSV *a-sa(k,y) 'rise, go up'
- Sye  say 'go up, go upstream, (tide) rise'
- Len  ahak '(sun) have already risen'
- SWT  hak/ta 'upwards'
- Kwm  aka/hāk '(sun) rise, (day) dawn'
- POC, PNCV *sake.

PSV *a-sa(u,v) 'go down'
- Len  la/hau 'down'
- SWT  -ie/hou 'downwards'
- Anj  aθe 'go down, go west'
- POC *sipo, PNCV *sivo. Note also Sye yep, Ura ip 'go down'; Len -hiaav 'downwards, north'.

PSV *a-(su)m̩ule 'return'
- Anj  aθum̩ojoj
- POC, PNCV *mule.

PSV *a-ray 'creep, crawl'
- Sye  n’arayaray 'k.o. ground plant (Cupaniopsis leptobotrys)'
- Anj  arayar
- PEOC *kaRaka 'climb', PNCV *karaka 'climb, crawl'. Cf. also Kwm erko (unexpl. k).
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PSV *a-rua(y)i 'go astray'
  Kwm aruei 'go astray, lose one’s way, walk off a trail'
PNCV *tua-ki ‘leave (s.t.), go away’.

PSV *(a,i)viy 'to fly'
  Ntn iiŋ
  Wsn iviŋ
  Len ivsk
  SWT iva ‘fly, jump’
  Kwm iva
  Anj ae

POc *Ropok; PNCV *rovo ‘run, flow, jump, fly’.

PSV *a-\[ Jb”u ‘to dance’
  Sye empyu
  Ura emyu
  Len ausap*uk (of men only)
  SWT orpu (Nāvai dial.)
  Kwm orupu

Cf. also Anj aurupu, possibly a loan from Kwm.

PSV *sui ‘follow’
  Kwm sui ‘chase, run after, follow, occur as consequence of’

POc *suRi, PNCV *usuri ‘follow (along)’.

PSV *tasi ‘slip, slide’
  Kwm resi ‘slide along or against, slip into’

PNCV *tasa ‘slip’.

The remaining reconstructions in this section are verbs of posture.

PSV *a-men ‘stay’
  Sye n/amen ‘crumbs, small pieced, residue’
  Anj amen
  POc *mono.

PSV *a-toy ‘sit, stay, live at, be at’
  Sye ete ‘stay, live, be’
  Ura era ‘stay, live’
  Ntn atŋ ‘live, dwell’
  Wsn atŋ ‘live, dwell’
  Len arak ‘live, dwell, be in a place, be engaged in an activity’
  SWT ala ‘live, dwell’
  Kwm ara ‘live, stay at, exist at’
  Anj atey ‘sit’
  etey ‘be, exist; (inanimate) stay’

POc *toka, PNCV *toka, *toko.
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PSV *a-ili ‘stand (up)’
LEN a’il
ANJ aji [animate subject]
iji [inanimate subject]

PSV *a-tu(u)r ‘stand’
SYE etur  ‘stand, step on’
URA wade
NTN atul
WSN etuul
SWT alel
KW M arér  ‘stand (on)’
POC *tuqur, PNCV *tu-ra.

PSV *a-vub’an ‘be in front’
NTN aub’en
WSN aup’en
LEN aup’en
SWT ok’up’en
KW M kup’en
ANJ uhu’p
cf. also SYE mampum, URA mabum ‘beforehand, earlier’.

PSV *a-(m*a)bus ‘to rest’
KWM apus
ANJ atu/m*ap
PNCV *mabu-si ‘breathe deeply, rest’.

PSV *botbot(et) ‘near, close (to)’
SYE potpot
URA burbut
ANJ upopotet

PSV *a-vtit ‘meet’
SYE evtit
URA evtit
ANJ ettet
note: ANJ ettet < earlier ehet.

PSV *sua(q) ‘meet’
LEN hua-funən  ‘meet or gather together, assemble’ [cf. afunən
all at once’]
POC, PNCV *sua ‘meet, encounter’.
8.5 Weaving, sewing, etc.

PSV *a-ivi-i 'weave, plait'

Sye evi
Ura ivi, ibi
Anj aihi-i 'begin to plait (mat)'
POc *piri, PNCV *viri?

PSV *a-vus-i 'weave, plait'

NTn ouh
Wsn ouh
Len owh
SWT k^uh
Kwm kusi
Anj ahoθ
POc *paus-i 'bind, lash, construct by tying together', PNCV *vau-si.

PSV *a-li(s,j)a-i 'to sew, string, braid'

Sye eleh 'braid (rope), plait (hair)'
NTn əlh 'sew, string'
Wsn əlhi 'sew, string'
SWT lhi 'sew'
Anj ejhei 'sew, string'

The next two verbs are phonologically quite similar, and there may be some connection between them:

PSV *a-tVr-i 'to sew, string, braid'

Sye etri 'pierce, sew'
Ura ehli 'pierce, stick into'
Len ələl 'braid'
SWT ələl 'braid'
Anj ete 'string (fish)'
POc *tuRi, PNCV *turu.

PSV *a-(t,d)il-i 'to sew, string, braid'

Wsn ətel 'braid'
Len til 'sew, string, put on a string'
SWT til 'string (fish)'
Kwm atiri 'sew, weave, string beads, shuffle'
Anj atij 'braid rope'
8.6 Cutting, splitting, etc.

PSV *a-tam* 'cut'
Anj atam’oθ
PNCV *taRa-qi *cut, chop’ + *masi ‘knife, cut’?

PSV *a-kic-i ‘cut, saw’
Len kṣ ‘saw’
akṣ ‘cut (hair)’
Kwm kīh ‘pick, cut, hew’
skīh ‘shave, cut up, dice’
Anj ayse-i ‘cut w. sawing motion’
POC, PNCV *koti?*

PSV *a-tai ‘cut, slice’
Sye etai ‘cut out, excise; write’
Ura arai ‘write’
NTn ete ‘cut’
Wsn sīe ‘cut’
Len arai ‘cut’
SWT sū ‘cut’
Kwm arai ‘cut, slice’
Anj atai ‘slice, cut without raising knife’
PNCV *taRaq-i, PNCV *taRa-qi ‘cut, chop’.

PSV *a-ta(d)v(i,u)-i ‘cut off’
Sye tanvi ‘remove foreskin’
Ura tanvu ‘cut (s.t. off s.t. else)’
Len arou ‘cut into strips’
Anj athi ‘cut into strips’

Possibly from POC *tapa ‘cut lengthwise’, or maybe *tepe ‘slice flesh, circumcise’;
PNCV *teve ‘cut, circumcise’.

PSV *a-vV(t,c)ak ‘split, break off’
Len oti ‘divide, separate, cut up, sort out, allot tasks’,
Kwm svṣ ‘snap off, break off’.
Anj ahtak/wai ‘split wood’
POC *potak ‘crack open, split open’, PNCV *vota ‘divide, break’.

PSV *a-taji ‘sharpen’
Sye tesi ‘to chip’
Ura tesi
Anj ates ‘to chip’
POC *tajim.'
PSV *a-va(ya)-i ‘sharpen’
  Kwm  avai  ‘hone, sharpen, grind down’
PNCV *vakali.

PSV *a-gris ‘scratch’
  Anj  akreθ  ‘scratch (a person)’
  POC *karis, PNCV *garu; and see next item. Cf. PSV *a-ras-i ‘grate, scrape’. Note also NTn aak, Wsn Len SWT aki, Kwm ɔki.

PSV *a-(k,y)ris ‘scrape’
  Anj  ayreθ
  POC *karis, PNCV *karo-si; and see previous item. Cf. PSV *a-ras-i ‘grate, scrape’.

8.7 Forceful impact: hitting, breaking, etc.

PSV *a-tka-i ‘hit’
  Sye  atki  ‘bang, knock’
  Ura  aryi  ‘knock, tap on’
  Anj  atyei  ‘hit, punch, fight, hammer +’
        etyei  ‘feel, touch’
  POC *tuk-i, *tutuk ‘pound, hammer +’, PNCV *tutu-ki ‘pound, hammer, hit w. fist’.

PSV *a-tu-i ‘hit’
  Wsn  øti
  Len  øru
  Kwm  øru-i
  POC *atu, PNCV *qatu. Cf. also NTn øhd.

PSV *a-tu(p”,b”)-i ‘hit’
  SWT  arap (Nɔvai dialect)
  Kwm  drup”i  ‘clap, applaud, pat’
PNCV *tib”a.

PSV *a-(u,w)Vs ‘hit’
  Wsn  uh
  Len  ho
  SWT  uh
  Kwm  os-i
  Anj  awoθ

PSV *a-vo(y) ‘hit’
  Kwm  eva  ‘hit, sock, fight’
PNCV *voka ‘attack’.
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PSV *γονατ 'pinch’
  Wsn γονατ
  Len κανατ

POc *κινιτ(η,π), PNCV *κινιτ-ι. If this reflects the POc form, then there has been an unexpected development in the final consonant.

PSV *α-κι ‘poke, touch w. finger’
  Len εκ 'touch w. finger'
  Kwm ακι 'push down, poke down'
  ieki 'touch, nudge, kick'
  Anj ακκ 'poke a hole in the reef when looking for fish'

PNCV *κιζι ? Anj kk unexpl.

PSV *α-(s)α(π*,β*)υ(υα) 'smash'
  Wsn ααιπυ
  Len hapυ 'smash, break, tear down'
  SWT ahipυ
  Kwm รก่าว 'smashed+'

PNCV *բורה. Cf. also Kwm парәs ‘smashed+’.

8.8 Carrying, throwing, taking, etc.

PSV *α-κυɾια ‘carry on pole or shoulder’
  Sye surie 'tie pig by legs to a pole so it can be carried by two people'
  Ura ehurya/ru 'carry on ends of pole slung over shoulder'
  Len esurye 'carry on shoulder'
  Kwm asulie 'carry on stick over shoulder'
  Kwm asoria 'carry by hanging on an elongated object, carry on a pole or a finger'

PNCV *סובה or *זולה. Cf. also Anjاهלוי-י ‘carry on shoulder’.

PSV *lʊ(כ,ג)υ(ν) ‘carry under arms’
  Len לתכון + ‘fold the arms’
  Kwm รกועון

POc *לוגו, PNCV *לגו.

PSV *α-γα(υ) ‘throw to make fly or spin’
  Sye ayau 'throw ntит [sharpened stick used in a game] so that it misses the ground before flying'
  Anj ʔya ‘throw s.t. to spin through the air’
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**8.9 Fastening and unfastening**

**PSV */le*(ν) 'take'**

- **Anj** le 'take (sg. subject)'
- **POc */alap* 'take', **PNCV */lavi* 'carry, take'.

**PSV */ə-vnak* 'steal'**

- **Wsn** əvnak
- **Len** əvnak
- **POc */panako*, **PNCV */vanako*. 

**PSV */(a)-tava-* 'discard, lose'**

- **Sye** tavo-ŋi
- **Anj** etha-ŋ

**PSV */a-itit* 'tie knot'**

- **Sye** eiti
- **Ura** iri
- **Anj** ititi [geminate medial t unexpl.]

**PSV */a-liy(e,i)c-i* 'tie up, hang'**

- **Sye** elki
- **Ura** elei
- **NTn** əliis
- **Len** əliis
- **SWT** əlks
- **Kwm** arihi, rihi
- **Anj** ajye-i
- **POc */liko(s?)* 'hang', **PNCV */liko-iti* 'tie up, tether, strangle, hang'.

**PSV */a-vis[vis]-i* 'fasten; tight'**

- **Sye** -avsisvi
- **Anj** ahiθ

**PSV */a-(t,d)o(u,v)Vt-i* 'wear a belt, tie a lavalava'**

- **Sye** etouti
- **NTn** etoutin
- **Len** atovat
- **SWT** etout

- **netouti** 'belt, loincloth'
- **NTn** etoutin
- **Len** atovat
- **SWT** etout

- **'wear a belt, wear around the waist'**
- **'tie a lavalava'**
- **'put on clothing by wrapping it around self'**
- **'belt'**
- **'tie or wear a lavalava'**
8.10 Setting down, covering, burying

The first set of verbs in this section are verbs of putting or setting down.

**PSV** *(a,v)lasu* 'put down, set down'

- **Sye** alei  'lie down'
- **Ura** ahlei  'lie down'
- **NTn** ələhu
- **Wsn** ələhu
- **Len** aləhau
- **SWT** əlu
- **Kwm** kure
- **Anj** aleθ  'lay out on the ground'

**POc** *polas, PNCY* *vola-si* 'spread (mat)'

**PSV** *(i, u)-liji-i* ‘put, leave’

- **Anj** ijni-i [pl. subject]

**PNCY** *liji*.

**PSV** *(a, i)-ti-* ‘put down’

- **Sye** eti-hep
- **Ura** ereji
- **Anj** ati-i, ati-i-se

And note also:

**PSV** *(i, u)-bau(ap) ‘deep, down’

- **Sye** ipwap, impwap
- **Ura** buwip
- **Anj** upou
The next three verbs relate to the idea of covering or burying.

**PSV *a-(t,c)uva-i 'bury, cover'**
- Sye  
  - *ehvi*  
  - ‘bury’
- Ura  
  - *isvi*  
  - ‘bury’
- Kwm  
  - *aruk"/afa*  
  - ‘bury, conceal’ (cf. *afafa* ‘hidden’)
  - *aruk"/evur*  
  - ‘submerge, dunk, drown at sea’
- Anj  
  - *athe-i*  
  - ‘cover laplap w. earth’
- POC *tupa ‘lid, cover’:

**PSV *(a)-se(n,y)a-i ‘cover, wear on head’**
- Sye  
  - *seni*  
  - ‘cover’
- Len  
  - *hin*  
  - ‘put up (umbrella), hold (leaf) over head as protection against rain’
- Kwm  
  - *seni*  
  - ‘cover, put over, shelter under, wear (hat)’
- Anj  
  - *aθaŋ*  
  - ‘put on head as protection’
- PNCV *suni ‘carry or wear on head’.

**PSV *(a)-tenum ‘bury’**
- Sye  
  - *eteno*  
  - ‘dive, swim under water’
- Ura  
  - *tenom*  
  - ‘bury’
- NTn  
  - *təm*  
  - ‘dive, swim under water’
- Wsn  
  - *tənom*  
  - ‘bury’
- Len  
  - *renom*  
  - ‘dive, swim under water’
- SWT  
  - *num*  
  - ‘bury’
- Kwm  
  - *num"-i*  
  - ‘bury’
- Anj  
  - *atenom*  
  - ‘bury’
- POC *tanum ‘plant, bury’.

### 8.11 Cleaning, bathing, drying, etc.

**PSV *a-ba(s,j)ali ‘to clean’**
- Sye  
  - *ompal/oni*  
  - ‘repair’
- Ura  
  - *obahli/ni*  
  - ‘repair’
- NTn  
  - *ahbel*  
  - ‘repair’
- Wsn  
  - *afol*  
  - ‘cover, put over, shelter under, wear (hat)’
- Len  
  - *hapol*  
  - ‘cover, put over, shelter under, wear (hat)’
- SWT  
  - *əspiil*  
  - ‘cover, put over, shelter under, wear (hat)’
- Kwm  
  - *apaɾhi*  
  - ‘cover laplap w. earth’
- Anj  
  - *eppeθ*  
  - ‘clean (food)’
PSV *a-ruya ‘swim, bathe (v.i.)’

Sye  oruy
oryai  ‘swim to’

Ura  ele
alyai  ‘swim to’

NTn  aįŋ

Wsn  aįŋ

Len  aık, aiuk

SWT  al

Kwm  aru

Anj  erey

Probably metathesised form of POc *kaRu, PNCV *karu. Paul Geraghty (pers. comm.) notes Lauan Fijian ruku ‘rinse (hair)’, PPN *huku ‘dive’.

PSV *e-tva-i ‘soak (tr.)’

Sye  etvi

Anj  etha-ų

PSV *a-man ‘to float’

Anj  amanaman

POc *maqanur.

PSV *a-teli ‘dry or warm oneself’

Sye  tel/yam  ‘warm self by fire’
etel/ah  ‘dry/warm self in the sun’

Ura  tel/yam  ‘warm self by fire’

Kwm  arei  ‘warm, dry by fire’

Anj  atij/yap”  ‘warm self by fire’
 atij/ŋa  ‘warm self in sun’

PNCV *teli.

PSV *a-iri-iri ‘fan (n. and v.)’

NTn  k-elel [n.]

Wsn  k-eileil [n.]

Len  ilil [v.]
k-ilil [n.]

SWT  k-ilil [n.]

Kwm  ereri [v.]

Anj  ererei [v.]

POc *irip, PNCV *iri-ŋi. Initial k- in the Tanna nouns is an instrumental prefix.

8.12 Other activities

This is a residual set of active verbs which do not fit into the categories above.
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PSV *a-(u,w)ō[(u,w)ō] 'do what?'
   Sye     owo
   Anj     owowo

PSV *a-bulvit(-i) 'stick to, sticky'
   Sye     amplét          'sticky'
   ampleti        'stick to'
   Ura     amlesi         'stick on to'
   Len     ap"iiit        'stick fast to'
   Anj     ap"oI          'stick to'
   POC     *bulut 'stick to, sticky', *bulit 'gum, resin'; PNCV *bulu-ti. Note also Kwm aptap"it 'sticky, gluey, tacky'.

PSV *a-ivu(c,s)jī 'blow'
   Sye     ovośi          'blow (fire)'
   Ura     ovośi          'smoke (cigarette)'
   NTn     ep             '(wind) blow'
   SWT     ek°ek"         '(wind) blow'
   Kwm     ek"i           'blow, move aside, break wind noisily, (wind) blow'
   Anj     aihoi          'blow during incantation'
   POC     *ipu(t), *pusi.

PSV *a-l(a)i[ ] 'blow (v.t.)'
   Sye     elimsi         'blow (instrument)'
   Ura     elumsi         'blow (instrument)'
   Anj     alai           'blow up (balloon+)'

PSV *a-(r)ayu[ ] 'to shade, be shady'
   Sye     orayu          'shelter in shade'
   n-orayu       'shade'
   Anj     aiyu           'be shady'
   n-aiyu        'shade, shadow'
   POC     *nuñu, PNCV *nunu-a 'shadow, image, soul'.

PSV *a-rur 'shake'
   Kwm     erur           'shake, shake down (fruit from tree), fizz'
   POC     *drudru 'shake', PNCV *ruru 'earthquake, to shake'.

PSV *san-i 'show'
   NTn     hanhan
   Wsn     ahanahan
   Len     hinhin
   Kwm     sani
   PNCV    *visa-ni.
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PSV *a-(u)(s,j)əŋ-i ‘wake (s.o.) up’
  Sye  ouyọŋi
  NTn  anŋ-abul (abul = ‘sleep’)
  Wsn  anŋi
  Len  səŋ
  SWT  səŋ

PSV *a-mu(y)av ‘yawn’
  Sye  amwap
  Anj  amuya

PSV *a-vni-i ‘finish’
  Sye  avni  ‘be last’
  ovni  ‘extinguish’
  Ura  avni  ‘last’
  Len  auni-in  ‘finish building a house’
  nauni-in  ‘end, completion’
  Anj  ihi-ni  ‘finish completely’

POc *punuq ‘kill, extinguish’, PNCV *vunu ‘finished, all, full’; cf. PNCV *bunu-qi ‘kill, extinguish’.

PSV *a-(c,sj)a(v,w)ula(s,j)ak ‘turn (v.t.)’
  Sye  savlehaŋ-ŋi  ‘turn right way up’
  Ura  savlasak-ŋi  ‘turn right way up’
  NTn  oulh-in  ‘turn round’
  Wsn  oulhin  ‘turn round’
  Len  vhin (=vhi-in?)  ‘turn (self or s.t.)’
  SWT  oklhe-kan  ‘turn self’
  Kwm  uvsini  ‘turn, turn over, twist’

POc *pulo, *puli, PNCV *vilo-si. Tanna languages show some unexpected developments with regard to *l: NTn and Wsn have l for expected i, while Kwm shows unexplained loss of *l.

PSV *a-yevi ‘pull’
  Sye  yevi
  Ura  yevi
  NTn  i
  Wsn  vi
  Len  vi
  evi  ‘pull out’
  evievi  ‘pull in jerks’
  SWT  vi
  Kwm  vi, evi, əvi
  Anj  ayihi-i
PSV *iŋvs ‘smile’
Len iŋh ‘smile’
POC *ŋiŋis, PNCV *ŋisa. Cf. PSV *na-ŋasV- ‘gums’.

9 States, qualities and attributes

9.1 Colours and brightness

PSV *a-bo(n,ŋ)i ‘black’
NTn abən
Wsn apən
Len apən
SWT apəŋ
Anj apəñ
POC *boŋi. Cf. PSV *na-bo(n,ŋ)i ‘night’.

PSV *a-(ma)la-mataq ‘green, blue’
Sye t/lemte ‘green’
Ura t/lemda ‘green’
NTn amimta ‘green’
Wsn amemta ‘green’
Len amimra ‘blue, green’
SWT amlmla ‘blue, green’
Kwm amsmmsra ‘green, light blue; raw, uncooked’
Anj emelmat ‘blue, green’
POC *mataq, PNCV *mata. Cf. PSV *a-mataq ‘raw, unripe, uncooked’.

PSV *yaŋ ‘yellow’
Sye mel/yeŋ
Ura arum/yəŋ
Anj yaŋ
POC *yaŋo ‘turmeric’, PNCV *aŋo ‘yellow, turmeric’.

PSV *sel(ai) ‘to shine, glow’
Sye selai
Ura selai
Len sel ‘glow’
Kwm ser ‘phosphorescence’

POC *sulu ‘shine light on; set on fire’.
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PSV *i-lar ‘bright’
Sye ilar ‘shine’
Anj la ‘bright’

PSV *a-b"at ‘dark, deaf’
Sye pat ‘(body part) blocked [refers to deafness, constipation, etc.]’
Ura abit ‘shut, close’
Anj ap"at ‘dark, hidden, secret, ignorant, blind, deaf’

PSV *ne-m(ə)a-b"at ‘blind’
Sye nimitap ‘(body part) blocked [refers to deafness, constipation, etc.]’
Anj nemiap"at
Cf. PSV *na-m(ə)a- ‘eye’ + *a-b"at ‘dark’.

9.2 Size and weight

PSV *a-tup\textsuperscript{w}uq ‘grow, swell up’
Sye etpu ‘grow, form; be a glutton’
Ura erpo ‘grow, overeat’
Kwm rupu ‘grow, overeat’
Anj atop‘enlarge, swell up (as from sore)’
POc *tubuq, PNCV *tobu.

PSV *a-(p,b)rav ‘long, tall’
Anj opra ‘tall, (thing, time) long’
PNCV *baravu (POc *(p,b)alapu?).

PSV *a-b"uy(d)am ‘heavy’
Sye ompuy, ompuyntom
NTn abənam
Wsn afənom
Len pkom
SWT p"am
Kwm ap"am
Anj op"oy

PSV *a-(i,r)vuy-a(i,r)vuy ‘light (in weight)’
Sye arvarve
Ura at/arverva
NTn oiioiiiŋ
Wsn oueunŋ
Proto Southern Vanuatu lexical reconstructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>alukaluk</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>eluelua</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>aruvareva</td>
<td>'big, thick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>aheyaheya</td>
<td>'big, large, grand, important, significant, tall'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *a-(m)ac(o,e)li 'big, thick'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>asool</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>asoli</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>asuul</td>
<td>'large in size or number'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>amha</td>
<td>'thick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>asori</td>
<td>'big, large, grand, important, significant, tall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>amesej</td>
<td>'flat object be thick'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *ma-tolu, PNCV *matolu.

PSV *a-re(k,g)ja 'thin'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>arka</td>
<td>'bony, malnourished'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>elek</td>
<td>'very thin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>erek, rek</td>
<td>'animate thin, wasted'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *a-(y)iVŋ 'thin'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>elon</td>
<td>'thin, skinny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>ileŋ</td>
<td>'thin, skinny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>ailŋ</td>
<td>'thin, skinny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>avilŋ</td>
<td>'thin, skinny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>avilŋ</td>
<td>'thin, skinny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>avilŋ</td>
<td>'thin, skinny'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *lau 'long'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>laupe</td>
<td>'long, tall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>lau, laulau</td>
<td>'long (of time)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POC *(m)a]lawa.
9.3 Taste, smell and quality

PSV *a-tolV 'hungry'
   Anj       etele
   POc *pitolon, PNCV *vitolo.

PSV *a-yon(V) ‘bitter, poisonous; drunk, affected by kava’
   Sye  ayan  ‘bitter’
   ayune  ‘begin to feel the effects of kava’
   Len  ajan  ‘sour, bitter’ [η unexpl.; < Whitesands?]
   SWT  nukna  ‘poison (n.)’
   Anj  ayen  ‘poisonous, sour, bitter, salty’
       eyni-i  ‘(kava+) make s.o. drunk’
   POc, PNCV *kona.

PSV *a-(l)mVl(i,u) ‘drunk, affected by kava; crazy, mad’
   Sye  emlu  ‘drunk, affected by kava’
   NTn  almål  ‘crazy, mad’
   Wsn  almali  ‘crazy, mad’
   Len  almål  ‘crazy, mad’
   Kwm  armari  ‘crazy, mad’
   PNCV *maloku ‘kava’ (see also POc *logu ‘bent’).

PSV *a-b(i)eni ‘smell (v.i.)’
   Sye  empen
   Ura  ibin
   NTn  obien
   Wsn  spien
   Len  spien
   SWT  spien
   Kwm  apein
   Anj  epeñ
   POc *bo-, PNCV *bo-ni.

PSV *a-bu[ ] ‘smell (v.i.)’
   Sye  empul
   Ura  ibu
   POc *bo-, PNCV *bo-ni.

PSV *(ε)-sqat ‘bad’
   Sye  sat  ‘badly; problem, trouble’
   Ura  ar-w/at
   NTn  araat
   Wsn  ørah
Len taat
SWT ha
Kwm era/ha, era/has
Anj has
POc *saqat, PNCV *saqa-ti.

PSV *a-hia-hia 'smooth'
Sye asyasye
Ura t/asyasye
Len ehiahia

PSV *mac(ai,ia) 'dry'
SWT nakien mōśia 'dry coconut'
Kwm napui mhiia 'dry/dried out coconut'
Anj mesei
POc *maqati.

PSV *matuy 'slow, slowly'
Sye metuy
Ura metuk
NTn metmetin
Wsn məmətin
Len mərük
SWT malamala
Kwm məru
Cf. PSV *matuy-matuy 'soft, easy'.

PSV *matuy-matuy 'soft, easy'
Len məruk məruk
Kwm məruməru
Cf. PSV *matuy 'slow, slowly'.

PSV *vau 'new'
Sye it-vau 'new, clean'
Ura ar-vau
Len vi
SWT vi
Kwm vi
POc *paqoRu, PNCV *vaqou.

PSV *(a,ə)-m"atət 'rotten'
Wsn amnam"at [n unexpl.]
Len amramər
SWT amərət
Kwm  \textit{marar}  \quad \textit{‘(wood) rotten’}

Anj  \textit{m"ottet}

PNCV *\textit{mada-da}. The Wsn and Len forms appear to show partial reduplication.

PSV *\textit{a(k,y)on} ‘very’

Sye  \textit{w/o\,yon}

Ura  \textit{b\slash y\,yan}

Len  \textit{ak\,en}

Anj  \textit{ayen}

9.4 Temperature

PSV *\textit{a-yab’an} ‘hot, warm’

NTn  \textit{an\,aban}

Len  \textit{akap’an}

SWT  \textit{ap’an}

Kwm  \textit{ap’an}

POc *(\textit{ma})panas.

PSV *\textit{a-malas} ‘be cold’

Len  \textit{m\,hal}

‘have a cold sore’

SWT  \textit{amla}

POc, PNCV *\textit{malaso}.

PSV *\textit{a-(t,d)abod} ‘cold’

Sye  \textit{etpon\,r}

Ura  \textit{urpon}

NTn  \textit{at\,e\,b}

Wsn  \textit{et\,ap}\,u

Len  \textit{ar\,ap}

9.5 Integrity

PSV *\textit{a-(d(o,u)Vn} ‘straight’

Kwm  \textit{atu\,n} \quad \textit{‘verbal adjunct, implies straightening’}

POc *\textit{donu}, PNCV *\textit{tunu}.

PSV *\textit{a-(i)gau} ‘crooked’

Sye  \textit{an\,kau}

Ura  \textit{aga\,u}

Len  \textit{iko, iko\,iko}

SWT  \textit{akou}

‘bend’

Kwm  \textit{ikou}

POc *\textit{logu} ‘bent’; see also PNCV *\textit{maloku} ‘kava’.
Proto Southern Vanuatu lexical reconstructions

PSV *a-mutVs 'broken, separated'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>omite</td>
<td>'break, broken'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>omde</td>
<td>'break, broken'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>ton-mutah</td>
<td>'island'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>ton-mutah</td>
<td>'island'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>mar</td>
<td>'(rope+) broken'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ton-murh</td>
<td>'island'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>m'eres</td>
<td>'(elongated objects) broken, separated'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>am'ot</td>
<td>'(yam vine+) broken because it has dried out'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*mutusi, PNCV *mutu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *tet 'break, broken'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>tet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>tes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *a-vuwar 'full'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>ovwar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>ovwar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>ak'il'iin</td>
<td>'(thing) be full'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>kuar</td>
<td>'full (of liquid)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>ohowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNCV</td>
<td>*vura.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *a-yon 'be caught'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anj</td>
<td>eyen</td>
<td>'be caught (in net, string, web)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNCV</td>
<td>*kona</td>
<td>'caught, tangled'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *a-vini 'be joined'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>avin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNCV</td>
<td>*viniti</td>
<td>'join mat at seam'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSV *a(v,w)aŋ 'be open'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sye</td>
<td>ovaŋ</td>
<td>'open mouth, be agape'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>aigaŋ</td>
<td>'open mouth, be agape'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTn</td>
<td>aŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsn</td>
<td>owaŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>owaŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>ok'angaŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwm</td>
<td>ak'angaŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POc</td>
<td>*(ŋ)awaŋ, PNCV *waŋa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6 Other

PSV *

PSV *i(t,d)o\(\eta\)a(q) 'foreign'
- Sye  \(\text{i}t\nu\jo\)
- Ura  \(\text{t}u\nu\a\)
- Len  \(\text{i}t\nu\a\)
- Kwm  \(\text{i}t\nu\a\)
- Anj  \(\text{i}t\nu\a\)

PPn \(\text{i}t\nu\a\) 'southeast trade wind'; possibly an early Polynesian loan, in which case there would have been no final \(\text{\textasteriskcentered}q\).

PSV *tabur 'sacred, tabu'
- Sye  \(\text{t}o\text{mpor}\)
- Ura  \(\text{d}o\text{bor}\)
- Len  \(\text{h}o\text{-}\text{a}r\text{pul}\) 'put a tabu on'
- Anj  \(\text{i}t\text{ap}^*\)
- POc, PNCV *tabu.

PSV *i-konan 'sacred'
- Kwm  \(\text{i}k\text{onan}\)
- PNCV *kona.

PSV *a-ron[aron] 'be quiet'
- Kwm  \(\text{a}r\text{h}n\text{a}r\text{a}r\text{a}r\text{a}n\) 'denotes stillness'
- PNCV *roro\(\text{g}o\) 'be quiet, pay attention'.

PSV *i-luaq 'outside'
- Len  \(\text{i}\text{lu}a\)
- Kwm  \(\text{i}\text{ru}a\)
- POc *lu\(\text{a}q\), PNCV *lu\(\text{a}\) 'out, away (post verbal)'.

PSV *a-tuai 'long ago'
- Sye  \(\text{e}t\text{wai}\) 'recently'
- \(\text{i}t\text{-}\text{e}t\text{wai}\) 'long time ago'
- Ura  \(\text{a}t\text{-}\text{i}r\text{wai}\) 'long time ago'
- Kwm  \(\text{tui}\) 'old, previous, of the past, ago, long ago'
- Anj  \(\text{i}t\text{u}w\text{u}\) 'long ago'
- PEOc *\(\text{t}u\text{a}\text{R}i\), PNCV *\(\text{t}u\text{ai}\).
Appendix III
English index of Proto Southern Vanuatu reconstructions

1EXC.NONSG.SUBJ *ga-
1INC.NONSG.SUBJ *gV-, *ta-
1SG.SUBJ *iak-
2NONSG.SUBJ *gia-
2SG.SUBJ *ki-, *n(a)-
3NONSG.SUBJ *(k,y)-, *ra-
3SG.SUBJ *t-, *y-

Abelmoschus manihot *na-(v,w)as
Acacia sp. *na-mari(u)
Acalypha sp. *na-yni(u,o)bVs
Aceratium sp. *na-(va)tau
afraid *a-met(ay)et
afraid of *a-mitia-ji
afternoon *na-(a,u)v{ar(a,u)v}
Agathis sp. *na-dVw
algae *(na)-l(i,u)muc
alive *a-mrang(s,j), *e-muru(p,y)
almond *n-apai
Alphitonia zizyphoides *na-bus(Vn)
and
(with clauses) *im, *ka[ ]
(with NPs) *m ~ *im
animate prefix *ia-
answer *a-tam{(c,s,j)i]
ant *kacik, *m*alaq-m*alaq
arm *na-lima-
artery *na-ur

Artocarpus sp. *na-mar
ashes *na-(m)tau
ask (for) *a-sai(n)
aunt (maternal) *ri-cinV-
axe *-pac(V)
back *na-taa-, *(na)-ta(k,y)u-
bad *(v)-sqt
bail (water) *ias
bailer *n-ias
bait *na-(p,b)Vyani
bamboo, bamboo implement *n-au
kind of bamboo *n-au-vat
banana (generic) *na-vuc
kinds of bananas *na-ban,
*na-rivram, *na-tai
banded rail *na-bi(l,r)a(dV,li)
banyan *na-bag(u)
barn owl *na-(IV)smii
Barringtonia edulis *na-velV(c,s,j)
base *boni-
of tail *na-lub*
basket *(na)-(k,y)aiVm, *na-to(p,y)i
bathe (v.i.) *a-ruya
be at *atoy
beach creeper *na-vua(c,s,j)
bear
fruit *a-vuaq
young (animal) *a-vuas-i
bèche-de-mer *(na)-cikavua(c,s)
beneactive preposition *(ka)mi
belly *na-tpu-
belt see *a-(t,d)o(u,v)Vt-i
big *a-lab"at, *a-(ma)c(o,e)li
bird *manuy
Bischofia javanica *na-vayan
bite *a-yac(-i)
bitter *a-yon(V)
black *a-bo(n,lJ)i
bleed *na-mada[ ]
blind *ne-m(ə)ka-b"at
blood *na-da(a)-, *na-da(q,V)
blow *a-ivu(c,sJ)i, *a-l(a)i[ ]
blue *a-(ma)la-mataq
body *na-su(r)V-
bottom *botni-
boundary-marker *n-ar
braid (v.) *a-li(sJ)ka-i, *a-(t,d)il-i, *a-tVr-i
brain *na-(v)utoy
branch *na-ra-, *na-raJV-
breadfruit (generic) *na-mar
kinds of breadfruit *na-mar-ab(ia,ai), *na-mar-uViq
break *tet
of day *ran(i)
breakoff *a-IVt(c,k)ak
breast *na-si-, *na-sis
Breynia sp. *na-m"li
bright *i-lar
broken *a-mutVs
brother
of man, older *(p"i)avV-, *-tua-
of man, younger *(na)-tasi-
of woman *na-m"ane-
bunch *na-navo-
burao *na-vau
Burckella obovata *na-yatuq
burn
(v.i.) *a-uavu
(v.t.) *a-van
bury *(a)-tenum, *a-(t,c)uva-i
buttocks *botni-
call out *a-ca(k,g), *auni-auni
calm *na-nibar(ata)
Calophyllum sp. *(na)-(p,b)ayur
Cananga odorata? *na-tVnlri
Canarium sp. *n-naJai
cane in river *n-i(u,w)au
canoe *na-layau
Carica papaya *neC[ ]
carry
on pole/shoulder *a-curia
underarms *lu(k,g)uV
Casuarina sp. (equisetifolia?) *na-yar
cought (as in net) *a-yon
causative prefix *(a)(v)a-
cause preposition *wa-ni
Charonia tritonis *na-tavu(r,i)(a)
chew *a-mai
chief *(n,i)-at-manuy
child *naJui-, *na-v(u)alawV
chin *na-(k,g)u(mu,m"V)-
citrus *ne-molis
clean (v.) *a-ba(sJ)ali
clear undergrowth *-rovo(cJ)
climb *a-(k,g)Vl
close (= near), close to *botbot(et)
close transitive suffix *-i
cloth, clothes *na-ma(cJ)
cloud *na-b"at, *na-yan(p,b)(u)
cockroach *na-vine(q)
coconut (generic) *na-yani
young, for drinking *na-(u)cilop
coconut fruit bud *i-ab"aj
coconut-shell *na-(vu)(p,b)ilo
Codiaeum variegatum *na-lab"ut
cold *na-malas, *a-(t,d)abod
collect water *a-(t,u)vu-i
Colocasia esculenta *na-taV

come *va
conch shell *na-tauvi(r,i)(a)

concurrent tense-aspect *ak=

container *ns(vu)(p,b)ilo
continuous aspect *am=

cook *a-tovom, *a-tVn-i, *a-van
cooked *a-uavu, *a-(ya)b"a(c)
copulate *a-ic-i, *a-ivici(c,j)
coral *na-laj
Cordyline sp. *na-ravus

count *a-s(b,v)i-

cover (v.) *(a)-se(n,1)iJ-i, *(a-t,c)uva-i
crab varieties *-gut(V), *(a)yavilas,

*i-o-yara(u,v), *(n-rak,ryum,

*n-un"a(n,n), *tupa[ ]
crawl *a-yray
crayfish *na-liwa[ni]-tasiy
crazy *a-(l)mV(i,u)
creep *a-yray
crooked *a-(i)gau
crotch *na-msanj, *(s,t)ap"aJet(e,i)-
croton *na-lab"ut
cry *a-ca(k,g), *(a)-taJi
cut *a-kic-i, *a-tai, *a-tam"as
cut off *a-ta(d)v(i,u)-i
cycad, Cycas circinnalis *na-m"e(o,o)le
cyclone *a-vayu[ ], *na-vayu[ ]

dance

(n.) *na-b"uyan

(v.) *a-[ ]b"uyu
dark *a-b"at
dative preposition *(k)ami
daughter *nau-
day, daylight *ran(i), *na-ran(i)
dead *(e)-mac
def *a-b"at
dee p *(i,u)-bau(ap)
defecate *a-veyas, *a-viqVs

Dendrocnide sp. *n-alyat
dew *a-nVm"ani, *na-nVm"ani
die *(e)-mac
dig *a-yali(-i)
Dillenia biflora *na-d(yo,o,ul)
Diodon hystrix *(na)-b"yai
Dioscorea sp. *n-uv
dirt *na-sag
discard *(a)-tava-
distant directional *-ban
(distant) past tense-aspect *(a)m"an=
do what? *a-(u,w)o((u,w)o)
door(way) *na-ta(p,b)ina(c,j)
down *(i,u)-bau(ap)
downwards *-jev

Dracontomelon sp. (vitiensis?)

*na-ray(i)
dragon plum *(n-o-ray(i)
draw water *a-t(u)yu-i
drink *a-m"uni(m,m")
drink possessive marker *na-m"a-
drunk = affected by kava *a-yon(V),

*a-(l)mV(i,u)
dry *mac(ai,ia)
dry oneself *(a)-telI

dry over a fire *a-ron(i)
dual pronominal suffix *-rau
dual subject *[ra]u=

Dysoxylum sp. *na-mtaw[an]

ear *(n-o-tali\text{"a}-
earth *(n-o-mapu(v), *(n-o-tanaq

earth-oven *(n-u(mu,mWa)n
earthquake *(n-o-m"i(y,v)
easy *matuy-matuy
eat *(e)-yani, *(a-v(a,e)\etaan(-i)
echo-subject *m-
eel (freshwater?) *(n-o-vini

Elaeocarpus augustifolia

*na-(s)ju(v,vw)as

Erythrina sp. *na-rap
Euodia sp. *(n-e-(s)tnaJi
evening *(n-a-r(a,u)V\{ar(a,u)V]
excrement *nə-(c,t)i(V,q), *nə-(c,t)i(V)-
Exoecaria agallocha *na-teta(q)
eye *na-m(ə)ta-
part of eye *n-ul-a-m(ə)ta-
face *na-m(ə)ta-
facilitative *lav
fan *a-iri-iri
fart *a-(si)sil
fasten *a-vis(vis)-i
father, father’s brother *e-toma-
fear (v.) *a-met(ay)et, *a-mitita-ŋ
feast (n.) *na-b'uyan
feather *na-(m"a, mu)rai
feed at breast *a-(m"a)sis
female *na-tavine
feminine article? *rV-
fermented breadfruit *na-marai
Ficus sp. *nə-bag(u), *na-bVbas, *na-təŋ
Ficus obloula *na-riviriv
finger *(na)-pisV-
finish *a-vni-i
Finschia cloroxantha *na-igam
fire *na-yab", *nə-ŋam
fish (generic) *namu
unidentified kind of fish *mesen
fish-hook *(a)-kil-i, *na-(k,g)awil
fish-net *na-kup"(e,u)n
five *-lima
Flagellaria sp. *na-b"(io,o)ir
flame *na-luame-, *na-ma-
flatfish *n-ali-ali
flesh *na-vVsayo-
float (v.) *a-man
flow (of water) *a-ras
uncontrollably *ya(r)
flower (n.) *na-vVŋu-, *nə-tal[(c,j)i](c,j)i-a-
fluid *na-si-
fly
(n.) *-lag

(v.) *(a,i)viy, *(k,y)av(V)
(flying-fish) *vənis
(flying-fox) *na-girai
follow *sui
food possessive marker *nə-yə-
foot *na-su(r)V-
footprint *na-m"(i,la)-
forage on reef *a-varəod
forehead *na-(v,b")Vnaya-
foreign *i(t,d)ona(q)
fork *na-msaŋ, *(s,t)ap"aŋ(e,i)-
four *gə-vət, *gə-vət
fowl *na-(d,t)uəq
front, be in *a-vub"an
fruit *na-vuaq
fruit dove *na-bune[ ]
fruit-picker *na-yawVc
full *a-vuar
future tense-aspect *a=, *p(i,u)=
Gallirallus philippensis
*na-bi(l,r)a(dV,li)
Garcinia sp. *(nə)-mab"(o,u)l
garden *a-su(m,m")
Geissois denhamii *na-gVrav
general possessive marker? *sa-
ghost *(n)i-at-mac
ginger *na-li(c,j)ei
give birth (animal) *a-vuas-i
Glochidion sp. *na-mel(p)au
glow *sel(ai)
go *a-(v,p)an, *va, *van
go astray *a-tua(y)i
go down *a-sa(u,v)
go up *a-sa(k,y)
goodbye *i(t,d)a
grandchild *mayub"u-
grandparent *e-t(p,b)u-
grass *na-(p,v)alijiy
grate *ə-ras-i
green *a-(ma)la-mataq
green-snail *na-bəg, *vusani
ground *na-mapu(v), *na-tanaq
grow *a-tup‘uq
grunt *a-sara(b,v)an
gums *na-nasV-

hair – on body *na-(m'a,mu)rai
Halcyon sp. *(na)-siyo(q)
Halfordia kendack *na-yl(u)(c,j)a(m,p)
hand *na-lima-, *na-ranV-
hang *a-liy(e,i)c-i
hawk *na-mal(i,e)
he, she, it *in
head *na-(k,g)ab'a1[ ]
headrest *n-alu'ni
heal, healed *a-mav
hear *a-ranV-i, *a-tou
heart *lolo-
heavy *a-b'uy(d)am

Heliconia sp. *na-mavu(y)
her *
hermit-crab *n-um"a(n,g)
Hibiscus sp. *na-b"al
Hibiscus tiliaceus *na-vau

high tide *a-ruvaruv
his, her, its *-n[i]
hit *a-tka-i, *a-tu-i, *a-tu(p",b")-i, *a-(w,v)Vs, *a-vo(y)
hold in mouth *a-gum"an
hole *na-p"anV-, *na-var(u)a-
Holothuria sp. *(na)-cikavua(c,s)
hook *(a)-kil-i, *na-(k,g)awil
horn *nV-ba(tV,di)-
hot *a-yab"an
house *n-ium"aq
how? be how? *-yu(va)
how many? *ga-vis
human prefix *ia-
hunger *na-(t,v)um"ac
hungry *a-tolV
husk (coconut) (v.) *a-y(s,j)omi(n)
I *iau

identify *a-naw-i
immediate tense-aspect *ak=
incubator bird *na-l(i,e)v
Indian coral tree *na-rap
Indian mulberry *na-(y)ura(t,c)
inland *baqasi
Inocarpus sp. *na-m"ab"
intentional tense-aspect *n(a)=
intermediate demonstrative *na
intestines *na-cin(V)qi-
irrealis tense-aspect *n(a)=, *p(i,u)=
is that so? *ga(i)
it *in
its *-n[i]

Java cedar *na-vayan
joined *a-vin
juice *na-si-

kauri *na-dVw
kava (wild) *lu(b,v)u(b,v)a(m,p")
kava-strainer *na-(n,g)ol(t,c)
kingfisher *(na)-siyo(q)
know *a-(k,y)il-i

Kyphosis sp. *na-vulai-mVb"u

Kyphosis cinerascens *na-vulai

land *na-mapu(v), *na-tanaq
land-crab *na-ra(k,y)um, *tup[ ]
laplap (tuber pudding) *(na)-up"at
laugh *a-(i,e)(s,j)
lawyer-cane *na-b"(io,oi)r
leave *a-lini-i
left hand(ed) *(na)-(m,m")aur
left over, of food *es-las
leg *na-su(r)V-
light (in weight) *a-(i,r)vuy-a(i,r)vuy
lightning *a-bi(t,c), *na-bi(t,c)
listen *(a-ta)va(n)do'l
live at *ato-
liver *-mab"V-
lobster *na-liwa[ni]-tasiy
kind of lobster *na-pmi(vi)
locative prefix *i-, *un-
long *a-(p,b)rav, *lau
long ago *a-tuai
look at/for *e-laqV's
lose *(a)-tava-
louse *na-yut
low tide *(o)-mac(a)
lychee *n3-tawa[ ]

mad *a-(l)mVl(i,u)
maggot *n-ilos(c,j)
Malay apple *na-yaviy
male, man *(n,i)a-tan"ane
mangrove *na-dog(a)q
mat *(na)-de(p,v)a(k,y)au, *n-eba[ ]
me *=iau
meat *na-Vsayo-
meet *a-viti, *su(a)q
megapode, Megapodius freycinet *na-l(i,e)v
Melochia odorata *na-mlav
men's house *i-im"arum
Meryta sp.? *na-vi(t,dr)au
milk *na-si-, *na-sis
month *(n3)-mavuya
moon *(n3)-mavuya
Morinda citrifolia *na-(y)ura(t,c)
mosquito *(n3)-yamuy
moss *(n3)-l(i,u)muc
morning *na-bo(n,η)i-bo(n,η)j
mother, mother's sister *ri-(t,c)inV-
mother's brother *mata-
moul t *a-il
mountain *n3-tavuat
mullet, Mugil sp. *na-yna[ ]
multiple subject prefix *a(va)r-
multiple action prefix *a(va)r-
multiple action *-g(u)
Myristica fatua *na-dani
nakamal *i-im"arum

name *na-qsanV-
Naso sp. *n(3)-yebog
navel *na-bunji-
near *botboi(et)
neck *(n(a)-ua-
negative marker *aci=
Neonauclea forsteri *na-bi(n,η)j
nephew *alw2-
net *na-kup7(e, u)n
nettle tree *n-alyat
new *vau
night *na-bo(n,η)j
nit *na-lisaq
non-singular kin prefix *r(η,u)-
on-singular postclitic *=mi[ ]
nose *na-(s, j)η7
numeral prefix *ga-, *g3-

oblique preposition *(i)ra, *itra-
occlusion *n3-ran(i)
ok *i(i,t)da
one *sV-kai, *t(ai,ia)
open (v.i.) *a(v,w)aŋ
open space *n3-m"asan
opening *na-vur(u)k-
optative tense-aspect *p(i,u)=
or *gua
other side *na-vali-
our.EXC *-mami
our.INC *-da
outtrigger (float) *na-liman(i,e).
*
outwards *-jdaVua
outside *i-luaq

paddle
(n.) *n3-vai(w)ə
(v.) *a-valus
pain, be in *a-misa
pandanus (variety?) *na-via(q)
parrotfish *(na-)magum
passive possessive marker *(i)ra, *ira-
past tense-aspect *(a)m"an=
path *n-alian(i,e)
pawpaw *necef]
peace *na-nibar(ata)
penis *na-valu-, *n-uci-
perceive *a-taV-i, *a-tou
person *(n,i)at, *(n,i)a-tamVmaq
personal article ? *e-
pick (fruit) *a-lat(v)a-i
pig *(na)-bo(k,y)asi
pillow *n-atunji
pinch *yanam
Piper wichmannii *lu(b,v)u(b,v)a(m,p*)
Pipturus sp. *na-(n)lm"ai
Pisonia sp. *na-b(y)ai, *na-(p,b)ia(q)
place (n.) *na-wari-
place possessive marker *ium"a-
plait (v.) *a-ivi, *a-vus-i
plant (v.) *a-(r)uw-i
plug (v.) *(a,i)-sVsfn(i)
plural pronominal suffix -*a(s,c)a, *-at
Poecaceae sp. *na-(v)iuuj, *n-i(u,w)au
poisonous *a-yon(V)
poisonwood *na-yilas
poke *a-ki
Polyscias cissodendron *liwi(c,s,j)
Pometia pinnata *na-tawa[ ]
pool *na-tunji
porcupinefish *(na)-b"yai
pour water on *a-wuwi(-i)
pray *a-v(u)(s,j)aki
pregnant *a-cian[an]
proximate demonstrative *i
proximate directional *baf ]
Pseuderanthemum sp. *na-bel
Ptlinopus sp. *na-bune[ ]
puffer fish *na-bubu(a,e)
pull *a-yevi
pumice *na-uvu(c,s,j)
pus *no-vsar
put *a-liji-i
put down *a-ti-, *a-(vu)lasu
put in mouth *a-gum"i
question-tag *gua
quicksand *na-m(a,i)t
quiet *a-roji(aronj)
rain (n.) *n-usan
(v.) *a-viv
rainbow *matara(n)
rainbow lorikeet *sivori
raincloud *(na)-ya(p,b)(u)
rat *(k,y)asuv
raw *a-mataq
ready, of food *a-(ya)b"a(c)
reef *(na)-mac(a), *(n,m)maloq
reef-bird *(na)-p"an(i,e)
reflection *na-[l,n]umu-
reflexive verb *a-c(p,b)"a
remote transitive suffix *-yini
remove hot stones from fire *a-cor
reply *a-tam[(c,s,j)i]
rest (v.) *a-(m"a)bus
return *a-(su)m"ule
Rhinecanthus sp. *na-su(m",mu)
Rhizophora sp. *na-doga(q)
right hand(ed) *(n,a)-(m,m)mantuv
ripe *a-mdaw, *matuaq
rise *a-sa(k,y)
river *na-wai
road *n-alian(i,e)
roast *a-van
roof *na-luvin(t,r)i-
root *(na)-ya-wa-, *(n,a)-w(a)(k,y)a-
rope *-del, *ne-rauc
rotten *(a,�)-m"amat
rubbish *na-sag
rudderfish *na-vulai, *na-vulai-mVb"u
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sacred *i-konan, *tabor
sail (n.) *n-i(p,v)an
sapling *na-tva-
saw (v.) *a-kic-i
say *a-naw-i
Scaevola sp. *nanas
scale (n.) *na-qa-nivi-
Scaridae *(n-s-)magum
scorpion *navau
scrape *a-(k,y)ris, *a-ras-i
scratch *a-gris
sea *na-tasy
sea almond *na-talis
sea-cucumber *(n-c-)cikauva(c,s)
sea-urchin varieties *na-m^eni, *na-von
see *a-yita-i
seed *na-(p,v)(c,j)e-
Semecarpus sp. (vitiensis?) *na-yilas
separated *a-muVVs
sequential tense-aspect *(e)b"[ ]=
set down *a-(vu)lasu
sew *a-li(s,j)a-i, *a-lVr-i, *a-(t,d)il-i
shade, shady *a-(r)ayu[ ]
shadow *na-[l,n]umu-
shake *a-rur
shark *na-byaw
sharpen *a-taji, *a-va[y]a-i
she *in
sheath of coconut leaf *na-(n,j)o(t,c)
shell (of coconut) *n-o-(vu)(p,b)jilo
shine *a-mar, *(a)-(c,j)a[ ]*sel(ai)
shoot of plant *na-jVli-
show *san-i
sibling older, same sex *(p^i)avV-, *-tua-
younger, same sex *(n-a)-tasi-
sick *a-misa
side *na-vali-
sinew *ne-rauc, *na-ur
singe *a-roy-i
sister of man *na-{va}vine-
of woman, older *(p^i)avV-, *-tua-
of woman, younger *(n-a)-tasi-
sit *atoV
skin (n.) *na-y(u)lic
sky *na-yai, *n-o-m^asan
sleeping place *n-o-m^asan
slice *a-tai
slide *tasi
sling (n.) *na-taliv
slip *tasi
slow, slowly *matuy
slurp *a-lVcik
smash *a-(s,j)a(p"b")u(ra)
smell (v.i.) *p-b(i)eni, *a-bu[ ]
smile *igVs
smoke (n.) *n-as(r)a-
smooth *a-hia-hia
sneeze *a-m^a(t,c)ua
snore *a-sora(b,v)a\]
social group *na-layau
soft *matuy-matuy
son *nau-
sore (n.) *n-o-maya(p"b")
spear (n.) *n-o-(s,j)a\]
(v.) *a-sua-i
spider *makali
spiderweb *ia-t(r)ilwaq, *na-lawaq
spiny puffer *(n-a)-b^yai
spirit *(n,i)-at-mac, *n-o-b^asVs
spit *aqVs-i, *a-sua[ ]
split *a-V(v,t,c)ak
Spondias dulcis *na-vivi(s)
spouse *aswa[ ]
sprouting coconut *na-varaq
squeezed (liquid from) *a-vis(a)q-i
squid *(n,i)a(j)i(i)
stand *a-li, *a-t(u)u
star *m* a(s,j)au	hestay *a-men,* a-toy
steal *e-vnak
steam (n.) *na-sua-
 Sterculia sp. *uosuas
stick to, sticky *a-bulVs-t(i)
stringray *na-var
stomach *na-ru-
stone *na-vatu(q)
straight *a-d(o,u)VN
string (v.) *a-li(s,j)a-i,* a-tVr-i,
*a-(t,d)il-i
suck *a-gum"-i,* a-lVcik,* a-(m"a)sis,
*a-s(u)mu-i
sugarcane *na-tuv
sun *(mata)-(a)(c,j)jal ]
swallow (v.) *a-(t,d)Vqol-i
swamp harrier *na-mal(i,e)
swell up *a-tup"uq
swiftlet *ka(p"b"')V
swim *a-ruya
Syzygium malaccense *na-yaviy
Syzygium sp. *na-m"anu

tabu *tabur
Tahitian chestnut *na-m"ab"
tail *na-bi(k,y)u-
take *le(v)
tall *a-(p,b)rav
tapa *na-ma(c,j)
taro *na-talV
	kind of taro *na-b"et
	wild taro? *na-viqaq
taro-stem *n-as-
taste *a-tVav
tear(s) *n-Vli-m( a)ta-
tease *a-gal(i,e)
temporal prefix *i-
tentacle of octopus *na-yawe-
Terminalia catappa *na-talis
their *nira
them *=ara

they *ira
thick *a-(ma)c(o,e)li
thigh *na-va-
thin *a-re(k,g)a,* a-(v)ilVη
thing *na-t(a)i
three *ga-sili
throw *a-ya(u)
thunder *(k,g)arua(q)ruaq
ti plant *na-rawus
tie
	high *a-ruvaruv

tie
	low *(s)-mac(a)
tie

ties

tie

knot *a-itit
lavalava *a-(t,d)o(u,v)Vt-i
tie up *a-liy(e,i)c-i
tight *a-vis(vis)-i
time *na-ran(i), *na-(u)b"(η)an
toe *(na)-pisV-
tomorrow *mrani
tongue *na-lua-, *na-ma-
tooth (prob. incisor) *na-livo-
top *na-livin(t,r)i-
torch *a-clua,* n-alic
touch *a-ki
track *na-m"(i,la)-
transitive suffix *-i,* -yini
tree *na-ya

trial pronominal suffix *-(t,s)ali
trial subject *(t,s)ali=

Trichoglossus haemotodus *sivori
triggerfish *na-su(m",mu)
Turbo sp. *na-bag,* vusani
turn (v.t.) *a-(c,s,j)a(v,w)ula(s,j)ak
turtle *(n,i)-avu(a)
tusk *nV-ba(tV,di)-
twins *na-m"al
two *ga-rua
two days from today *n(a,ε)-w(a)ias
Tyto alba *na-(lV)su"it
uncle
maternal *(mata-)
paternal *(e-tama-)
uncooked *(a-mataq)
unicornfish *(na)-yeboy
untie *(a-vac)
unwrap *(a-vac)
upwards *(sa(k,y), *(u,i)dai
urinate *(a-mi, *a-mia(m)riri
us.EXC *=yam(i)
us.INC *=yad(i)
vein *(na-ur
very *(a(k,y)on
village *(na-(u)vanua
vine (generic?) *(na-[(p,b)V]lwa-
kkinds of vine *(na-lima(q), *na-vup
voice *(na-vu(y,r)a-
vomit *(a-luaq
wake (s.o.) up *(a-(u)(s,j)øy-i
walk *(aliuok, *(a-(v,p)an
w. a stick *(a-c(i,o)kon
wall *(na-var
warm *(a-yab*an
warm oneself *(a-teli
water
(n.) *(na-wai
(n.), on grass/leaves *(na-nm"ani
(v.) *(a-vwi(-i)
waterfall *(na-usyal(q)
wattles of fowl *[ta]tau
we.EXC *gam(i), *(i)damV
we.INC *gadi
wear
a belt *(a-(t,d)o(u,v)V-t-i

on head *(a)-se(n,g)a-i
weave *(a-ivi-i, *(a-vus-i
weep *(a)-taqi
what? *sa, *(na-va(s), *(na-da[j
] do what? *(a-(u,w)ø((u,w)o)
when? *(na-nisan
where? *(i-sia, *(i=sia
whistle (v.) *(a-vaseli(p)
white-eye *(na-(va)øyav
whitewood *(na-b"us(Vn)
who? *(si, *(pasV
wild cane *(na-(v)iuq
wild kava *(lu(b,v)u(b,v)a(m,p*)
wild nutmeg *(na-dani
wild taro? *(na-viaq
wild yam? *(na-ra[(k,g)au]ø
wind (n.) *(ne-ma(t,d)øni, *(na-vi-
wing *(k,y)av(V)
woman *(na-tavine
wood *(na-yai
wood-grub *(n-avat
yam *(n-uv
yam varieties *(m"ariq,
*(na-ra[(k,g)au]ø, *(na-tai-b"atyV-
yawn *(a-mu(y)av
yellow *(yaq
yesterday *(na-yan(a,u)v
you.NONSG.FOCAL *(gami(u)
you.NONSG.OBJ *=(yamiu, *(i)da[m]u(V
you.SG.FOCAL *(igo(e)
you.SG.OBJ *(yo
your *(mu
your.NONSG *(mi(u)

Zingiber sp. *(na-li(c,j)ei
Zosterops flavifrons *(na-(va)øyav
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Other reconstructions

This Appendix contains three separate lists.

1. suggested alternates to established POc reconstructions based on SV and other data;
2. proposed PSOc reconstructions which involve a phonological innovation shared by PNCV and PSV; and
3. additional PSOc reconstructions based on cognates in PSV and PNCV (and occasionally other protolanguages) for which to my knowledge there is no POc reconstructed source.

1 Possible additional/alternate Proto Oceanic reconstructions

Below are three proposed alternates to Proto Oceanic reconstructions, marked with * rather than *, which I suggested at various places in the text might need to be adopted. The supporting evidence is given here.

*bayani ‘bait’
- There are three POc reconstructions: *bani, *bani and *bayan (Ross, Pawley & Osmond 1998:218-219).
- PSV has *na-(p,b)Vyani (reflected as Len na/pien, Kwm na/piien and Anj ne/pyaŋ).
- This suggests the composite POc reconstruction *bayani.

*(p,b)ikuR ‘tail’
- The POc reconstruction is *ikuR.
- PSV has *na-bi(k,y)u- (for example Sye novlai-mpyo-, NTn na/bika-), with an initial labial stop. (Anj n/iye-, however, reflects *ikuR with no initial labial.)
- Other Oceanic languages which reflect the initial labial include Tomoip piuk, Roviana, Nduke pikutu.
- Malcolm Ross (pers. comm.) points out that there is evidence supporting a POc reconstruction *(p,b)ut or *(p,b)uut ‘tail’. There may have been some conflation of this form with the *ikuR form, as the Roviana and Nduke evidence suggest *pikut.
- I propose here, however, that the conflation may have yielded POc *(p,b)ikuR, at least in the dialect of POc which was ancestral to PSV.
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'tapuR 'ashes'
- POc has both *gapu(k) and *rapu(R).
- PSV has *na-(m)tapu (for example Ura be/dop, NTn nam/tap, SWT nam/lakw) with a root-initial *t, possibly preceded by a reflex of the POc stative prefix *ma-.
- One other Oceanic language has this initial *t, and also reflects final *R: this is Tolai tavul-iap.
- These data thus suggest a third POc form 'tapuR.

2 Proto Southern Oceanic reconstructions involving innovations

In various places in the text, I attributed some reconstructions to Proto Southern Oceanic. These are normally forms which are inherited from Proto Oceanic, but where an innovation has taken place, and where that innovation is shared by PNCV and PSV. These are listed below. I assume that PSOc had the same phonemic system as reconstructed by Clark for PNCV, except I write the PSOc protophonemes in the same orthography as POc (thus PNCV *q, *q and *g correspond to PSOc *g, *q and *n respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSOc</th>
<th>POc</th>
<th>PNCV</th>
<th>PSV</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*gam[am)i</td>
<td>*kamami</td>
<td>*gam(am)i</td>
<td>*gam(i)</td>
<td>POc *k unexpectedly reflected as *g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'we EXC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gamiu</td>
<td>*kamiu</td>
<td>*gamuyu</td>
<td>*gami(u)</td>
<td>POc *k unexpectedly reflected as *g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'you PL'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(k,g)iida</td>
<td>*kita</td>
<td>*kida</td>
<td>*gadi</td>
<td>POc *t unexpectedly reflected as *d; some NCV languages also show a reflex of *g rather than *k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'we INC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gomo</td>
<td>*komu</td>
<td>*gogo-mi, *gumi</td>
<td>*a-guma'i</td>
<td>POc *k unexpectedly reflected as *g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hold in mouth'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*igo(e)</td>
<td>*[i]ko[e]</td>
<td>*n/igo</td>
<td>*igo(e)</td>
<td>POc *k unexpectedly reflected as *g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'you SG'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma-teli</td>
<td>*ma-tolu</td>
<td>*matolu, but some reflect *mateli</td>
<td>*a-(ma)c(o,e)li</td>
<td>POc *o &gt; *e and *u &gt; *i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'thick'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*munim</td>
<td>*inun</td>
<td>*muni</td>
<td>*a-m&quot;uni(m,m)&quot;</td>
<td>Unexpected initial *m and metathesis of vowels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'drink'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*teili</td>
<td>*tuln</td>
<td>*tulu, but some reflect *teili</td>
<td>*ga-sili</td>
<td>POc *o &gt; *e and *u &gt; *i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'three'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First POc *o unexpectedly &gt; *i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tikon</td>
<td>*tokon</td>
<td>*tiko</td>
<td>*a-(c,i,o)kon</td>
<td>POc *o &gt; *e and *u &gt; *i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Other Proto Southern Oceanic reconstructions

The bulk of the PSOc forms listed here have cognates in PNCV and PSV, but no POc reconstruction has as yet been made. PSOc orthography is as described in §2 immediately above. Occasionally, forms in other protolanguages appear in the PNCV column; these are always preceded by the name of the protolanguage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSOc</th>
<th>PNCV</th>
<th>PSV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ali[ali]</td>
<td>‘flatfish’</td>
<td>PCP *(y)ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*baiga</td>
<td>‘green-snail, Turbo sp.’</td>
<td>*baiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bila[ ]</td>
<td>‘banded rail, Gallirallus philippensis’</td>
<td>*bila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*buebue</td>
<td>‘puffer fish’</td>
<td>*(y)ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*buka(i)</td>
<td>‘k.o. tree, Pisonia sp.’</td>
<td>*buka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(b,b&quot;)ura</td>
<td>‘smash’</td>
<td>*bura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(b,b&quot;)atu</td>
<td>‘deaf, mute; dark’</td>
<td>*butu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b&quot;a[kala]</td>
<td>‘hibiscus’</td>
<td>*bwakala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b&quot;akaR(e,i)</td>
<td>‘porcupine fish’</td>
<td>*bwakaR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*b&quot;eta</td>
<td>‘(k.o.) taro’</td>
<td>*bweta ‘tarot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*digori(q)</td>
<td>‘perfume tree’</td>
<td>*digori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(a,i)ra(i)</td>
<td>‘flying-fox’</td>
<td>*garai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kaR(k,b&quot;)a</td>
<td>‘swiftlet’</td>
<td>*kabakaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kadik</td>
<td>‘black biting ant’</td>
<td>*kadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(k.g)aie</td>
<td>‘tease’</td>
<td>*kaRuve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kawa-ri</td>
<td>‘k.o. crab’</td>
<td>*kawa-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kizi</td>
<td>‘poke’</td>
<td>*kizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kona</td>
<td>‘caught, tangled’</td>
<td>*kona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*konan(V)</td>
<td>‘sacred, tabu’</td>
<td>*konan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(k,w)Vlasi</td>
<td>‘poisonwood, Semecarpus’</td>
<td>*waIasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lab&quot;e</td>
<td>‘(part of) tail’</td>
<td>*labwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lakav[ ]</td>
<td>‘white-eye, Zosterops sp.’</td>
<td>*lako[akak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lolo</td>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>*lolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(m,m&quot;)abusi</td>
<td>‘to rest, (breathe)’</td>
<td>*mabu-si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(m,m&quot;)ab&quot;e</td>
<td>‘liver’</td>
<td>*mwabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(m,m&quot;)adada</td>
<td>‘rotten’</td>
<td>*mada-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma-daRa</td>
<td>‘bleed’</td>
<td>*madaRa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(m,m&quot;)ala[va]</td>
<td>‘twins’</td>
<td>*malava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ma-lazi</td>
<td>‘be left over; leftovers’</td>
<td>*malazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maloku</td>
<td>‘kava; drunk on kava’</td>
<td>*maloku ‘kava’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOc</td>
<td>PNCV</td>
<td>PSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mal²V</td>
<td>'hawk'</td>
<td>*mala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m&quot;ab&quot;e</td>
<td>'chestnut, <em>Inocarpus</em> sp.'</td>
<td><em>mwa</em>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m&quot;az</em>V</td>
<td>'star'</td>
<td><em>mw</em>aoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m&quot;ele</td>
<td>'cycad'</td>
<td><em>mwe</em>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(p,b)isu</td>
<td>'finger, toe, nail'</td>
<td>*bisu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *(p","b")ano-* | 'hole, mouth (also face?)' | *bw*ano | *na-*p"an*-
| *qata-mate | 'spirit, ghost' | *qatam*ate | *(n,i)-at-*mac |
| *gavua | 'turtle'  | *gavua   | *(n,i)-avu(a) |
| *raga- | 'branch'  | *raga    | *na-*rag*V- |
| *raga-si | 'roast, singe' | *raga-si | *a-*ra*ŋ-i |
| *ru(v,w)i | 'to plant' | *ruvi    | *a-(r)uw-i |
| *siv(i,o)ri | 'rainbow lorikeet' | *siviri  | *sivori |
| *(p","b")af)o-* | 'hole, mouth (also face?)' | *bw*af)o | *a-*wa*ŋ-i |
| *qata-mate | 'spirit, ghost' | *qatam*ate | *(n,i)-at-*mac |
| *gavua | 'turtle'  | *gavua   | *(n,i)-avu(a) |
| *ta*V | 'side, other side' | *tava, *ta*valu | *na-*val*-
| *tavoat | 'mountain' | *tavo* | *na-*tavoat |
| *teli | 'dry/warm oneself' | *teli    | *a-*teli |
| *tiana(n) | 'pregnant' | *tiana   | *a-*cian[an] |
| *tib"a-i | 'hit'     | *tib*wa  | *a-*tu(p","b")-i |
| *tuy(u,i) | 'pool'    | *tuyu   | *na-*tuy* |
| *tuaki | 'go away/astray' | *tua*ki | *a-*tua(y)i |
| *ruvat, *tuvat-i | '(wear) belt, (tie) lavalava' | *tava   | *a-(t,d)o(u,v)Vt-i |
| *[vi]san-i | 'show' | *visa*ni | *san-i |
| *(u)asusu | 'bear young' | *vasusu  | *a-*vu*as-i |
| *vakali | 'sharpen' | *vakali  | *a-*val[ya]-i |
| *vana | 'sea-urchin' | PCP *vana | *na-*v*an |
| *van-i | 'cook'   | *van*    | *a-*van |
| *vini* | 'join(ed)' | *vini*   | *a-*vin |
| *voka | 'hit, attack' | *voka   | *a-*vay |
| *vura | 'full'   | *vura   | *a-*vuar |
| *zum(u)i | 'suck, (kiss)' | *zumi, *zimi | *a-*s(u)mu-i |


f/c/a, What happened to Erromangan possessive morphology? In Joel Bradshaw and Ken Rehg, eds *Festschrift for Byron Bender*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
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