9 Demonstratives, local nouns and directionals in Oceanic languages: a diachronic perspective

MALCOLM D. ROSS

1 Introduction

The languages whose demonstrative systems are described in the preceding chapters all belong to the Oceanic subgroup of the Austronesian language family. Austronesian languages are spoken in parts of Taiwan, in the Philippines, in parts of Vietnam, in most of Malaysia and Indonesia, in Madagascar, in coastal enclaves on the island of New Guinea and on its offshore islands, throughout most of island Melanesia and on all the inhabited islands of Polynesia and Micronesia. The Austronesian family consists of perhaps ten primary groupings, but all of these except one are located on the island of Taiwan (Blust 1999). The tenth is the Malayo-Polynesian grouping, which includes all Austronesian languages spoken outside Taiwan. Its common ancestor, Proto Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) was probably spoken in the northern Philippines.

The Oceanic subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian consists of most of the Austronesian languages of New Guinea, island Melanesia, Polynesia and Micronesia,¹ which share a common ancestor conventionally labelled “Proto Oceanic” (POc). Proto Oceanic was evidently spoken somewhere in the Bismarck Archipelago — the most likely candidate for the homeland is the island of New Britain, to the east of New Guinea — around the middle of the second millennium B.C. (Lynch, Ross & Crowley 2002; Pawley & Ross 1993; Pawley & Ross 1995; Ross 1999:Ch. 4).

My purpose in this chapter is to present what I can of the systems of Proto Oceanic that were ancestral to the daughter systems described in the chapters of this book and to discuss the kinds of change that have led to today’s systems. I will also be interested in what has apparently not changed in the past three-and-a-half thousand years. The systems described in this book are demonstrative systems, directional particles (which also have deictic meanings) and, in some cases, relational nouns. I will discuss the Proto Oceanic demonstrative system first, in §2, then the morphosyntax of Proto Oceanic local nouns in §3 (since demonstratives and relational nouns were both apparently subtypes of local noun).

¹ Exceptions are the Austronesian languages of the islands of Yap, Belau and Guam in the west of Micronesia and Austronesian languages around Cenderawasih Bay in the northwest of New Guinea.
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and finally, in §4, the Proto Oceanic directional verbs which have given rise to today’s directional particles and have contributed in various ways to the deictic systems of modern Oceanic languages.

Table 1 shows in simplified form the subgroups within Oceanic and the locations of the languages discussed in this volume within that subgrouping. These languages are spread right across Oceanic, but coverage of even the major subgroups of Oceanic is not possible in a volume that focuses on careful description of single languages. Because reconstruction of a proto-language needs to draw on a database that samples as many subgroups as possible, as well as an external (non-Oceanic Austronesian) evidence, the reconstructions offered here are based on data drawn from a wider sample of languages than those discussed in this book.

Table 1: Subgrouping of Oceanic languages

Oceanic

1. Yapese
2. Admiralties
3. Manus
4. Western Oceanic
   a. North New Guinea (Takia)
   b. Papuan Tip (Saliba, Kilivila)
   c. Moss-Melanesian: east New Britain, New Ireland, Bougainville, northwest Solomons
5. Central/Eastern Oceanic
   a. Southeast Solomon
   b. Uluppu and Vatikoro: tiny islands between the Solomoners and Vanuatu
   c. Southern Oceanic
      Northern Vanuatu
      Nuclear Southern Oceanic
      Central Vanuatu (South Malakula)
   South Efate/Southern Melanesian
     South Efate
     Southern Melanesian
     Southern Vanuatu
     New Caledonian
     Loyalty Islands (Rai)
   d. Micronesian
   e. Central Pacific
     Western Central Pacific: western Fijian dialects, Rotuman
     Eastern Central Pacific
     Eastern Fijian dialects
     Polynesian
     Tongic
     Nuclear Polynesian
     Samoic (Samoan)
     Ellicean Outlier (Pileni)
     Eastern Polynesian

2 Demonstratives in Proto Oceanic

Demonstratives in Oceanic languages usually make a three-way distinction based either on person — near speaker, near addressee, near neither or near a third person — or on /proximal, intermediate, distal/ or on a mixture of body/position in Takia. With some systems it is difficult to distinguish between these two possibilities, as their members seem to be used in both ways. So widespread are these three-way systems that it is virtually certain that Proto Oceanic had such a system, and it is reasonably certain that it was person-oriented, as are the majority of systems in both Oceanic and non-Oceanic Austronesian languages. I gloss the three members of such systems here as 1, 2 and 3. Usually, one member of an Oceanic demonstrative system functions anaphorically, in accordance with one of two strategies. Under the first, form 2 is semantically the least marked, serving as an anaphor and often as a relative-clause marker. In Takia, form 2 has lost its deictic function and is only used anaphorically. It seems likely that form 2 was also the least marked in Proto Oceanic, but we cannot infer with any certainty what its non-deictic uses were. Under the second strategy, the system has a fourth purely anaphoric member, with neither person- nor distance-orientation. There is some evidence that the Proto Oceanic system may also have had an anaphoric fourth member. A sample from the systems described in this book is given in (1).

(1) 1 2 3 anaphoric
Saliba teina temeta tem, temen
Takia /f Ren on
Kilivila baen, baya baya beyanua
Pileni nef/ na lu
Port Sandwich xina naxia naxia
Nělënnwa -Pony -eoa -eali -eili
Iaui ay e ile loe luy

The forms in (1) are all used pronominally, except for those in Nělënnwa, which are cliticised to a noun.

More complex demonstrative systems which additionally mark distinctions such as inland/seaward or upper/lower are found in some modern languages, but there is no evidence that the additional categories formed part of the demonstrative system in Proto Oceanic.

For the historical Oceanicist, a notable feature of (1) is that these forms do not readily form cognate sets, and this remains true as one adds additional languages to the collection.

---

2 For more detailed discussion, see Chapter 5 of Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002), from which this subgrouping is drawn.

3 Reconstructions are drawn from Ross (2003), whose supporting data and discussion are also provided.

4 Material in square brackets here and elsewhere occurs optionally. Except where otherwise indicated, data sources are the contributions to this book and are as follows: Ambae (Hayton 2001), Angkori (Lynch 2000), Aror-Lekupa (D’Jemies & D’Jemies n.d.), Baraa (Gailllard 1998), Basum (Standard Fijian) and Boomen Fijian (Dixon 1988), Eromanga (Crowley 1998), Gela (Crowley 2002), Gawa (Davis 1997), Ilala-Melie (Clark, in press), Kiribati (Groves & Jacobs 1985), Kokata (Palmer 1991), Kosarom (Lee 1975), Label (Perkel 1930), Lenoki (Lynch 1978), Lewo (Early 1949), Longue (Hill 1992), Lusit (Comrie 1969), Marquesan (Lynch 2002a), Mikrones (Harrison 1976), Motu (Lesuer-Turner & Clark 1954), Nakanai (Johnston 1988), Nylbua (Bir 1994), Paukekike (Crowley 1982), Pulotu (Lynch 2002b), Ramuakana (Davies & Fizellel 1992), Saliba (Anna Margates pers. comm.), Tabwai (Elbert 1997), Tavu (Ouami 1995), Toa (Moele 1984), Tongan (Churchward 1953), Tofa (Lynch 2002a), Wailevu (Kalo) (Ritsuko Kikosawa pers. comm.), Wiyun (Pawley & Snyders forthcoming), Woleai (Sohn 1975), Xiblici (Mayer-Faure 1995), ‘Ala‘ala, Hali, Libi, Meramana, Mingir, Musu, Nochi, Puapat, Sia, Tabua, Tanga, Taifoi and Takia data are from my fieldnotes.
Proto Oceanic forms can be reconstructed, but only with considerable difficulty and by also examining evidence from non-Oceanic languages. Reconstructed Proto Oceanic demonstrative forms are set out in (2). Doubtful forms are parenthesized.

(2)

1. nai
2. *nai
3. anaphoric history

*u, *u  
*ui, *ua  
?ui, ?u

PMP subject determiner
PMP genitive determiner
PMP oblique determiner?
PMP demonstrative base
not known
not known
not known

PMP direction verb

The unlikeliness of this set suggests that we do not yet know the full story of Oceanic demonstratives (and probably never will). A full discussion of these forms lies beyond the scope of this contribution, but certain points can be made. The forms in (2) come from at least three sources, as indicated in the right-hand column. One, *nai, is also a Proto Oceanic direction verb, and I return to this in §4. The other two identifiable sources are Proto Malayo-Polynesian. In Proto Malayo-Polynesian, there were two person-oriented sets: demonstrative bases and the determiners used with common nouns. The subject determiners were PMP *ni, *ni 2, *ni 3, the genitive determiners PMP *ni 1, *ni 2, *ni 3, and the oblique determiners PMP *di 1, *di 2, *di 3. The demonstrative bases were nominals, and were normally preceded by a determiner. The bases relevant here were PMP *a/ja/ji 1, *a/ji 1, *na 2, *na 3, PMP *di 1, PMP *di 2, PMP *di 3, *ma "anaphoric" (1+2 means "near both speaker and addressee"). There is reasonably good evidence that some Proto Oceanic demonstratives were descended from PMP determiners, others from demonstrative bases, and some were descended indistinguishably from a member of each set. For example, we cannot be summoned to an Oceanic demonstrative with the form ni 1 is descended from the PMP genitive determiner *ni 1 or the PMP demonstrative base *jim 1. The same is true of forms reflecting the PMP genitive determiners *ni 2 and the PMP demonstrative base *ma 2.

Why should Proto Oceanic demonstratives be descended from both Proto Malayo-Polynesian determiners and demonstrative bases? The most obvious inference is that the syntactic distinction then disappeared perhaps around the time that the Proto Oceanic speech community broke up.

And why were two or three different case forms of determiners retained when modern Oceanic languages do not in general mark case in their demonstrers and when there is no clear evidence that Proto Oceanic did not? Only a general answer can be given. Proto Oceanic seems to have been the outcome of a brief period of rapid and radical change in the language of a group of Austronesian speakers who found their way into the Bismarck Archipelago. This change was probably the result of contact with speakers of Papuan (i.e. non-Austronesian) languages. There is evidence that the language of these new arrivals contained a cut-down version of the Proto Malayo-Polynesian voice system, similar to the voice of ‘focus’ systems of modern Formosan and Philippine languages.6 This system

6 A fuller discussion of the reconstruction of these forms is provided by Ross (2003).
6 These developments are discussed in Chapter 4 of Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002).
Only in Sanoan does a reflex of *i serve as a locative marker. In isi, the locative forms are also used adnominally. This is a change that has evidently been repeated over and over again in the history of Oceanic languages: a locative proform is used adnominally (e.g. 'the house there'), and eventually replaces its adnominal counterpart. In Kiribati, it is apparent reflexes of the *qa- set that have come to be used adnominally, whilst in Sae (Meso-Melanesian, New Ireland) the *qa- set retains its locative function and the *i set (assuming this is their origin) have graduated to pronominal status.

The functional difference between Proto Oceanic forms reflecting *i and those reflecting *qa- remains unclear. However, Pawley (1972:32-33) reconstitutes Proto Eastern Oceanic *qa- as a marker of time rather than of location. I have not investigated temporal uses of Oceanic demonstratives, so I am uncertain what forms were used temporally in Proto Oceanic. Most Oceanic languages, however, use demonstratives temporally, as do some non-Oceanic Austronesian languages, so I infer that Proto Oceanic did so too. The form i pronoun was evidently used for 'now' or for a time close to the present, whilst forms 2 and 3 were used for times further from the present. It is not clear that either had a dedicated past or future usage.

Taken together, the sets in (3) illustrate two of the processes which operate in the Oceanic languages of Melanesia to further complicate the reconstruction of Proto Oceanic demonstratives. The first is the addition of morphological material, sometimes before, sometimes after the base, which often becomes fossilised when the second process occurs, namely shift in function from (usually) adverbial to adnominal. Boumaa Fijiian, for example, has only one demonstrative set (Dixon 1988:58) for adnominal, pronominal and adverbial functions, whereas other Fijiian dialects have at least two. We can infer that the surviving set has expanded its functions at the expense of at least one other set.

Sometimes material, like *qa-, has been added for functional reasons, but sometimes material is added apparently to give phonological weight to a light form. For example in Marama (Meso-Melanesian, New Britain) the locative forms are te and inani 'here' and iota 'there', the pronominal enclitics -de 'this' and -do 'that'. I no may also occur with the enclitic -do, giving inodo. This appears to make no semantic difference, but simply provides a weightier variant. There is apparently no need for a weightier variant for te, as inani (once the 2 of a 1-3-3 system) also serves as 'here'. In Labu (Meso-Melanesian, New Ireland) the adnominal forms are ne 1, niga 2, no 3. The same forms may be used pronominally. When they are, ne alternates with nehe, niga with a reduplicated niga, whilst no alternates with niga, i.e. the additional weight for form 3 is provided by prefixing form 2. The most striking case of change of this kind is provided by Jones (1998:157-159), who reports ongoing change in Melos (Papuan Tip) dialects. Some of his data are shown in (4). The most conservative forms occur in the north-western dialect. Form 3 has undergone suppletion in the other three dialects, the new form consisting of form 2 with additional material. In the northern and western dialects, form 1 is replaced by the corresponding identifiable demonstrative no-no. This has been formed from ino.

7 The initial r- of the adverbial forms presumably reflects the preposition *ri, but the base forms *e, *i, *ina and *ina no longer occur.
8 The use of somewhat ad hoc word-order here is not meant to imply that I believe in goal-driven change. Negatives like inodo arise as high-frequency pattern in discourse which become automated and thereby grammaticalised.
9 Jones does not discuss the source of the material -he/le, but it is almost certainly an emphatic particle.

Changes of the kinds I have just described have evidently been common among Oceanic demonstratives in Melanesia. They are sometimes detectable through irregularities in morphological paradigmaticity like those just examined, sometimes through differences between the systems of quite closely related languages. For example, (5) shows the demonstrative forms from Lusi and Bariá, whose close relationship is attested by the work of Goulden (1982, 1996). Although there are some obvious formal similarities between the two systems, reconstituting the prootosystem from which they are both descended is impossible.

In the case of the three Central Papuan languages in (6), whose close relationship was demonstrated by Pawley (1975), the cognacy of Motu and N.W. Melos is self-evident. It is also clear on inspection that the 'A'ala system is derived from the same prootosystem, but reconstructing the steps by which development occurred is impossible.

Cases like these occur throughout Melanesia. Only in Micronesia and Polynesia do we find more or less self-evident and straightforward cognacy. Micronesian forms are set out in (7). There are two cognate sets each for 2 and 3, and I take Pulawatese mua, Woleisian mua to represent a local innovation. Not only are Proto Micronesian forms quite easily reconstructible; it is also easy to relate them back to their Proto Oceanic ancestors in (2).

10 This analysis is confirmed by the E. Melos identifiable form inoi 1, representing the intermediate stage of change.
### Demonstratives, local nouns and directionals in Oceanic languages

Chaotic as the rest of Melanesia and quite unlike Polynesia, as a comparison of (8) with the Fijian data in (9) shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Oceanic</th>
<th>*e</th>
<th>*na</th>
<th>*o</th>
<th>*rai</th>
<th>*wa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Micronesian</td>
<td>*ei</td>
<td>*na</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*rai</td>
<td>*wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>a-ei</td>
<td>a-me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a-rei</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosraean</td>
<td>a-ei</td>
<td>a-me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a-rei</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokilese</td>
<td>ADN SG</td>
<td>a-ei</td>
<td>a-me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a-rei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulotawes</td>
<td>ADN, PRO</td>
<td>ye-ey</td>
<td>ye-en</td>
<td>me-naun</td>
<td>ye-naun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseyan</td>
<td>ADN SG</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td>m’ua</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulithian</td>
<td>ADN SG</td>
<td>l-ei</td>
<td>lua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lany we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>ADN PL</td>
<td>a-i-i</td>
<td>e-ka-me</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a-ke-ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokilese</td>
<td>ADN PL</td>
<td>k-a-i</td>
<td>k-a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolseyan</td>
<td>ADN PL</td>
<td>k-a-th</td>
<td>k-a-th’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>k-a-th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulithian</td>
<td>ADN PL</td>
<td>k-a-th</td>
<td>k-a-th’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>k-a-th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One question which the reconstructions in (7) raise is whether forms 3 and 3a represent a Proto Micronesian semantic distinction lost in all the present-day languages, and, if they do, whether that distinction was inherited from Proto Oceanic. In other words, was POc *e perhaps the default 3 form, and did POc *rai perhaps mean ‘3 + far’? The reconstruction of Proto Polynesian forms is equally straightforward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto Oceanic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto Polynesian</td>
<td>ADN, PRO</td>
<td>*ni</td>
<td>*nei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>e-qi</td>
<td>e-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliira-Mele</td>
<td>ADN</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pileni</td>
<td>ADN, PRO</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanean</td>
<td>ADN, PRO</td>
<td>le-nei</td>
<td>le-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquesan</td>
<td>ADN</td>
<td>nei</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How can we summarise our findings with regard to demonstratives? There are two basic points to be made. Firstly, even were forms are undergoing rapid change, the semantic organisation of the system remains fairly stable. Proto Oceanic evidently had a person-oriented demonstrative system of three members, with a possible fourth member denoting greater distance than 3 or invisibility. There was also perhaps a fifth, anaphoric, member. Changes in this system usually entail a reduction to three person-oriented members. A scattering of languages have shifted to a distance-oriented system of three members, and a few have made the system more complex (e.g. Koda, a Meso-Melanesian language of Santa Isabel, see Palmer 1999). Where the system has been reduced to two members in a few languages of the New Guinea area, it has automatically become distance-oriented.

The second point concerns changes of form. These seem to have been rife and rapid in Melanesia, as far east as Fiji, but limited in Micronesia and Polynesia just to sound changes which affected the whole language. Why should Micronesia and Polynesia be so conservative, Melanesia so radically unstable? This clearly has nothing to do with genetic groupings, as the systems of Fijian languages, genetically the closest to Polynesia, are as

---

11 Closeness of the Pulotawes forms are 1 “very near speaker”, 2 “near speaker”, 3a “very near addressed” and 3 “distant.”

---

12 The presence of Pauaian speakers in the Reiti-Santa Cruz Islands (between the Solomons and Vanuatu) is an exception, and archaeological research may yet find evidence of pre-Austronesian occupation in the north-east of the main Solomons chain.

13 I have suggested elsewhere that migration is an important factor in language change in Melanesia (Ross 1991).
to reconstruct from Melanesian data as demonstratives. It is these small paradigms whose high-frequency terms are subject to attrition, coalescence and reanalysis. In the languages of Melanesia, these processes are allowed to have their way, whereas in the more stable and conservative speech communities of Micronesia and Polynesia there is greater pressure to preserve linguistic form.

3 Local nouns and the local construction

Proto Oceanic local nouns are important in a discussion of space and deixis because they include directional terms which relate to the various directional axes around which Oceanic speakers partly organise their conceptions of space (Hill 1997; Orna-Rivière 1997). Although the axes — inland vs seaward, up vs down — are in a sense absolute, not deictic, reflexes of absolute terms find their way into the systems used for deixis in some modern languages, a matter I touch on in §4.

Three syntactic classes of noun can be distinguished in Proto Oceanic, as they can in many modern Oceanic languages. With their various subclasses they are as follows:

(a) Personal: personal proper names and kin terms used as proper names;
(b) Common:
   (i) human nouns not in the personal category and non-human animates;
   (ii) inanimates and abstract nouns;
(c) Local:
   (i) proper placenames;
   (ii) free (unpossessed) nouns including:
      - nouns denoting familiar places (e.g. ‘home’, ‘own village’,
        ‘own garden’, ‘bush’, ‘beach’ etc.);
      - nouns denoting directionally based regions (‘down below’,
        ‘up above’);
      - one or two relational nouns (‘front’, ‘back’);
   (iii) inalienably possessed relational nouns (e.g. nouns denoting parts, like
        ‘inside’, ‘upper surface or space above’, ‘lower surface’, ‘space
        beneath’ and so on);
   (iv) temporal nouns.

Of these classes and subclasses, only common inanimates (b.i.i), local free (c.i.i) and local inalienably possessed relational nouns (c.i.ii) will concern us here.

Reference is made in (10c) to inalienably possessed nouns. In Proto Oceanic these had a possessor suffix marking the person and number of the possessor. For example:

(11) *tama-gu ‘my father’
    *tama-ha ‘her/his father’
    *paig-gu ‘my leg’
    *paig-ha ‘her/his leg’
    *mar-gu ‘my back’
    *mar-ha ‘her/his back’

If there was a noun phrase possessor, it followed:

(12) *a gaig-gu tam-*ha
    DET leg-his nun
    ‘the man’s leg’

To talk of classes of noun is actually a convenient but inaccurate way of talking about classes of nominal construction. Some nouns could occur in more than one kind of nominal construction, and in such cases it was the construction that determined the class of the noun. For example, if the POE kin noun *tama-gu ‘my father’ was preceded by the POE personal determiner *e/*t, then it was being used as a personal noun, in a manner analogous to a proper personal name (‘Dad’, ‘Papa’), but if it occurred without a determiner (Crowley 1985), then it was being used as a common human noun (‘my father’, or, in a classifierific kinship system, ‘my fathers’).

The distinction in usage between a common and a local noun was similar, but somewhat more complex. If POE *Rumag ‘house’ was preceded by the common determiner *a/*na, then it served as a common non-human noun (*a/the house’). If it was used in a prepositional phrase, however, there were the two possibilities shown in (13). Preceded simply by the preposition *i, as in (13a), it served as a local noun. That is, it referred to a location known to the interlocutors, in this case ‘home’. In the construction in (13b), however, *Rumag serves as a common noun referring to a specific house which was not necessarily home to either speaker or addressee. In this construction, *Rumag was the possessor of the inalienably possessed dummy noun *ta- (glossed TA), where the noun phrase ta-qa Rumag has the same structure as *paig-gu tam-*ata ‘man’s leg’ in (12).

(13) a. *i *Rumag
    PREP house
    ‘at home’

   b. *i ta-*ta Rumag
    PREP TA-*its house
    ‘at a/the house’

I return to the semantic distinction between (13a) and (13b) below.

Only a few modern languages directly reflect the construction in (13b). In most Oceanic languages where this latter construction is reflected, however, *i has dropped out, leaving *ta- as an anomalous preposition — ‘anomalous’ because it was apparently the only preposition to take a possessor suffix agreeing with its governee noun phrase.12 Two reflexes are shown in (14).

---

15 This proposition has sometimes been reconstructed as *ep. It can be shown, however, that POE had two distinct forms, the locative preposition *i and the non-specific possession linker *ep (Ross 2001).
16 On the reconsrtuction of (13b), see Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002:79-89) and Ross (2003).
17 In some languages, the new preposition *ta- became the model for grammaticalization of further prepositions. See the history of Tigaq prepositions in Ross (1998a).
(14) a. Tariq ( messed-up, Bougainville) 
E Maras to noger no-n na ka-nu na naton 
DET Maras REAL stay IMPF-he inside-its ditch
‘Maras is in the ditch.’

b. Longgu (East-South Solomon) 
... me la sara ta-nu taapacu-na-mu lua 
and-he go arrive PREP-his ten-ORDINAL house

... an he arrived at the tenth house.

In (15) are listed the free local nouns that can be reconstructed in Proto Oceanic. From the left the columns show the reconstruction, then its meaning as a common noun, then its meaning as a local noun and finally the adverb formed with *qa-, the formative noted in §2. Two of these nouns, *tawar and *tanu, seem never to have been used as common nouns, and this may also be true of *tupa and *taka. The adverbial forms in *qa- are those for which reflexes have been found in modern languages. The fact that there is no *qa-form against a particular noun may simply be due to a gap in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Noun</th>
<th>Local Noun</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*muka</td>
<td>‘front’</td>
<td>*qa-muka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*livoq</td>
<td>‘open space’</td>
<td>*qa-livoq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rumak</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
<td>*qa-Rumak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanu(q)</td>
<td>‘earth, soil’</td>
<td>*qa-tanu(q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tana</td>
<td>‘up above’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tupap</td>
<td>‘sky, weather’</td>
<td>*qa-tupap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*taka</td>
<td>‘top, high up’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qumak</td>
<td>‘bushland, hinterland’</td>
<td>*qa-qumak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tupa</td>
<td>‘inland’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tara</td>
<td>‘seawards’</td>
<td>*qa-tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tatak</td>
<td>‘sea, salt water’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two nouns on the list were apparently relational nouns, i.e. nouns that denoted a part of an object or a position in relation to an object. Most relational nouns were inalienably possessed, but these two were free.18 The other items in (15) denoted parts of the environment. Apart from *Rumak ‘home’, they express orientation along major directional axes. The common noun sense of *tanu(q) ‘earth, soil’ suggests that *tanu(q) and *tana referred to the vertical axis on an immediately local scale. The remaining items denoted directionally based regions in the wider environment. Proto Oceanic almost certainly had more free local nouns than this. The last four items listed in (15) are directions roughly at right-angles to the coastline. A few languages have pairs of terms for the two directions oriented along the coastline. The two pairs in (16) are reconstructable for Proto Western Oceanic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Noun</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*nua</td>
<td>‘to one’s left when facing the sea’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tara</td>
<td>‘to one’s left when facing the sea’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 The noun *tupa may have had an inalienably possessed variant.

---

It seems rather likely that such terms also occurred in Proto Oceanic, as a similar pair has been noted by Florey and Kelly (2002) in the non-Oceanic Austro-Asiatic language Alume in eastern Indonesia.

The semantic commonality among the non-relational local nouns in (15) is that they all denote a place or region which is part of the common knowledge of speaker and addressee and which, like a place-name, requires no further specification. In most instances in (15) this is because the noun denotes a part of the geographic environment known to speaker and addressee. In the case of *Rumak ‘home’, the noun denotes the place where a discourse participant lives. It is clear that other nouns have also been co-opted into the local class in various Oceanic languages at different times, and that this must also have happened in Proto Oceanic. The co-opted nouns, like ‘home’, refer to a locality whose identity is taken for granted for the relevant discourse participant. A selection is given in (17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masa</td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arop</td>
<td>bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biau</td>
<td>garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amat</td>
<td>beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nako</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohu</td>
<td>lamana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nohi</td>
<td>kokoel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolu</td>
<td>korom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salbe</td>
<td>kumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toli</td>
<td>kaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nochi</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolu</td>
<td>kouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolu</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanu</td>
<td>panunun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naveun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenakel</td>
<td>tanunu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I mentioned earlier, to speak of noun classes is a convenient shortcut. What we are actually dealing with here are different meaning-imparting constructions. I will call a construction like (13a) a ‘local construction’ and one like (13b) an ‘adjunct construction’ (‘adjunct’ because its meanings span a wider range than just location). Although there seem to have been Proto Oceanic nouns that were used only in the local construction (see (15)), when a noun like *Rumak was used in the local construction, it was the construction that contributed the semantic feature of ‘identity taken for granted’, not the noun itself. The same is true of all the nouns listed in (17). The at-noun construction in English works in much the same way. At home, at school, at hospital, at work, at church are all accepted collocations. It is possible, however, to recruit new nouns into the construction, like at group in a circumstance where there is no question for speaker or addressee which group is being talked about. Again, it is the construction that ensures the sense of ‘identity taken for granted’.

In many modern Oceanic languages the distinction between the two Proto Oceanic constructions in (13a) and (13b) has been kept but they have undergone morphosyntactic changes. By way of illustration, the adpositions occurring in a range of Oceanic languages that retain the constructional contrast are shown in (18) (the notation ‘(‘) indicates that a variety of prepositions occur in the adjunct construction to indicate location).

---

19 In a number of descriptions this category is not mentioned, or contains only nouns denoting parts of the larger environments like ‘sea’, ‘seawards’ and ‘inside’. I suspect that in at least some of these descriptions there are gaps because the writer has missed the relevant generalisation. A dash (-) indicates that the item does not occur. These dots (...) indicate that the item was not referenced.

20 Constructional meaning is far more pervasive than most syntactic theories recognise. For example, a in a beer forces a ‘count’ sense on a mass noun (Michelbab 2000). More complex examples are handled by Fillmore, Kay and O’Connor (1988), Goldberg (1995), and Kay and Fillmore (1999).
(18) in local construction in adjunct construction
Mussau e ia-
Kilivina va o
Tawala bai u
Satiba (POSTP) i unai
Meso-Melanesian
Tubur, Libir i si
Siar an o-
Tangga na ta-
Patapat, Minigir na ta
Bilu no- ma
Ramoanaea ea u
Tolai na ta
Halita i ta-
Taiof 0 ta-
Hoava pa ta-
Kokota 0 ka-
South-east Solomonic
Gela, Longgu i ta-
Central Vanuatu
Ambae lo lobe (+)
Paamene 0 en
Lewo 0 e
Southern Vanuatu
Anejom 0 0
Lenakel 0 le, to
New Caledonia
Tinin 0 gi(+)
Nyoluyu 0 nan (+)
Xaileu 0 lo (+)
Micronesian
Kosraeen 0 ku
Woleaian 0 in

Thus in Longgu, one of the languages that continues to reflect the POe forms *i* and *ta*, we find a contrast in prepositional usage between *i* in (19a), which treats *huwela* 'floor' as a local noun in need of no further specification, and *ta-* in (19b), where reference is to a specified house.

(19) a. ... m-e la na\-i\-a i helsea
and-he go put-IT PREP floor
'... and she put it on the floor'
b. ... m-e la sara te-na tagasula-moga lume
and-he go arrive PREP his ten-ORDINAL house
'... and he arrived at the tenth house'

A similar contrast occurs in Hoava. Here, POe *ti* has been replaced by *pa* in (20a), but POe *ta* continues to be reflected in (20b).

(20) a. Koni la gami pa hiniyola.
FUTURE go WE:EXC PREP garden
'We will go to the garden.'

b. La tiga ga ria, moe tota maen ga tani sa miba.
go reach REST they come close come REST PREP:3SG DET:3SG headland
'They arrived, came close to the headland.'

In Kilivina both Proto Oceanic prepositions have been replaced by forms derived from verbs (Ross 2003), but the semantic distinction survives between (21a), where the identity of the garden is presupposed by the use of the local preposition *va*, and (21b), where its identity is already known.

(21) a. Ba-la va bugolo.
IFUT:GO PREP garden
'I will go to the garden.'

b. Ba-la o bugolo.
IFUT:GO PREP garden
'I will go to my garden.'

In a range of Oceanic languages some or all locative nouns — or forms derived from locative nouns — form a paradigm with demonstrative bases. One such language is Iaai (Ozanne-Riviere, this volume). Others are Yapese (Jessen 1977:234); Luci (North New Guinea; Cautera 1969:124); the Papuan Tip languages Minavea (Lovell 1994:24), and Gumawana (Olson 1992); the Meso-Melanesian languages Meramera, Nalk, Nochi (Erickson & Erickson 1992), Star, Label (Peekel 1989), Ramoanaea (Davies & Fritzell 1992), Minigir, Tolai (Mose 1982) and Taiof, and the Central Vanuatu languages Mereri (Chung 1998:26) and Araki (François 2002). The significance of this observation is apparently that demonstrative bases in Proto Oceanic were also local nouns.

We turn now to inalienably possessed relational nouns, that is nouns which denote parts, like 'inside', 'upper surface or space above', 'lower surface', 'space beneath' and so on. Those that are reconstructable with reasonable certainty for Proto Oceanic are listed in (22). It appears that in Proto Oceanic all inalienably possessed nouns also occurred as free (unpossessed) nouns.21 As was shown in (11), an inalienably possessed noun takes a possessor suffix. Thus forms in (22) which end in a hyphen are inalienably possessed, and forms without a hyphen are free.

---

21 See Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002:76). This not true of many Western Oceanic languages today, where inalienably possessed nouns have a free form.
Unlike the nouns in (15), none of these formed an adverb with *go-.

In each case where a noun in (15) has a common-noun sense, it denotes a body part, and the possessive construction in which these nouns occurred was identical to that used with body parts, i.e. (12), except that it was embedded in the local construction and thus preceded by the preposition *i, as illustrated in (23).

(23) *i  lalo-ŋa Rumaq
   PREP inside-its house
   'inside the house' (more literally 'at the inside of the house')

I will call the combined construction the 'relational local construction'. The free gloss in (23) illustrates the fact that these nouns were used — and continue to be used in most Oceanic languages, as examples throughout this book show — to express senses that European languages tend to denote with a range of prepositions (although these too are often derived from nouns and are sometimes still complex, like on top of). Thus *i lalo-ŋa Rumaq in (23), semantically 'at the inside of the house', is most naturally glossed 'inside a/the house' or 'in a/the house' in English.

An interesting diachronic feature of the relational local construction is that it survives as a dedicated construction into many modern languages even when there have been changes in the local and/or the possessive construction. It has simply undergone the morphosyntactic changes of the constructions from which it gets its morphosyntax. Examples of relational noun phrases from a number of Oceanic languages are shown in (24). To the right of each example the structure is shown schematically. The abbreviations are: NREL relational noun, NPOSSR possessor noun, PREP preposition, and POSTP postposition. Thus (24a) reflects the Proto Oceanic construction in (23); (24b) reflects it with a change of preposition; (24c) with loss of the preposition. In (24e) the preposition is retained but the possessor precedes the relational noun; in (24f) the preposition intervenes between the two nouns. The languages in (24g) and (24h) have the order of (24e-f) but replace the preposition with a free or enclitic postposition; and (24i) has this order but no adposition.

(24) a. Gela (South-East Solomonics)
   i  muri-na  na  vale  PREP NREL NPOSSR
   PREP back-its DET house
   'behind the house'

b. Bali (Meso-Melanesian, New Britain)
   ɾa  lo-na  rumata-isi
   PREP inside-its house-DEM
   'inside that house'

c. Wolof (Mame)
   f 자리-ri we
   PREP NPOSSR
   under of breadfruit DEM
   'under the breadfruit tree'

d. Tiirir (New Caledonia)
   ɾo-ri ʷi ʷi
   PREP NREL-NPOSSR
   inside-house
   'inside the house'

e. Sudest (Papuan Tip)
   c  yolo  yaalila-ye
   PREP house slide-its
   'inside the house'

f. Tawain (Papuan Tip)
   mana  u  gobuli-ŋa
   house PREP underneath-its
   'under the house'

g. Saliba (Papuan Tip)
   ɾe  kewa-ŋa  ne  una
   table top-its DET POSTP:SG
   'on the table'

h. Tobaki (West Papuan)
   rum  truŋ-a
   house back-POSTP
   'behind the house'

i. Arop-Lokap (North New Guinea)
   fri ɾa ɾa
   house inside-its
   'in the house'

However, the relational local construction does not survive unscathed throughout Oceanic. In a number of languages some or all relational nouns have been reclassified as adpositions (sometimes with concomitant phonological reduction), so that there is now a set of locative prepositions corresponding to, say, *in', *on', *under', 'beside' and so on. These languages include Takaia (North New Guinea), Nuchi (Meso-Melanesian), Ahane (Central Vanuatu), Sye and Anjor (South Vanuatu), and Tisir, Nyelbub, Cemihul and Xarihla (New Caledonia). Thus in Takaia we find the postpositions bo 'at, at', reflecting POE *lo- 'inside', and fo/fo 'on', reflecting POE *po- 'papoa- 'upper surface' (Ross, this volume). Some relational nouns remain, however, like para- 'back' in (25c).

22 On the conceptual transfer from body parts to relational locations in Oceanic languages, see Bowden (1992).
4 Directional verbs and their derivatives

Perhaps the most confusing and diachronically complex area associated with deixis is the one surrounding what many writers call 'directional'. By 'directional', I mean a morpheme — often a clitic — that occurs in a verb phrase and has a deictic meaning. It lies well beyond the scope of this chapter to offer more than the barest outline of the history of these and associated morphemes.23

The Pileni (Polynesian) examples in (26) are drawn from Nasa (this volume):

(26) a. Lu-aka-gia mai te thoka nei!
you/ two-open-TR DIR.1 DET door DEM
‘Open the door for me!’

b. U-ku av-a tu nei e potopoto.
I-TA give-DIR.2 DEM TA short
‘I’ll give you this short one.’

c. Ko nh-ahe ko kake ake i hai takaun.
TA go-up TA climb up PREP DET tree
(She) went up and climbed up into a tree.

d. Ko-i too te au niu ko kave-ho.
TA-he take DET tree coconut PERFECTIVE bring-down
‘(He) took a coconut tree and brought it down.’

Four members of the Pileni directional paradigm are represented here: mai DIR.1, atu DIR.2, ake ‘up(ward)’ and iho ‘down(ward)’. As the glosses indicate, these form two semantic sets. The first two are deictic directional (DIR.1 means ‘towards the speaker’, DIR.2 ‘towards the addressee’), whilst ake and iho are absolute directional. Similar sets of morphemes occur in Nëlemwa (Bril, this volume), and (27) contains both an absolute directional, ake, and a deictic directional, me.

(27) Na o-o-lo me na Frâis.
I go-up DIR.1 PREP France
‘I’m coming back (here) from France.’

Both Nëlemwa and Iasi (Oceanic-Riviere, this volume) have fewer directionals than Pileni. The Nëlemwa set has just one more member, xi DIR.3. Iasi has jeem DIR.1, illustrated in (28), and three ‘away from speaker’ (DIR.3) forms, jito ‘westward’, deih ‘eastward’ and hidih ‘crosswise’.

(28) He diho jeem!
go IMPERATIVE DIR.1
‘Come here!’

Present-day Takia has no directionals. Instead we find serial-verb constructions like those in (29), where the directional semantics are carried by the verbs -a/e ‘go from speaker’, poda ‘come to speaker’ and da ‘descend’.

---

23 Because the common determiner does not occur in this construction, it is arguable for some languages that the ‘preposition’ is in fact a (case-marking) determiner. Hyslop (2001) argues this for Anahaefo, and it can certainly be argued that locative ‘prepositions’ in many non-Oceanic Austronesian languages of the Philippines are better analyzed as determiners.

24 This is a slight simplification. In the relational local construction of some languages, the local construction has been replaced by the adjunct construction, i.e. the local adposition has been replaced by the general-purpose adposition (in the languages of Fiji and Polynesia and in certain other parts of Oceania the local and adjunct constructions have in any case collapsed into a single construction). In one or two cases the indelible possession construction has been replaced by the construction used for alienable possession.

25 For a fuller discussion, again see Rats (2001).

26 The third example is from Watene, Tuamotu and Rehberg (1993).
It is easy to see that Pilcani mai, attu, ake and iho are descended respectively from POC *mai, *atu, *ake and *iho, whilst Nkhêmwa da and me reflect POC *da, *me. Intriguingly, the Iaai and Takia examples above reflect the cycle of change that affects directional verbs and particles. For example, the second syllable of Takia -oma ‘get up’ in (29a) reflects POC *sauk ‘go upward’, also preserved in Takia as the verb -sa ‘go up’. In other words, at sometime in the past history of Takia, there were directions, which were cliticised, then suffixed to verbs, finishing off as fossilised compounds. Other fossils of sa in Takia are -sita ‘come up, approach, climb high up’; -siti ‘pull up, hitch up’ and -sata ‘come out’ (-l-a ‘move away from speaker’). The directional *sipo ‘go downward’ is not reflected as a verb in Takia, but occurs in various fossilised compounds: -sapa ‘put down, give birth’ (-gane ‘do, make, put’); -bisek ‘quieten (oneself) down’ (-kise release), -bat ‘put down, throw down’ (-hal throw), -ansi ‘lie down’ (-en die, sleep, stay) and -esam ‘bend down’. The first syllables of the fossilised compounds -sala ‘go inland’ and -sita ‘go seawards’ reflect POC *sauk and *sipo, their second syllable POC *da ‘go to’. It is not difficult to imagine that a (formerly compound) verb like Takia -sala or -sita, occurring frequently as the final verb of a serial-verb construction, might then develop into a directional, starting the second phase of a cycle. Exactly this seems to have happened with the Iaai directional jeem dri 2 in (28), which apparently reflects POC *ef, dri ‘rise’ + *mai ‘come to speaker’. That is, jeem reflects what was once a serial verb construction.

The grammaticalisation of directional verbs as directionalities is a fairly obvious process, and so is the compoundisation of verb + directional reflected in Takia, and in the Ambae (Central Vanuatu) set shown in (32) together with the Proto Oceanic forms from which it is descended.
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give compounds which have become, e.g., Nakani o-ina 'be there' (-ina < *POC *tina 'ground'), o-ata 'be up above' (-ata < POC *tata 'space above'). These compounds are verbs in their own right, and have shifted their sense from direction to location. They may also take a noun phrase as locative complement:

(34) a. E tue o-ata la luma.
DET father o-above DET house
'Father is up at the house.'

b. E tue o-ata la hokoi.
DET father o-above DET bush
'They are up in the bush.'

When *ua in the clauses in (33) became a directional, it became more closely bound, at least in terms of constituency, to the preceding verb. But it was equally possible for it to come to form a constituent with the following phrasal item. In a number of Meso-
Melanesian languages — Meranera of New Britain and Lambasa, Madak, Barok, Surumurungu, Targga, Konomalga, Patpatar, Minigir, Tolai, Label, Bilur, Kandas and Ramonaul, all of central and southern New Ireland — a more complex development has occurred. At some time in their history, clauses occurred with the structure of (35).29

(35) a. *ia-piano ua i atus [tu'hu Runnaq].
s-he-go.across UA PREP space.above [PREP house]
'S/he went up to the house.'

b. *ia-piano ua to-toh Runnaq.
s-he-go.across UA PREP-prep house
'S/he went to the house.'

By this stage the reflex of *ua had lost its verbal status and become criticised to what followed it, the construction in (35a) giving rise to compounds like *ia-(t)-atus. Unlike in Nakani, where such compounds remained verbal, here they became directional adverbs. In Meranera, the paradigm in (36) has arisen (-do and -de are demonstrative enclitics). The Proto Oceanic roots are shown on the right. The locative forms are descended from the local construction with *i, the allatives from the construction just described with *ua, and the ablatives are the analogous forms descended from the directional *ma 'come', reinterpreted as 'come from'.

(36) locative allative ablative POC root
here' ianami u-s-ianami ma'-ianami *i
'there' inu ino ino ma'-ino *no
down [from'] tono-do u-tano ma'-tano *tanoq
'up [from'] fajama-do u-tama-do ma'-tama-de *tamaq
'beach' lau u-lau ... *lau
'home' luma u-luma ... *Runnaq

The examples in (37) illustrate these forms in context.

(37) a. ia *iuiau ia-tama-do.
s-he UA-down-DEM
'I am going down there.'

b. ia *iuiau ia-tama-do.
s-he UA-down-DEM
'I have come from that house.'

As (37b) shows, these adverbs may take a locative complement, in this case na luma-de 'at that house'.

Adverbial paradigms like this one also exist in the other Meso-Melanesian languages listed above. The most fully recorded of these is the one recorded for Tolai by Mosel (1982). The main forms are set out in (38).

(38) Tolai locative allative ablative POC root
'here' a-i a-o ma-i *i
'there' a-o a-i ma-o *o
'down, seawards' a-a a-o ma-a *ipo
'up, inland' a-i a-o ma-i ma-a ...
'straight up' a-a ma-a ma-a ...
'inside' a-i a-o ma-i a-o ...
'inside and up' a-i ma-a ma-a ma-a ...
'inside and down' a-i-ka a-o-ka ma-i-ka ...!
'behind' a-o-ka a-i-ka ma-o-ka ...

Again the reflexes of *ua and *mai are readily recognisable. Here, however, the prefix of the locative paradigm is derived not from *i but from the adverb-forming prefix *qa-. Indeed, it is likely that it was the already existing locative forms in -a that provided a model for the grammaticisation of the prefixes -o- and -ma-. The forms in (38) are apparently the outcomes of a great deal of phonological reduction. From closely related Patpatar we know that the forms in final -a 'down, seawards' were formerly *-as (Tolai has lost *s entirely), and I take the final *s in turn to be all that was left of POC *ipo 'go down'.

The Tolai clauses in (39a) and (39b) from Mosel (1982) reflect the constructions in (35a). The locative complement may be a placename, a common noun phrase introduced by the article ra, as below, or by the preposition ta.30 A personal noun phrase preceded by the preposition pire; or a local noun phrase preceded by the preposition na.

(39) a. i ga bura u-ra ra pite.
s-he PAST fall UA-DOWN DET ground
'S/he fell down to the ground.'

b. i gape ma-rana ra ud na dava.
s-he go.out MA-UP DET head LIG tree
'S/he climbed down from the tree.'

c. i ki a-ka-nama lia ra pali.
s-he stay QA-far-straight.up high.above PREP DET house
'S/he is on top of the house.'

29 Forms in -a may insert -ka to indicate 'further'. Forms in -a, -e, -oma and -o may have -ka inserted before this root to indicate emphatic reference, i.e. the lesser known it. The -ka-ka- sequence also occurs.

30 The distribution of these two possibilities with common noun phrases is unclear from the available descriptions, including my fieldnotes.
An interesting syntactic feature of these adverbs is that they not only take a locative complement, but it is rare for the complement to occur without the preceding adverb. Thus (39c) would be infelicitous, if not ungrammatical, without a-ka-namba. Or, putting it another way, there is a very strong tendency in Tolu and in some of its close relatives to specify a location or direction deictically before further specification is given. As far as I know, this is quite a rare feature among the world's languages.\(^{31}\)

I have so far left the reconstruction (35b) hanging, with no modern outcomes. It has fewer reflexes than (35a): they occur in Sarsurangu, Tanga, Koromala, Putpatu, Kandus and Ramaolona, and in the Southeast Solomon language Longau (Hill 1997). In these languages we find a reflex of *nu or *mal/masl directly preceding its locative complement, as in the Ramaolona clauses in (40).

(40) a. I ruk u-a no rana.
    *She went into the house.

b. Dho wan u na bua.
    They go UA PREP fish
    *They went into the bush.'

c. Keteke i ka u ra age.
    Keteke she go up UA DET bush
    *They went into the bush.'

The clause in (40a) resembles the Tolu clauses in (39a): u-a is an adverbial like those in the Tolu paradigm in (38). The other two clauses, (40b-c), differ from the Meranera and Tolu construction in consisting of the bare reflex of *nu. It is only a short step from here to reinterpret the *nu reflex as a preposition, and this is what it appears to be in Ramaolona, where it now the preposition of the adjunct construction.\(^{32}\)

Deictic sets of this degree of complexity are evidently rare, but a set with a paradigm similar in structure to Tolu is described by Ozanne-Riviere (this volume, Table 2) for Ila. I take it that this set is the result of innovations independent of those in Meranera and the New Ireland languages, but that it has arisen by a similar grammaticalisation path.

The discussion thus far has largely concerned the fate of Proto Oceanic deictic directional verbs. Reflexes of the absolute directional verb POE *sypo 'go down' and POE *suke 'go up' in (31) have acquired the senses 'down below' and 'up above.' This has had two outcomes. Reflexes of *sypo 'go up', at least, have in a few languages become local nouns. This is not surprising, as the shift to a locative sense 'up above' takes it close to reflexes of the meaning of the local noun *aias, so that in Baun Fijian, for example, both serve as local nouns and both i yatari 'on top' and i dake 'up above' occur. The other outcome is that in Enenamangan (South Vanuatu) and Nélémwa, reflexes of absolute directional verbs occur in the locative deictic system. The Nélémwa forms are given by Brit (this volume, Table

6b. Errormangan has a paradigm which includes the the forms in (41), where hep reflects POE *sypo 'go down' and hay reflects POE *suke 'go up'.

(41) 'there' 'over there'
    down ye-hep e-nep-hep
    up ya-hay e-nep-hay

There is just one case where a Proto Oceanic deictic directional verb becomes a demonstrative, and this was noted in \(^2\). The form *u-a has demonstrative reflexes, either form 3 or anaphoric, and one of these is found in Saliba wu (Margetts, this volume). This recategorisation could have occurred by one of two possible routes. The first is similar to that outlined for reflexes of *sypo and *suke. A reflex of POE *nua was reinterpretated as an adverb meaning 'over there', and this was then used as a modifier to a noun phrase. The other is that the verb *u-a was used in an unmarked relative clause ('that is over there') which became grammaticised as an adnominal demonstrative.

Pulling together the threads of this section is difficult, but two sets of comments about diachronic tendencies can be made. The first concerns semantic organisation. The reflexes of directional verbs and directionalities have continued to play a major role in Oceanic languages, but the situation does not quite match that of the demonstratives. There, the person-oriented internal organisation of the system has subsisted. Here, the three-way system based on persons has often collapsed into a speaker-oriented system with two directions: towards the speaker and away from the speaker. However, the directional orientation of events, both speaker-oriented and on the up/down axis, continues to be explicitly expressed in many modern systems.

The second set of comments concerns diachronic morphophrasis. We have seen here that directional verbs and their reflexes are readily subject to category shift and to various kinds of grammaticalisation. In this respect they are very different from local nouns, which are embedded in diachronically rather stable constructions, but more similar to demonstratives, which undergo rapid changes of form, as well as category shift, e.g. from locative to adnominal.

5 Concluding thoughts

From the standpoint of a historical linguist, several interesting thoughts emerge from the study reported in this chapter.

Semantic organisation can be remarkably stable over very long periods of time. This is true of Oceanic demonstrative systems and of the axes of spatial orientation expressed by Proto Oceanic directional verbs and their descendants. However, the directional particles of many Oceanic languages have moved from the expression of a person-oriented to a speaker-oriented system. Why a person-oriented system should survive among demonstratives but not in directional particles is not completely clear to me, but I infer that it has to do with the different typical usages of these systems. A primary use of demonstrative systems is to locate referents in relation to the speech-act participants, so a person-oriented system is an evidently usable (but not a necessary) strategy. The major use of directional verbs and particles, however, has to do with the narration of dynamic events and the movement of referents. Here, a deictic centre — by default the speaker — is important, but the addressee, who was not present at the narrated events, is often irrelevant. Hence the addressee-related member of the directional set falls out of use.

\(^{31}\) It is reported, however, by Bowden (2001) for the neo-Oceanic Austronesian language Tabu of eastern Indonesia, as well as for the nearby Papuan language Temeke (John Bowden, pers. comm.).

\(^{32}\) It may also be the origin of Kivilita o, Tawala u, but this is less certain.
Morphosynthetically the sets of items examined in this chapter appear to have two quite different diachronic fates, but the appearance is deceptive. On the one hand, the local constructions examined in §3 have enjoyed remarkable stability. As I pointed out there, this does not mean that their morphosyntax has remained unchanged, only that the pairing of meaning and grammatical function has survived. On the other hand, both the demonstratives and the directional verbs of Proto Oceanic have undergone radical changes of both form and, in some cases, syntax, so there would appear to be major differences in what has happened to local constructions and what has happened to demonstratives and directionals.

To compare the two phenomena in this way, however, is to compare unlike objects. Demonstratives and directional verbs are both elements within constructions. One is the demonstrative noun phrase construction (‘this man’ vs ‘that man’) and this construction has inevitably survived over time. Directional verbs and particles form part of verb phrase constructions for expressing certain kinds of events, and we can probably argue too that these constructions have been remarkably stable over time (in the sense that the constructions have retained devices for attributing directionality to events). What is different about directional verbs, however, is that they have also been grammaticized into new constructions. The adverb + locative complement construction in Tolai and its neighbours represents a new construction which apparently did not exist before (as it is dedicated to expressing a combination of meanings that were not previously expressed) and has arisen through the accident of grammaticisation.

At the same time, the observation that the adpositions within the local construction have undergone change in form and syntax over time is of the same kind as the observation that demonstratives have undergone morphosynthetic change. And just as I noted that demonstratives have been far more conservative in Micronesia and Polynesia than in Melanesia, so the same is true of both prepositions in the local and adjacent constructions and of directional particles.

So it can be said in sum, that complex though they are, the changes that have occurred since Proto Oceanic times in demonstratives, in the local construction and in directional adpositions to much the same patterns, provided that we view them all from the same perspective. Semantic organisation remains relatively stable in the face of morphosynthetic change. Constructural organisation is also rather stable, but grammaticisation may result in the rise of the occasional new construction, whilst constructional loss may sometimes occur through the merger of two constructions into one (e.g. the local and adjacent constructions in some languages). Changes in form within small paradigms can be quite radical, and this change reflects the social conditions of the language’s speakers over time.
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