

CENTRAL-EASTERN OCEANIC: A SUBGROUPING HYPOTHESIS

John Lynch and D.T. Tryon

This paper represents the first report on a long-term project which has as its major aim a subgrouping of the Oceanic languages, based largely on morphological evidence. Previous classifications of the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian give the impression that Proto-Oceanic split into a large number of first-order branches.¹

1. PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS AT LARGE-SCALE SUBGROUPING

Since the recognition of an Oceanic subgroup by Dempwolff, there have been few major attempts at an overall subgrouping of the Oceanic languages, largely because of the huge number of languages involved, and the unavailability of representative data.² Grace published a tentative subgrouping of Oceanic, which he subsequently revised in 1971 and again most recently in 1981.³ His original classification divided Oceanic into nineteen subgroups, but it seems clear that Grace did not necessarily intend that these should be interpreted as first-order subgroups. The original nineteen subgroups were distributed geographically as follows: ten in Papua New Guinea, four in the Solomons, four in New Caledonia and the Loyalties, and one comprising the languages of Vanuatu, Fiji, Rotuma, Polynesia, as well as those languages known as Micronesian. The two later versions of the paper show certain changes in details, mainly as more data became available from regions not well known to Grace in the 1950s. Thus we find, for example, that in the 1971 revision Grace adds two branches in Irian Jaya, while in the 1981 paper he recognises more groups in the Papua New Guinea region. Although various subgroups proposed by other scholars are mentioned in this latest revision, it is not always clear whether Grace is happy to accept them. Because of this, and also because of the format of the 1981 paper, it is difficult to see just exactly how many subgroups Grace would now recognise.

The other major classification was that of Dyen, who published his lexicostatistical classification of the whole Austronesian family, which included material from both Oceanic and western languages, in 1965. This classification in fact found no lexicostatistical basis at all for an Oceanic subgroup. Instead, Dyen proposed a forty-branch family-tree for Austronesian, with thirty-three of these branches being wholly or partly located in the region which most other linguists believe is occupied by the Oceanic subgroup. One of these

Andrew Pawley and Lois Carrington, eds *Austronesian linguistics at the 15th Pacific Science Congress*, 31-52.
Pacific Linguistics, C-88, 1985
© John Lynch & D.T. Tryon

thirty-three branches, the large Malayopolynesian Linkage, had most of its members in the western (Indonesian) region, but also included the languages of Polynesia, Rotuma, and Fiji, as well as Mota and the languages of Efate in Vanuatu, Kerebutu, Lau, and To'ambaita in the Solomons, and Motu in Papua New Guinea. The other thirty-two branches had no such western connections; and although two of them — Yapese and Nauruan — may not in fact belong to the Oceanic subgroup, the remaining thirty branches are clearly recognised to be Oceanic by the vast majority of Austronesianists, and were distributed geographically as follows: two in Irian Jaya, seventeen in Papua New Guinea, three in the Solomons, four in Vanuatu, three in New Caledonia, and one in Micronesia.

Despite the considerable differences in approach and results, these two attempts at large-scale classification clearly have one feature in common: no large subgroups are recognised, and any 'family-trees' of Oceanic that could be drawn from these classifications must of necessity be unstratified and show many first-order branches. A considerable amount of more recent research has attempted to draw together some of the subgroups recognised by Dyen or Grace and to combine them into somewhat larger groups: we might mention here in particular research into the Austronesian languages of the New Guinea/Western Solomons area by Blust, Bradshaw, Johnston, Lincoln, Ross, and Tryon, among others. However, the bases on which these proposals have been made differ, and most of them do not at this stage seem to have gained general acceptance.

The project we are engaged on will eventually involve comparison of grammatical morphemes and some grammatical structures across as wide a range of Oceanic languages for which data are available. This present paper discusses the first results from this project. We will show in section 3 that there is a body of apparent morphological innovations indicating a subgroup which expands the Eastern Oceanic (EO) group as defined by Biggs (1965) and Pawley (1972). Apart from including the Micronesian languages (Grace 1955), the expanded subgroup also includes the Southern Vanuatu subgroup and the languages of Utupua and Vanikoro in the Santa Cruz area. We call this putative subgroup Central-Eastern Oceanic. Before examining the evidence for the Central-Eastern Oceanic subgroup however, we first discuss the various hypotheses relating to the Eastern Oceanic group.

2. EASTERN OCEANIC

The term 'Eastern Oceanic' was apparently first used by Biggs (1965). In his classic article on the historical phonology of Rotuman, Biggs adopted as a working hypothesis the existence of an EO subgroup:

... there is some evidence that Fijian, Polynesian, Rotuman and certain languages of the Solomons-New Hebrides chain ... are members of a single subgroup of Austronesian. This paper assumes such to be the case (Biggs 1965:383).

Nothing, however, was said of any innovations identifying EO as a closed subgroup.

It was Pawley's (1972) paper which made explicit the innovations on which the subgrouping proposal is based, and upon which most subsequent discussion of the subgroup is based.

Pawley (1972) expanded on Biggs' proposal in a number of ways. First, he listed a number of morphological features, and one phonological innovation, apparently shared by the languages of the EO subgroup. Second, he reconstructed

a considerable portion of EO grammar.⁴ Third, he argued for the following subgroups of EO:

- (i) Southeast Solomonian, with two subgroups:
 - a. Guadalcanal-Nggelic
 - b. Cristobal-Malaitan
- (ii) North Hebridean-Central Pacific, with two subgroups:
 - a. North Hebridean, further subdividing into Northern New Hebrides-Banks and Central New Hebrides subgroups;
 - b. Central Pacific, with Fijian and Polynesian subgroups.

Gilbertese and Rotuman were also considered in Pawley's (1972) article, but although both languages satisfied some of the criteria for inclusion within EO, there were some arguments against their inclusion, and they remained unclassified.⁵

Grace, whose 1955 classification of the Oceanic languages was discussed above⁶, reviewed Pawley's (1972) paper in 1976. In this he appeared to accept the main thrust of the argument, although he was critical of a number of aspects of the proposal, in particular the use of the one phonological innovation for the EO subgroup — the loss of Proto-Austronesian (PAN) final consonants in absolute final position. In reaction, Pawley (1977) redefined the subgroup; he withdrew the Southeast Solomonian subgroup, and renamed the rump Remote Oceanic.

More recent work has shown that Pawley may have been somewhat precipitate. Blust (1982), for example, presents a body of evidence suggesting that Pawley's Cristobal-Malaitan subgroup and the Micronesian languages form a subgroup of Eastern Oceanic. While this proposal is inconsistent with Pawley's Southeast Solomons subgroup, it nevertheless suggests that the wider Eastern Oceanic group has considerable validity.⁷

3. CENTRAL-EASTERN OCEANIC

Below we present evidence for a subgroup of Oceanic, called Central-Eastern Oceanic (CEO), comprising the following sets of languages:

1. Eastern Oceanic (EO)
 - a. Southeast Solomonian
 - b. North and Central Vanuatu
 - c. Central Pacific (including Rotuman)
 - d. Micronesian
2. Southern Vanuatu (SV)
3. Utupua and Vanikoro (eastern Outer Islands, Solomon Islands) (UV)

The evidence for CEO consists of a number of morphological features apparently exclusively shared by one or more members of most of the sets of languages shown above, and apparently not found in other Oceanic subgroups.⁸ We use the term 'sets of languages' rather than 'subgroups' because at this stage the internal subgrouping of the proposed CEO group remains uncertain in several respects (although cf. section 4 below).

EASTERN OCEANIC. This set of languages is basically as outlined in the previous section, although given Blust's most recent (1982) paper, the subdivisions of this set listed here must at the moment be taken to be partly geographical and partly genetic.

SOUTHERN VANUATU. This subgroup, which was established by Lynch (1978a), includes the languages of Erromango, Tanna, and Aneityum. Although a certain amount of reconstruction has been done in this subgroup (Lynch 1982c, 1983b), little of this has yet been published.

UTUPUA-VANIKORO. The languages of Utupua and Vanikoro have recently been shown (Tryon and Hackman 1983) to form a rather tenuous subgroup on phonological grounds, although the subgrouping hypothesis is somewhat more secure when morphological evidence is taken into account.

3.1 Exclusively shared features

The following morphological reconstructions are attributed here to PCEO and regarded as innovations of the CEO subgroup:

1. *muni *dative preposition or prepositional verb*
2. *ni *second person singular preverbal subject-marking particle*
3. *le *locative preposition, an irregular development of POC *lo*
4. *(n)tewa *one*
5. *po(η)koto, or *poto(η)ko, *near, nearby*
6. *(q)a *personal article*
7. *ma *preverbal particle marking realis/past/non-future*
8. *tua(i) *verbal particle, 'already, finished, long ago'*
9. *(n)teŋma[na] *particle linking ten and smaller units in numerals above ten*
10. *ŋke *preverbal particle marking conditional*
11. *pia *where? a metathesised form of POC *pai*
12. *tapa *verbal prefix or particle marking spontaneous action*
13. *-(k)i *construct suffix to possessed nouns*
14. *i- *agentive noun derivative*
15. *ka- *instrumental noun derivative*

Of these fifteen reconstructions, the first six or seven seem secure, since they are either found in all the sets of languages noted above, or else their absence from one particular set of languages is explainable in some principled way; in addition, no one set of languages consistently shows more such gaps than any other. The remaining eight or nine shared grammatical features are less secure (and are marked ?PCEO), since they are not found in all sets of languages, although again, there is no one set of languages which consistently misses out on these latter exclusively shared features. We believe that these also provide quite strong evidence for the hypothesis, and may also provide evidence for internal subgrouping at some later date. The exclusively shared features, which are discussed in detail below, are thus ranked from most secure to least secure.

Since there appears to be no significant phonological difference between POC (the ancestor of PCEO) and PEO (a presumed daughter-language of PCEO), we assume for the present that the phonological system of PCEO is the same as that of POC.

The putative innovations are discussed in detail below. Data from each set of languages are presented separately, and this presentation is followed in a number of cases by a discussion of any points of interest which arise.

1. PCEO *muni *dative preposition* or *prepositional verb*

EO: Pawley (1972:8) reconstructed, as an Eastern Oceanic innovation, the form PEO *muni, with the function *prepositional verb indicating dative (to, for, with a person)*, on the basis of reflexes in Fiji (e.g., Wayan muni), Northern Vanuatu and the Banks (e.g., Mota mun, Maewo min) and the South-East Solomons (e.g., Ulawa muni) (1972:88). To the data given there by Pawley can be added the forms Mosina mun, Nume min, and Vatrata men. We have not found cognate forms in Micronesian.⁹

SV: The Tanna languages show morphemes which are formally cognate, although functionally they share only the comitative sense of Pawley's reconstruction. The forms in question are reflected as mone in all five Tanna languages. The Anejom comitative verbal prefix imi- may possibly also be cognate.

UV: The dative forms Vano nimini-, imini-, and Buma nimini- are cognate with *muni.

2. PCEO *ni *second person singular preverbal subject-marking particle*.

EO: The forms Motlav nek, Mota, Vatrata, Mosina, Merlav nik may reflect *ni, though it is more probable that they are reduced forms of the free pronoun (Proto-North Hebridean *(i)-niko (Pawley 1972:113)) rather than true subject-marking particles.

SV: North Tanna, Whitesands, Lenakel, South-West Tanna n-, Anejom nei, na.

UV: Asumboa ni, Tanimbili, Vano nu-, Nembao ni-.

3. PCEO *le *locative preposition*, as an irregular development of POC *lo (cf. PEO *lalo *inside*).

EO: The type PCEO *le appears not to be found in two of the EO regions: South-East Solomons and Central Pacific. It is, however, found in the other two regions. In the Banks, Vatrata, Mosina, Nume, and Merlav all show le. In Nuclear Micronesian, we find Puluwat le or lee *at*, and Woleaian le- *in, prefix to some nouns indicating time or space*.

SV: The locative prepositions in the Southern Vanuatu languages are Sie, Ura ra, North Tanna e, Whitesands, South-West Tanna ie, Lenakel le, Kwamera ia, Anejom a. In each of these languages for which sufficient data are available, a variant form occurs when a pronominal object is suffixed: the forms are Sie, Kwamera, Anejom ira-, Ura ara-, Lenakel la-, South-West Tanna il-. Although there has obviously been some confusion between the palatal (i) and non-palatal (l or r) reflexes of POC liquids in the northern Tanna languages, which appears to have spread to South-West Tanna and Kwamera, it seems nevertheless that these forms are derived from *le.

While the innovation appears to be widespread throughout the putative Central-Eastern Oceanic subgroup, there are also cases of reflexes of POC *lo with a mid back vowel — i.e., cases within CEO languages where the innovation has not taken place. In contrast to the Micronesian forms given earlier, for example, we also find Marshallese ilo. Note in particular the very similar cases of Mota lo, ilo, alo, and Nume le, ile, ale, and also the sets of double reflexes in the same language: Vatrata lo, le; Puluwat llɔ-, lee-, le-. Data from the Utupua and Vanikoro languages are also somewhat confusing. While the

Buma form *lelema* *inside, in the house* is reminiscent of **le*, Asumboa *lu* suggests **lo*, and Nembao *la, ra* suggest **lalo*. A plausible hypothesis is that the change **lo* > **le* was not complete at the time PCEO had broken up, and that the two forms remained variants in at least some dialects of PCEO for some time:

4. PCEO *(n)tewa *one*

EO: Pawley (1972) reconstructed as a North Hebridean-Central Pacific innovation a form for the numeral *one* – variously given as **tu(w)a*, **te(w)a* (p.52) or *(n)tewa (p.113) – on the basis of such forms as East Fijian *dua*, Rotuman *taa*, Merlav *tuwa/le*, Maewo *tewa*, Tangoa *tea*. No cognate forms seem to be found in the South-East Solomons, though there are apparent cognates in Micronesian: cf. Marshallese *juon*, Sonsorol *det*, and possibly also Ulithian *se*, Kusaiean *sie*, *se*, and Woleaian *se-*.

SV: North Tanna, Whitesands *ka/tia*, Kwamera *kwa/tia* may well be cognate.

UV: Nembao *tua*, Tanimbili *suo* are clearly cognate.

Forms reconstructed for *one* include POC *(n)sa and *-kai, and PEO *ke(n)s[ae], *(n)sa, *(n)sakai, and *ta(n)sa. Although a number of these forms are also reflected in various Central-Eastern Oceanic languages, it is plausible that reflexes of more than one such form may occur in the same language with separate functions (e.g., *one, in counting; a, an, indefinite article; one, used in counting tens; etc.*). The presence of reflexes of some of these POC forms for *one* in various CEO languages does not, then, invalidate the proposed innovation.

5. PCEO *(m)po(ŋ)koto or *(m)poto(ŋ)ko, *near, nearby*.

EO: North/Central Vanuatu: Motlav *beteŋ*, Mota *peteŋ*, Vatrata *ro/v'e*, Mosina *ri/pte*, Nume *a/mbəti*, Port Sandwich *paricaŋ*.

SV: Sie *potpot*, Ura *burubut*, North Tanna *i/uakər*, Whitesands *i/uokər*, Lenakel *i/uokət*, South-West Tanna, Kwamera *i/paka*, Anejom *o/potpotet*.

UV: Asumboa *a/vitako*, Tanimbili *ma/voko*, Vano *fatioko*, Buma *fetokɔ*.

6. PCEO *(q)a *personal article*

EO: Pawley (1972:9, 58) reconstructed as an Eastern Oceanic innovation the personal name marker or personal article PEO *(q)a, with reflexes in Polynesian (PPN *(?)a) and the South-East Solomons (e.g., Kwara'ae, Sa'a, Nggela a). A personal article a is also found in Big Nambas in Northern Vanuatu. As a specifically South-East Solomons innovation, Pawley (1972:100) noted that this form occurs only before personal names and kinship terms in focal and subject position (contrasting with the Polynesian function of occurring before personal pronouns, personal interrogatives and personal names in object position).

SV: The Anejom form a, which marks the subject of a clause and is fused initially on the focal pronouns, may parallel the specifically South-East Solomons innovation.

UV: Tanimbili has a personal article of the form a.

7. PCEO *ma *preverbal particle marking realis/past/non-future*

EO: Pawley (1972:48, 112) reconstructed as a North Hebridean-Central Pacific innovation the preverbal particle *ma with reflexes in the Banks and Northern Vanuatu regions (e.g., Merlav *me*, Mota, Nogugu *ma*, Tasiriki *mo*), and also in several Fijian dialects (e.g., Bua, Kadavu *maa*). The form was glossed as marking past or non-future tense. A possible reflex of the form appears to be

found in the South-East Solomons region, in Kwaio *me'e narrative past*. In the Micronesian area, Ulithian *ma habitual* may also be cognate.

SV: All of the Southern Vanuatu languages with the exception of Kwamera show what appears to be a cognate form, though in many cases there is an accreted initial vowel, and in two cases there is a final *n*.¹⁰ The forms in question are Sie, Ura *m- mid past*, *m-em- remote past*; North Tanna *amw-*, Whitesands *am-*, Lenakel *əm-*, South-West Tanna *əm-*, all marking past tense; and Anejom *mwan perfective*.

UV: No cognate form occurs in the Utupua-Vanikoro languages. However, it appears that these languages have undergone a significant change in their tense-marking system. Essentially, no tense-marking particles may occur in the verb phrase in the languages of Utupua, the time of the action being marked (where necessary) by adverbials:

ASUMBOA: *anambo* *na-mbure-ndyo*
 yesterday I-see-them
 I saw them yesterday

tambo *nene* *na-save* *tavio*
 tomorrow by-and-by I-cut *wood*
 Tomorrow I'll cut the wood

The sole exception to this rule appears to be a particle Nembao *ma-*, Tanimbili *me-*, which marks future. In Vanikoro, on the other hand, tense-marking appears to be effected by a change in the vowel of the subject prefix, especially (though not solely) in the first and second persons singular:

BUMA: *pepane* *ni-romo* *mwoe* *iono*
 yesterday I:PAST-see house your
 I saw your house yesterday

mombo *ne-romo* *mwoe* *iono*
 tomorrow I:FUTURE-see house your
 I will see your house tomorrow

The proposed exclusively shared feature, then, is not strongly contradicted by the Utupua-Vanikoro evidence, which suggests that considerable simplification has taken place in the tense-marking system in these languages.

8. PCEO **tua(i)* verbal particle, 'already, finished, long ago'.

EO: Pawley (1972:9, 51) reconstructed as an Eastern Oceanic innovation the postverbal particle PEO **tua(i)* marking perfective aspect, with reflexes in Polynesian (Proto-Polynesian (PPN) **tuai*), Gilbertese (*tuai*), the South-East Solomons (e.g., Kwara'ae 'ua, Nggela tua), and North/Central Vanuatu (e.g., Mota, Tangoa *tuai*). Although the form has apparent cognates in PAN **tuqaS old*, POC, PEO **ma-tuqa old, mature*, and **tuqa-ka older sibling of same sex*, a number of features seem to be innovations: loss of **q*, accretion in at least some languages of *-i*, and its function as an aspect marker. Note also the following forms in Micronesian which are almost certainly cognate in form if not exactly cognate in function: Woleaian *taai no longer*, Sonsorol *mɔ/duwe long ago*. In addition, Pawley established as an innovation of his Central New Hebridean subgroup the change from **tua(i)* to the type Nguna *sua* (1972:119).

SV: Two reflexes of **tua(i)* in Southern Vanuatu are Sie *itetuai*, Anejom *ituwu long ago*. The Sie form shows an accreted *ite-*, which is probably the identificatory prefix *it-* plus epenthetic *e* (Lynch and Capell 1983). The Anejom form is more problematical, and in any case neither is used as an aspect marker per se.

However, the Sie perfective verbal suffix *-su* may be cognate either with **tua(i)* or, more likely, with the Central New Hebridean innovation of the type *Nguna sua*; in this case, the form is clearly an aspect marker.

UV: Two possible cognates are the perfective aspect markers *Asumboa so-*, a verbal prefix, and *Nembaao ao-*, a verbal suffix.

9. PCEO *(n)teŋma [na] *particle linking ten and smaller units in numerals above ten.*

EO: Pawley (1972:47) reconstructed the form *(n)tum(w)a, as a numeral particle linking tens and smaller numbers, on the basis of reflexes in Polynesian (PPN **tumaa*), Rotuman (*fumaa*), North/Central Vanuatu (e.g., *Merlav demwe/i*, *Raga domwa*) and the South-East Solomons (e.g., *Bugotu toma/ga*). Additional data from languages not listed in Pawley's tables include *Motlav nadmwe*, *Vatrata wal demwei*, *Mosina o numweyi*, *Nume domwen*, *Big Nambas deman*, and possibly *Port Sandwich ndromuxer*. While Pawley did not establish this form as an Eastern Oceanic innovation, it does not appear to be found outside the putative Central-Eastern Oceanic subgroup.¹¹

UV: *Vano lemene*, *Buma tamana*.

The absence of this particle in the languages of Southern Vanuatu can be explained by the fact that these languages have changed to a quinary numeral system. Forms above ten in those languages thus behave no differently from forms above five, and the rationale for a particle linking ten and lower numerals which was distinct from that linking five and lower numerals has disappeared.

10. ?PCEO *ŋke *preverbal particle marking conditional*

EO: The preverbal particle POC *(ŋ)ke, *suppositional, purposive, prospective* was reconstructed as an Eastern Oceanic innovation by Pawley (1972:8-9, 48), on the basis of reflexes in Polynesian (PPN **ke*), Fijian (East Fijian, *Wayan ke*), and the South-East Solomons languages (e.g., *Kwara'ae*, *Lau ke*, *Nggela ke*, *ŋge*). To these can be added *Kusaiean ke when* (subordinating conjunction), and *Gilbertese ŋke*, marking conditional.

UV: *Asumboa*, *Tanimbili mbwa-ke if*; cf. also *Tanimbili*, *Asumboa ke because*.

It should be noted that this form, either as a preverbal particle or a subordinating conjunction, is represented in all of the regions in question except Southern Vanuatu, where at least the languages of *Erromango* and *Tanna* appear to have innovated by using a form of the quotative verb to express conditions. Thus *Sie nan̄ku if*, for example, is a nominalisation of the irrealis form (*aŋku*) of the quotative verb *oyu*; while *Lenakel takamwa* (real conditional), *kapamwa* (irreal conditional) are impersonal verbal forms of the quotative verb *emwa*.

11. ?PCEO *pia *where?* an irregular development involving metathesis of vowels from POC *pai.

EO: Pawley (1972:78, 111-112) posited, as an innovation of the North Hebridean-Central Pacific subgroup, the formal change from POC **pai where?* to PHC **p[e]ia*, based on such reflexes as PPN **fea*, *Merlav via*, *Mota vea*, and *Maewo bea*. He notes, however, the difficulty involved in accepting this as an innovation caused by such forms as East Fijian and *Wayan vei*, which do not show the metathesis. While unmetathesised forms occur in the South-East Solomons (e.g., *Arosi hei*, *Lau fai*, *Nggela vei*), Nuclear Micronesian languages reflect the metathesised form: *Gilbertese iia*, *iaa*, *Marshallese ia*, *Puluwat yiya*, *yiye*, *Ulithian yiyaa*, *Woleaian iiya*, and *Sonsorol iia*.

SV: The Southern Vanuatu languages reflect forms with the phoneme combination *ia*, but show irregular loss of the initial **p*. The forms are Sie *iya*, North Tanna, Whitesands *ihia*, Lenakel, South-West Tanna *ihie*, Kwamera *isa*, Anejom *eθa*, suggesting a Proto-Southern Vanuatu form **isia* or **isa*.

Forms recorded in Utupua and Vanikoro are probably more recent innovations, being cognate neither with **pia* nor with **pai* (e.g., Asumboa *ñiñi*, Tanimbili *maa*, Vano *mene*, etc.).

The innovation proposed for PHC thus can be extended to PCEO, with the same kinds of reservations as expressed by Pawley: the problem of the unmetathesised form occurring in the South-East Solomons and Fijian.

12. ?PCEO **tapa* prefix or particle marking spontaneous action.

EO: The forms **ta-*, **tapa-*, stative derivative, have been reconstructed for PEO (Pawley 1972:45). A footnote (which refers only to **tapa-* ?) states that 'with some verbs this marks a spontaneously arising condition'. The stative-marker **ta-* is not an EO innovation, as it is found in other Oceanic subgroups.¹² The (variant?) form **tapa-*, however did not appear to be found outside Eastern Oceanic. In Pawley's tables (1972:45) reflexes of **tapa-*, apparently with the meaning of *spontaneity*, are shown as occurring in the Banks and Northern Vanuatu (e.g., Mota *tapa-*, Naewi *rava-*) and also in the South-East Solomons (e.g., Fagani *'afa-*, Bugotu *tava-*). To the data given there can be added Motlav *tav-*, Nume *tava*, Vatrata *'av*, *'amw*, and Mosina *tamw*, *tav*.

SV: Possible cognates of **tapa* occur as suffixes to verbs in the languages of Tanna marking *reflexive*, *reciprocal*, *spontaneously occurring action* — e.g., Lenakel *r-əm-ol-atu* (3SG-PAST-*do*-REC/REF/SPONT) *it happened by itself*. The forms, with accreted initial *a*, are Whitesands *-aru*, Lenakel *-atu*, South-West Tanna *-atukw*, and Kwamera *-atuk*.¹³ Ura of Erromango has the prefix *esebin-* marking spontaneity which may possibly be cognate.

This form does not appear to occur in Micronesian, although the type Marshallese *ja-* may presumably reflect either **tapa-* or the shorter form **ta-*. No affix marking spontaneity has been recorded for the languages of Utupua or Vanikoro and further research is needed to determine (a) whether spontaneity is marked at all in those languages and (b) if it is, whether it is marked at all in those languages and, if so, whether it is marked with a reflex of **tapa-*.

13. ?PCEO *-(*k*)*i* construct suffix to possessed nouns when the possessor is a noun.¹⁴

EO: The following forms appear to derive from the suggested reconstruction. In the South-East Solomons: Kwaio *-i*, *-i*, Nggela *-i* (cf. C.E. Fox 1950:149), and possibly To'ambaita *-e* (Ray 1926). In the North/Central Vanuatu region: Mota *-i*, *-iu*, Vatrata, Mosina, Merlav *-yi*, *-i*. In Central Pacific: East Fijian *-i*.¹⁵ In Nuclear Micronesian: Puluwat *-y*, *-i*, and possibly Ulithian *-li*.

SV: South-West Tanna, Kwamera, and Anejom have a construct suffix *-i*.

Information presently available on the languages of Utupua and Vanikoro shows no evidence of construct suffixes.

14. ?PCEO **i-* agentive noun derivative.

15. ?PCEO **ka-* instrumental noun derivative.

A form **i-* is reconstructed for POC and PEO, and glossed as *instrumental noun derivative*. Within the Eastern Oceanic subgroup, it has reflexes in Fijian,

Northern Vanuatu, and the South-East Solomons. However, there is considerable evidence that a homophonous form *i- can be reconstructed for PCEO with the function *agentive noun derivative*, while a PCEO form *ka- can be reconstructed with the function of *instrumental noun derivative*. The evidence is presented first, and is followed by a discussion of the relationship between these two forms and other forms reconstructed as *i.

Agentive *i:

EO: North/Central Vanuatu: Mota, Motlav, Merlav i, Mosina e.

SV: Whitesands, South-West Tanna, Lenakel, Kwamera i-.

Instrumental *ka:

EO: North/Central Vanuatu: Mota, Mosina, Nume, Merlav ya. Nuclear Micronesian: Sonsorol ya- *forms abstract nouns, including instrumental nouns*. Central Pacific: note Fijian kaa *thing*.

SV: North Tanna, Whitesands, Lenakel, South-West Tanna, Kwamera k-.

It appears that considerable switching of function has occurred in Oceanic languages generally with regard to these two morphemes. The proposed PCEO prefix *ka-, for example, appears to be reflected in some languages with the function of forming agentive rather than instrumental nouns. At the same time, it is our contention that the same kind of reanalysis was taking place with respect to *i, possibly under pressure from a homophonous particle, the personal article PAN, POC, PEO *i. While *i can be reconstructed with purely instrumental functions for PCEO, there is also evidence, as given above, for suggesting that it had acquired, or was acquiring, agentive functions.

Consider the case of Mota (Codrington 1885). It is clear there that both i (from *i-) and a (from *ka-) have instrumental uses. At the same time, there is a certain amount of evidence for the agentive use of i, as in *ɣale deceive*, *i ɣale the deceiver*; *ɣilala know*, *i ɣilala the knowing one*; *ɣopa sick*, *ɣopae sickness*, *i ɣopae a sick man*; and so on. Similar evidence exists for Motlav and Merlav.

It would seem, therefore, that POC *i was an instrumental prefix. Possibly due to contamination from the homophonous personal article *i, however, this instrumental prefix began taking on agentive-marking functions, as seems to have happened in Mota, and the form *ka- seems to have been innovated to take over the instrumental functions of *i. The process seems to have reached its furthest development in Southern Vanuatu, where *i now has no instrumental uses.

4. CENTRAL-EASTERN OCEANIC: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL SUBGROUPING

Both Pawley (1977) and Blust (1982) question, in one way or another, the original Eastern Oceanic proposal, and in both cases it is the affiliations of the languages of the South-East Solomons which are the major problem. Pawley proposes withdrawing them altogether from the subgroup, while Blust finds evidence linking Nuclear Micronesian with one of Pawley's (1972) South-East Solomons subgroups, but not with the other. But although the integrity of the Eastern Oceanic subgroup clearly requires considerable further investigation, we have not addressed ourselves to this question in this paper. Rather, in briefly examining the internal subgrouping and the external links of the putative Central-Eastern Oceanic grouping, we assume for the present that Eastern Oceanic is a valid subgroup.¹⁶

An examination of the innovations proposed above suggests two conclusions:

- a. that a strong case exists for including the languages of Southern Vanuatu (SV) in CEO.
- b. that a weaker case exists for including the languages of Utupua and Vanikoro (UV) in CEO.

It is clear that a great deal more work is necessary to clarify the internal subgrouping of Central-Eastern Oceanic.

As for the immediate external relationships of CEO, it is difficult at this stage of the investigation to make any positive statement. However, our impressions — and they are only impressions at this early stage of the investigation — are that the closest relatives of the putative Central-Eastern Oceanic subgroup, an expansion of the original Eastern Oceanic subgroup, will be found on the one hand in the Loyalty Islands and New Caledonia and on the other in the New Ireland/Bougainville/Western Solomons regions, areas geographically contiguous to that covered by Central-Eastern Oceanic.

5. CONCLUSION

We have suggested in this paper that there is a body of evidence supporting the existence of a subgroup which is geographically continuous in central and eastern Oceania. This subgroup clearly includes both the languages generally labelled Eastern Oceanic, and also the Southern Vanuatu subgroup: this conclusion matches exactly that of Grace (1955), though it escaped Pawley (1972) and especially Lynch (1978a).¹⁷ There is also a considerable body of evidence supporting the inclusion of the Utupua-Vanikoro languages in this subgroup.

Obviously, this proposal is a tentative one at this stage, and considerably more research is required to (a) establish the grouping more securely, (b) decide its internal subgrouping, and (c) locate it within the Oceanic family tree.

CENTRAL-EASTERN OCEANIC SOUND CORRESPONDENCES

POC	*p	*mp	*t	*nt	*k	*ŋk
Woleaian	f,∅	p	t,s,∅	ʃ	g,∅	∅
Puluwat	f,∅	p	h,∅	r	k,∅	∅
Sonsorol	f,∅	p	t,d	s	k	∅
Marshallese	y,∅	p,b	j	d	k	k,∅
Kusaiean	∅	p	t,s	sr	k	k
Gilbertese	∅	p	t,∅	r	k,∅	k,∅
Bugotu	v	b	t	t,d	ʎ,g	g
Nggela	v,b	b	t	t,d	ʎ,g	k
Lau	f,b	b	∅	∅,t	?,∅,g	g
Kwara'ae	h,b	b	∅	∅	?,∅,k	k
Kwaio	f,b	b	∅	∅	?,g	g
Ulawa	h,p	p	∅	∅,ts	?,k	
Arosi	h,b	b	∅	∅	?,k	g
Fagani	h,p	p	∅	∅	ʎ,k	k
Nembaō	v,∅		t,r		∅,k	g
Asumboa	v,b		t,s		∅,k	g
Tanimbili	v,∅		t,s	j	∅,k	g
Buma	v,∅,p	b	t,d	t	∅,k	
Vano	v,∅,p	b	t,l	t	∅,k	
Mota	v,w	p	t,s	n(?)	ʎ,w,k	k
Motlav	v,w,p	b	t	d	ʎ,w,k	k
Merlav	v,w	b	t	d	ʎ,w,k	k
Mosina	v,w		t		ʎ,w,k	k
Vatrata	v,w		?	d	ʎ,w,k	k
Nume	v,w	b	t,s	d	ʎ,w,k	k
Cent.Maewo	v	b	t	d	ʎ, v ^w , k	k
Raga	v,p	p	t,s	d	x,k	g
Nogugu	v,w	p,p ^w	t	?	?,k	
Tasiriki	v,w	p	t,k	k	?,k	k
Tangoa	v,ṽ	p,ṽ	t	dr	h,k	k
Big Nambas	v,ṽ	p,ṽ	t,d	d	x,k	k
Pt.Sandwich	v	b	t,dr	dr	ʎ,ŋk	ŋk
Nguna	v,w,p	p	t,d	d	k,ŋ	
Sie	v,p	mp	t,h	t,h	ʎ,k,∅	
Ura	v	b	t,s	s(?)	g,w	
Lenakel	v,w,p	p,p ^w	t,s,r	t	k,∅	k
Whitesands	v,w	p,p ^w	t,s	t,r	k,ŋ,∅	k
SW Tanna	v,w,k ^w	p,p ^w	t,l,s	t	∅,k	k
Kwamera	v,w	p,p ^w	t,r,h	t,r	∅,k	k
N Tanna	v,w,p	mp	t,s	t	k,ŋ,∅	k
Anejom	h,w,p	p,h	t,s	t,ts	x,k,∅	k
Pije	p,v,∅	b,b ^w ,g	t,d,ts	d	ts,k,∅	ts,ŋ
Fwai	p,v,∅	b,b ^w ,g	t,d,ts	d	ts,k,∅	ts,ŋ
Nemi	p,v,∅	b,b ^w ,g	t,d,ts	d	ts,k,∅	ts,ŋ
Jawe	p,v,∅	b,b ^w ,g	ts,j	j	ts,k,∅	ts,ŋ
Rotuman	h	p	f	f	?	k
Fijian	v	b	t,d	d	k	g
Wayan	v	b	t	d	k	g

POC	*pw	*q	*d	*nd	*m	*mw
Woleaian	p	∅	r	ʃ	m	mw
Puluwat	pw	∅	ʃ	r	m	mw
Sonsorol	b	∅	l.r	s	m	mw
Marshallese	b	∅	r	d	m	mw
Kusaiean	f	∅	l	sr	m	m
Gilbertese	pw	∅	∅	r	m	mw
Bugotu	b	∅	r, (d)	r	m	m
Nggela	b	∅, y	r	r	m	m
Lau	gw, b	∅, s	r, d	d	m	ŋ ^w
Kwara'ae	gw	∅, s	r, d	d, r	m	ŋ ^w
Kwaio	g, b	∅, l	r	r	m	w
Ulawá	pw, p	∅, s	r, ts	ts	m	mw
Arosi	bw, b	∅	r, d	d, r	m	mw
Fagani	bw, b	∅	r, t	t, r	m	mw
Nembaó	b	∅	l	l	m	m
Asumboa	p	∅	y, l	l	m	mu
Tanimbili	p	∅	y	l	m	mw
Buma	b, pw	∅	l	m	m	mw
Vano	b, pw	∅	l	m	m	mw
Mota	kpw	∅	r	n(?)	m	mw
Motlav	kw	∅	y	m	m	mw
Merlav	kpw	∅	r	d	m	ŋ ^w
Mosina	kpw	∅	r	m	m	mw
Vatrata	kw	∅	r	d	m	mw
Nume	kw	∅	r	d	m	mw
Cent. Maewo	bw	∅	r	d	m	mw
Raga	pw	∅	r	r	m	mw
Nogugu	p	∅	r	r	m	m
Tasiriki	p	∅	r, k	r	m	m
Tangoa	p	∅	r	r	m, m̄	m, m̄
Big Nambas	p	∅	r, d	r	m, m̄	m, m̄
Pt. Sandwich	b	∅	∅, dr		m	mw
Nguna	pw	∅	r, d		m	mw
Sie	b	∅	r, d	t	m	m
Ura	b	∅	r, t		m	m
Lenakel	p	∅	l, y, t	r	m, mw	mw
Whitesands	p	∅	l, y, r	t	m, mw	mw
SW Tanna	p	∅	r, t	r	m	mw
Kwamera	p	∅	r, t	r	m, mw	mw
N Tanna	p	∅	l, y, t	t	m, mw	mw
Anejom	p	∅	r, ts	r	m, mw	mw
Pije	bw, g	k, ∅	t, l	d	m, mw	m
Fwai	bw, g	k, ∅	t, l	d	m, mw	m
Nemi	bw, g	k, ∅	t, l	d	m, mw	m
Jawe	bw, g	k, ∅	t, l	d	m, mw	m
Rotuman		∅	r	dr	m	
Fijian		∅	r	t, l	m	ŋ
Wayan		∅	r	dr	m	ŋ ^w

POC	*n	*ñ	*ŋ	*s	*ns
Woleaian	l	l	ŋ	t	t
Puluwat	n	n	ŋ	t	t
Sonsorol	n	n	ŋ	t	t
Marshallese	n	n	ŋ	t	t
Kusaiean	n	n	ŋ	t,∅	∅
Gilbertese	n	n	ŋ	r	r
Bugotu	n	ñ	ŋ	∅,h	h
Nggela	n	n	ŋ	h	h
Lau	n	n	ŋ	t,s	t,s
Kwara'ae	n	n	ŋ	t,s	t,s
Kwaio	n	n	ŋ	t,s	t,s
Ulawá	n	n	ŋ	t,s	t,s
Arosi	n	n	ŋ	t,s	t,s
Fagani	n	n	ŋ	t,s	t,s
Nembaó	n	n	n(?)		h
Asumboa	n	n	ŋ	∅	s,∅
Tanimbili	n	n	ŋ	∅	s,∅
Buma	n	n	ŋ	s	
Vano	n		ŋ	s	s
Mota	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Motlav	n	n	ŋ	h	h
Merlav	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Mosina	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Vatrata	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Nume	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Cent.Maewo	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Raga	n	n	ŋ	h	h
Nogugu	n	n	n	s	s,ts
Tasiriki	n	n	n	s	s,ts
Tangoa	n	n	ŋ	s	s,ts
Big Nambas	n	n	n	∅,s	∅,ts
Pt.Sandwich	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Nguna	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Sie	n	n	ŋ	s,(h)	s
Ura	n	n	ŋ	s,(h)	
Lenakel	n,ŋ	n	ŋ,n	s,h	h
Whitesands	n,ŋ	n	ŋ,n	s,h	h
SW Tanna	n,ŋ	n	ŋ,n	s,h	h
Kwamera	n,ŋ	n	ŋ,n	s,h	s,h
N Tanna	n,ŋ	n	ŋ,n	s,h	h
Anejom	n,ñ	n,ñ	ŋ,ñ	s,θ	h,θ
Pije	n	n	n	d	th,t,l
Fwai	n	n	n	d	th,t,l
Nemi	n	n	n	d	th,t,l
Jawe	n	n	n	d	th,t,l
Rotuman	n	n	ŋ	s	s
Fijian	n	n	ŋ	s,ð	ð
Wayan	n	y,∅	ŋ	s	ð

POC	*l	*R	*w	*y
Woleaian	l	Ø, r	w	Ø
Puluwat	l	Ø, r	w	Ø
Sonsorol	n	Ø, l	w	Ø
Marshallese	l	Ø, r	w	Ø
Kusaiean	l	Ø	Ø	Ø
Gilbertese	n	Ø, r	w	Ø
Bugotu	l	l	Ø	Ø
Nggela	l	l	Ø, u	Ø
Lau	l	l	kw	Ø
Kwara'ae	l	l	kw	Ø
Kwaio	r	r	kw	Ø
Ulawa	l	l	w	Ø
Arosi	r	r	w	Ø
Fagani	r	r	w	Ø
Nembaio	l, Ø	y, Ø	v, Ø	Ø
Asumboa	y, Ø	l, Ø	w, Ø	Ø
Tanimbili	l, Ø	y, Ø	w, Ø	Ø
Buna	l, Ø	r, Ø	w, Ø	Ø
Vano	l, Ø	r, Ø	w	Ø
Mota	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Motlav	l	y	w	Ø
Merlav	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Mosina	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Vatrata	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Nume	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Cent. Maewo	l	r, Ø	w	y
Raga	l	r, Ø	w	y
Nogugu	l	Ø	w	Ø
Tasiriki	l	Ø	w	Ø
Tangoa	l	Ø	w	
Big Nambas	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Pt. Sandwich	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Nguna	l	r, Ø	w	Ø
Sie	l	r, Ø	Ø	
Ura	l			
Lenakel	l, y	l, Ø	w, Ø	
Whitesands	l, y	l, Ø	Ø	
SW Tanna	r	r, Ø	Ø, kw	
Kwamera	r, y	r, Ø	w	
N Tanna	l, y		Ø	
Anejom	l, ts	r, Ø	w	y
Pije	n	Ø	w	
Fwai	n	Ø	w	
Nemi	n	Ø	w	
Jawe	n	Ø	w	
Rotuman	l	Ø	v	
Fijian	l	Ø	w	ō, Ø
Wayan	l	Ø	w	ō, Ø

NOTES

1. Of course a more definitive subgrouping will have to take into account and weigh all of the linguistic evidence, not just morphological innovations. The weighting of this evidence will become crucial at that point, as it will effect the classificatory model adopted ultimately.

Procedures used and languages examined: a checklist of over 230 morphological items or categories has been devised and information will be collected from as many Oceanic languages as possible. To date, fifty-one languages have been investigated in this way, and the data fed into a computer. For the current paper, these fifty-one computer files were compacted, and a preliminary search for possible innovations was conducted. Once the feasibility of the Central-Eastern Oceanic subgroup became apparent, an investigation of possible Central-Eastern Oceanic cognates of the innovations listed in Pawley (1972) was made and also a wider search for innovations in other languages which were potential members of the CEO subgroup was carried out.

The fifty-one languages which have been investigated so far in the manner described above, together with data sources, are listed below: the abbreviation (L) or (T) indicates that data derive respectively from Lynch's and Tryon's fieldnotes:

CENTRAL-EASTERN OCEANIC LANGUAGES.

South-East Solomons: Nggela (Codrington 1885, C.E.Fox 1950); Kwaio (Keesing 1982).

Utupua-Vanikoro: Asumboa (T); Tanimbili (T); Nembao/Amba (T); Vano (T); Buma/Te Ano (T, Peter Lincoln fieldnotes).

North/Central Vanuatu and Banks: Motlav, Mota, Vatrata, Mosina, Nume, Merlav (Codrington 1885); Big Nambas (G.J. Fox 1979); Port Sandwich (Charpentier 1979); Maii (T).

Southern Vanuatu: Sie (Lynch and Capell 1983); Ura (Lynch 1983a); North Tanna (L); Whitesands (L); Lenakel (Lynch 1978b); South-West Tanna (Lynch 1982a); Kwamera (Lindstrom 1982, L); Anejom (Lynch 1982b).

Nuclear Micronesian: Gilbertese (Cowell 1950, Groves, Groves and Jacobs 1985; Marshallese (Zewen 1977); Puluwat (Elbert 1974).

OTHER LANGUAGES.

New Guinea Region: Gitua (Lincoln n.d.); Kaliai-Kove (Counts 1969); Labu (Siegel 1982); Adzera (Holzknecht in press); Central Buang (Hooley 1970); Are (Paisawa, Pagotto and Kale 1976); Dobu (Arnold (1931)); Maisin (Ross 1984, L); Sinagoro (Kolia 1975); Motu (Lister-Turner and Clark n.d., Taylor 1970); Bileki/Nakanai (Johnston 1980); Tangga (Bell 1977); Tigak (Beaumont 1979); Banoni (Lincoln 1976).

Western Solomons Region: Mono-Alu (Boch n.d.); Sengga (T); Roviana (Jones 1949).

New Caledonia: Cemuhi (J-C. Rivierre 1980); Anjie (Lichtenberk 1978); Pije, Fwai, Nemi and Jawe (Haudricourt and Ozanne-Rivierre 1982).

Loyalty Islands: Nengone (Tryon 1967); Iai (Tryon 1968b); Dehu (Tryon 1968a).

Possibly Oceanic languages: Nauruan (Kayser 1938); Yapese (Jensen 1977).

Other potential members of the putative Central-Eastern Oceanic subgroup were then examined in less detail to test whether the presumed Central-Eastern Oceanic innovations were present; in Micronesia - Woleaian (Sohn 1975), and Sonsorol (Capell 1969). More general information was gleaned from Leenhardt (1946), Ray (1926) and Codrington (1885), as well as Pawley (1972).

2. Naturally, these attempts did not involve all the Oceanic languages, but the important feature which distinguishes them from other classifications is that virtually every Oceanic-speaking area is represented.
3. The 1971 and 1981 papers appeared only in mimeographed form.
4. A number of the defining Eastern Oceanic morphological features listed by Pawley can now, with the addition of further data, be shown to be more widespread. Among these are (1) *(w)atu *motion away from speaker*, which has cognates in Roviana atu and Mono-Alu au; (2) *(n)tani *prepositional verb, motion away from object NP*, which is found in Motu -tani; (3) *(C)ana, *(C)a *transforms verb or noun into an abstract noun*, with cognates like Gitua -na, -ana, -zana, Kaliai -na, Labu -ya, and numerous forms of the type Roviana -ana in western Oceanic languages; (4) *ke *demonstrative formative*, with such cognates as Tangga ge *demonstrative, near speaker* and Sengga ye, yi *demonstrative, distant*; and (5) *[ka]Raka *upwards*, with the Banoni cognate yareya. The innovation *ke(n)s(ae) *one, only, apart* may also be invalidated by such forms as Gitua eze, Kaliai ere.
5. Ka'eo (n.d.) has subsequently argued that Nuclear Micronesian qualifies for membership within EO, while the position of Rotuman was clarified by Pawley (1979).
6. Grace's 1955 classification proposed, as one of the nineteen 'subgroups' of Oceanic, a grouping consisting of
 - (i) the languages of Southern Vanuatu;
 - (ii) Fijian, Rotuman, the Polynesian languages, and the languages of Central and North-West Vanuatu;
 - (iii) the languages of North-East Vanuatu and the Banks Islands;
 - (iv) the Nuclear Micronesian languages.
7. Our investigations have suggested that the following six original morphological innovations proposed by Pawley as marking off the EO subgroup are still valid: *su(ldR)i *prepositional verb, 'motion towards or reference to object NP'*; *i *preverbal particle, marking future*; *(n)soko *numeral prefix, 'collectivity, all at once', postnominal particle, 'all, every'*; *-ka, *-a *stative formative*; *-di *demonstrative suffix*; and *kua *today, presently*. In addition, we suggest one further apparent EO morphological innovation, namely ?PEO *(i)ro *feminine (singular) personal article*. Pawley (1972:58, 116) reconstructed for the Northern New Hebrides-Banks subgroup the feminine article *(i)ro, suggesting that while the *i reflects PEO *i, *pronominal article*, the feminine component *-ro is an innovation. To the data given there by Pawley we can add Motlav rV, Vatrata, Nume iro, and Mosina ero. Cognate forms are found, however, within other parts of the EO area: in the South-East Solomons, the Arosi form re- *prefix to names of women* may be cognate; in Nuclear Micronesian, note the forms Marshallese le-, Gilbertese liy-, and Woleaian la-.

8. An explanation of the procedures involved in the comparison, and a list of the languages investigated, together with sources from which the data were drawn, can be found in note 1, above.
9. Pawley (personal communication) indicates that some of the reflexes differ in function from the reconstruction; e.g. Wayan muni is a postverbal or nominal particle meaning *also, as well*.
10. The accreted n may derive from compounding with a past or perfective marker; note Proto-Tanna *(eə)n- *perfective* (Lynch 1982c:17). The presence of the accreted vowel in this form, as in other verbal affixes in these languages, is probably explained by the fact that tense-markers in most of these languages immediately follow person-markers, which generally consist of a single consonant; vowel-epenthesis is common in such cases, and what has been analysed as vowel + m may in fact be epenthetic vowel + m.
11. Wurm and Wilson (1975) give no POC reconstruction although a PAN form *belas is listed (1975:140).
12. Pawley (personal communication) indicates that *ta- also occurs in Indonesian, marking accidental or spontaneously induced states.
13. For the conditioned reflexes Whitesands u, Lenakel u or w, South-West Tanna kw, Kwamera k or kw < POC *p, note the following: POC *ndapu *ashes* > Whitesands nəm/taau, Lenakel nəm/raau, South-West Tanna nəm/lakw, Kwamera nəm/rakw; POC *puaq *fruit* > Whitesands, Lenakel nə/ua-, South-West Tanna, Kwamera nu/kwa-; POC *topu *sugarcane* > Whitesands nə/tu, Lenakel nə/ruw, South-West Tanna nə/tukw, Kwamera nə/ruk (cf. Lynch 1978a). The accreted initial a is discussed in note 10, above.
14. Robin Hooper's paper "Proto-Oceanic *qi" (in this volume) suggests *qi rather than *-(k)i as the reconstruction, and that it may not be confined to CEO.
15. The East Fijian form is found after an inalienably-possessed noun or a possessive article when followed by a proper noun possessor, as in na tama-i Jone *John's father*, na vale ne-i Jone *John's house*.
16. See also note 7, above.
17. Grace (1955) of course excluded the South-East Solomons, see note 6, above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARNOLD, John K.

1931 *A grammar of the language of Edugaura*. Port Moresby: Government Printer.

BEAUMONT, C.H.

1979 *The Tigak language of New Ireland*. PL, B-58.

BELL, F.L.S.

1977 *Tanga-English English-Tanga dictionary*. Oceania Linguistic Monographs 21. Sydney (Introduction by Capell).

- BIGGS, Bruce
 1965 Direct and indirect inheritance in Rotuman. *Lingua* 13:373-405.
- BLUST, Robert A.
 1984 Malaita-Micronesian: an Eastern Oceanic subgroup? *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 93/2:99-140.
- BOCH, Rev. M.
 n.d. A short Alu grammar. Mimeo.
- CAPELL, A.
 1969 *Grammar and vocabulary of the language of Sonsorol-Tobi*. Oceania Linguistic Monographs 12.
 1971 *Arosi Grammar*. PL, B-20.
- CHARPENTIER, J.M.
 1979 *La langue de Port Sandwich*. Paris: SELAF.
- CODRINGTON, R.H.
 1885 *The Melanesian languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- COUNTS, David T.
 1969 *A grammar of Kaliai-Kove*. Oceanic Linguistic Special Publication No.6.
- COWELL, Reid
 1950 *The structure of Gilbertese*. Beru: Rongorongo Press.
- DYEN, Isidore
 1965 *A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages*. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Memoir 19.
- ELBERT, Samuel H.
 1974 *Puluwat grammar*. PL, B-29.
- FOX, C.E.
 1950 Some notes on Nggela grammar. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 59/2:135-169.
- FOX, G.J.
 1979 *Big Nambas grammar*. PL, B-29.
- GRACE, George W.
 1955 Subgrouping of Malayo-Polynesian: a report of tentative findings. *American Anthropologist* 57:337-339.
 1971 Notes on the phonological history of the Austronesian languages of the Sarmi coast. *Oceanic Linguistics* 10:11-37.
 1976 Review article: Green and Kelly, eds 1972. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 85/1:103-112.
 1981 Tentative Oceanic subgrouping. Mimeo.
- GREEN, R.C., and Marion KELLY, eds
 1972 *Studies in Oceanic culture history*, vol.3. Pacific Anthropological Records 13. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

GROVES, Gordon W., Terab'ata GROVES and Roderick JACOBS

1985 *Kiribatese: an outline grammar and vocabulary.* PL, D-64.

HAUDRICOURT, André-Georges

1971 *New Caledonia and the Loyalty Islands.* In Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. *Current trends in linguistics*, vol.8: *Linguistics in Oceania*, 359-396. The Hague: Mouton.

HAUDRICOURT, André-Georges and Françoise Ozanne-Rivierre

1982 *Dictionnaire thématique des langues de la région de Hienghène (Nouvelle-Calédonie).* Paris: SELAF.

HOLZKNECHT, Susanne

A morphology and grammar of the Amari language, Morobe Province, Papua New Guinea. In press.

HOOLEY, B.A.

1970 *Mapos Buang - Territory of New Guinea.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

JENSEN, John Thayer

1977 *Yapese reference grammar.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

JOHNSTON, R.L.

1980 *Nakanai of New Britain: the grammar of an Oceanic language.* PL, B-70.

JONES, L.M.

1949 *A Roviana and English dictionary.* Sydney: Epworth.

KA'EO, Karen

1977 *Eastern Oceanic and the Nuclear Micronesian languages.* Typescript.

KAYSER, Fr. W.

1938 *Nauruan grammar.* Mimeo.

KOLIA, J.A.

1975 *A Balawaia grammar sketch and vocabulary.* In T.E. Dutton, ed. *Studies in languages of central and south-east Papua.* PL, C-29: 107:226.

KEESING, R.M.

1985 *Kwaio grammar.* PL, B-88.

LEE, Kee-dong

1975 *Kusaiean reference grammar.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

LEENHARDT, Maurice

1946 *Langues et dialectes de l'Austro-Mélanésie.* Travaux et Memoirs de l'Institut d'Ethnologie, 46.

LICHTENBERK, Frantisek

1978 *A sketch of Houailou grammar.* *Working Papers in Linguistics*, University of Hawaii 10/2:74-116.

LINCOLN, Peter C.

- 1976 Describing Banoni, an Austronesian language of Southwest Bougainville. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
n.d. Basics of Gitua language. Mimeo, University of Papua New Guinea.

LINDSTROM, Lamont

- 1982 Kwamera (Nyninyfe) dictionary. Computer printout.

LISTER-TURNER, R., and J.B. CLARK

- n.d. *A grammar of the Motu language of Papua* (2nd. edn, edited by Percy Chatterton). Sydney: Government Printer.

LYNCH, John

- 1978a Proto-South Hebridean and Proto-Oceanic. In S.A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, eds *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: proceedings*, 717-779. PL, C-61.
1978b *A grammar of Lenakel*. PL, B-55.
1982a. Southwest Tanna grammar outline and vocabulary. PL, A-64:1-91.
1982b Anejom grammar sketch. PL, A-64:93-154.
1982c Some notes on Proto-Tanna morphology. Typescript.
1983a Ura grammar sketch and vocabulary. In Lynch, ed. 1983:148-183.
1983b Preliminary remarks on Proto-Erromangan. In Lynch, ed. 1983:193-220.

LYNCH, John ed.

- 1983 *Studies in the Erromangan languages*. PL, C-79.

LYNCH, John and A. CAPELL

- 1983 Sie grammar outline. In Lynch, ed. 1983:11-74.

MILNER, G.B.

- 1972 *Fijian grammar*. Suva: Government Press.

MOYSE-FAURIE, Claire, and Françoise OZANNE-RIVIERRE

- 1983 Subject case markers and word order in New Caledonia and Loyalty Islands languages. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, S.A. Wurm, eds *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol.4: *Thematic variation*, 113-152. PL, C-77.

PAISAWA, Elsie, Louise PAGOTTO and Joan KALE

- 1976 *A short sketch of Are (or Mukawa), Milne Bay, Papua New Guinea*. University of Papua New Guinea Department of Language Occasional Paper No. 2.

PAWLEY, Andrew

- 1972 On the internal relationships of Eastern Oceanic languages. In Green and Kelly, eds 1972:1-142.
1977 On redefining 'Eastern Oceanic'. Mimeo.
1979 *New Evidence on the position of Rotuman*. Working Papers in Anthropology, Archaeology, Linguistics and Maori Studies No. 56. University of Auckland.

RAY, Sidney H.

- 1926 *A comparative study of the Melanesian island languages*. Cambridge: University Press.

RIVIERRE, Jean-Claude

- 1980 *La langue de Touho: phonologie et grammaire du cemuhi (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*. Paris: SELAF.

ROSS, Malcolm

- 1984 Maisin: a preliminary sketch. *PL*, A-69:1-82.

SIEGEL, Jeff

- 1984 Introduction to the Labu language. *PL*, A-69:83-159.

SOHN, Ho-min

- 1975 *Woleaian reference grammar*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

SOHN, Ho-min and B.W. BENDER

- 1973 *A Ulithian grammar*. *PL*, C-27.

TAYLOR, A.J.

- 1970 Syntax and phonology of Motu (Papua): a transformational approach. Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University.

TRYON, D.T.

- 1967 *Nengone grammar*. *PL*, B-6.
 1968a *Dehu grammar*. *PL*, B-7.
 1968b *Iai grammar*. *PL*, B-8.
 1973 Linguistic subgrouping in the New Hebrides: a preliminary approach. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:303-351.

TRYON, D.T. and B.D. HACKMAN

- 1983 *Solomon Islands languages: an internal classification*. *PL*, C-72.

WURM, S.A., and B. WILSON

- 1975 *English finderlist of reconstructions in Austronesian languages (post-Brandstetter)*. *PL*, C-33.

ZEWEN, François-Xavier Nicolas

- 1977 *The Marshallese language: a study of its phonology, morphology, and syntax*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.