Journal of the Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea
ISSN: 0023-1959

Special Issue 2012

Harald Hammarström & Wilco van den Heuvel (eds.)
History, contact and classification of Papuan languages

Part One

VERBS WITH PRONOMINAL OBJECT PREFIXES IN FINISTERRE-HUON LANGUAGES

Edgar Suter
University of Cologne
esut@sunrise.ch

ABSTRACT

The Finisterre-Huon stock was established by Kenneth McElhanon (1975). His evidence for a genealogical relationship among these 60 plus languages is reviewed and found to be compelling. In this article I take up one of his pieces of evidence, verbs with pronominal object prefixes, and elaborate on it.

The Finisterre-Huon languages have a small closed class of transitive verbs taking pronominal object prefixes. A few of these verbs are cognate across both putative first-order subgroups, the Huon Peninsula family and the Finisterre-Saruwaged family, and can be reconstructed for proto Finisterre-Huon. Most of the pronominal object prefixes can also be reconstructed and are found to be identical to the free pronouns proposed for proto Trans New Guinea by Stephen Wurm (1975) and Malcolm Ross (2005), to which I suggest adding **ya* 'they'. Three of the prefixed verbs reconstructed for proto Finisterre-Huon have cognates in other Trans New Guinea subfamilies giving rise to higher level reconstructions.

KEYWORDS: Finisterre-Huon, Trans New Guinea, reconstruction, verb morphology, personal pronouns, object verbs

INTRODUCTION

The Finisterre-Huon languages are spoken in the northern half of Morobe Province and the adjacent part of Madang Province in Papua New Guinea.[1] They cover the whole Huon Peninsula, except for the coastal fringes where Oceanic languages are spoken, run along the Saruwaged mountains and end in the Finisterre Range, which straddles the border between

[1] The research for this paper was commissioned by the Department of Linguistics of the University of Cologne, Germany. I am grateful to the head of department, Professor Nikolaus Himmelmann, for the financial support. Much of the data for this paper comes from the unpublished manuscripts of linguists and translators affiliated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics. They are too numerous to be all mentioned here by name, but the manuscripts they kindly made available to me are acknowledged in the references at the end of this paper. My heartfelt thanks go to all of them and to René van den Berg and Rudy Yawiro who brought me in touch with them. Valuable comments came from Tom Dutton and three reviewers. The responsibility for all remaining infelicities is of course mine.

Morobe and Madang Provinces. One Finisterre-Huon language, Kovai, is spoken on the other side of the Vitiaz Strait on Umboi island.

McElhanon (1973) recognized eight families combining to form two subgroups in the Finisterre-Huon (FH) stock. One subgroup is the Huon Peninsula (HP) family which subdivides into the Eastern Huon and the Western Huon families. The HP languages share only a low number of cognates with the other subgroup of FH languages, the Finisterre-Saruwaged (FS) family. The four eastern FS subfamilies – the Uruwa, Erap, Wantoat and Yupna families – share a good deal of vocabulary with one another. The two remaining subfamilies in the west, Warup and the Gusap-Mot, stand apart. They have only a low number of cognates in common with the eastern four FS subfamilies and they also do not share much vocabulary with each other. Further research beyond these impressions gained in the course of collecting cognate words would be necessary to improve on the lexicostatistical classification by McElhanon, but that is beyond the scope of this paper.

1 **Classification of the Finisterre-Huon languages**

Trans New Guinea (TNG)
- North East New Guinea (NENG)
  - Finisterre-Huon (FH)
    - Huon Peninsula (HP)
      - Eastern Huon
      - Western Huon
    - Finisterre-Saruwaged (FS)
      - Uruwa
      - Erap
      - Wantoat
      - Yupna
      - Warup
      - Gusap-Mot

The data for this paper consists of the verbs taking pronominal object prefixes in 19 of the 22 Huon Peninsula languages. For two languages, Kumukio and Kinalaknga, I lack the data, and one HP language, Kovai, has lost all object prefixes. The data for the Finisterre-Saruwaged family is less ample. Of the more than 40 FS languages I have a more or less complete list of the verbs taking object prefixes for only 14 languages. Fortunately, these languages are favorably distributed over the six subfamilies. For all FS subfamilies except one I have been

able to compile the verbs with object prefixes of at least two languages. For the Warup family, I only know the object prefix verbs of a single language, Gwahatike.

SETTING THE STAGE: MCELHANON (1975)

The Finisterre-Huon stock was established by Kenneth McElhanon in the late 1960s and early 1970s. McElhanon (1967) embarked on his classificatory career with a survey of the Papuan languages of the Huon Peninsula . He published word lists in the languages of the western half of the peninsula, complementing Pilhofer's (1929) survey of the eastern half. After additional fieldwork he presented a detailed lexicostatistical study of all Huon Peninsula languages and discussed different ways of interpreting the data (McElhanon 1970). In a joint article he extended his perspective to all Papuan languages in the northern part of Morobe Province and suggested that they were all interrelated (Hooley and McElhanon 1970). In an addendum to this paper he named the newly discovered group of languages the Finisterre-Huon micro-phylum. Then he joined forces with Oren Claassen who had surveyed the area of Madang Province adjacent to Morobe Province. Together they proposed a lexicostatistical classification of the Finisterre-Saruwaged languages (Claassen and McElhanon 1970). Furthermore, McElhanon (1973) published grammatical data from a selection of Finisterre-Huon languages demonstrating the existence of numerous typological similarities.

The crowning achievement in his classificatory career was his contribution to the big survey volume on Papuan languages edited by Wurm (McElhanon 1975). In this article he did not expand on the lexicostatistical figures from his earlier publications but rather sought out morphological parallels shared by most or all Finisterre-Huon languages for which he had sufficient data. Some of his comparisons were typological in nature, involving parallel structures but no phonologically resemblant morphemes. But he drew particular attention to shared morphological patterns that did involve cognate morphemes. The most striking case in point are the first person forms of the imperative or optative mood, which are cognate throughout the FH stock (McElhanon 1975: 553). In Table 1 I have assembled these forms from languages representing all second-order subfamilies, including the Uruwa and Warup families, for which McElhanon did not yet have any morphological data. It can be seen that the forms of the HP language Selepet perfectly match those of such geographically distant FS languages as Awara and Nankina. This permits us to reconstruct proto Finisterre-Huon (pFH) original forms. In Uri, the forms have been extended with person-number markers from other

paradigms. The languages representing the two westernmost subfamilies, Gwahatike and Iyo, only seem to have retained the pFH dual ending. The singular optative forms of Gwahatike, all starting with an optional /w/, are etymologically unclear to me. In Iyo there is no first person singular optative form. However, the first person singular form of different subject medial verbs, which is homonymous with the optative form in most FH languages, is *-we*.

Table 1: The Finisterre-Huon first person optative forms[2]

language	subfamily	1SG	1DU	1PL
pFH		*-ba	*-ta	*-na
Ono	Eastern Huon	-we	-te	(-ŋem)
Selepet	Western Huon	-be	-re	-ne
Yau	Uruwa	-wa	-ta	-na
Uri	Erap	-wak	-dam	-nam
Awara	Wantoat	-pa	-ta	-na
Nankina	Yupna	-wa	-da	-na
Gwahatike	Warup	(-[w]e)	-re	(-ning)
Iyo	Gusap-Mot		-ro	(-to)

The congruence of three inflectional verb endings constituting a coherent part of a paradigm is good evidence of a genealogical relationship. Equally telling is the match of the personal pronouns, which McElhanon (1975: 549) tried to unite in a schematic reconstruction. These two pieces of evidence alone would have been enough to make a strong case for a common origin of the FH languages. But McElhanon pointed out further pieces of evidence, which I will illustrate here with my own provisional reconstructions. First, he noted a widespread adjectivizing suffix that is usually identical to the third person singular possessive suffix (pFH **-ŋa*). Second, the number marker for the dual adjoining the possessive suffixes in nouns (pFH **-yakat*) is shared by many FH languages and is identical to the numeral two in some of them. Third, among the elevational demonstratives, the forms for 'that over there' (pFH **ad(i,u)*) are cognate throughout the FH stock. Finally, he anticipated the topic of this paper by drawing attention to the existence of cognates among the verbs taking pronominal

[2] Data taken from the following sources: Ono: Phinnemore (1990: 59), Selepet: McElhanon (1972: 69), Yau: Wegmann and Lauver (1990: 37), Uri: T. Webb (1980: 50), Awara: S. Quigley (2002a: 75), Nankina: Spaulding and Spaulding (1994: 53), Gwahatike (= Dahating): An and An (1993b: 28), Iyo (= Nahu): Minter (2009: 45).

object prefixes (McElhanon 1975: 557f). In the rest of this paper I will focus on these verb forms. The aim is to reconstruct all such verbs that the FH languages have in common.

OBJECT VERBS

The FH languages index the person and number of the subject as well as the object argument on the verb. The cross-reference morphology is made for human referents. Inanimate referents usually trigger the form of the third person singular. The subject person and number markers combine with tense and mood markers and are always suffixes. The object person and number markers, on the other hand, can be prefixes or suffixes. Most FH languages use both kinds of affixation to register human object referents on different verbs.

2 **Ono** (Eastern Huon family; Wacke 1931: 175, 174, 178)[3]

a *ŋma-ŋo* *ne-ku-ke?*
who-ERG 1sO-hit-FPST.3s
'Who hit me?'

b *Nan-maike.*
1sO.see-PRS.3s
'He sees me.'

c *Onokawane* *mi* *qesiŋ-nan-goi?*
why not support-1sO-FPST.2p
'Why didn't you support me?'

The Eastern Huon language Ono has 14 transitive verbs that cross-reference the object by means of prefixes. Two of these verbs are 'hit' (2a) and 'see' (2b). The prefix and the verb root are sometimes fused, as in *nan* 'see me', where it is impossible to tell whether the vowel *-a-* belongs to the prefix or the root. If there are only 14 verbs taking object prefixes in Ono, the question arises of how other transitive verbs treat their human object referents. The answer can be seen in (2c). The verb *qesiŋ* 'support' cannot take object prefixes. Nonetheless, the person and number of a human object referent must be cross-referenced on this verb, too.

[3] Abbreviations used:

ABL	ablative	FFUT	far future	p	plural
BEN	benefactive	FPST	far past	POSS	possessive
CL	classifier	IND	indicative	PRS	present
d	dual	LNK	linker	PST	past
DIPF	dynamic imperfective	NPST	near past	s	singular
ERG	ergative	O	object	TOP	topic

This is achieved by suffixing the person-number marker *-nan* 'me'. We notice that this marker is homonymous with the verb form *nan* 'see me' (2b). From a historical perspective, the person-number marker derives from the verb form. Verbs such as *qesiŋ* 'support' entered into a serial verb construction with the object-inflected verb 'see'. The object-inflected verb form then lost its lexical meaning and became a purely grammatical marker. The majority of the transitive verbs in Ono cross-reference the object with these suffixal person-number markers. The 14 verbs taking object prefixes are a residual class. Pilhofer (1928, 1933) noted that the prefixed verbs of the HP languages are irregular and must be exhaustively listed in a grammar. He called them "object verbs", a shorthand expression for "verbs taking pronominal object prefixes". Henceforth I will use this term and adopt the practice of citing object verbs with their first person singular form.

Most of the Ono object verbs, such as *neku* 'hit' (2a), are purely lexical items. Two of them, however, have a double use as a lexical item and as a grammatical marker. As we have seen above, the verb *nan* 'see' doubles as an object person-number marker. The other object verb having a grammatical function is *nin* 'give'. As in most other FH languages, this verb can be used as a benefactive marker.

3 **Awara** (Wantoat family; S. Quigley 2002b: 58)

a *Hiyäkän* *Anatu=tä* *hangä* *naxalä* *ni-mi-kut.*
truth God=ABL thing much 1pO-give-3s.PST
'... and, true, God gave us many things.'

b *... hangä* *ngäkge=kän* *gatä-ni-mi-ga-k.*
thing much=only help-1p-O-s.DIPF-3s.PRS
'... he helps us with many things.'

c *Bolom=u* *u=gwen=u* *haluku-nga-mi-kut,*
lump=LNK that=CL.lump=TOP wash-1s-BEN-3s.PST
'He washed the bump for me.'

Sometimes the two grammatical functions are conflated. This is the case in the Wantoat language Awara (3). In Awara, the object verb *nami* 'give' (3a) can be used as an object person-number marker (3b) or to cross-reference a beneficiary (3c). Thus, Awara puts only a single one of its 14 object verbs to a grammatical use. All others are purely lexical items.

4 **Komba** (Western Huon family; Southwell 1979: 172, 283, 177, 68)

a *Mukan nâ kât gi-bat.*
tomorrow I stone 2sO.give-FFUT.1s
'Tomorrow I will give you the money.'

b *Mambât-ni-ban.*
await-1sO-FFUT.2s
'You will wait for me.'

c *Ibâ-gandâ go-bap.*
father-2sPOSS.ERG 2sO.hit-FFUT.3s
'Your father will hit you.'

d *Den kânok zi mân dâ-go-man.*
message one this not tell-2sO-PRS.1s
'There is one thing that I have not been telling you.'

The Western Huon language Komba also uses the object verb 'give' both as an object and as a benefactive marker. But *ni* 'give' (4a) is not the only object verb that can cross-reference the object argument (4b). The verb *no* 'hit' (4c) is also used in this function (4d). The transitive verbs of Komba are divided into two classes, one of them specified to co-occur with suffixed forms of *ni* 'give', the other with *no* 'hit' as object person-number markers. There does not appear to be any semantic motivation for the assignment of a verb to one of these two classes, the class membership is a semantically empty lexical feature of a particular verb. The eight verbs with prefixal object inflection stand outside this system. They cannot be assigned to either of the object classes.

The object prefixes cross-reference an argument that has a human referent. In the case of a bitransitive verb like 'give' this is the recipient rather than the theme. The recipient of a bitransitive verb thus receives the same marking on the verb as the patient of a unitransitive verb like 'hit' while the theme is not marked. From a typological perspective, object verbs therefore follow the secundative type of alignment (Bickel 2010: 404). The primary object is cross-referenced on the verb while the secondary object receives no morphological marking.

5 **Rawa** (Gusap-Mot family; Toland and Toland 1991: 59, 61)

a *Ginggani* *go-ki-te*
mosquito 2sO-bite-PRS.3s
'The mosquito is biting you.'

b *Ene* *gana-gero-wo.*
3s deceive-2sO-PST.3s
'He deceived you.'

The Gusap-Mot language Rawa has ten object verbs like *noki* 'bite' (5a). The other verbs governing human objects cross-reference them with a set of suffixes that has no counterpart among the object verbs of the language (5b). While these suffixes undoubtedly go back to an object-inflected verb,[4] this verb has disappeared from contemporary Rawa. This example shows that there is no necessary connection between the regular, usually suffixal, object inflections and an object verb. The link can be broken and the object person-number suffixes remain without a homonym among the lexical verbs. This is the end point of grammaticalization.

6 **Numanggang** (Erap family; Hynum 1995: 52, 51)

a Ni-lam-guk.
1pO-shoot-FPST.3s
'He shot us.'

b Nihi-kele-lumuk.
1pO-follow-NPST.2d
'You two followed us.'

In all FH languages we have looked at so far the regular object inflections are suffixes. There is, however, an exception among the languages for which I have morphological data. In the Erap language Numanggang the productive object person-number inflections are prefixes (6b). The innovative productive object prefix *nihi-* 'us' (6b) differs from its inherited counterpart *ni-* 'us' (6a) found in object verbs in having an additional syllable. The second syllable *hi* was originally no doubt a verb root. I do not know whether an object verb with

[4] In the closely related language Iyo the object suffixes *-nere* 'me' etc. seem to be derived from the object verb *nore* 'get, put'. The Rawa object suffixes probably go back to the same etymon.

this root still exists in Numanggang. In any case, it is not among the twelve object verbs in my data. Unusually, the forms of the object verb with the root *hi* were grammaticalized into prefixes rather than suffixes in Numanggang. Prefixation of an object verb seems to be an areal phenomenon. In the nearby Western Huon languages Nabak and Mesem there are also partially productive object prefixes derived from object verbs. Although there is no data for most of the intervening languages, it appears that this parallel innovation across the boundary between the HP and the FS families is due to diffusion.

This brief survey has shown that FH languages have two different constructions to cross-reference human objects on verbs. A limited number of verbs, typically between half a dozen and two dozen, take pronominal prefixes. The remaining transitive verbs use person-number affixes, most often suffixes, which derive historically from one of the verbs with pronominal prefixes. The verbs most often grammaticalized into object person-number markers are 'give', 'see' and 'hit'. There is no widespread agreement between these constructions, the choice of verb varies even within the eight second-order subfamilies. Obviously, the development of the present-day object person-number suffixes from object verbs happened after the dispersal of the FH stock. No such construction can be reconstructed for pFH. The verbs with pronominal object prefixes, on the other hand, are an ancient feature of the FH languages. All documented languages, with the sole exception of Kovai, agree in having a closed class of such verbs. The idea suggests itself that some object verbs may be traced back to pFH. In the following section I will gather the comparative evidence and attempt some reconstructions.

PROTO FINISTERRE-HUON RECONSTRUCTIONS

To be able to attribute correspondences to pFH we must have a hypothesis about the tree structure of the FH stock. Much further research is required to arrive at a definitive genealogical classification of the FH languages. Therefore the best we can do now is to proceed from a reasonable working hypothesis. Even though I cannot exclude the possibility that the Gusap-Mot family constitutes a first-order branch, I think McElhanon's (1973) division of the FH stock into two first-order subgroups, the HP family and the FS family, is the best hypothesis to start out from. My knowledge of the historical development of the languages of these two branches is unequal. While I have a good grasp of the sound correspondences of the HP languages, I have only a rough idea of the sound correspondences of the FS languages. For this reason the pFH reconstructions I will propose lean on the HP proto-forms and must be considered provisional. Having sounded this note of caution, I

would like to add that the simple phonological structure of the verb roots to be reconstructed puts the difficulty of the task into perspective. All verb roots considered have the structure CV and do not leave much room for error.

Table 2: Proto Finisterre-Huon **naki* 'bite'[5]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pFH		*naki	*gaki	*ki	*yaki
Ono	E. Huon	(nirot)	(girot)	ki	(edot)
Dedua	W. Huon	ni	gi	ki	yini
Somba	W. Huon	nöhö	göhö	yöhö	eŋgöhö
Nomu	W. Huon	niko	giko	yoko	yeiko
Selepet	W. Huon	nihi	gihi	ihi	yingi
Nukna	Uruwa	ne	ke	(sá)	(yángnge)
Yau	Uruwa	ne	ge	yi	yi
Nek	Erap	nai	gai	(sɨ)	ei
Ma Manda	Erap	ne	ge	(sê)	(idê)
Iyo	Gusap-Mot	niki	kiki	ki	yiki
Rawa	Gusap-Mot	noki	goki	ki	yoki

The verb forms in Table 2 are deemed to be reflexes of the pFH reconstructions in the top line with the exception of the forms enclosed in parentheses, which are later innovations. The Ono paradigm illustrates a common phenomenon in object verbs, namely suppletion. There is one root, *ki*, for the third person singular and another root, *-rot*, for all other person-number combinations. Only the third singular form goes back to pFH. In Nukna and Ma Manda there are innovative suppletive plural forms. Another common phenomenon in object verbs is the assimilation of the prefix vowel to the root vowel. This has happened in Somba *nöhö*, Selepet *nihi* and Iyo *niki* < **naki*. In Dedua *ni* < **nihi* the intervocalic consonant has dropped, leaving a monosyllabic verb stem. I presume that the same has happened in Nukna, Yau, Nek and Ma Manda. In Nek *nai* the vowel sequence arising from the loss of the consonant has been preserved, in Nukna, Yau and Ma Manda *ne* the vowels have coalesced.

[5] Data sources: Ono: Wacke (1931: 175), Dedua: Ceder and Ceder (1990: 93), Somba (=Burum): Olkkonen and Olkkonen (1983: 45), Nomu: author's fieldnotes, Selepet: McElhanon (1972: 39), Nukna (= Komutu): Taylor and Taylor (2011), Yau: Wegmann and Lauver (1990: 28), Nek: Linnasalo (1993: 18), Ma Manda (= Sauk): Pennington (2011), Iyo: Minter (2009: 44, 58), Rawa: Toland and Toland (1991: 58f).

Unfortunately, it is not immediately clear from the comparative evidence what consonant has disappeared in Nek *nai* and in the other Erap and Uruwa languages. Within the FS family we find the object verbs Wantoat (Wantoat) *nasi* 'bite' and Gwahatike (Warup) *nisi* 'bite'. The same *s*-initial verb root occurs as the third person singular form in Nukna, Nek and Ma Manda. The inference might be drawn that the first and second person singular forms in these languages etymologically contain the same root. However, the comparative phonological evidence, limited though it is, militates against such a conclusion. There is a good FH cognate suggesting that intervocalic **-s-* is retained in one of the languages concerned. The verb root (suffixed with the nominalizer *-k*) in Ma Manda (Erap) *basok* 'the carrying of a child on one's shoulders' has straightforward cognates in Iyo (Gusap-Mot) *pasi* 'carry on back' and Somba (Western Huon) *bisi* 'carry on the back'. The correspondence of Ma Manda (Erap) *dêsê* 'take sth out (of a bag)' to Yopno (Yupna) *disɨ* 'get sth out of string bag' corroborates the assumption that **-s-* is regularly retained in Ma Manda. In the other Erap language, Nek, there is also a good cognate that speaks for the retention of **-s-:* Nek (Erap) *kesɨt* 'path, road, way' corresponds to Yopno (Yupna) *kosit* 'trail, road, way'. Unfortunately, there are no good examples showing whether **-s-* is retained in the two Uruwa languages, Nukna and Yau. The piece of evidence that speaks for the etymological presence of **ki* in the Yau forms is the third person singular form *yi*. Initial **s-* is retained in Yau so that *yi* cannot be derived from **sɨ*. Initial **k-*, on the other hand, regularly disappears in Yau and *yi* is the expected reflex of **ki*. It looks, therefore, as if the root **sɨ* has not entered the paradigm of the object verb 'bite' in Yau. In the other three Uruwa and Erap languages it has replaced **ki* in the third person singular.

To confirm the hypothesis that the root initial consonant that has disappeared from Nek *nai* and Nukna, Yau and Ma Manda *ne* was **k* rather than **s* we need to look into the development of intervocalic **-k-* in the four languages under discussion. A good cognate suggesting that **-k-* regularly disappears in these languages is the FH numeral for 'two'. The reflexes in the HP languages Kâte (Eastern Huon) *jajahec* 'two' and Somba (Western Huon) *yahöt* 'two' testify to the original presence of **-k-* in this word. But in Nukna (Uruwa) *yará* 'two', Yau (Uruwa) *yai* 'two' and Ma Manda (Erap) *yaal* 'two' there is no trace of this sound. Another possible comparison that illustrates this loss is the FH verb meaning 'vomit'. Kovai (Eastern Huon) *mangl* 'vomit' and Selepet (Western Huon) *mohat* 'vomit' reflect **-k-* whereas this sound is absent from Nukna (Uruwa) *murá* 'spit, vomit', Yau (Uruwa) *mî* 'vomit', Nek

(Erap) *mat* 'vomit, spit out' and Ma Manda (Erap) *maand* 'vomit'. The equation between the HP and the Uruwa and Erap words for 'vomit' is not beyond doubt and there is some conflicting evidence, too complex to be presented here, which prevents me from stating that the disappearance of **-k-* in the Uruwa and Erap languages is an established fact. Nevertheless, after considering all the available evidence I regard it as likely that the four Uruwa and Erap languages represented in Table 2 reflect the root **ki* in their first and second person singular forms. The comparative phonology speaks against the other candidate, **si*.

While there may be some lingering doubts about the inclusion of the Uruwa and Erap reflexes in Table 2, the cognacy of the Western Huon forms with the Gusap-Mot forms can hardly be questioned. This match alone suffices to postulate pFH original forms and the reconstructions arrived at are solid. There is another cognate whose reconstruction is based on reflexes from both ends of the far-flung FH stock. The object verb **naza* 'burn' (Table 3) is only attested in five languages, four HP languages and a single FS language, the geographically distant Gusap-Mot language Rawa.

Table 3: Proto Finisterre-Huon **naza* 'burn'[6]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pFH		*naza	*gaza	*za	*yaza
Sialum	E. Huon	nize	gize	ze	eze
Ono	E. Huon	nae	gae	ze	ezo
Nomu	W. Huon	nozi	gozi	ze	yezi
Komba	W. Huon	nise	gise	se	ziŋgâse
Rawa	Gusap-Mot	node	gode	de	yode

As for all pFH object verbs, only the three singular forms and the third plural form of **naza* 'burn' can be reconstructed. For the second person plural there is a bewildering variety of forms that cannot be reduced to a common origin. The prefix for the first person plural in the HP family and in the FS family is a close mismatch. External cognates will have to be taken into consideration to arrive at a reliable reconstruction. Dual prefixes are only attested in the HP family. The question of whether they are old can also only be answered in a wider context. These are tasks I leave for further research.

[6] Data sources: Sialum: author's fieldnotes, Ono: Wacke (1931: 176), Nomu: author's fieldnotes, Komba: Southwell (1979: 72), Rawa: Toland and Toland (1983)

Although only five FH languages reflect the object verb **naza* 'burn' the root of this verb is found in a great many more languages. When a language gives up the prefixes of an object verb such as this, what remains is the unprefixed third person singular form. Most HP languages reflect the original third person singular form **za* as an invariable verb root taking the regular object person-number suffixes, e.g. Kâte (Eastern Huon) *za* 'burn, cook' and Nabak (Western Huon) *zi* 'cook, burn'. The root is also well attested in the two easternmost FS subfamilies, e.g. Nukna (Uruwa) *ra* 'burn sth', Yau (Uruwa) *di* 'burn, be burned', Nek (Erap) *koba dɨ* 'burn, be hot' (*koba* 'fire') and Ma Manda (Erap) *d* 'light, be lit'. The Tuma (Wantoat) reflex *inji* 'alight, cook' contains a trace of the secondary third singular object prefix *i-* that we find in several object verbs such as *i-miN* 'give him/her' or *i-waT* 'follow him/her'.

The equation between Rawa /d/ in *node* 'burn me' and *de* 'burn him/her/it' and pHP **z* is based on rather slim phonological evidence. We find this sound correspondence in pFH **zuŋa* 'eye' > Rawa (Gusap-Mot) *donge-* 'eye' and Kâte (Eastern Huon) *zâŋe* 'eye'. Apart from this reliable cognate there is only one other example for this sound correspondence in my data. Rawa *de* 'fire, wood, tree' and Kâte *zoc* 'fire, firewood' presumably derive from pFH **zap* 'burning, fire'. This is the same etymon as in **naza* 'burn', the verb root **za* suffixed with the nominalizer **-p*.

Before we go into the details of the correspondence set behind pFH **nama* 'take' > Somba *nömi* 'take' and Awara *nami* 'give' (Table 4), some thoughts about the semantic side of this etymology are in order. For this purpose I would like to take a look at a different etymon with a comparable range of semantic reflexes. Pawley (2001: 282) reconstructs pTNG **tV* 'take'. The correctness of his semantic reconstruction is confirmed by the mass of the reflexes in the FH stock: Nabak (Western Huon) *ti* 'take, carry', Nukna (Uruwa) *tá* 'get, hold', Awara (Wanotat) *tä* 'take, catch, marry', Gwahatike (Warup) *tV* 'get, take' < pFH **ta* 'take'. In the Eastern Huon family, however, we can observe how the meaning 'give' springs forth from this cognate.

7 **Kovai** (Eastern Huon family; Brown 1992: 10)

a *Gima atel, ari, bol ta-yang-e.*
Gima briars vine thorn take-3pO-3s.PST
'Gima took briars, vine and thorns.'

b *Gaun ta-yat-pe.*
dog give-3dO-3p.PST
'They gave the two of them a dog.'

In the Eastern Huon language Kovai the semantic shift 'take' > 'give' is in a transitional stage. In the two example sentences in (7) we see that the verb *ta* can have the meaning 'take' (7a) as well as 'give' (7b) in a similar word construction with a pronominal object suffix. In the relatively closely related language Kâte the two meanings have separated into two lexemes. Owing to opposing vowel changes the etymological connection between the root verb *ro* 'take' (< **ta*) and the object verb *nare* 'give' (< **na-ta*) is synchronically no longer obvious. In a further Eastern Huon language, Migabac, the cognate only survives with the meaning 'give'. In Migabac *(ne-)le* 'give' < pFH **ta* 'take' the semantic shift has reached its end point.

Thus we find a clear example of the semantic change 'take' > 'give' in the languages under study. The opposite change, 'give' > 'take', on the other hand, is unattested and I doubt if this is a possible semantic shift. For this reason I reconstruct the meaning 'take' for pFH **nama* even though only a single language, Somba, reflects this meaning. The remaining Western Huon languages of the Pindiu subfamily and the FS languages, my assumption goes, have independently shifted the meaning of this cognate to 'give'. Somba *nömi* 'marry sb, have sex with sb' has in fact narrowed its meaning, but it is clear that it is only a small step away from 'take' which, for the sake of simplicity, I have used as gloss in Table 4.

There are some comparative phonological problems attached to the reflexes of pFH **nama* 'take'. Of foremost concern is the vowel of the verb root, whose quality I cannot reconstruct with certainty on the level of pFH. In the three Western Huon languages in Table 4 the root vowel of the third person singular forms seems to point to **i*. Unfortunately, in the first and second person singular forms this vowel has been apocopated in Dedua and Tobo so that the Somba reflexes are all we can go by. The root vowel in Somba is /i/ in all three singular forms. In the dual and plural forms, however, represented in Table 4 by the third plural form, the root vowel is /e/ in Dedua and Somba. The verb root *-me* we find in these non-singular forms is the expected outcome of the well-attested verb pHP **ma* 'take, hold' > Ono (Eastern Huon) *ma* 'hold, take', Komba (Western Huon) *me* 'get, take, have'. This verb continues its existence in Dedua *me* 'take, make', Tobo *me* 'take, work' and Somba *me* 'take, hold, make'. If *me* 'take' is etymologically identical with Dedua *mi* 'give him/her' and Tobo *mi* 'give him/her',

the question arises why these reflexes of the same etymon show different vowels. The raising of the vowel in Dedua and Tobo *mi* might be explained as a sporadic sound change provoked by the semantic differentiation between 'take' (*me*) and 'give him/her' (**me* > *mi*). The separate development of the vowels in Kâte *ro* 'take' (< **ta*) and *nare* 'give' (< **na-ta*), though phonologically regular, is a parallel. The two senses 'take' and 'give' crave distinct phonological expression.[7]

Table 4: Proto Finisterre-Huon **nama* 'take'[8]

language	family	meaning	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pFH		take	*nama	*gama		*yama
pPindiu		take	*nəme	*gəme	*me	*yenme
Dedua	W. Huon	give	neng	geng	mi	yemme
Tobo	W. Huon	give	ném	gém	mi	(énépé)
Somba	W. Huon	take	nömi	gömi	ami	eŋgöme
pFS		give	*namɨ	*gamɨ	*imɨ	*yamɨ
Nukna	Uruwa	give	namá	kamá	imá	yámá
Yau	Uruwa	give	namo	gamo	imo	yemo
Nek	Erap	give	namɨ	gamɨ	mɨ	emɨ
Ma Manda	Erap	give	naam	gaam	m	yem
Uri	Erap	give	naam	gaam	am	yam
Numanggang	Erap	give	naam	gaam	mim	yeem
Tuma	Wantoat	give	nämiN	gämiN	imiN	yämiN
Awara	Wantoat	give	nami	gami	imi	yämi
Wantoat	Wantoat	give	namu	gamu	imu	yemu
Yopno	Yupna	give	namɨ	gamɨ	imɨ	yomɨ
Nankina	Yupna	give	namu	gamu	ʌmu	yemu

The raising of the vowel in the Somba singular root *-mi* 'take', however, cannot be so explained. Rather, we must look for a phonological reason. There is some evidence that pHP **a* becomes Somba /i/ in the unstressed second syllable of words whereas it becomes /e/ in

[7] This phenomenon is called *Homonymenflucht* in German.

[8] Data sources: Dedua: Ceder and Ceder (1990: 94), Tobo: Mankins (2009), Somba: Olkkonen and Olkkonen (2007), Nukna: Taylor and Taylor (2011), Yau: Wegmann and Lauver (1990: 27), Nek: Linnasalo (1993: 18), Ma Manda: Pennington (2011), Uri: T. Webb (1980: 53), Numanggang: Hynum (1995: 53), Tuma (= Irumu): R. Webb (1989: 54), Awara: E. Quigley (2003: 146), Wantoat: Davis (1964: 153ff), Yopno: Reed (2000b: 20), Nankina: Spaulding and Spaulding (1994: 40).

the stressed first syllable. If we further postulate that **a* also becomes /e/ in third syllables carrying a secondary stress, these phonological rules would account for the different outcome of **-ma* in the disyllabic singular forms (> *-mi*) and in the trisyllabic dual and plural forms (> *-me*). Consequently, the raising of the root vowel in the singular forms of Somba and in the third singular form of Dedua and Tobo are independent developments and should not be projected back to proto Pindiu. Rather, we must reconstruct the root vowel /e/ in the singular as well as the non-singular forms.

pFS **namɨ* 'give' is only attested in the four eastern FS subfamilies which probably form a subgroup, but not in the Warup and Gusap-Mot subfamilies. Therefore the reconstructions cannot really be attributed to pFS and I have only used this label for want of a better one. My knowledge of the vowel correspondences of the FS languages is rudimentary, hence the reconstruction of the root vowel is highly tentative. A high central vowel /ɨ/ is found in Nukna (Uruwa), Nek (Erap) and Yopno (Yupna) and seems to be the best candidate for the proto-form. It is not clear to me whether this vowel can be reconciled with pFH **a* from which the Western Huon reflexes can be derived. This uncertainty casts doubt on the etymological connection between proto Pindiu **nəme* 'take' and pFS **namɨ* 'give'. In Table 4 I take the stance that these lower level cognates can be united under pFH **nama* 'take'. In Table 10, however, I will proceed from the alternative assumption that they are unrelated. Both possibilities deserve to be explored.

A comparison of the object verbs with the meaning 'see' in the FH languages reveals an extraordinary amount of suppletion (Table 5). A majority of the languages have etymologically unrelated verb roots in the third person singular form, on the one hand, and in the other person-number forms, on the other. The FS languages Nukna, Awara, Yopno and Nankina further have a third suppletive form in the third person plural. Only the third person singular form is cognate throughout the FH stock. The Eastern Huon languages Sialum and Ono agree with the Uruwa, Erap, Wantoat and Yupna languages in reflecting pFH **ka* 'see him/her/it'. The forms in the Warup and Gusap-Mot languages and those in the Eastern Huon languages Mape and Momare can be reduced to **kana* 'see him/her/it'. I assume that this is the same etymon **ka* enlarged by a suffix **-na* of unknown function.

The person-number forms other than the third singular have been frequently renewed. A look at the first and second person singular forms in Table 5 shows that even such closely related

languages as Sialum and Ono, Tuma and Awara, or Yopno and Nankina have different verb roots in these forms. The Uruwa and the Erap languages share a root **-bɨ* which is also present in Tuma (Wantoat) and Nankina (Yupna). Apart from this, there are no widespread forms. Obviously, reconstruction is impossible here. We will see in Table 11, however, that external evidence allows us to single out the ancient inherited first and second person singular root from among the many competing forms in the FH stock.

Table 5: Proto Finisterre-Huon **ka[na]* 'see him/her/it'[9]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pFH				*ka[na]	
Sialum	E. Huon	no	go	ka	yo
Ono	E. Huon	nan	gan	ka	on
Mape	E. Huon	naŋone	gaŋone	ŋone	jaŋone
Momare	E. Huon	naŋane	gaŋane	ŋane	jaŋane
Somba	W.Huon	nek	gek	ek	yengek
Selepet	W. Huon	nek	gek	ek	yek
Nabak	W. Huon	nik	gik	ek	indik
Nukna	Uruwa	nahá	kahá	ka	kápá
Yau	Uruwa	na	ga	a	ya
Nek	Erap	nabɨ	gabɨ	ka	yabɨ
Uri	Erap	naab	gaab	ka	yaab
Tuma	Wantoat	nambäN	gambäN	ka	yämbäN
Awara	Wantoat	nadup	gadup	ka	dayip
Yopno	Yupna	nandɨ	gandɨ	ko	pɨndak
Nankina	Yupna	nabʌ	gabʌ	ka	darʌ
Gwahatike	Warup	nen	gen	ken	yen
Iyo	Gusap-Mot	niyo	kiyo	ɋene	yiyo

The object verb pFH **natu* 'hit' (Table 6) is reflected in all documented FS languages but only in four HP languages. The cognate has changed its meaning to 'shoot' in the HP languages.

[9] Data sources: Sialum: author's fieldnotes, Ono: Wacke (1931: 174), Mape: author's fieldnotes, Momare: Pilhofer (1928: 224), Somba: Pilhofer (1928: 224), Selepet: McElhanon (1972: 38), Nabak: Fabian, Fabian and Waters (1998: 48), Nukna: Taylor and Taylor (2011), Yau: Wegmann and Lauver (1990: 26), Nek: Linnasalo (1993: 18), Uri: T. Webb (1980: 55), Tuma: R. Webb (1989: 54), Awara: S. Quigley (2002a: 64), Yopno: Reed (2000b: 20), Nankina: Spaulding and Spaulding (1994: 40), Gwahatike (= Dahating): An and An (1993b: 21), Iyo: Minter and Minter (2011).

The same natural meaning shift has independently taken place in a single FS language, the Warup language Gwahatike. The Ono first and second person singular forms are the most conservative. The verb root *-*tu* can be clearly recognized in them. In the FS languages the vowel of this root has been apocopated. But before this happened, the vowel of the object prefixes assimilated to the root vowel: **natu* > **nutu* > **nut*. The root vowel we see in the Gusap-Mot languages Iyo and Rawa may be of secondary origin. All verb roots in these two languages end in a vowel. To make the proto-form **nut* conform to this phonotactic pattern a vowel had to be appended

Table 6: Proto Finisterre-Huon **natu* 'hit'[10]

language	family	meaning	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pFH		hit	*natu	*gatu		*yatu
pHP		shoot	*natu	*gatu	*yatu	
Ono	E. Huon	shoot	nato	gato	yato	(egotat)
Somba	W. Huon	shoot	neri	geri	eri	eŋgeri
Nomu	W. Huon	shoot	nito	gito	yoto	yeito
Nabak	W. Huon	shoot	nele	gele	ele	(indele)
pFS		hit	*nut	*gut	*wut	
Nukna	Uruwa	hit	nut	kut	ut	(ráhá)
Yau	Uruwa	hit	not	got	wot	(top)
Nek	Erap	hit	nut	gut	wɨt	(yendɨpmɨ)
Ma Manda	Erap	hit	nul	gul	ul	(idêpm)
Numanggang	Erap	hit	nut	gut	ut	(widihi)
Tuma	Wantoat	hit	nuT	guT	uT	(däpmäŋ)
Awara	Wantoat	hit	nut	gut	(tangut)	(sipmä)
Yopno	Yupna	hit	nɨt	gɨt	(aŋat)	(dapmaŋ)
Gwahatike	Warup	shoot	nur	gur	ur	Yur
Iyo	Gusap-Mot	hit	nuro	kuro	uro	Yuro
Rawa	Gusap-Mot	hit	nuroo	guroo	uroo	Yuroo

[10] Data sources: Ono: Wacke (1931: 175), Somba: Olkkonen and Olkkonen (1983: 45), Nomu: author's fieldnotes, Nabak: Fabian, Fabian and Waters (1998: 253), Nukna: Taylor and Taylor (2011), Yau: Wegmann and Lauver (1990: 28), Nek: Linnasalo (1993: 18), Ma Manda: Pennington (2011), Numanggang: Hynum (1995: 52), Tuma: R. Webb (1989: 55), Awara: S. Quigley (2002a: 65), Yopno: Reed (2000a), Gwahatike: An and An (1993a), Iyo: Minter (2009: 44, 58), Rawa: Toland and Toland (1991: 58f).

The pronominal prefixes of the first and second person singular forms are straightforward matches across the FH stock. But the third singular forms pHP **yatu* and pFS **wut* are at variance with each other. A pFH reconstruction based on the reflexes in Table 6 is not possible. We will see in Table 12, however, that external evidence suggests that pFS **wut* is the older of the two forms. The original third person singular prefix pFH **wa-* has been replaced in the HP family by the free pronoun pHP **ya* 'he/she'. The reconstruction of the third person plural form pFH **yatu* draws upon evidence from both ends of the FH stock. The third plural prefix **ya-* is clearly reflected on the one hand in Nomu (Western Huon) *yeito* and on the other in Gwahatike (Warup) *yur* and in Iyo (Gusap-Mot) *yuro*. The languages of the four eastern FS subfamilies, situated between these two conservative areas, have innovative suppletive plural forms.

HUON PENINSULA VS. FINISTERRE-SARUWAGED

The five object verbs compared in Tables 2 to 6 are the sum of what can be reconstructed at the highest level in the FH stock. Do these correspondence sets contain any information relevant to subgrouping? The answer to this question is largely negative. I am unable to see any such evidence in the comparisons in Tables 2 to 5. There is, however, some weak evidence hidden behind the correspondences in Table 6. We have seen that the verb pFH **natu* 'hit' changed its meaning to 'shoot' in the HP family. In itself, this meaning shift is insignificant. The same shift in the FS language Gwahatike shows that such a semantic change is nothing unusual and may well have happened several times independently. However, there is a fact that speaks for the probability that the shift actually happened only once, to wit in pHP. The object verb pHP **naku* 'hit' > Ono (Eastern Huon) *neku*, Selepet (Western Huon) *noho* is attested in every single HP language, but I am not aware of any cognates in the FS family. It stands to reason that this verb replaced **natu* 'hit' once it had changed its meaning to 'shoot'. Thus, pHP **naku* 'hit' looks like a common lexical innovation of the HP languages.[11]

A look at Table 6 suggests that my pFS reconstructions (**nut* 'hit me' etc.) presuppose that the FS languages jointly assimilated the vowel of the object prefixes to the root vowel and then apocopated that root vowel. While this is a plausible interpretation of the data, it is not the only possible one. I prefer simple reconstructions to complicated ones including a welter of

[11] Unlike the Ok languages, the FH languages have only one object verb with the meaning 'hit'.

alternatives. The reconstructions I suggest are my best guess, but they must not be taken at face value for the purpose of subgrouping. For that purpose the correspondences must be considered afresh. The assimilation of the prefix vowel to a high root vowel of an object verb is a common phenomenon in the FH stock. We have seen in the discussion of **naki* 'bite' (Table 2) that this happened twice independently, in proto Western Huon and in Iyo (Gusap-Mot). It cannot be excluded that the assimilation took place twice independently, too, in the history of **natu* 'hit' in the FS family. The apocope of the root vowel is a somewhat more unusual phenomenon. It is a sporadic phonological development that may affect object verbs with a high frequency of occurrence in discourse. This change may also have happened more than once independently. What is more, the Gusap-Mot languages do show a root vowel and I cannot prove that this vowel has arisen secondarily. The correspondences in Table 6 therefore contain no conclusive evidence that FS is a valid first-order subgroup of FH.

Table 7: Proto Finisterre-Saruwaged **nanɨ* 'tell'[12]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
pFS		*nanɨ	*ganɨ	*inɨ	*ninɨ		*yanɨ
Nukna	Uruwa	naná	kaná	iná	náná	sáná	yáná
Yau	Uruwa	nano	gano	ino	nino	kano	
Nek	Erap	nanɨ	ganɨ	nɨ	nɨnɨ	sanɨ	enɨ
Ma Manda	Erap	naanê	gaanê	nê	nênê	saanê	yenê
Numanggang	Erap	naaniŋ	gaaniŋ	niŋ	niiniŋ	haaniŋ	yeeniŋ
Awara	Wantoat	nani	gani	ini	nini	dani	yäni
Wantoat	Wantoat	nani	gani	ini	nini	dani	yeni
Nankina	Yupna	nanu	ganu	ʌnu	ninu	danu	yenu
Gwahatike	Warup	nin	gin	in	din	din	yin

A conspicuous isogloss separating the HP and the FS families from each other is the distribution of the object verb roots with the meaning 'tell'. The root **-zu* 'tell' reconstructable for pHP (Table 8) stands beside **-nɨ* 'tell' found in five of the six subfamilies of the FS family (Table 7). Again, the Gusap-Mot family stands apart. Iyo has the unrelated verb *nimiro* 'tell' and Rawa lacks an object verb with the meaning 'tell'. In Tables 7 and 8 the full paradigm of object person-number forms is presented, including the non-singular forms that were left

[12] Data sources: Nukna: Taylor and Taylor (2011), Yau: Wegmann and Lauver (1990: 27), Nek: Linnasalo (1993: 18), Ma Manda: Pennington (2011), Numanggang: Hynum (1995: 53), Awara: E. Quigley (2003: 195), Wantoat: Davis (1964: 153ff), Nankina: Spaulding and Spaulding (1994: 40), Gwahatike: An and An (1993a).

away in Tables 2 through 6. It becomes apparent that the HP languages have dual as well as plural forms whereas the FS languages only have plural forms. This isogloss includes the Gusap-Mot family with the other FS subfamilies. I do not venture to say whether the state of affairs in the HP family or in the FS family is old. There are other TNG subfamilies like FS which only distinguish between singular and plural in the object prefix paradigm even though there is a dual number in the subject inflections of the verb. It is therefore not immediately clear whether the dual forms of the HP family are inherited or an innovation. To answer this question the pFH free personal pronouns, with which the object prefixes interact

Table 8: Proto Huon Peninsula **nazu* 'tell'[13]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG
pHP		*nazu	*gazu	*azu
Mape	E. Huon	nazû	gazû	âzû
Kâte	E. Huon	naza	gaza	âzâcne
Sene	E. Huon	nâze	gâze	eze
Migabac	E. Huon	nedo	gedo	edo
Tobo	W. Huon	nézé	gézé	ézé
Borong	W.Huon	nije	gije	ije
Siawari	W. Huon	nözö	gözö	ezö
Nomu	W. Huon	nozo	gozo	yozo

language	1DU	2DU	3DU	1PL	2PL	3PL
pHP	*natzu	*ŋatzu	*yatzu	*nanzu	*ŋazu	*yazu
Mape	nâsû	ŋasû	jasû	nâzû	ŋazû	jazû
Kâte	nâsâ	ŋasa	jasa	nâzâ	ŋaza	jaza
Sene	neze	ŋâze	jâze	neze	ŋâze	jâze
Migabac	noto	ŋeto	jeto	nodo	ŋedo	jedo
Tobo	nérézé	érézé	érézé	nénézé	énézé	énézé
Borong	nirije	irije	irije	ninije	iŋije	iŋije
Siawari	netkezö	etkezö	etkezö	neŋgezö	eŋgezö	eŋgezö
Nomu	netzo	yetzo	yetzo	nenzo	yezo	yezo

[13] Data sources: Mape: Pilhofer (1928: 220), Kâte: Pilhofer (1933: 39), Sene: Pilhofer (1928: 220), Migabac: Pilhofer (1928: 221), Tobo: Mankins (2009), Borong: Olkkonen and Olkkonen (2000: 8), Siawari (=Mindik): Olkkonen and Olkkonen (2007), Nomu: author's fieldnotes.

in their diachronic development, must be reconstructed. This task involves the consultation of word lists and is beyond the scope of this paper.

PRONOMINAL OBJECT PREFIXES

In Table 9 I have assembled the pronominal object prefixes reconstructed in Tables 2 to 8. It can be seen that there is perfect agreement between the HP and the FS families for the first and second person singular leading to the reconstruction of pFH **na-* 'me' and **ga-* 'you'. These prefixes are identical to the corresponding free pronouns proposed for pTNG by Wurm (1975: 194) and Ross (2005: 29). We will see in the following section that there is evidence from the Gorokan family that the TNG pronominal object prefixes were once more mobile than they are in the FH stock, where they are firmly attached to verb roots. From this observation I conclude that the contemporary object prefixes go back to proclitic personal pronouns. At the level of pTNG the object prefixes therefore merge with the free personal pronouns and it is legitimate to use them as evidence for the reconstruction of pTNG free pronouns.

Table 9: Proto Finisterre-Huon pronominal object prefixes

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1DU	2DU	3DU	1PL	2PL	3PL
pFH	*na-	*ga-	*Ø, *wa-				*n...-	?	*ya-
pHP	*na-	*ga-	*Ø, *a-, *ya-, *wâ-	*nat-	*ŋat-	*yat-	*nan-	*ŋa-	*ya-
pFS	*na-	*ga-	*Ø, *i-, *wu-	—	—	—	*nV-	?	*ya-

In the third person singular different object verbs have different prefixes. The most common form is the zero prefix. The bare verb root serves as the third singular form in the object verbs pFH **naki* 'bite' (Table 2) and **naza* 'burn' (Table 3) and is the only form that can be reconstructed of the object verb 'see' (Table 5). The only other third singular prefix that can be posited for pFH is **wa-*. This prefix is a relic form that is only attested in a single object verb in the HP and in the FS family. Proto Western Huon **negi* 'give' > Somba *niŋgi*, Nomu *nogi* has the third singular form **wagi* 'give him/her' > Somba *waŋgi*, Nomu *wagi*. This is the reflex of **wa-* in the HP family. In the FS family a possible reflex of **wa-* can be found in **nut* 'hit' (Table 6). The third singular form of this object verb can be reconstructed as **wut* 'hit him/her/it' < **watu*. The correspondences behind this form are, however, ambiguous. The

initial /w/ in Yau *wot* and Nek *wɨt* may reflect a phoneme **w* or else it may go back to an automatic phonetic feature of all words starting with the vowel **u*. In the latter case, we would have to derive pFS **ut* 'hit him/her/it' from **atu*, undoing the assimilation of the prefix vowel. There is neither a parallel for a third singular prefix **a-* nor for **wa-* in pFS, but **wa=tu* 'hit him/her' is the probable TNG proto-form of this verb form (cf. Table 12).

For the first and second person plural no definitive pFS, and hence no pFH, reconstructions can be made. The four eastern FS subfamilies reflect a first person plural prefix **ni-* 'us', but the Warup and Gusap-Mot languages I have morphological data from all merge the first person plural with another person-number category. Gwahatike (Warup) has extended the second plural prefix to the first person plural, e.g. *dun* 'give us/you all'. In Iyo (Gusap-Mot) the first plural prefix is identical to the first singular prefix, e.g. *nuno* 'give me/us'. Thus we find no evidence of a separate first person plural prefix in the Warup and Gusap-Mot data. The best candidate for the second person plural prefix of pFS is **da-,* found in the Wantoat, Yupna and Warup subfamilies. But the absence of this prefix from the two documented Gusap-Mot languages precludes its projection to pFS. To arrive at reliable reconstructions of the first and second person plural object prefixes in pFS, morphological data from more Warup and Gusap-Mot languages is needed.

The third plural prefix pFH **ya-* 'them' is almost as well attested as the singular prefixes **na-* 'me' and **ga-* 'you'. Yet for this form we do not find a possible precursor among the pTNG pronouns proposed by Wurm (1975) and Ross (2005). Wurm refrained from giving a third person plural basic pronoun form and Ross reconstructs pTNG **i* 'they'. I do not think that pFH **ya-* can be derived from pTNG **i* 'they', a reconstruction for which the comparative evidence is slim. Rather, I would like to suggest that pFH **ya-* descends from pTNG **ya* 'they'. To make a case for this suggestion I will provide a brief survey of reflexes which point to such a proto-form.

There is excellent evidence in the tail end of Papua New Guinea for a pronoun **ya.* Reflexes of such a pronoun can be found in all six subfamilies of the South-East Papuan stock. Ross (2000: 24) unites them under the reconstruction proto South-East Papuan **ya* 'you all' > Dimadima (Dagan) *ye* 'you all', Bauwaki (Mailuan) *ya* 'you all', Yareba (Yareban) *ya* 'we all, you all' (Weimer and Weimer 1974), Doromu (Manubaran) *ya* 'you, you all', Uare (Kwalean) *za* 'you all' (Kikkawa 1990), Koiari (Koiarian) *ya* 'you all' (all unsourced data from Tom

Dutton's fieldnotes). An obvious problem is that these pronouns all mean 'you all' rather than 'they'. A look at some reflexes of pFH **ya-* 'them' shows us how this problem can be surmounted. The pronominal prefix **ya-* 'them' has been extended to the second person plural at least twice independently in the FH stock, as can be seen in Nomu (Western Huon) *yeiko* 'bite you all/them' and Iyo (Gusap-Mot) *yiki* 'bite you all/them'. Rawa (Gusap-Mot) has further extended this form to the first person plural, thus turning **ya-* 'them' into a general plural prefix, cf. *yoki* 'bite us/you all/them'. The same extension to a general plural form, I presume, took place in pre-Yareba. The other South-East Papuan languages quoted above only extended **ya* 'they' to the second person plural.

What makes it difficult to see this historical process is the fact that most South-East Papuan languages have replaced proto South-East Papuan **ya* 'you all, they' in the third person plural with innovative forms so that the pronoun seems to belong to the second person plural alone. There is, however, evidence from two subfamilies that proto South-East Papuan **ya* covered the third person plural as well. In Uare (Kwalean) the pronouns of the second and third person plural, *za* 'you all' and *ze* 'they' (Kikkawa 1990), strongly resemble each other. I think that they are etymologically identical and go back to **ya* 'you all, they'. What happened in pre-Uare is a phonetic development that can also be observed in several FS languages in Table 4. The palatal semivowel in **ya* exerted an assimilatory force on the following vowel and raised it: **ya* > **ye*. This sporadic sound change produced two variants, *za* and *ze*, which were exploited to differentiate between the second and third person plural. This account is confirmed by the possessive suffix *-ze* 'of you all, of them' which preserves the double meaning of proto South-East Papuan.

The second subfamily in which we find evidence of the spread of **ya* from the third person plural is Koiarian. Dutton (2010: 84) reconstructs proto Koiarian **ya* 'you all' > Koiari *ya*, Managalasi *ja* and **yabu* 'they' > Koiari *yabu*, Ömie *jabu*. The first syllable of **yabu* 'they' is phonologically and, I would like to contend, etymologically identical with **ya* 'you all'. In Koiarian, too, proto South-East Papuan **ya* 'you all, they', conflating the second and third person plural, has been split into two different forms. This was achieved by adding what appears to be a reinforcing particle **-bu* to **ya* in the third person plural. Managalasi went a step further. It dropped the original pronoun root from **yabu* 'they' and only retains the particle *pu* 'they' as third person plural pronoun.

The foregoing discussion has spelled out the reasons why the gloss of Ross's reconstruction needs to be emended to proto South-East Papuan **ya* 'you all, they'. I hope it has also made it plausible to derive this pronoun from pTNG **ya* 'they'. This pronoun has a propensity to spread to the second person plural. Evidence for it is by no means limited to the FH and the South-East Papuan stocks. For the Kainantu family Ross (2000: 52) reconstructs **yé* 'they' > Awa *se*, Gadsup *ye*, Waffa *iyə́* and **wé* 'he, she' > Awa *we*, Gadsup *ve* which are straightforward reflexes of pTNG **ya* 'they' and **wa* 'he/she'. The Marind and Ok families also preserve both of these pronouns in their verbs with pronominal object prefixes. In the Marind language **ya* 'they' has been extended to the second person plural, e.g. *jesov* 'follow you all/them', *wesov* 'follow him/her' (Drabbe 1955: 77), in the Ok languages it has been extended to the whole plural number, e.g. Mian *yalò* 'hit us/you all/them', *walò* 'hit her', *alò* 'hit him' (Fedden 2011: 265f). In the Greater Awyu family, Kombai reflects pTNG **ya* 'they' in the free pronoun *ya* 'they' (de Vries, Wester and van den Heuvel 2012). The Awyu-Dumut languages have added a suffix that marks the whole plural, e.g. Yonggom Wambon *ya^{ŋ}gup* 'they', *na^{ŋ}gup* 'we', *^{ŋ}ga^{ŋ}gup* 'you all'. The pronominal roots in these plural forms may, however, go back to singular forms, cf. *yup* 'he, she' < **ya-up*, lacking the plural marker *-^{ŋ}g*. Finally, in Ekagi (Wissel Lakes) some object-inflected verbs have a third person prefix *ja(a)-* as *jaakii* 'escape him/her/them' (Drabbe 1952: 40).

This far from exhaustive survey has, I hope, shown that there is good comparative evidence for the reconstruction of pTNG **ya* 'they'. The reflexes pointing to this form are widespread and not confined to a particular region. They occur in the paradigm of pronominal object prefixes on verbs, arguably the most conservative source of information on the pTNG personal pronouns. Furthermore, apparent reflexes of **i* can be derived from **ya* via the assimilatory process we have touched upon in the preceding discussion: *ya* > *ye* > *yi* > *i*. It is much harder to derive **ya* from **i*. For these reasons Ross's proposed reconstruction of pTNG **i* 'they' must be rejected.

HIGHER LEVEL CONNECTIONS

In this section I want to track the wider connections of the pFH object verb forms reconstructed in the preceding sections. The first place to look are the other member stocks of the North East New Guinea (NENG) section of the TNG phylum. However, the Madang languages have replaced the TNG object prefixes and the Simbu-Wahgi languages lack them

altogether. This leaves us with the Eastern Highlands stock consisting of the Kainantu and the Gorokan families. In a second step we must extend our view to all TNG subfamilies reflecting the same pronominal object prefixes as the FH languages. There is a forerunner who undertook this task a quarter of a century ago. Foley (1986: 259) compared the object prefixes of the Eastern Highlands languages with those of the HP and the Great Dani languages and found evidence of cognate forms. I will go a step further than Foley by including the verb root in the comparison. The probative value of correspondences involving a verb root as well as several prefixes attached to it is greater than that of prefixes alone.

The TNG pronominal object prefixes manifest themselves in a more archaic state in the Gorokan family than in the FH stock. Grammars of Gorokan languages usually treat them as productive inflections, although "a great number of transitive verbs never occur with the prefixed object marker." (Renck 1975: 137). No grammar I have consulted puts down the number of the verbs that can take object prefixes, but that number appears to be considerably higher than in the average FH language. Like the FH languages, Yagaria (Gorokan) has a periphrastic construction making use of the object verb *to* 'put (animates)' as an auxiliary to inflect verbs for object person and number that cannot take object prefixes (Renck 1975: 141). However, this construction has a much narrower range of use than the corresponding construction with the object verb *nu* 'hit' in Kâte (HP), which has all but overwhelmed the verbs with object prefixes.

8 **Yagaria** (Gorokan family; Renck 1975: 151)
da-tava *hu-d-i-e*
1sO-grabbing do-PST-3s-IND
'He grabbed me.'

9 **Fore** (Gorokan family; Scott 1978: 51)
na-ba-na-y-e
1sO-biting-eat-3s-IND
'It bites me.'

There is a second respect in which the pronominal object prefixes preserve a more archaic state in the Gorokan languages than in the FH stock. In the FH languages they are firmly attached to verb roots and processes of fusion such as the assimilation of the prefix vowel to the root vowel or the growth of suppletion can be observed in their historical development. In the Gorokan languages there are no signs of fusion whatsoever. On the contrary, the object

prefixes preserve some mobility. In (8) and (9) we see that they can be separated from the verb root by a verb adjunct. The object prefix then attaches to the verb adjunct, *tava* 'grabbing' in Yagaria (8) and *-ba* 'biting' in Fore (9). The same prefixes can also be attached to nouns as possessive markers. All this points to their origin as free pronouns. For any ancestral language including the Gorokan family among its offspring we must therefore reconstruct proclitic personal pronouns rather than prefixes.

Table 10: Proto North East New Guinea **na=mi* 'give'[14]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pNENG		*na=mi	*ga=mi		*ya=mi
Yau	FS	namo	gamo	imo	yemo
Awara	FS	nami	gami	imi	yämi
Yopno	FS	nam~~ɨ~~	gam~~ɨ~~	im~~ɨ~~	yom~~ɨ~~
Gadsup	Kainantu	(time)	ame	ame	yime
Kosena	Kainantu	(simé)	amé	amé	timé
Tairora	Kainantu	(timi)	ami	ami	(nimi)
Fore	Gorokan	nami	kami	ami	(imi)
Yagaria	Gorokan	dami	gami	ami	(pami)
Benabena	Gorokan	nimi	kimi	emi	(epi)
Gende	Gorokan	nemi	kemi	emi	(inimi)

In Table 4 I tried to unite proto Pindiu (HP) **nəme* 'take' with pFS **nam~~ɨ~~* 'give' under a common reconstruction. Now I am changing tack and give up this connection. In Table 10 I only compare pFS **nam~~ɨ~~* 'give' with verbs having the same meaning in the Kainantu and Gorokan languages. The reflexes of the root vowel seem to point to a high vowel and I tentatively reconstruct the verb root as pNENG **mi* 'give'. However, the vowel correspondences of the FS and the Kainantu languages are not clear to me so that this is only a guess. For the reconstruction of the first and second person singular pronominal proclitics there is good evidence in the FS and the Gorokan languages. The third person plural proclitic is reflected in the FS and two Kainantu languages. The initial consonants of the Gadsup and Kosena third plural forms go back to proto Kainantu **y-* (Bee 1965: 23). The third person

[14] Data sources: Yau, Awara and Yopno: see Table 4, Gadsup: Frantz and McKaughan (1973: 441), Kosena: Marks (1974a: 15, 1974b), Tairora: Vincent (1973: 563), Fore: Scott (1978: 52f), Yagaria: Renck (1975: 21, 139), Benabena: Young (1971: 43), Gende: Aufenanger (1952: 208).

singular prefixes of the FS and the Eastern Highlands languages diverge from each other and I attempt no reconstruction.

I have made the equation between the FS and the Eastern Highlands verbs meaning 'give' because it seems so obvious. A problem with this equation is that it forces us to leave proto Pindiu (HP) **nəme* 'take' behind. While the verb root in **nəme* 'take' goes back to pHP **ma* 'take, hold', the decision to reconstruct pNENG **na=mi* 'give' divorces this verb from **ma*. In other words, under this hypothesis there are two different etyma, **ma* 'take' and **mi* 'give'. While this is a possibility that deserves to be explored, I am not really convinced by it.

We saw in the discussion of Table 4 that Dedua and Tobo *mi* 'give him/her' is etymologically identical with *me* 'take' and has raised its vowel in a semantically driven process of dissimilation. The coexistence of the two senses 'take' and 'give' in the same verb was felt to be disturbing and gave rise to a sporadic sound change that dissimilated the phonological representations of the two senses. The same process can be observed in the Koiarian family. Dutton (2010: 71) reconstructs proto Koiarian **ma* 'get, take' > Koita *ma* 'get (sg obj)', Koiari *ma* 'get (sg obj)', which is cognate with pHP **ma* 'take, hold'. Dutton (2010: 73) further reconstructs proto Koiarian **m(o,a)* 'give (sg IO)' > Koita *mo* 'give', Koiari *mo ~ ma* 'give', South Barai *ma* 'give'. These two verbs are, I believe, etymologically identical. Dutton hesitates with the reconstruction of the vowel in **m(o,a)* 'give' because Koita points to **o* whereas South Barai points to **a*. I think the conservative reflex is South Barai *ma* 'give' because South Barai lacks a phonologically similar verb with the meaning 'take'. Therefore there is no reason to change the vowel of *ma* 'give'. In Koita, on the other hand, a process of dissimilation has separated *mo* 'give' from *ma* 'get' ending the homonymy that must be postulated for proto Koiarian. In Koiari the dissimilatory split of proto Koiarian **ma* 'take, give' is in the middle of running its course. Some inflectional forms show the root *mo* 'give' while others still have *ma* 'give'.

The diachronic developments in the Pindiu and the Koiarian families show that a verb with the meaning 'give' and an altered vowel can spring forth from pTNG **ma* 'take'. It is possible that pNENG **na=mi* 'give' must also be explained in this manner. In that case the gloss of the reconstruction is incorrect because the meaning 'give' has developed independently in the FS and the Eastern Highlands languages. The alternative hypothesis that there is an

etymologically separate verb root **mi* 'give' appears less likely to me. pTNG **ma* 'take' is widely attested in Papua New Guinea, e.g. in Uare (Kwalean) *mae* 'take' (Kikkawa 1990), Menya (Angan) *ma* 'get, have' (Whitehead 2004: 76), Ku Waru (Simbu-Wahgi) *me* 'take, bring' (Merlan and Rumsey 1989), Kewa (Engan) *mea* 'fetch' (Franklin and Franklin 1978), Fasu (West Kutubuan) *ma* (sg obj), *mo* (pl obj) 'take, get' (May and Loeweke 1981). I leave it to others to try and collect comparative evidence for **mi* 'give'.

Table 11: Proto North East New Guinea **na=ka* 'see' and proto Trans New Guinea **ka* 'see him/her/it'[15]

language	family	1SG	2SG	3SG
pTNG				*ka
Western Dani	Great Dani	neya	keya	ka
Grand Valley Dani	Great Dani	nee	hee	he
pNENG		*na=ka	*ga=ka	
Kanite	Gorokan	nake	kake	(ake)
Yagaria	Gorokan	dago	gago	(ago)
Fore	Gorokan	naga	kaga	(aga)
Awara	FS	(nadup)	(gadup)	ka
Nek	FS	(nabɨ)	(gabɨ)	ka
Selepet	HP	nek	gek	(ek)
Somba	HP	nek	gek	(ek)
Ono	HP	(nan)	(gan)	ka

In Table 5 we saw that there is frequent suppletion in the object verbs meaning 'see' in the FH stock. There was only enough comparative evidence for the reconstruction of the third person singular form, in the first and second person singular there was no widespread agreement. Table 11 juxtaposes the FH first and second person singular forms with the synonymous forms of three Gorokan languages. This allows us to identify the ancient inherited forms from among the plethora of unrelated forms in the FH stock. The Gorokan forms match those of the HP languages Selepet and Somba. All of them can be derived from pNENG **na=ka* 'see me' and **ga=ka* 'see you'. The Selepet and Somba paradigms of the object verb *nek* 'see' stand out in the FH stock in that they are not suppletive. This is a sign of their great age. There was

[15] Data sources: Western Dani: Barclay (2008: 344), Grand Valley Dani: Bromley (1981: 108), Kanite: Gibson and McCarthy (2002: 36), Yagaria: Renck (1975: 21, 139), Fore: Scott (1978: 52f), Awara, Nek, Selepet, Somba and Ono: see Table 5.

probably no suppletion in verbs taking pronominal proclitics in pNENG, but suppletive forms developed after the proclitics became fused to the verb root, i.e. in the history of the FH stock.

In the third person singular the three Gorokan languages and the two HP languages that retained the original first and second person singular forms agree in showing a prefixed form that might be captured by the reconstruction **a=ka* 'see him/her/it'. But the three FH languages that have suppletive first and second person singular forms show the bare root *ka* 'see him/her/it'. A moment's reflection suggests that the unprefixed form is older. The prefixed third singular form **a=ka,* apparently reflected in Kanite, Yagaria, Fore, Selepet and Somba, is an analogical innovation modeled on the first and second singular forms. It is a zero onset form that results from canceling the prefix initial consonants *n-* and *g-* characteristic of the first respectively the second person singular. In the FS languages Awara and Nek and the HP language Ono, where the first and second persons singular are expressed by a suppletive verb root, there is no model for such an analogical transformation. Hence the third singular form *ka* of these languages must be old. This conclusion is confirmed by the existence of straightforward cognates in two geographically distant TNG languages, Western Dani and Grand Valley Dani. The two Great Dani languages also have a suppletive paradigm for the

Table 12: Proto Trans New Guinea **na=tu* 'hit'[16]

language	family	meaning	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
pTNG		hit	*na=tu	*ga=tu	*wa=tu	*ya=tu
Ono	HP	shoot	nato	gato	(yato)	(egotat)
Nomu	HP	shoot	nito	gito	(yoto)	yeito
Yau	FS	hit	not	got	wot	(top)
Gwahatike	FS	shoot	nur	gur	ur	yur
Mian	Ok	hit	nalò	kalò	walò 'her' (alò 'him')	yalò
Grand Valley Dani	Great Dani	hit	nat	hat	wat	(inat)
Western Dani	Great Dani	hit	noot	koot	wat	(inoot)

verb 'see' and the third singular form matches that of the FH languages with a suppletive paradigm. This match allows us to reconstruct pTNG **ka* 'see him/her/it'.

[16] Data sources: Ono, Nomu, Yau and Gwahatike: see Table 6, Mian: Fedden (2011: 265f), Grand Valley Dani: Bromley (1981: 100), Western Dani: Barclay (2008: 334).

The object verb pFH **natu* 'hit' reconstructed in Table 6 has cognates in the Ok language Mian and the Great Dani languages Grand Valley Dani and Western Dani (Table 12). All languages agree in reflecting the first and second person singular forms pTNG **na=tu* 'hit me' and **ga=tu* 'hit you'. Remarkably, the third person singular and plural forms can both also be reconstructed. The third singular form *wat* 'hit him/her/it' in the two Great Dani languages agrees with the feminine form *walò* 'hit her' in Mian. The third singular forms in the FS languages Yau and Gwahatike can also be interpreted as deriving from pTNG **wa=tu* 'hit him/her'. The reconstruction of the third plural form pTNG **ya=tu* is based on the reflexes in the FH languages Nomu and Gwahatike, on the one hand, and in the Ok language Mian, on the other. The third plural forms in the Great Dani languages contain the innovative plural marker *-n-*. If one subtracts this marker, the original prefix that remains is **i-* 'they'. In the absence of any knowledge about the historical phonology of the Great Dani languages I cannot say whether this prefix may be derived from **ya*.

Only a small number of TNG languages reflect the object paradigm made up of pronominal proclitics of the verb pTNG **tu* 'hit'. The verb root itself is reflected in a far wider range of languages. Interestingly, we find two types of reflexes. Some languages retain the root **tu* 'hit' with a trace of prefixation, presumably reflecting the third person singular proclitic **wa=* 'him/her', e.g. Yareba (Yareban) *ur* 'hit' (Weimer and Weimer 1974), Rerau (Rai Coast) *wol* 'hit, kill', Dimir (Northern Adelbert Range) *-uru* 'hit, kill' (Pawley 2011, s.v. hit), Korowai (Greater Awyu) *ülmo* 'kill, hit' (Enk and de Vries 1997). Other languages, however, reflect the bare verb root, e.g. Daga (Dagan) *to* 'hit, kill (sg obj) ' (Murane and Murane 2007), Ku Waru (Simbu-Wahgi) *to* 'hit' (Merlan and Rumsey 1989), Fasu (West Kutubuan) *ru* 'hit, strike' (May and Loeweke 1981). How can this be explained? I think that the object paradigm in pTNG included the bare verb root as well as the forms with proclitic pronouns so that there was an opposition between **tu* 'hit it' and **wa=tu* 'hit him/her'. This suggests that **wa* was a personal pronoun rather than a demonstrative. When the proclitics became prefixes the distinction between human and inanimate referents was given up and either **tu* or **watu* was chosen as the general third person singular form. The third person singular form becomes the new verb root when a language gives up prefixation.

CONCLUSION

Verbs with pronominal object prefixes are a residual class in Finisterre-Huon languages. The average language has between half a dozen and two dozen such verbs. The remaining transitive verbs use another construction to cross-reference the person and number of human object referents. McElhanon (1975) pointed out cognates among these verbs in the Finisterre-Huon stock. There is enough agreement between Huon Peninsula and Finisterre-Saruwaged languages for the reconstruction of five verbs with object prefixes: pFH **naki* 'bite', **naza* 'burn', **nama* 'take', **ka[na]* 'see him/her/it' and **natu* 'hit'. Reconstruction is hampered by the dearth of cognates in genealogically distant languages, which makes it difficult to establish sound correspondences for all consonants in all positions. The Huon Peninsula languages differ from the Finisterre-Saruwaged languages in that they have dual as well as plural prefixes. The pronominal object prefixes of the Finisterre-Huon languages go back to the personal pronouns that have been reconstructed for proto Trans New Guinea. The Finisterre-Huon object verbs preserve excellent evidence of the third person plural pronoun pTNG **ya* 'they', a reconstruction that has hitherto not been proposed. Three of the object verbs reconstructed have possible cognates in other member families of the putative Trans New Guinea phylum. This finding confirms the view that the verbs with pronominal object prefixes are an ancient feature of the Finisterre-Huon languages. A notable aspect of their historical development is the introduction of suppletive verb roots into the paradigms of the most frequently used verbs.

REFERENCES

An, Jee-Young and Jin-Sook An 1993a. Gwahatike dictionary. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

An, Jee-Young and Jin-Sook An 1993b. Gwahatike grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Aufenanger, Heinrich 1952. *Vokabular und Grammatik der Gende-Sprache in Zentral-Neuguinea.* [Micro-Bibliotheca Anthropos, Vol. 1]. Posieux: Anthropos-Institut.

Barclay, Peter 2008. *A grammar of Western Dani.* [LINCOM Grammar Handbooks 1]. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Bee, Darlene 1965. "Comparative and historical problems in East New Guinea Highland languages" *Papers in New Guinea Linguistics* 4: 1-37. [PL A-6]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Bickel, Balthasar 2010. "Grammatical relations typology" In: Jae Jung Song (ed.). *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 399-444.

Bromley, H. Myron 1981. *A grammar of Lower Grand Valley Dani.* [PL C-63]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Brown, Alan 1992. Kovai grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Ceder, Sune and Britt Ceder 1990. Dedua grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Claassen, O.R. and K.A. McElhanon 1970. "Languages of the Finisterre Range – New Guinea" *Papers in New Guinea Linguistics* 11: 45-78. [PL A-23]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Davis, Donald R. 1964. "Wantoat verb stem classes and affixation" In: Alan Pence (ed.). *Verb studies in five New Guinea languages.* [Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 10]. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma. 131-80.

Drabbe, P. 1952. *Spraakkunst van het Ekagi.* Wisselmeren ned. N. Guinea. 'S-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Drabbe, P. 1955. *Spraakkunst van het Marind.* Zuidkust nederlands Nieuw-Guinea. [Studia Instituti Anthropos, vol. 11]. Wien-Mödling: St. Gabriel.

Dutton, Tom 2010. *Reconstructing Proto Koiarian.* The history of a Papuan language family. [PL 610]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

van Enk, Gerrit J. and Lourens de Vries 1997. *The Korowai of Irian Jaya.* Their language in its cultural context. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fabian, Grace, Edmund Fabian and Bruce Waters 1998. *Morphology, syntax and cohesion in Nabak, Papua New Guinea.* [PL C-144]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Fedden, Sebastian 2011. *A grammar of Mian.* [Mouton Grammar Library 55]. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Foley, William 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Franklin, Karl J. and Joice Franklin, assisted by Yapua Kirapeasi 1978. *A Kewa dictionary.* With supplementary grammatical and anthropological materials. [PL C-53]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Frantz, Chester and Howard McKaughan 1973. "Gadsup independent verb affixes" In: McKaughan (ed.). 439-49.

Gibson, Gwen and Joy McCarthy 2002. Kanite grammar sketch. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL. http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=50267

Hooley, B.A. and K.A. McElhanon 1970. "Languages of the Morobe District – New Guinea" In: S.A. Wurm and D.C. Laycock (eds). *Pacific linguistic studies in honour of Arthur Capell.* [PL C-13]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 1065-94.

Hynum, David 1995. Numanggang grammar notes. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Kikkawa, Keiko 1990. Kware dictionary. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Linnasalo, Katri 1993. Nek grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Mankins, Chad 2009. Tobo verb forms. Unpublished manuscript. New Tribes Mission.

Marks, Doreen 1974a. Kosena grammar. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL. http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=49802

Marks, Doreen 1974b. Kosena English dictionary. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL. http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=49881

May, Jean and Eunice Loeweke 1981. *Fasu (Námo Mē) - English dictionary.* Ukarumpa: SIL.

McElhanon, Kenneth A. 1967. "Preliminary observations on Huon Peninsula languages" *Oceanic Linguistics* 6: 1-45.

McElhanon, Kenneth A. 1970. "Lexicostatistics and the classification of Huon Peninsula languages" *Oceania* 40: 214-31.

McElhanon, Kenneth A. 1972. *Selepet grammar.* Part I: From root to phrase. [PL B-21]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McElhanon, Kenneth A. 1973. *Towards a typology of the Finisterre-Huon languages, New Guinea.* [PL B-22]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McElhanon, Kenneth A. 1975. "North-eastern Trans-New Guinea phylum languages" In: Wurm (ed.). 527-67.

McKaughan, Howard (ed.) 1973. *The languages of the Eastern Family of the East New Guinea Highland Stock.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Merlan, Francesca and Alan Rumsey 1989. Ku Waru – English word list. Unpublished manuscript. Canberra: Australian National University.

Minter, Paul 2009. *Iyo grammar sketch*. [Data Papers on Papua New Guinea Languages 56]. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Minter, Paul and Jennie Minter 2011. Iyo dictionary. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Murane, John and Elizabeth Murane 2007. *Daga-English dictionary.* Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL. http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=49559

Olkkonen, Soini and Kaija Olkkonen 1983. Burum grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Olkkonen, Soini and Kaija Olkkonen 2000. Borong (Kosorong) grammar. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Olkkonen, Soini and Kaija Olkkonen 2007. Somba-Siawari (Burum Mindik)—English dictionary. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL. http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=48953

Pawley, Andrew 2001. "The Proto Trans New Guinea obstruents: arguments from top-down reconstruction" In: Andrew Pawley, Malcolm Ross and Darrell Tryon (eds). *The boy from Bundaberg.* Studies in Melanesian linguistics in honour of Tom Dutton. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 261-300.

Pawley, Andrew 2011. Some Trans New Guinea etymologies. Unpublished manuscript. Canberra: Australian National University.

Pennington, Ryan 2011. Ma Manda pronouns. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Phinnemore, Penny 1990. Ono verbs. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Pilhofer, G. 1928. "Formenlehre von zehn Mundarten und Nachbarsprachen des Kâte" *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 18: 196-231, 298-313.

Pilhofer, G. 1929. "Wörterverzeichnis aus zwölf Mundarten und Nachbarsprachen des Kâte" *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 19: 41-69.

Pilhofer, G. 1933. *Grammatik der Kâte-Sprache in Neuguinea.* [Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 14]. Berlin: Reimer.

Quigley, Edward C. 2003. Awara phonology. M.A. thesis. University of North Dakota. http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/linguistics/theses/2003QuigleyE.htm

Quigley, Susan R. 2002a. The Awara verbal system. M.A. thesis. University of North Dakota. http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/linguistics/theses/2002QuigleyS.htm

Quigley, Susan R. 2002b. Awara grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Reed, Wesley 2000a. Yopno dictionary. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Reed, Wesley 2000b. Yopno grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Renck, G.L. 1975. *A grammar of Yagaria*. [PL B-40]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Ross, Malcolm 2000. Defining the Trans New Guinea family: preliminary evidence from pronouns. In: Andrew Pawley, Malcolm Ross and Meredith Osmond. Papuan languages

and the Trans New Guinea phylum. Unpublished manuscript. Canberra: Australian National University.

Ross, Malcolm 2005. "Pronouns as a preliminary diagnostic for grouping Papuan languages" In: Andrew Pawley, Robert Attenborough, Jack Golson and Robin Hide (eds) 2005. *Papuan pasts: cultural, linguistic and biological histories of Papuan-speaking peoples.* [PL 572]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Scott, Graham 1978. *The Fore language of Papua New Guinea.* [PL B-47]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Southwell, Neville 1979. Komba grammar sketch. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL. http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/abstract.asp?id=50178

Spaulding, Craig and Pat Spaulding 1994. *Phonology and grammar of Nankina.* [Data Papers on Papua New Guinea Languages 41]. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Taylor, Matt and Christy Taylor 2011. Nukna verb and pronoun paradigms. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Toland, Donald F. and Norma R. Toland 1983. Rawa dictionary. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Toland, Norma R. and Donald F. Toland 1991. *Reference grammar of the Karo/Rawa language.* [Data Papers on Papua New Guinea Languages 38]. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Vincent, Alex 1973. "Tairora verb structure" In: McKaughan (ed.). 561-87.

de Vries, Lourens, Ruth Wester and Wilco van den Heuvel 2012. The Greater Awyu family. Slide show at the conference on the history, contact and classification of Papuan languages, VU University of Amsterdam.

Wacke, K. 1931. "Formenlehre der Ono-Sprache (Neuguinea)" *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 21: 161-207.

Webb, Ross 1989. Upper Irumu grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Webb, Thomas 1980. An Uri grammar. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Wegmann, Urs and Doug Lauver 1990. Yau grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Weimer, Harry and Natalia Weimer 1974. *Yareba language*. [Dictionaries of Papua New Guinea, volume 2]. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Whitehead, Carl R. 2004. A reference grammar of Menya, an Angan language of Papua New Guinea. PhD thesis. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Wurm, S.A. 1975. "Personal pronouns" In: Wurm (ed.). 191-218.

Wurm, S.A. (ed.) 1975. *New Guinea area languages and language study, vol. 1. Papuan languages and the New Guinea linguistic scene*. [PL C-38]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Young, R.A. 1971. *The verb in Bena-bena: its form and function*. [PL B-18]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.