Talking about space: terms of location and direction
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1 Introduction

Talking about space is a part of talking about the environment as a whole. We include talking about space in this volume because some of the terms reconstructed in §2 are also used to denote parts of the landscape and seascape reconstructed in Chapters 3 and 4. However, much of the terminology reconstructed in this chapter was also used to talk about space in relation to manufactured objects (vol. 1), to flora and fauna (vols. 3 and 4) and to human beings (vol. 5). Many languages have complex terminologies for talking about space, and the length of this chapter bears witness to the fact that Proto Oceanic was no exception.

Following Levinson (1996) and Hyslop (2001), we distinguish four kinds of semantic system employed in talking about space. These are listed here with some commentary on their expression in Oceanic languages.

1. A system of geographic directions based on a division of the environment that normally has a vertical (‘up’/‘down’) axis and a horizontal axis. On the horizontal axis European languages have the cardinal directions ‘north’, ‘south’, ‘east’ and ‘west’. In Oceanic languages there are usually two sets of geographic directions, one used on or near land, the other used at sea (cf. Hill 1997, François 2003, 2004). Typically each has two subsystems.

(a) The land-based subsystems are (cf. Ozanne-Rivierre 1997):

(i) one with an inland/seaward axis, sometimes with a transverse axis pointing left and right along the coast (each axis is typically denoted by a local noun in a local construction; p.232);

(ii) one based on a river valley with an up/down axis (often using the vertical terms) and a transverse axis with one directionally neutral (‘across the valley’) term (each axis is typically expressed by a directional verb or other directional morpheme).
(b) The sea-based subsystems both refer to a northwest–southeast axis,
   (i) one using the terms for the northwest storm wind and the southeast trade wind (POc *apaRat and *raki respectively; Ch. 5, §4.2);
   (ii) the other applying the river valley subsystem with its up/down axis (and perhaps its transverse axis) metaphorically to the sea, such that ‘down’ is towards the northwest and ‘up’ towards the southeast (François 2003, 2004).

If we wanted to be particular, incidentally, we could label a number of geographic expressions ‘deictic-geographic’. To say that something is seawards, for example, is to place it in relation to the speaker. If the speaker were closer to the sea, the same referent might be ‘inland’.

2. An intrinsic system specifies the location of an object in relation to a reference object. European languages often use prepositions for this purpose (in, on, under, over, beside). A few Oceanic languages also use adpositions, but in the majority a local construction is used. This is often an adpositional phrase containing a relational local noun, i.e. a noun that refers to a part of the reference object or to a location in relation to the reference object (‘inside’, ‘upper surface’, ‘top’, ‘underside’, ‘side’).

3. Relative locations entail both the position of a reference person, often the speaker, and the position of a reference object. Relative locations look like intrinsic locations, but the latter do not entail a reference person (Leech 1969:167–168). For example, ‘in front of the house’ is an intrinsic location because a house has a ‘front’. For an Oceanic speaker, this is the side with the ladder, balcony and door. But ‘in front of the tree’ is a relative location because a tree has no intrinsic front. When an English speaker uses this expression, s/he treats the tree as if it were facing her/him, and so the part of the tree that ‘faces’ the speaker is treated as its front. Thus the ‘front’ changes with a change in the speaker’s position. Similarly, ‘turn left’ entails a reference person—the addressee—and a reference object. The reference object is the addressee’s body, and the direction of ‘left’ varies according to the addressee’s location and which way s/he is facing. Relative locations are not used in Oceanic languages, however. Oceanic speakers use terms like ‘front’ and ‘left’ intrinsically. One does not talk about the ‘front’ of a tree, and ‘left’ is strictly an intrinsic part of the speaker’s body, not a direction (Ozanne-Rivierre 1997). Instead, one uses the geographic system: ‘seawards of the tree’, ‘go left-along-the-coast’ (cf. Hill 1997).

4. A deictic system is based on location relative to the speaker or to some other person and often also relative to the addressee. Deictic expressions are tied to the context of the individual speech act; they do not refer to fixed points in space. All languages probably have demonstratives of some kind (‘this’/‘that’, ‘here’/‘there’, ‘voici’/‘voilà’ etc). Many Oceanic languages in addition have deictic directional morphemes in their verb phrases (or sometimes in locative phrases) which indicate whether direction associated with the event is towards the speaker and/or, in some languages, towards the addressee.1

---

1 I am very grateful to John Lynch for his help and advice in interpreting data from New Caledonian languages, to Alexandre François for sharing with me his work on Oceanic marine directions, and to Andrew Pawley for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
Relationships between widespread Oceanic categories that probably existed in POc and systems of talking about space are summarised below.

(a) Some **local nouns** (§2) are used to express the directions of the vertical, inland/seaward and coastal axes of the **geographic** system. Overlapping with these semantically are local nouns that express locations and directions in the local environment that are part of the shared experience of speaker and addressee (‘home’, ‘bush’, ‘garden’ etc). There are also relational local nouns that express locations (‘inside’ etc) in the **intrinsic** system.

(b) **Directional** morphemes (§3) in verb phrases and in adjuncts are used in Oceanic languages to express **geographic** (vertical and valley-based) and **deictic** directions. In single-verb predicates and in serial verb constructions these morphemes are verbs. Elsewhere they are morphemes grammaticised from verbs. Grammaticisation had probably already occurred in some cases in Proto Oceanic (Ross 2003).2

(c) **Demonstratives** are used as static **deictics**. The reconstruction of demonstratives is not treated in this chapter.

We can illustrate the typical Oceanic system by summarising the system in Longgu (SES) as described by Hill (1992, 1997, 2002). Local nouns marking the axes of the geographic system are asi ‘seawards’, loya ‘inland’, aia ‘east’, toli ‘west’, vu‘a ‘down’, lanj ‘up’. Longgu has terms meaning ‘left’ and ‘right’, but their referents are the arms and the sides of the body, and they do not form part of the system of spatial orientation and are not local nouns. Where English would use ‘left’ or ‘right’, a Longgu speaker refers to aia ‘the seawards leg’ or aia longa-i ‘the inland leg’. ‘Nouns such as komu ‘village’ and luma ‘house’ function as place [local] nouns when their referent is the village or house considered to be the “home” location’ (Hill 1997:103) and occur in different constructions from when they are used as common nouns (p.233). One of these constructions is with the preposition i or with no preposition. Relational local nouns express intrinsic locations in relation to objects. For example, ubu- ‘inside’ is treated as possessum in relation to the possessor pera ‘basket’:

```
        vugi ubu-na pera-i
banana inside-P:3SG basket-SG
'The banana is inside the basket.'
```

Other relational local nouns are buri- ‘behind’, na?ova- ‘front’, gege- ‘side’, orova- ‘underneath’, vavo- ‘top surface, space above’, levua- ‘middle, centre’. Demonstratives are also a type of local noun, occurring with the preposition i to indicate a location. Unlike many Oceanic languages, which have a person-oriented deictic system (§3.4), Longgu deictics distinguish four degrees of deictic distance from the speaker: nene ‘this, here’, nina ‘that, there’, ninaina ‘that yonder, yonder’ and nihou ‘that/there far away’.

Like many Oceanic languages, Longgu has postverbal particles that distinguish motion towards and away from the speaker—mai ‘hither’ and hou ‘thither’—and are hence deictic. Some languages have a third particle indicating motion towards the addressee (§3.4), and others also express have particles expressing the geographic directions ‘up (valley)’, ‘down (valley)’ and ‘across (valley)’ (§3.3).

---

2 Note that two morphosyntactic categories were used to express the vertical dimension in POc: local nouns and directional verbs.
There is no one-to-one relationship between the geographic, intrinsic, and deictic systems and the morphosyntactic categories used to express them. For this reason this chapter is organised on the basis of the morphosyntactic categories as they occurred in POc, rather than on the basis of the semantic systems outlined above.

2 Local nouns

In POc and indeed throughout the history of many Oceanic subgroups there were three subclasses of noun: personal, common and local. These subclasses are defined by the constructions in which they occur. Since some nouns occur in a number of constructions, they are assigned to more than one subclass.

1. **Personal**: personal proper names and kin terms used of known individuals. In POc a **personal noun phrase construction** consisted of the personal article *i* or *e* plus a personal noun, reflected in Taiof (MM) *e Maras* ‘Maras (proper name)’, *e cina-nai* (ART mother-P:3SG) ‘his/her mother’.

2. **Common**: human nouns and non-human animates when not used of known individuals, as well as inanimates and abstract nouns. A common noun with a specific referent was in most cases preceded by the common article *a* or *na Rumaq* ‘a/the house’. The construction is reflected in Taiof *a numa* ‘a/the house’, *a patu-re* (ART head-P:3PL) ‘their heads’; Longgu *a komu-i* (ART village-SG) ‘the village’. If such a noun was used in an **adjunct construction** it was preceded by the sequence *i ta-*, as in POc *i ta-ña Rumaq* (PREP *ta-P:3SG house) ‘at a/the house’. In this construction *ta-* was a monovalent semantically empty noun. In most Oceanic languages where this latter construction is reflected, however, *i* has dropped out, leaving *ta-* as a preposition.

3. **Local**: nouns used with reference to a specific location, a time, or an intrinsically located part of something. The POc **local construction** consisted of the preposition *i* plus a local noun, with no intervening article. Local nouns include:

---

3. The distribution of these forms is not clear. Perhaps *e* was the POc phrase-initial form, *i* the phrase-internal form. It is also possible that the POc form was simply *i*, and that this, like the preposition *i* (§2.1), has independently become *e* in a number of languages.

4. Taiof *cina-nai* reflects POc *tina- ‘mother’ + *ña ‘3SG possessor’ + Taiof *aye ‘3SG free pronoun’.

5. Crowley (1985) suggests that human common nouns had no article. This was apparently true of kin terms, but perhaps not of non-kin human common nouns, as an article is reconstructable in this context in Proto Eastern Oceanic (Pawley 1972).

6. Longgu *i* marks a referential noun as singular.

7. The suffix -ña agrees in person and number with *Rumaq ‘house’.

8. Evidence for reconstructing the sequence *i ta-* is found in Mussau (Adm) *e ta-gi ‘to me, for me’, Gela *i ta-gua ‘with me’ (both reflecting POc *i ta-gu*) and in a Longgu (SES) paradigm of prepositions and relators shown on p.5 (Hill 1992). Paradigmaticity indicates that the cell now occupied by *ta-* once contained *i ta-. Proto South Vanuatu *ira- (Lynch 2001) appears from its possessive suffixation and its uses as general and possessive preposition also to reflect POc *i ta-, but this entails assuming the form underwent an idiosyncratic innovation, as it reflects POc *ira-.
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(a) proper placenames;
(b) nouns denoting locations, including
   (i) nouns denoting familiar places like ‘home’, ‘(own) village’, ‘(own) garden’, ‘bush’, ‘beach’ etc.;
   (ii) nouns denoting geographic directions, ‘down below’, ‘up above’;
(c) temporal nouns;
(d) monovalent relational nouns, e.g. nouns denoting intrinsic parts, like ‘inside’, ‘upper surface or space above’, ‘lower surface’, ‘space beneath’ and so on;

In Taiof a local noun may form a locative expression without a preposition (i.e. *i has been lost), like *koma-na matan below.\(^9\) A locative expression with a common noun must be formed with a preposition.

\[E \text{ Maras to no } n\text{ o-n koma=}n\text{a matan.}\]
\[\text{ART Maras REAL dwell IMPF-P:3SG inside=ART ditch}\]
‘Maras is in the ditch.’

In Longgu local and common nouns are preceded by different paradigms of relators and prepositions (the term ‘relator’ is explained on p.268):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location</th>
<th>extent</th>
<th>direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘at’</td>
<td>‘as far as’</td>
<td>‘to, towards’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with a local noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>vu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thus we find:

\[e \text{ la vu komu (local noun)}\]
\[\text{S:3SG go R village}\]
‘s/he went towards her/his (home) village’

\[e \text{ la vu ta-na iola } n\text{ aia (common noun)}\]
\[\text{S:3SG go R PREP-P:3SG canoe D:3SG}\]
‘s/he went to her/his (canoe)’

When a local noun indicating a geographic direction follows a verb it may occur without a preposition or relator, e.g. lae asi ‘go seawards’.

A noun like *tama-gu (father-my) used with the personal article served as a name (‘Dad’, ‘Papa’); used without an article it served as a common human noun (‘my father(s)’). Similarly, in a local construction a noun like *Rumaq ‘house’ behaved grammatically and semantically like a placename, so that *i Rumaq meant ‘at home’ (p.241), but in the general adjunct construction *i ta-ña Rumaq ‘at a/the house’ *Rumaq was a common noun.

---
\(^9\) Abbreviations used in glosses are as follows: 1, 2, 3 first, second and third persons; ADN adnominal; ADV adverb; ART article; AUX auxiliary; COM common; CSTR construction marker; D: disjunctive pronoun; DEM demonstrative; DIR direction, directional; E exclusive; ENCL enclitic; HYP hypothetical; I inclusive; IMPF imperfective; IRR irrealis; LOC local, locative; N noun; O: object pronoun; PERS personal; PL plural; P: possessor pronoun; PLC placename; PREP preposition; PREPV prepositional verb; PRO pronoun; R relator; REAL realis; REL relative clause marker; SEQ sequential; SG singular; S: subject pronoun; V verb; VF final verb.
Inspection of the grammars of Oceanic languages shows that many have retained the distinction between local and common constructions, although a majority express it with morphemes other than reflexes of *i and *ta- (for elaboration, see Ross 2004); see also the local prepositions listed under POc *la[-] (p.289). This inspection also shows that common nouns can be readily co-opted into the local construction. Thus it is common to find the common nouns for ‘house’, ‘garden’, ‘village’, ‘bush’ and ‘beach’ also occurring in the local construction, but this does not mean that the POc etyma they reflect necessarily occurred in the POc local construction.

As the Taiof examples above show, the division into common and local nouns cut across the division into zero-valency and monovalent nouns (vol. 1, p.32).

Zero-valency local nouns denoted familiar places like ‘home’, ‘own village’, ‘own garden’, ‘bush’, ‘beach’, i.e. locations whose reference would be clear to the addressee without further specification or whose exact reference was irrelevant (like the English construction with at and no article in at home, at school, at hospital, at work). Also belonging to the zero-valency local category were nouns denoting regions, either in relation to, say, the island home of the interlocutors or in relation to the speaker. These nouns denote geographic directions such as ‘up above’, ‘down below’, ‘inland’, ‘at sea’ and so on. There is no sharp distinction between these and nouns for familiar places: ‘inland’ and ‘bush’, for example, are often synonymous in Oceanic languages. This is not surprising. Palmer (2001) points out that the terms for a culture’s geographic directions are commonly grammaticised from perceptually salient phenomena of the landscape. These nouns have sometimes been labelled ‘absolute’ local nouns in the literature, to distinguish them from relational local nouns, but I prefer the label ‘geographic’ as some of their uses are deictic, referring to a location in relation to the speaker and addressee. Familiar-place and geographic local nouns are reconstructed in §2.2.

Monovalent local nouns, often labelled ‘relational’ nouns in the literature, referred to parts of objects. These are reconstructed in §2.3.

In POc the zero-valency/monovalent distinction was apparently not as sharp as it is in many modern Oceanic languages (Lynch, Ross & Crowley 2002:78–79), but there were semantically driven tendencies in the behaviour of nouns. When a noun was viewed as semantically inalienable, like the inside of an object, it was monovalent (i.e. directly possessed, with a possessor suffix), but the same noun could also have zero valency if used in a context where inalienability was irrelevant. For this reason, the relational nouns reconstructed in §2.3 have both monovalent and zero-valency forms, and we find cases where some reflexes of a relational noun are monovalent, others zero-valency.

The major local nouns reconstructed below are listed here with simplified glosses, in two groups, relational and familiar-place/geographic. Where a noun is also reconstructed as a common noun, its common-noun gloss is also given, and where a local adverb in *qa- is reconstructable this is also shown.
Familiar-place and geographic local nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as common noun</th>
<th>as local noun</th>
<th>adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*qutan</td>
<td>‘bushland, hinterland’</td>
<td>‘inland’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lona</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>‘inland’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*laur</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>‘seaways’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tasik</td>
<td>‘sea, salt water’</td>
<td>‘at sea’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rumaq</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
<td>‘home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tanoq</td>
<td>‘earth, soil’</td>
<td>‘down below’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*atas</td>
<td>‘high country, uplands’</td>
<td>‘up above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*langit</td>
<td>‘sky, weather’</td>
<td>‘up top, high up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*laka</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>‘up above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*liway</td>
<td>‘open space’</td>
<td>‘middle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relational local nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>as common noun</th>
<th>as local noun</th>
<th>adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*lalo-, *lo-, *lalom</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*papa-, *pa-, *papak, *pak</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘underside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*papo-, *po-, *papo, *po</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘upper surface’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qulu-, *qulu</td>
<td>‘head, (head) hair’</td>
<td>‘top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[p\^w\^a]p\^w\^aRa-, *[p\^w\^a]p\^w\^aRa</td>
<td>‘cheek’</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qaru-, *qarop</td>
<td>‘face’?</td>
<td>‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*muqa-, *muqa</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mata-, *mata</td>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nako-, *nako</td>
<td>‘face’</td>
<td>‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*muri-</td>
<td>‘back’</td>
<td>‘back’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘—’ indicates that the item is not reconstructable, ‘…’ that the evidence is insufficient to decide whether it is reconstructable.

Heine (1989) observes an implicational relationship ‘under’ > ‘on’/’in’ > ‘front’ > ‘back’ such that if any of these relational meanings is derived historically from a body-part term, so will be the meanings to the right of it. This is supported by the listing above, as ‘under’ and ‘on’/’in’ are not derived from body-part nouns, but ‘front’ and ‘back’ are. Heine argues that this is a scale of increasing deixivity from left to right, but Bowden (1992:53) argues that ‘front’ and ‘back’ are based on body-part terms simply because entities in the landscape are not perceived as having intrinsic fronts and backs, i.e. Oceanic languages do not have a relative spatial system (p.230).

### 2.1 The preposition *i and the prefix *qa-

The preposition *i, which occurred before local nouns, is widely reflected in Oceanic languages, but there are also many languages in which a local noun occurs without a preposition.
PAn *i (PREP) locative (ACD)
Poc *i (PREP w PLC, N LOC) locative

Adm: Mussau e- fossilised prefix on locative nouns
Adm: Penchal i (PREP) locative, temporal, allative, instrumental
Adm: Lou e (PREP) locative, allative
NNG: Manam e- locative prefix (e.g. e-lau ‘seawards’)
PT: Molima i- locative prefix
PT: Sudest e (PREP) locative
MM: Tigak e (PREP w PLC) locative
MM: Kara i (PREP) locative
MM: Nalik i- prefix on locative demonstratives
MM: Tabar i (PREP w PLC, N LOC) locative
MM: Lihir i (PREP w PLC, N LOC) locative
MM: Sursurunga i (PREP) locative, temporal
MM: Ramoaaina i- prefix on locative demonstratives
MM: Halia i (PREP) locative
MM: Taiof i (PREP w predicate N LOC) locative
SES: Bugotu i (PREP) locative
SES: Gela i (PREP w N LOC) locative
SES: Lengo i (PREP) locative
SES: Longgu i (PREP w N LOC) locative
SES: Lau i (PREP w PLC, N LOC) locative
SES: Kwaio i (PREP) locative
SES: Kwar’a ae i (PREP) locative
SES: Sa’a i (PREP) locative
SES: Arosi i (PREP) locative
NCV: Mota i (PREP) locative
NCV: Merlav i (PREP) locative
NCV: Nguna e- (PREP) locative
SV: Kwamera i- prefix on locative nouns
SV: Lenakel i- prefix on locative nouns
SV: Anejom i- prefix on locative nouns
NCal: Iaai e- prefix on locative adverbs
Fij: Wayan i (PREP) locative
Fij: Bauan e (PREP) locative
Pn: Tongan i, ?i (PREP) locative
Pn: Niuafo’ou ?i (PREP) locative
Pn: E Futunan i (PREP) locative
Pn: E Uvean ?i (PREP) locative
Pn: Samoan i (PREP) locative
Pn: Pileni i (PREP) locative
Pn: Marquesan ?i (PREP) locative
Tongan, Niuafou’ou and East Uvean *i are phonologically problematic, as they reflect POc *qi, the form of the genitive preposition governing a non-specific inalienable possessor (Pawley 1972, Clark 1976, Hooper 1985, Ross 1998b, 2001b). However, as Clark (1976) and Blust (ACD) note, the introduction of a historically secondary glottal stop also occurs in some other Tongan grammatical formatives.

POc *i occurred with local nouns. Its exact distribution is not clear, but it is likely that *i was omissible if the phrase it initiated was licensed by the verb.

There are a number of languages in which the reflex of *i is the general locative preposition. I take these to be cases where an extension of meaning has occurred, as there are ample and widely distributed languages where *i is attested only with local nouns.

As mentioned above, a number of local nouns also formed POc local adverbs with the prefix *qa-. Jauncey (1997) notes for Tamambo that the prefix a- means ‘location in/at a place’, and must be prefixed to a noun signifying a place in relation to the speaker, i.e. a local noun. The cognate set is listed below. This is the *qa- which Pawley (1972:82, 114) found in Southeast Solomonic and Northern Vanuatu languages as a formative of temporal adverbs (Ch. 9, p.324).

POc *qa- local adverb formative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Bariai</td>
<td>ga- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Manam</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative (fossil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kairiru</td>
<td>qa- local adverb formative (fossil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Vitu</td>
<td>ye- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Siar</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tolai</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Gela</td>
<td>ya- local adverb formative (fossil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mota</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Raga</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Port Sandwich</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Tamambo</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Paamese</td>
<td>a- local adverb formative (fossil)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There also seems to have been an alternant *ŋa-, reflected in Poeng (NNG) ŋa-, Nakanai (MM) ga-, Longgu (SES) ŋa- and Samoan, Tikopia (Pn) ŋa-, but it is not strongly attested.

2.2 Familiar-place and geographic local nouns

The nouns reconstructed in this section are zero-valency local nouns denoting regions, either in relation to the island home of the interlocutors or in relation to the speaker. They have meanings like ‘inland, bush’, ‘seaward, beach’, ‘down below’ and ‘up above’. Some of these glosses are adverbia l in English. This is because a zero-valency local noun preceded by *i often performed the task of an English adverbial. For example, POc *i tanoq evidently expressed something like ‘down there’.

Some POc zero-valency local nouns, at least, were also used as common nouns, and this difference sometimes also entailed a difference in meaning. Thus *i tanoq meant ‘down there’ but *tanoq meant ‘earth, soil’ (vol. 1, p.119); *i qutan meant, among other things, ‘inland’, but *qutan meant ‘bushland’ (vol. 1, p.118).
As far as possible, the cognate sets below are limited to reflexes of local-noun uses. However, the glosses of the reconstructions distinguish between common-noun (N) and local-noun (N LOC) meanings.

2.2.1 ‘Inland, bush’

As a common noun POc *qutan meant ‘bushland, hinterland’ (vol. 1, p.118; this volume, Ch. 3, §5.1). As a local noun, however, *qutan denoted the direction of the bush, namely ‘inland’. By extension, this has come to mean ‘upwards’ in a number of languages, by virtue of the fact that the inland region is significantly higher than the coast on many Pacific islands.

PAn *quCaN ‘scrubland, bush’ (ACD)
PMP *qutan ‘small wild herbaceous plants; scrubland, bush’ (ACD; Dempwolff 1938)
POc (N)*qutan ‘bushland, hinterland’, (N LOC) *qutan, (ADV) *qa-qutan ‘in the bush, inland’

NNG: Manam -uta (root of adverbials) ‘inland’
(a)uta (N) ‘inland’

NCV: Mota uta ‘bush, forest, unoccupied land; the inland country
NCV: NE Ambae (a)ute (ADV) ‘up in the bush’
NCV: Tamambo (a)uta (ADV) ‘inland direction’
NCV: Paamese ut (N LOC) ‘ashore’
NCV: Lewo ura (N LOC) ‘ashore’
NCV: Nguna uta ‘inland’

SV: Lenakel -ơt, -it (DIR) ‘upwards’

SV: Kwamera (p)uta (N LOC) ‘up, upwards, on top of’

Mic: Kosraean wat (N) ‘area inland or towards the mountains’
Mic: Marshallese (e)bic (N) ‘interior of an island’
Mic: Mokilese (e)wic (N) ‘inland’
Fij: Rotuman ufa ‘land (from the sea); interior (from the coast’)
Pn: Tongan ?uta (N LOC) ‘inland (from shore); shore, land (from sea)’
Pn: Niuafo’ou (ŋā)?uta (N LOC) ‘upland’
Pn: Samoan uta (ADV) ‘on shore, inland’; (N LOC) i uta ‘on the side facing the land’ as opposed to i tai ‘on the side facing the sea’

(ŋā)?uta (ADV) ‘to shore, in an inland direction’
Pn: Pileni (ya)uta (N LOC) ‘shore, village location on shore, inland’
Pn: Tikopia (ŋa)uta ‘inland, landwards’
Pn: Hawaiian uka ‘inland (from shore); shore, land (from sea)’
Pn: Marquesan uta (N LOC) ‘towards the mountain’

The cognate set below has fewer members than the one above, but appears to reflect a local noun with similar meanings. Polynesian reflexes display a vowel change and a change in meaning from ‘inland’ to ‘top, space above, up top’, a change presumably mediated by the fact that on a high island (as opposed to atoll) the inland of the island was also its ‘top’.
2.2.2 ‘Seaward, towards the beach, at sea’

The principal POc local noun meaning ‘seawards’ was *laur, and it was evidently the antonym of *qutan and *loŋa above. It reflects PMP *lahud ‘downriver, towards the sea’, and it is likely that it was inherited into POc primarily, perhaps exclusively, as a local noun denoting a direction (for common-noun reflexes, see p.95). In this regard it differed from POc *tasik ‘sea, salt water’ and POc *laman ‘deep sea beyond the reef’, reconstructed in Chapter 4, which were common nouns.

POc *tasik is quite often reflected as a local noun and presumably functioned as both a local and a common noun in POc. Occasional reflexes have meanings similar to those of POc *laur, but most mean ‘at sea’, and this was presumably its POc meaning.

It is unlikely that POc *laman normally occurred as a local noun, as only two local noun reflexes have been found (Mussau [Adm] lamana ‘beach’, Tigak [MM] laman ‘down there, at the beach’).

PMP *lahud ‘downriver, towards the sea’ (Dempwolff 1938, Blust 1997)

POc (N LOC)*laur ‘sea, seawards’; (ADV) *qa-laur ‘in a seaward direction’

Yap: Yapese lʔây ‘seaward’
NNG: Manam -lau (root of adverbials) ‘seawards’
        (i)lau (N) ’seawards’
MM: Nakanai (go)lau ‘go toward the sea’
MM: Meramera -lau (root of adverbials) ‘beach’
MM: Kokota rauru ‘seaward’
SES: Bugotu lau, (i)lau ‘seawards’ (as opposed to i-loŋa ‘landwards, inland, towards land’)
SES: Gela lau, (i)lau ‘seawards, shorewards from a speaker inland, (river) bank’ (as opposed to i-loŋa ‘landwards, inland, towards land’)
SES: Lau lau ‘north; open sea to the north’
NCV: Mota lau ‘the beach, as approached from the land’
NCV: NE Ambae (a)lau (ADV) ‘down by the sea’
NCV: Tamambo (a)lau (ADV) ‘seawards, shore direction’
NCV: Paamese (a)lau ‘seawards’

PMP *tasik ‘sea’ (Dempwolff 1938)
POc (N)*tasik ‘sea, salt water’, (N LOC)*tasik ‘at sea’

MM: Lihir (i) tes ‘at sea’
MM: Ramoaaina (no)ta ‘on the sea, out to sea’ (not ‘seawards’)
MM: Tolai (na)ta ‘on the sea, out to sea’ (not ‘seawards’)
SES: Longgu asi (N LOC) ‘seawards’
SES: Kwaio (i) asi ‘at the coast’
SV: Lenakel (i)rhe (ADV)’ at/to sea’
Fij: Wayan taði (N LOC) ‘coast, seashore, sea, from the perspective of the land’
Pn: Niuafo’ou (ŋā)ta (N LOC) ‘outer sea’
Pn: Samoan tai (ADV) ‘at sea’, (i tai ‘on the side facing the sea’, as opposed to i uta ‘on the side facing the land’)(ŋā)ta (ADV) ‘to sea’
Pn: Marquesan tai (N LOC) ‘sea’

2.2.3 Directions along the coastline

The items reconstructed above for ‘inland’ and ‘seawards’ were orientations at an angle to the coastline. Also recorded for a few languages are items referring to the two directions along the coastline. Possible PWOc candidates for these meanings are given below. Although the data are fragmentary, the fact that both members of the pair are recorded in widely separated languages supports their reconstruction. The Nalik glosses ‘south-east’ and ‘north-west’ are equivalent respectively to ‘to one’s left when facing the sea’ and ‘to one’s right when facing the sea’ if one is on the west coast of New Ireland.

PWOc (N LOC) *pa, (ADV) *qa-pa ‘to one’s left when facing the sea’

NNG: Manam (a)wa (N) ‘to one’s left when facing the sea’
MM: Vitu (ye)va (ADV) ‘downwards’
MM: Nalik pa (N LOC) ‘south-east’

PWOc (N LOC) *ta, (ADV) *qa-ta ‘to one’s right when facing the sea’

NNG: Manam (a)ta (N) ‘to one’s right when facing the sea’
MM: Vitu (ye)ta (ADV) ‘upwards’
MM: Nalik ta (N LOC) ‘north-west’

Nakanai (MM) has the non-cognate pair of roots (used in directional and local verbs) -ale ‘to one’s left when facing the sea’ and -muli ‘to one’s right when facing the sea’.
2.2.4 ‘At home’

The cognate set attesting POc *Rumaq ‘house’ was presented in vol. 1, p.48. It is reasonably clear that it also functioned as a local noun in the phrase *i Rumaq ‘at home’, and apparently also in the adverb *qa-Rumaq.

PAn *Rumaq ‘dwelling house’ (Blust 1987)
POc (N)*Rumaq ‘house’, (N LOC) *Rumaq, (ADV) *qa-Rumaq ‘at home’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Saliba numa</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Nakanai (go)luma</td>
<td>‘go to nearest hamlet, usually one’s home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Meramera luma</td>
<td>(root of adverbials) ‘home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Ramoaaina (na)ruma</td>
<td>‘at home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Taiof numa</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>Tamambo (a)imo</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘at home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>Paamese (tela)im</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>Lewo umwa</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘home’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SV       | Lenakel īmwa | ‘at home, homewards’ (cf. nimwa ‘house’)

2.2.5 ‘Down below’

POc *tanoq is reconstructed as a common noun meaning ‘earth, soil, ground; land’ in vol. 1, p.119 and in this volume, p.41. However, there is well distributed evidence that as a local noun it meant ‘down below’. This is not surprising when one considers that POc speakers must generally have lived in stilt houses (vol. 1, Ch. 3) for whose inhabitants the ground was indeed ‘down below’.

PMP *taneq ‘earth, land’ (Dempwolff 1938)
POc (N)*tanoq ‘earth, soil, ground; land’, (N LOC) *tanoq, (ADV) *qa-tanoq ‘down on the ground, down below’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Loniu tan</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘down’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG</td>
<td>Takia tan (na)</td>
<td>(N + POSTPOSITION) ‘on the ground, down below’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Gumawana tano</td>
<td>‘down’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Harua tano</td>
<td>‘down there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Nakanai (go)talo</td>
<td>‘go down’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Meramera tano(do)</td>
<td>‘down there’ (-do DEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>Tamambo (a)tano</td>
<td>‘down on the ground, downwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>Paamese dan</td>
<td>‘down, below’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>Lewo tano</td>
<td>‘underneath, downwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Kwamera tana</td>
<td>‘earth, ground; land, island, country’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal</td>
<td>Iaai kmc</td>
<td>‘earth, ground’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal</td>
<td>Nengone ten</td>
<td>‘under’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meanings above overlap with the adverb reflexes of POc *sipo ‘go downward’, (ADV) ‘down below’, but *tanoq, a noun, and *sipo a verb (and perhaps adverb), belonged to different word classes (§3.3.1).
2.2.6 ‘Up above’

A few of the reflexes of POc *atas ‘top, space above’ are monovalent relational nouns. However, the vast majority of reflexes are geographic, not relational, nouns, and it seems that POc *atas was also a geographic noun. It also seems that it was not a common noun (in this respect it resembles POc *laur, p.239).

The items listed under ‘cf. also’ below reflect a Proto North Bougainville form *yasa, which has replaced *yatasa. Possibly *yasa is derived from expected *yatasa by idiosyncratic deletion of the middle syllable.

PAn *aCas ‘high, tall’ (ACD)
POc (N)*atas ‘top; space above’, (N LOC) *atas ‘up top’

NNG: Ali yat ‘on top’
NNG: Tumleo yot ‘on top’
PT: Are yata ‘on top’
PT: Gapapaiwa yata ‘on top’
PT: Sinaugoro iata(na-i) ‘on top of it’ (N-P:3SG-POSTP)
PT: Motu lata- ‘summit, top’
ata(i) ‘on top’ (N-POSTP)

MM: Bali yata ‘up (there)’
MM: Nakanai (go)ata ‘go upwards’
MM: Meramera uata ‘upwards’
MM: Lavongai (la)kat ‘top’
MM: Nalik uata ‘top’
MM: Sursurunga (u-ram)iet ‘upwards’
ieti ‘top’
MM: Tangga (l)iat ‘up (there)’
(i)yat ‘upwards’
Mic: Kiribati (i)eta ‘up, on high, above, top, upper, heavens’
Mic: Marshallese ec ‘upper, eastern’
Mic: Chuukese ās ‘upper part, top, summit, eastern side’
asa- ‘upper part’
Mic: Woleaian yat ‘up, top’
Fij: Wayanian ata (N LOC) ‘top, above; interior of a mountainous island, up the hill, inland’

cf. also
MM: Solos yas ‘top’
(i)yas ‘up (there)’
MM: Petats (i)yas ‘up (there)’
yas ‘topside; upwards’
MM: Halia (Haku) (i)yas ‘up (there)’
(pal)yasa ‘upwards’
MM: Halia (Selau) (i)yas ‘up (there)’
MM: Taiof yas ‘up (there); upwards’
POc *lanjit ‘sky, weather’ is reconstructed as a common noun in Chapter 5, but the reflexes below suggest that it was also used as a POc local noun.

PAnc *lanjiC ‘sky’ (Dempwolff 1938)

POc (N) *lanjit ‘sky, weather’, (N LOC) *lanjit ‘up top, high up’

Yap: Yapese laŋ ’up’
SES: Lau (i) lanji- ’up, above’
SES: Kwaio lanji- ’space above’
NCV: Mota lan ’upwards, heavenwards’
NCV: Nguna (e)lanji ’up, high, above, top’
Mic: Marshallese laŋ ’up, above’

The meanings above overlap with the adverb reflexes of POc *sake ‘go upward’, (ADV) ‘upwards, up top’, but *atas and *lanjit were nouns, *sake a verb (and perhaps adverb, p.277).

It is less clear whether POc *laka ‘up above’ was a noun or a verb. In Takia its reflex is a zero-valency noun, in Mapos Buang and Kiriwina a local adverb. These could be derived from either a noun or a directional verb. Monovalent noun reflexes occur in the two New Ireland (MM) languages Lihir and Siar, but in other New Ireland languages (Lavongai, Tigak and Kara) the reflexes are verbs. However, the Southeast Solomonic reflexes reflect the derived adverb *qa-laka ‘up there, up above’ (which was then used as a verb in some SES languages). Since *qa- is far more readily reconstructable as a prefix to nouns than to verbs, I assume that *laka was a noun.

POc (N LOC) *laka ‘up above’, (ADV) *qa-laka ‘in an upward direction’

NNG: Takia lak (na) ‘high up’ (na local postposition)
NNG: Mapos Buang raq ‘up, above’
PT: Kiriwina lake(va) ’top, in sky’
MM: Lavongai (san)lak ‘(sun) rise’
MM: Tigak lak ‘(sun) rise’
MM: Kara (East) lak ‘(sun) rise’
MM: Lihir laka- ‘top surface, space above’
MM: Siar laka- ‘top surface, space above’
SES: Gela (ya)laya ‘up’
SES: Talise (ya)laya ‘go up’
SES: Birao (ha)laha ‘go up’

There was also a POc verb *laka, which meant ‘walk’ and apparently had no directional meaning.

2.2.7 ‘In the middle, between’

There is well distributed evidence that POc *liwaŋ, *liwa-/*liwaŋa- was a local noun meaning ‘open space, space between, middle’, and that it had at least one relational alternant. The form we would expect to find reflected in most languages with relational forms is POc *liwa-. However, we also find reflexes of *liwaŋa-. This may be the result of local developments, and this in turn may suggest that there was no relational form in POc.
The forms listed below under ‘cf. also’ are similar in form to those listed here. However, the fact that they share a formal irregularity—they seem to reflect POc *lua—and a different meaning—‘outside’—suggests that POc *lua ‘outside’ may have been a separate etymon, and also a local noun.

**PMP *liway ‘open space’ (ACD: Proto Western Malayo-Polynesian)**

POc (N) *liwan, *liwa-/*liwaŋa- ‘open space, space between, middle’, (N LOC) *liwan ‘in the middle’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Loniu</td>
<td>(lɔhɔ)luwa-</td>
<td>‘middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Mbangap</td>
<td>lu-</td>
<td>‘torso; middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Manam</td>
<td>luʔaŋa-</td>
<td>‘space in middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Hote (Misim)</td>
<td>livuŋ</td>
<td>‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Minaveva</td>
<td>niwani-</td>
<td>‘midst, among’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Sudest</td>
<td>luyawo-luyawo-</td>
<td>‘middle’ (metathesis of **luwayo-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Ramoaaina</td>
<td>(nə)liwaŋ</td>
<td>‘between’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tolai</td>
<td>(nə)liwuan</td>
<td>‘in the middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>livuan</td>
<td>‘(be) in the middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Longgu</td>
<td>levua-</td>
<td>‘middle, centre’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae</td>
<td>livuŋe-</td>
<td>‘middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Tamambo</td>
<td>livuŋa-</td>
<td>‘middle part of s.t.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Paamese</td>
<td>luhi, luhu</td>
<td>‘middle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Sye</td>
<td>(i)lvuŋ(keve)-</td>
<td>‘between, in the middle of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Woleaian</td>
<td>riwan-</td>
<td>‘between, among’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Bauan</td>
<td>liwa</td>
<td>(N) ‘ocean far from land’, (ADV) ‘far from habitation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mä)liwa</td>
<td>(N) ‘space between, interstice’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**cf. also:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM: Minigir</td>
<td>(nə)lua</td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tolai</td>
<td>(nə)lua</td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Lenakel</td>
<td>(i)lua</td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Kwamera</td>
<td>(i)rua</td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Relational local nouns

The function of a POc monovalent relational local noun preceded by *i was similar to that of an English preposition, as in these Tabar (MM) examples, where the relational noun *paki- ‘underneath’ performs a function similar to that of the English preposition *under.10*

\[i \ paki-na \ mi \ vanua\]

PREP underneath-P:3SG ART house

‘under the house’ (more literally ‘at the house’s underneath’) 

\[i \ paki-gu\]

PREP underneath-P:1SG

‘under me’

---

10 Tabar and Lengo sentences are from my fieldnotes.
In these Lengo (SES) expressions the relational noun *muri- ‘back’ performs a function similar to that of the English preposition *behind.

\[
i \quad \text{muri-\text{-e na vae}
\]
\[
\text{PREP back-CSTR ART house}
\]
\[
\text{‘behind the house’ (more literally ‘at the house’s back’)}
\]

\[
i \quad \text{muri-gu}
\]
\[
\text{PREP back-P:1SG}
\]
\[
\text{‘behind me’}
\]

Hence we can with reasonable confidence make POc reconstructions such as:

\[
*i \quad \text{lalo-\text{-ña Rumaq}}
\]
\[
\text{PREP inside-P:3SG house}
\]
\[
\text{‘inside the house’ (more literally ‘at the house’s inside’)}
\]

\[
*i \quad \text{gabwari-\text{-ña Rumaq}}
\]
\[
\text{PREP underneath-P:3SG house}
\]
\[
\text{‘underneath the house’ (more literally ‘at the house’s underneath’)}
\]
\[
\text{(gabwari- ‘the area underneath a raised house’; vol. 1, p.51)}
\]

\[
*i \quad \text{muri-gu}
\]
\[
\text{PREP back-P:1SG}
\]
\[
\text{‘behind me’}
\]

Many Oceanic languages have relational nouns with the meanings reconstructed below:

‘inside’ (§2.3.1), ‘underneath, lower surface, space below’ (§2.3.2), ‘top, upper surface, space above’ (§2.3.3), ‘side’ (§2.3.4), ‘outside’ (§2.3.5), ‘front, time before’ (§2.3.6), ‘back, space behind, time after’ (§2.3.7). Although the nearest semantic equivalents of Oceanic relational nouns are English prepositions, I have used nouns and noun phrases in the titles of these subsections in an attempt to replicate the meanings of the reconstructed Oceanic terms.\(^{11}\)

In their monovalent form, relational local nouns are reconstructed below like other monovalent nouns, i.e. without their final consonant, on the assumption that it was lost before a possessor suffix: for example, *lalom ‘inside’ became *lalo-, *papak ‘underneath’ became *papa-. However, as I note in Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002, Ch. 4), there is some evidence from Tanna languages (SV) that POc retained the final consonant in this context, so that, e.g., POc *lalo-ña in the reconstructed example above may have been (optionally?) *lalom-ña.

**2.3.1 Inside**

The most widely reflected POc term for ‘inside’ is *lalo-/*lalom. This reflects PMP *Dalom with assimilation of the initial liquid to the intervocalic liquid: the expected POc form is **ralo-/**ralom. Reconstruction of unsuffixed *lalom is supported by just one reflex, Mussau e-lom-e.\(^{12}\)

\[^{11}\text{Some of these titles, like ‘inside’, show categorial ambiguity between noun and preposition because the English preposition reflects the grammaticisation of a relational noun.}\]

\[^{12}\text{Initial e- reflects the POc local preposition *i. Final -e is also found on another Mussau relational noun, pak-e, reflecting POc *pak ‘underside’. Its origin is not known.}\]
In Polynesian languages reflexes of *lalo-/*lalom denote the region underneath something. Blust (1997) suggests that this meaning change comes from the use of *lalom in relation to a planar surface, the sea, rather than a three-dimensional container.

**PMP *Dalom ‘inside’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc (N, N LOC)</th>
<th><em>lalo-</em>, *lalom ‘inside’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau</td>
<td>(e)lom(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Gitua</td>
<td>lolo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Mangap</td>
<td>lele-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kakuna</td>
<td>lolo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Bam</td>
<td>liluo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kairiru</td>
<td>lal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Ulau-Suain</td>
<td>lulua-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Ali</td>
<td>lal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Numbami</td>
<td>(tae)lalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(weni)lalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Yabem</td>
<td>(ya)lelom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kela</td>
<td>raro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Motu</td>
<td>lalo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Mekeo</td>
<td>alo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Bola</td>
<td>lilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Meramera</td>
<td>lilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Notsi</td>
<td>lolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Lihir</td>
<td>lilie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Sursurunga</td>
<td>lali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Ramoaaina</td>
<td>lolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Gela</td>
<td>lalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Talise</td>
<td>lalo-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Lau</td>
<td>(i)lalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Sa’a</td>
<td>lalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Arosi</td>
<td>raro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mota</td>
<td>lolo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Raga</td>
<td>lolo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Uripiv</td>
<td>lolo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Port Sandwich</td>
<td>nalō-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Kwamera</td>
<td>reri-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Anejom</td>
<td>lele-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Tinrin</td>
<td>ēwēwē-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kiribati</td>
<td>(i)nano-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kosraean</td>
<td>l̪awal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Marshallese</td>
<td>i-lōwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Ponapean</td>
<td>lēke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Mic: Chuukese | rr:ç | ‘inside of’ |
| Mic: Puluwatase | ll:ñ | ‘in it’ |
| Mic: Woleaian | raro | ‘inside’ |

PnP *lalo ‘region underneath’

| Pn: Tongan | lalo | ‘below, under’ |
| Pn: Samoan | lalo | ‘under, down, below’ |
| Pn: Pileni | lalo | ‘bottom, down, west’ |

There is evidence that POc *lalo- had two short forms, *lo- and *la-. A number of their reflexes occur as prepositions and may have been conflated with reflexes of POc *lako/*la ‘go (to); away from speaker’. They are listed together with a discussion of this conflation in §3.4.5. Listed below are those reflexes of the short forms which are not prepositions; most are local nouns. Significantly, there is a difference between the distributions of the two short forms. Reflexes of *lo- occur quite commonly as local nouns, and a number of them have a fossilised prefix reflecting the POc local preposition *i. Reflexes of *la- have a stronger tendency to occur as prepositions (p.288), and may reflect the short form of *lako rather than of *lalo-.

There is, of course, also a possibility that *lalo- has undergone haplology to form *lo- more than once in the history of Oceanic languages, but reflexes of *lo- below and in §3.4.5 are widespread enough to warrant its reconstruction in POc.

POc (N LOC) *lo- ‘inside’

| Adm: | Titan | lo(n-um) | ‘floor, inside of a house’ (um ‘house’) |
| NNG: Malasanga | lo- | ‘inside’ |
| NNG: Sio | (i)lo | ‘inside’ |
| NNG: Tami | lo | ‘inside’ |
| NNG: Poeng | lo- | ‘inside’ |
| NNG: Roinji | lo | ‘inside’ |
| NNG: Manam | (i)lo- | ‘inside, in’ |
| NNG: Bing | lo | ‘inside’ |
| NNG: Takia | (i)lo- | ‘inside, in’ |
| MM: Nakanai | -(i)lo | ‘inside’ |
| MM: Siar | lo | ‘inside’ |
| SES: Gela | lo- | ‘inside’ |
| NCV: Lonwolwol | lo- | ‘inside; heart, feelings’ |

POc (N LOC) *la- ‘inside’; ?? (PREP) ‘in’

| Yap: | Yapese | lā-n | ‘inside’ |
| MM: Tigak | la- | ‘inside’ |
| MM: Kara (East) | la | ‘inside’ |
| Mic: Woleaian | ra-n | ‘inside’ |

POc *loto- ‘space within a concave object’ is not well supported. It has become the default relational noun for ‘inside’ in Polynesian languages (where POc *lalo- is reflected with the meaning ‘underneath’; see above) and is also reflected in Wayan Fijian, so it can be reconstructed for Proto Central Pacific. Its reconstruction in POc rests on a single Admiralties reflex, Loniu lätie-, with -i- for expected -o-. 
POc (N, N LOC) *loto ‘space within a concave object’

Adm: Loniu lo tep ‘inside’
Fij: Wayan loto- ‘bottom, lowest part (e.g. of kava bowl)’

PpN *loto ‘inside’

Pn: Tongan loto ‘inside; hole or depression in coral reef or sea bed’
Pn: Samoan loto ‘deep hole in lagoon; (house) interior’
Pn: Tahitian roto ‘pool, lake, lagoon; inside’
Pn: Hawaiian loko ‘pond, lake, pool; inside, interior; internal organs, as tripe’

In many Oceanic languages the word for ‘inside’ is the reflex of a POc body-part term. Two of these may have had the secondary meaning ‘inside’: POc *bwal(o,a)-, *bwal(o,a)k seems to have denoted the belly, POc *tinaqe- the intestines.

POc (N) *bwal(o,a)-, *bwal(o,a)k ‘belly; hollow space’, (N LOC) ‘inside’

Adm: Nyindrou bolo-n ‘inside, in’
Adm: Titan pólo-n (PREP) ‘among, inside’
NNG: Kairiru balai ‘inside’
MM: Vitu polok ‘inside’
MM: Sursurunga polgo ‘inside’
MM: Tolai (ta ra) bala-na ‘inside, in’ (ta PREP, ra ART, bala- ‘belly, interior’)
NCV: Raga bwa la ‘shell’
NCV: Raga bwa la (lolo) ‘middle’
NCV: Lonwolwol bwele-n ‘hollow vessel, empty shell’
NCV: Paamese vale(-ŋe-ne) ‘hollow part of something, cave’
NCV: Namakir bwele-n ‘belly’
NCV: Nguna (na-)pwele ‘stomach, belly, abdomen, waist, genital region’
NCV: Nguna (na)-pwala(u-na) ‘among, middle, inside’

PMP *tinaqi ‘small intestine’ (Blust 1981)

POc (N) *tinaqe- ‘intestines; ?? (N LOC) inside’

Adm: Drehet kxine ‘inner part, inside’
PT: Tawala (u) hine-na ‘inside, in’
PT: Iduna hinage-ne ‘inside’
PT: Gapapaiwa sine ‘inside’
PT: Sudest tine ‘inside’

2.3.2 ‘Underneath, lower surface, space below’

The most widely reflected POc term for ‘underneath, underside’ is *papa-, *papak. This reflects PMP *babaq, which Blust reconstructs as referring to the underside or lower surface of something (the change from PMP *-q to POc *-k is unexplained). In a number
of Oceanic languages, its meaning also includes the space beneath something, e.g. a house (see the NNG reflexes below), and it is probable that this extension of meaning had already occurred in POc. Its zero-valency forms are the source of local adverbs meaning ‘below, down there’ in a number of languages.

Scattered reflexes also suggest the reconstruction of monosyllabic forms without the first (reduplicated) syllable. An innovative monovalent form *pwake- is reflected in Meso-Melanesian languages, apparently by the addition of *-e to the monosyllabic form *pak.

No reflexes occur in Central Pacific languages. In Fijian, *papa-, *papak has been ousted by reflexes of POc *ruku- ‘underneath’ (see below), in Polynesian languages by reflexes of POc *lalom ‘inside’ (p.247).

PMP *babaq ‘lower surface, bottom, underside’ (ACD)
POc (N, N LOC) *papa-, *pa-, *papak, *pak ‘underneath, lower surface, bottom, underside’
Adm: Mussau pak(e) ‘underside’
Adm: Loniu pa?a(a) ‘underside’ (metathesis of *paha?a- < *papaga- with unexplained final *-a-)
Adm: Drehet pehe(kxa-) ‘underside’
NNG: Lukep (Pono) pa(rumu) ‘area under house’ (< POc *pak qi Rumaq ‘underneath of house’)
NNG: Dami pa(rume) ‘under’ (< POc *pak qi Rumaq)
NNG: Bing papa(rum) ‘under (a house)’ (< POc *papak qi Rumaq)
PT: Are baba- ‘beneath’
PT: Gapapaiwa vava- ‘beneath’
PT: Tawala baba- ‘base, underneath, bottom; reason’
PT: Mekeo papu- ‘under’
SES: Talise vava- ‘below’
SES: Birao vava- ‘below’
NCV: Nokuku veva-n ‘underside’
NCV: Kiäi vova-na ‘underside’
NCV: Uripiv (mel)ve-n ‘the underneath of it, the shade of it’ (*malu ‘shadow’)
NCV: Lonwolwol fa-n ‘underneath’
NCV: Paamese hehe-ne ‘underneath’
NCV: Nguna na-ve(ruku) ‘underneath’
Mic: Kiribati ā- ‘underside, underneath, bottom’
Mic: Ponapean pā- ‘underneath’
Mic: Mokilese pā- ‘underneath’
Mic: Chuukese fā- ‘underneath’
Mic: Woleaian fā- ‘underneath’
NCal: Cēmuhī hāhī-n ‘underneath’

Proto Meso-Melanesian *pake- ‘underneath, underside’
MM: Bali va-vake(ni) ‘down (there)’
MM: Tigak pak(a-) ‘underside’
MM: Kara (East) pa- ‘underside; down there’
Three other POc terms can be reconstructed with a meaning related to ‘underneath’ or with a denotation which has given rise to it in daughter languages.

Several reflexes of the first, POc *ruku-*, are concatenated with a reflex of *pa- ‘underside’, the short form of *papa-. These seem to be compounds, implying that the meaning of *ruku- was perhaps more specific than that of *papa-. The latter was evidently the generic term for ‘underneath’. Perhaps *ruku- denoted the undersurface of something.

The second term, POc *gaborari- meant ‘the area underneath a raised house’ (vol. 1, p.51) and has come to mean ‘underneath’ in some languages by extension. POc *puqu-, puqun had the relational meaning ‘base, foundation’ when used in association with an object, as well as the more abstract meaning ‘origin, source, reason’.

POc (N, N LOC) *ruku- ‘underneath, undersurface (?)’

POc (N, N LOC) *gaborari- ‘the area underneath a raised house’ (vol. 1, p.51)
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2.3.3 ‘Top, upper surface, space above’

The basic POc term for ‘top, upper surface, space above’ is *papo[-], *po[-]. Blust (ACD, 1997) writes that PMP *babaw ‘upper surface, top’ is the antonym of PMP *babaq ‘lower surface, bottom’, and the same is true of their POc reflexes: POc *papo[-], *po[-] is the antonym of POc *papa-, *papak (p.249).

The unsuffixed forms are a source of local adverbs meaning ‘above, up there’ in a number of languages, although here POc *qulu[-] below is a close competitor.

The Kiribati (Mic) reflex of POc *papo[-] also has the meaning ‘outside’, and this is the sole sense of the Nemi (NCal) and Polynesian reflexes. Blust (ACD) suggests that (as with *lalom; p.246) this is the result of applying the term to the planar surface of the sea. In relation to the sea, *papo[-] was its surface and the space above it. This is beyond the land, hence ‘outside’ it.

---

13 Yabem $ (syllabic low-tone bilabial nasal) is the regular reflex of earlier *vu < POc *puqu-.
Given the tendency for body-part terms to be used by metaphorical extension as relational nouns (cf. p.248), it is unsurprising that the word for ‘head’ and ‘head hair’, POc *qulu[-], also acquired the meaning ‘top’.
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PAn *qulu ‘head’ (ACD)
POc (N)*qulu[-] ‘head, (head) hair’, (N LOC) ‘top part’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau</td>
<td>ulu (bo)</td>
<td>‘headwaters of a river’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Nauna</td>
<td>kulu(n puli)</td>
<td>‘(mountain) peak’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Yabem</td>
<td>lo-lo(?)</td>
<td>‘topside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Bukawa</td>
<td>lu-lu(?)</td>
<td>‘topside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Molima</td>
<td>?unu-?unu-</td>
<td>‘head, forehead; (river) source’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tigak</td>
<td>kuli-</td>
<td>‘top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tiang</td>
<td>kə∅</td>
<td>‘topside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Nalik</td>
<td>kula</td>
<td>‘up (there)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tabar</td>
<td>kulu</td>
<td>‘topside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Lamasong</td>
<td>kun</td>
<td>‘up (there)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Konomala</td>
<td>ul∅</td>
<td>‘topside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tolai</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>‘head, hair, top, apex, crown’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Roviana</td>
<td>ulu</td>
<td>‘top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Gela</td>
<td>ulu-</td>
<td>‘head, except of a chief; (in compounds) hair; eastern end, upper end’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Bugotu</td>
<td>ulu</td>
<td>‘head, top end’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Lau</td>
<td>ulu(nao)</td>
<td>‘first-born, elder, senior’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: A’re’are</td>
<td>uru</td>
<td>‘cloud, heaven, sky, top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae</td>
<td>ulu-</td>
<td>‘top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Tamambo</td>
<td>ulu-</td>
<td>‘top part’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Raga</td>
<td>ulu-</td>
<td>‘space above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Paamese</td>
<td>(n)ulu(yout)</td>
<td>‘at the top of the garden’ (&lt; POc *na qulu ni qutan ART top PREP bush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Nemi</td>
<td>hule-n</td>
<td>‘top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kosraean</td>
<td>ulu-</td>
<td>‘top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Wayan</td>
<td>-ulu</td>
<td>‘head or top part of an animal or thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Bauan</td>
<td>ulu-</td>
<td>‘head, top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Tongan</td>
<td>?ulu</td>
<td>‘head, upper end’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Samoan</td>
<td>ulu</td>
<td>‘head, hair’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Maori</td>
<td>uru</td>
<td>‘head, (head) hair; chief; top, upper end; (weapon +) point’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In NCV languages we find reflexes of the adverb *qa-qulu ‘up there, up above’: NE Ambae a-ulul ‘up high, on top’, Tamambo a-ulul ‘on top, at the gardens’, Kiai aulu ‘above’.

2.3.4 ‘Side’

It is tempting to look for a POc relational noun which would correspond in its use to the English preposition ‘beside’. However, in many of its English uses ‘beside’ denotes a relative location, and, as I noted in §1, speakers of Oceanic languages do not make use of
relative locations. We would expect POc reconstructions corresponding to meanings of English ‘side’ to denote an intrinsic, not a relative, location, and consequently perhaps to denote a part of a particular object.

This expectation is at least partly fulfilled. We can reconstruct POc *[p\textsuperscript{wa}]a[p\textsuperscript{wa}Ra\textsuperscript{-}] ‘side; cheek’, a body-part term whose primary meaning was probably ‘side of the face’. Its uses are analogous to those of POc *[mata\textsuperscript{-}] ‘eye; face; front’ (p.249). However, a good deal of confusion surrounds reflexes of *[p\textsuperscript{wa}]a[p\textsuperscript{wa}Ra\textsuperscript{-}]. Reflexes of POc *baban/*bapan ‘plank; canoe plank or strake’ (vol. 1, p.185) are similar in both form and meaning to those of *[p\textsuperscript{wa}]a[p\textsuperscript{wa}Ra\textsuperscript{-}]. Listed under ‘cf. also’ below *[p\textsuperscript{wa}]a[p\textsuperscript{wa}Ra\textsuperscript{-}] are terms whose glosses include the meaning ‘side’ but whose forms reflect *baban. The Lau and Bauan reflexes have glosses which are associated with both items, suggesting conflation.

PCEMP *papaR ‘cheek, temple, side,’ (ACD)\textsuperscript{14}

POc (N) *[p\textsuperscript{wa}]a[p\textsuperscript{wa}Ra\textsuperscript{-}] ‘cheek, side of head’, (N LOC) ‘side’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kairiru</td>
<td>poreq</td>
<td>‘side of house’ (-q unexplained)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Nalik</td>
<td>par, p\textsuperscript{\textacutesign}ran</td>
<td>‘side’ (dialectal variants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tolai</td>
<td>papar, papa-</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Minigir</td>
<td>papara</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Ramoaaina</td>
<td>papar</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Kandas</td>
<td>papor</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Taiof</td>
<td>pana</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Mono-Alu</td>
<td>(p)apala</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Roviana</td>
<td>papara</td>
<td>‘side of face, cheek’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cf. also

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Rauto</td>
<td>vava-</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Maeng</td>
<td>vava-</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Poeng</td>
<td>vava-</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ: Sobei</td>
<td>popa</td>
<td>‘cheek’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Kwaio</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>‘side, cheek’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Lau</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>‘side; long side board of canoe’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Arosi</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>‘cheek, temples; side (of a stream +)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Bauan</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>‘side of s.t., cheek bone; side of a canoe’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *p\textsuperscript{wa}la(\textacutesign) ‘side, part’ is reconstructable, but its exact sense is unclear.

PMP *balan ‘side, part’ (ACD)

POc *p\textsuperscript{wa}la(\textacutesign) ‘side, part’ (ACD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tigak</td>
<td>pal</td>
<td>‘part’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Gela</td>
<td>pala</td>
<td>‘side, part’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Lau</td>
<td>bara-</td>
<td>‘side’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mota</td>
<td>para</td>
<td>‘sideways, turning aside’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Tongan</td>
<td>pala</td>
<td>‘side, edge’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *bali denoted ‘one of two (opposing) sides or parts’.

\textsuperscript{14} Blust also gives ‘plank’ as a gloss. See text.
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PMP *baliw ‘moiety; answer; oppose; partner, friend, enemy; opposite side or part’

(ACD)\textsuperscript{15}

POc (N, N LOC) *bali[-] ‘one of two (opposing) sides or parts’

SES: Gela bali ‘bring together (opposite planks of a canoe)’

SES: Kwaio bali- ‘part, side, portion, half’

NCV: Mota (ta)vali(u) ‘one of two sides or parts’

NCV: Raga bal(si) ‘side’

NCV: Lonwolwol wali ‘one of (a pair); the mate of’

Mic: Ponapean pali ‘side’

Mic: Woleaian pari(n) ‘side’

Pn: Tahitian pari ‘side’

Pn: Tuamotuan pari(a) ‘a half’

cf. also:

MM: Motu badi(nai) ‘beside’ (-d- for expected **r-) –

There are two other reconstructions from which terms for ‘side’ are derived. One, POc *siriŋ ‘side, edge’, is derived from a PMP term whose basic meaning was apparently ‘be close to, be near to’. Only three Oceanic reflexes have been found to date. The other, PEOc *tapa- ‘side, outside’, is limited to Eastern Oceanic, where the earlier sense seems to have been ‘side’ in the sense of ‘outer surface other than front or back’.

PMP *sidiŋ ‘border on, neighbour; peer, equal’ (ACD)

POc (N, N LOC) *siriŋ ‘side, edge’

NNG: Dami siri- ‘side’

NNG: Takia sitiŋe- ‘side’

Mic: Marshallese turiu ‘beside’

PEOc (N, N LOC) *tapa- ‘side, outside’

NCV: NE Ambae tava(lu)- ‘side’

NCV: Tamambo tava(lu) ‘side part of s.t.’

NCV: Paamese tav ‘one side’

Pn: Tongan tafa ‘edge, border’

Pn: Samoan tafa ‘side’

Pn: K’marangi taha ‘outside, edge’

Pn: Rennellese taha ‘outside, beside, near, edge, side’

Pn: Tuamotuan taha ‘side, margin, edge, border’

2.3.5 ‘Outside’

It is reasonably clear that the ‘inside’/‘outside’ opposition found in European languages did not occur in POc. This is unsurprising, since POc relation terms were nouns denoting parts of an object. The inside of a house is readily conceived as a part of it (POc *lalo-), but the English term ‘outside’ only denotes a part insofar as it refers to the external surfaces of the building. As noted at various points in §2.3, terms which denote (among

\textsuperscript{15} The PMP etymon is discussed at length by Blust (1980a) and in the ACD.
other things) particular external surfaces are also used metonymically to denote the external surface or ‘outside’ of an object in general. This is true of some reflexes of POc *
*papof-* ‘upper surface, top’ (p.252), of POc *
murif-* ‘back part, rear’ (p.261) and of PEOc *
tapa- ‘side, outside’ (above).

The terms in the set below could tempt us to reconstruct POc *
luku- ‘side, outside’.16 However, their uneven distribution is suspicious, and it seems far more likely that they reflect PMP *
likuD, POc *
liku(r) ‘(person’s) back’ (Blust 1981). The meaning of scattered reflexes of this word has extended to include the backs and rear parts of inanimate objects (like POc *
murif-), and thence the external surfaces of objects in general. The specification of ‘back’ in the Marshallese and Woleaian reflexes below supports this interpretation.

Yap: Yapese

NNG: Manam

Mic: Kosraean

Mic: Marshallese

Mic: Ponapean

Mic: Mokilese

Mic: Chuukese

Mic: Woleaian

Fij: Wayan

2.3.6 ‘Front, time before’

According to Blust (1997), the PMP relational noun for ‘front’ was *
qadap ‘front’, which was also used of the human face. Although reflexes of this term have been replaced by body-part terms (see below) in a majority of Oceanic languages, enough reflexes survive to make it clear that its reflex POc *
qaro-, *
qarop ‘front; face’ is reconstructable.

PAn *
qadap ‘front, face’

POc (N) *
qaro-, *
qarop ‘face’, (N LOC) ‘front’

NNG: Mangap

NNG: Manam

NNG: Kairiru

PT: Dawawa

SES: Sa’a

Fij: Rotuman

Pn: Tongan

Pn: E Futunan

Pn: Marquesan

Pn: Hawaiian

Pn: Maori

16 This putative item resembles POc *
ruku- ‘underneath’, but this is probably fortuitous.
None of the items above reflects final POc *-p, but we can be certain that the form *garop occurred, as a reflex is preserved in PPN *taroﬁwa‘e ‘sole of foot’ (e.g. Tongan ṭaofi va‘e, East Futunan ṭaloﬁ-va‘e, Samoan aloﬁva‘e), reflecting POc *garop qi qaqe, literally ‘front of foot’ (where *qi is the non-specific possessive preposition (Ross 1998b, 2001b)).

Another generic POc term for ‘front’ (but probably not ‘face’) was *muqa[-], which—its reflexes suggest—occurred more often as a zero-valency than a monovalent noun. As a zero-valency local noun it occurred in the prepositional phrase *i muqa ‘in front, formerly’. The reduplicated form *muqa-muqa ‘in front, formerly’ represents a morphological pattern not found with other local nouns.

As the glosses indicate, POc *muqa[-] had the temporal sense of ‘time before’ as well as the local sense of ‘front’. It was thus the antonym of POc *muri[-] ‘back, time after’ (§2.3.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POc (N LOC) *muqa[-] ‘front’, *muqa ‘front, be in front’, *i muqa, *qa-muqa *muqa-muqa (ADV) ‘in front, formerly’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yap: Yapese mōn ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau mua ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Titan mo(ndrol) ‘bow of canoe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Manam mua ‘go first, precede’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Vitu muya- ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Nalik (pa)mua ‘in front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Notsi (la)mua ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tabar mu-mua ‘formerly’ moa ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Lihir (i)muo ‘formerly’ mua ‘in front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Solos ma-mua ‘in front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Halia (Selau) (to)mua-na ‘old’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Taiof (i)mua-n ‘formerly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Teop (ta)mua-na ‘old’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Banoni ma-ma ‘in front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mota mōoa-i ‘first, foremost, principal; to be first’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Raga mua-i ‘first’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae mue- ‘front of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Lewo (va)mo ‘front’ (va ‘go’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Nauruan (ā)mōō ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kiribati mōa ‘front, fore part’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Woleaian mmw‘a- ‘front, first, tip, before’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Marshallese mwā- ‘front’ mwāha- ‘ahead of, before, in front of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Mokilese mwō- ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Ponapean mwowe- ‘ahead of, in front of, before’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Chuukese mw-mwa- ‘in front of, more than’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Wayan mua ‘end-point or tip of a long object; head for or set course for a place’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fij: Bauan  

Pn: Tongan  

Pn: Niuafo’ou  

Pn: Rapanui  

Pn: Tahitian  

In NCV languages we find reflexes of the adverb \*qa-muqa ‘in front, formerly’: Mota (a)mwoa ‘before, first’, Raga (a)mua ‘before, at first, first, in front of’, NE Ambae (a)mue ‘in front, at the front’, Port Sandwich (a)mo (POSTVERBAL ADV) ‘before’.

There is evidence in Western Oceanic languages for a competing form \*muga. This occurs far more often in verbal reflexes than does \*muqa, so it is possible that \*muga was the POc verb, and that \*muqa supplanted \*muga in PEOc. The possibility of conflating the two terms is illustrated in Vitu and Bali, dialects of the Bali-Vitu language. In one, Vitu, the monovalent term for ‘front’ is mu\*a-, reflecting \*muqa, whilst in the other, Bali, it is muga-, reflecting \*muga. Since reflexes of \*muga are otherwise not monovalent, it is reasonable to infer that this is a conflation whereby the noun \*muqa- has been replaced by the verb-form muga.

Although \*muqa and \*muga are formally similar, a historical relationship between them is problematic: we would expect an alternation between POc \*k and \*g, but not between \*q and \*g.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{PWOc (?? N LOC, V) \*muga ‘front; be in front; formerly’}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
NNG: Bariai & muga ‘front’ \\
 & muga(\*a) ‘forehead’ \\
 & muga(eai) ‘formerly’ (-eai POSTP) \\
NNG: Arop-Lokep & mugu ‘first of all, formerly’ \\
NNG: Mangap & mu\*gu ‘first of all, formerly, long ago’ \\
NNG: Gitua & muga ‘precede, go ahead, future’ \\
NNG: Sio & muga ‘precede; before’ \\
NNG: Tami & mu\* ‘front; in front’ \\
NNG: Bing & mug ‘formerly’ \\
NNG: Gedaged & mug ‘precede’ \\
NNG: Yabem & mu\* ‘precede’ \\
NNG: Adzera & mo\*? ‘prior’ \\
 & mo\*?(an) ‘precede’ \\
PT: Suau & -muga(i) ‘precede’ \\
MM: Bali & muga- ‘front’ \\
MM: Bola & muga ‘frontside’ \\
MM: Nakanai & ma-muga (RELATIONAL N) ‘front’ \\
MM: Ramoaaina & (n)\*muga ‘in front; formerly’ \\
MM: Kandas & mugu ‘in front’ \\
MM: Bilur & mugo ‘frontside’ \\
MM: Siar & mu\* ‘in front of’
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{17} There are non-Oceanic items that look cognate, but they are descended from borrowings of Sanskrit mukha ‘face’. The items are Isneg mukat ‘face’, Ilokano mukat ‘eye mucus’, Tagalog mukha?, Indonesian muka ‘face’, Balinese mua ‘face’. Sasak mua ‘face’ (Gonda 1973:104). I am grateful to Robert Blust for this information.
The body-part terms whose reflexes are often used for ‘front’ are POc *mata[-] ‘eye, face, front’ and POc *nako[-] face, front’. The original and basic meanings of *mata[-] and *nako[-] were ‘eye’ and ‘face’ respectively. Nonetheless, reflexes of these terms occur with great frequency in the meaning ‘front’. Scattered reflexes below suggest that *i mata was a POc expression meaning ‘in front’, and other modern uses suggest that it has long been used for the front of an inanimate object, e.g. Nalik (MM) la maran a fal [PREP eye PREP house] and Tolai (MM) ta ra mata-na pal [PREP ART eye-P:3SG house], both ‘in front of the house’.

**PAn *maCa ‘eye’**

**POc (N) *mata[-] ‘eye; face’; (N LOC) ‘front’**

| NNG: | Bariai | mata- | ‘eye; front’ |
| NNG: | Mangap | mata- | ‘eye; front’ |
| NNG: | Takia | mala- | ‘eye, front’ |
| NNG: | Buang | mala | ‘eye, front’ |
| NNG: | Adzera | mara- | ‘eye, front’ |
| NNG: | Kaulong | (e)mara | ‘in front’ |
| PT: | Kiriwina | mata- | ‘eye; front’ |
| MM: | Nalik | mara- | ‘eye; front’ |
| MM: | Siar | mata- | ‘eye; front’ |
| MM: | Tolai | mata | ‘eye; front’ |
| MM: | Taiof | mata- | ‘eye; front’ |
| SES: | Gela | (i)mata | ‘in front of’ |
| SES: | Sa’a | mā | ‘eye; front’ |
| NCal: | Tinrin | (n̄i)mw-aɾp̈a | ‘front’ |
| Mic: | Kosraean | m̃ta- | ‘eye; front’ |
| Fij: | Wayan | mata- | ‘face, front of head, face of object with both front and back side’ |
| Fij: | Bauan | mata- | ‘eye; face; front’ |
| Pn: | Tongan | mata | ‘eye, face’ |
| Pn: | Samoan | mata | ‘eye, face’ |
| Pn: | Maori | mata | ‘eye, face’ |

**POc (N, N LOC) *nako[-] ‘face, front’**

| Adm: | Pak | nogo(gi) | ‘front, before, face’ |
| NNG: | Gitua | nago | ‘face’ |
| NNG: | Tami | nao | ‘front, face’ |
| NNG: | Takia | nao- | ‘face’ |
| PT: | Ubir | na(-na-i) | ‘in front of it, him’ |
2.3.7 ‘Back, space behind, time after’

The generic POc term for the back (of something or someone), the space behind (something or someone), and the time after (an event) was *muri[-]. However, it has a more complex history than other POc relational nouns. Blust (ACD) derives it from PMP *ma-udehi, containing the PMP undergoer-subject verbal prefix *ma- and the root *udehi which he glosses as ‘last; come after or behind; late, later; future; stern of a boat; youngest child.’ Blust’s glosses are not intended to be a claim about the morpholexical class of the item, but it is a reasonable inference from work on the history of PMP and POc *ma- (Evans and Ross 2001) that PMP *udehi was a noun, perhaps meaning ‘that which is behind, that which is last, that which is after or in the future’ and that *ma-udehi was a stative (adjectival) verb derived from it.

There is evidence in the Gapapaiwa (PT), Ramoaaina (MM), Arosi (SES), Bauan (Fij), Samoan (Pn), and Rennellese (Pn) definitions below that POc *muri remained a stative verb, but there is also overwhelming evidence that it was a monovalent relational noun with spatial meanings like ‘back part, rear, behind, space to the rear of, time after’ as well as more concrete uses like ‘stern of a canoe’. It is also glossed as an adverb of place and/or time in a number of languages, but where there is evidence about its morpholexical class, these uses derive from its nominal use with a preposition, suggesting POc *i muri ‘behind, later’ (more literally, ‘in the space behind, at a time after’). POc *muri thus also had a temporal use, referring to time after the time of speaking (p.322). Note that the syntactic behaviour of POc *muri[-] broadly matches that of its antonym *muqa[-]/*muga (§2.3.6), which also had both nominal and verbal uses.
It appears that the PMP root *udehi was also inherited into POc as the base *uri, but only two reflexes have been found. They are both in NNG languages: Gedaged uli ‘follow, pursue; come after, succeed; go to the rear’ and Kaulong e-ulı-‘back’ (e- ART).

PMP *ma-udehi ‘be last; be after or behind; be late, be later; future’ (ACD)18
POc (N, N LOC)*muri[-] ‘be behind, be after; back part, rear, behind, space to the rear of, time after; (canoe) stern; space outside’, *i muri, *muri-muri ‘at the back, later’

| Adm: Wuvulu | muki | ‘(canoe) stern’ |
| Adm: Loniu | muri(tun) | ‘(canoe) stern’ |
| Adm: Drehet | (omu(y)) | ‘back’ |
| NNG: Kove | muhi- | ‘s.o.’s back’ |
| NNG: Barai | muri[-] | ‘s.o.’s back’ |
| NNG: Gitua | mur | ‘behind, afterwards’ |
| NNG: Gedaged | muli- | ‘behind, rear, back part, stern, rear, posterior, outside of s.t.’ |
| NNG: Manam | muri | ‘behind’ |
| NNG: Yabem | (ya)mu(ŋa) | ‘back of s.t.’ |
| NNG: Bukawa | (ya)m�u(ŋa) | ‘back of s.t.’ |
| NNG: Kaiwa | mul | ‘back of s.t.’ |
| PT: Iduna | muli(ne) | ‘back of s.t., behind’ |
| PT: Dobu | muri- | ‘behind, afterwards’ |
| PT: Gapapaiwa | muri | ‘follow’ |
| | muri- | ‘back of s.t.; behind, afterwards’ |
| PT: Tawala | muri- | ‘back of s.t.; behind, afterwards’ |
| PT: Motu | muri- | ‘back of s.t.; space behind’ |
| MM: Bali | muri | ‘back of s.t.’ |
| MM: Meramera | (ma)muli | ‘back of s.t.’ |
| | (muli)muli | ‘later’ |
| MM: Nakanai | (muli)muli | ‘later’ |
| MM: Lavongai | muy | ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’ |
| MM: Tigak | (ai)muk | ‘later’ |
| | mugi- | ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’ |
| MM: Tabar | muri- | ‘back of s.t.’ |
| MM: Ramoaaina | muri- | ‘follow; behind, back; last’ |
| | (na)mur | ‘later, afterwards’ |
| | mur | ‘s.o.’s back’ |
| SES: Gela | muri- | ‘behind, afterwards; back; outside of s.t.; afterbirth; posterity’ |
| SES: Lengo | (i)muri(a) | ‘after’ |
| SES: Arosi | muri- | ‘follow; behind, back; outside of s.t.; afterwards; left hand when facing an object’ |
| Mic: Ponapean | muri | ‘behind’ |
| Mic: Woleaian | mizi- | ‘behind, after, backside, rear’ |

18 Blust (ACD) does not provide a gloss for *ma-udehi. The gloss here is based on that for *udehi.
Mic: Mokilese $m^\text{weri-}$ ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’
Mic: Puluwatese $m^\text{uir-}$ ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’
Fij: Bauan $muri$ ‘following, after’

(e) $muri$ ‘behind, later’

(ki) $muri$ ‘to the rear’

Pn: Tongan $mui$ ‘space behind; rear; end, extremity, tip; back, rear; later; young, immature, only partly developed’

Pn: Samoan $muli$ ‘come last, be last; young, new’

Pn: Rennellese $mugi$ ‘follow, be or go behind or after; rear end, esp. lower or western end’

Pn: Maori $muri$ ‘rear, hind part; sequel, time to come; behind, afterwards, backwards; youngest child’

Pn: Hawaiian $muli$ ‘behind, afterwards; last, following behind; younger, youngest; (canoe) stern’

The reflexes below contain a Northwest Solomonic innovation whereby Proto Northwest Solomonic *$mudi[-]$ is reconstructable (this would reflect POc *$mudri$) instead of expected **$muri[-]$.

Proto Northwest Solomonic *$mudi$–‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’

MM: Nehan $mudi$ ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’
MM: Petats $muru$ ‘s.o.’s back’
MM: Halia (Haku) $muru$ ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’
MM: Halia (Selau) $muri$– ‘back of s.t’

$mur$ ‘s.o.’s back’

MM: Banoni $muri$ ‘behind’
MM: Mono-Alu (muri)$muri$ ‘later’
MM: Vangunu (tara)$meji-na$ ‘after’
MM: Varisi (tara)$muzi-na$ ‘after’

MM: Nduke $mudi$– ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’
MM: Roviana $mudi$– ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’

The semantic and formal similarity of the reflexes of POc *$burit$ below to those of POc *$muri[-]$ above is evidently due to chance. In the 2003 version of this chapter, I attributed members of the set below to a putative PMP *pa-udehi, paradigmatically related to PMP *ma-udehi (ancestral to POc *$muri[-]$), but the presence in this set (listed in the ACD) of Bugotu $buriti$ indicates that I was wrong.

PMP *$burit$ ‘hind part, rear, back’ (ACD)

POc *$burit$ ‘hind part, rear, back’, (N, N LOC) ‘back part, rear, behind, space to the rear of, time after; (canoe) stern’, (ADV) ‘behind, afterwards’

NNG: Kela *$buri(ya)$ ‘back of s.t.’

MM: Tinputz $puri$ ‘behind’
MM: Teop $buri$ ‘behind’

SES: Lau $buri$ ‘back, stern’

SES: Bugotu $buriti$ ‘back’
Talking about space: terms of location and direction

**SES:** Longgu  
*buri-*  ‘behind; after’

**SES:** Lau  
*buri*  ‘back; behind, after; stern, rear’

*buri*(wela)  ‘after-birth’

(i) *buri*  ‘afterwards’

**SES:** Kwaio  
*buli-na*  ‘after’

*buli*  ‘after, behind’

**SES:** ’Are’are  
*puri-na*  ‘after’

**SES:** Sa’a  
(i) *puri*  ‘back of, behind; stern of a canoe’

*puri-na*  ‘after, back, stern’

One body-part term occurs with fair frequency with the sense of ‘back part of, space behind’. This is POc *takuRu[-]* ‘(s.o.’s) back’. The evidence that this was a body-part term in POc is clear. It may also have been used by extension as a POc relational local noun, but it is also possible that local-noun uses in modern languages represent independent parallel developments.

POc (N, ? N LOC) *takuRu[-] ‘(s.o.’s) back’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adm:</strong> Titan</td>
<td><em>lakulo-</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’ (l- for expected t-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NNG:</strong> Sio</td>
<td><em>taulo</em></td>
<td>‘behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT:</strong> Gumawana</td>
<td><em>tulo</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT:</strong> Dawawa</td>
<td><em>tauri</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT:</strong> Motu</td>
<td><em>doru-</em></td>
<td>‘back, behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Lavongai</td>
<td><em>toy</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Nalik</td>
<td><em>toru-</em></td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘space behind’ (e.g. <em>la toru-gu</em> [PREP N LOC-P:1SG] ‘behind me’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Minigir</td>
<td><em>tauru-</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Bilur</td>
<td><em>taru-</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Siar</td>
<td><em>taru-</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Taiof</td>
<td><em>touno-</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Teop</td>
<td><em>tonu-</em></td>
<td>‘(s.o.’s) back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Kia</td>
<td><em>tayuru-</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Kokota</td>
<td><em>tagru-</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM:</strong> Maringe</td>
<td><em>t’agruru-</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV Mota</strong></td>
<td><em>tawur, tawuru-</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV:</strong> NE Ambae</td>
<td><em>tagu-</em></td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘space behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV:</strong> Raga</td>
<td><em>(a)tyu-</em></td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV:</strong> Port Sandwich</td>
<td><em>(a)rax</em></td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV:</strong> Lonwolwol</td>
<td><em>tso-</em></td>
<td>‘lower back (region around hips); behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV:</strong> Lewo</td>
<td><em>ra-</em></td>
<td>‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(va)ractoru</em></td>
<td>‘behind’ (va ‘go’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCV:</strong> Nguna</td>
<td><em>(na)taku</em></td>
<td>‘back; the far side, other side’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(e)daku</em></td>
<td>(ADV) ‘at the back, behind; after’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SV:</strong> Sye</td>
<td><em>(n)toc(-noki)</em></td>
<td>‘back of skull’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(n)tocu(-nta-)</em></td>
<td>‘shoulder blade’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SV: Kwamera  
\textit{taku-}  ‘back’

SV: Anejom  
\textit{(i)ta}  (ADV) ‘behind’ (e.g. \textit{itay a niom\textsuperscript{w}})

[ADV PREP N] ‘behind the house’)

NCal: Nyelâyu  
\textit{dū-}  ‘(s.o.’s) back; behind’

NCal: Tinrin  
\textit{ţō-}  ‘(s.o.’s) back’

Mic: Kiribati  
\textit{akū-}  ‘back; behind’

Mic: Kosraean  
\textit{təkə-}  ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’

Mic: Marshallese  
\textit{æliki-}  ‘(s.o.’s) back’

Mic: Puluwatese  
\textit{hækir}  ‘(s.o.’s) back’

Mic: Woleaian  
\textit{taxiži-}  ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’

Fij: Wayan  
\textit{takū}  (N LOC) ‘behind’

Fij: Bauan  
\textit{daku-}  ‘back of s.t.; s.o.’s back’

cf. also

SES: ’Are’are  
\textit{kokoru-}  ‘(s.o.’s) back’

SES: Sa’a  
\textit{kokolu-}  ‘(s.o.’s) back’

2.4 The interrogative local noun ‘where?’

The interrogative local noun ‘where?’ was POc *\textit{pai}. Micronesian reflexes of *\textit{i pai} reflect Proto Micronesian *\textit{i-fā} rather than expected *\textit{i-fai}.

PMP *\textit{pai} ‘where?’ (ACD)

POc (N LOC) *\textit{pai}, *\textit{i pai} ‘where at?’

NNG: Bebeli  
\textit{ehae}  ‘where?’

NNG: Numbami  
\textit{ai(a)}  ‘where?’

MM: Bali  
\textit{ve(ni)}  ‘where?’

MM: Bola  
\textit{vai}  ‘where?’

MM: Meramera  
\textit{(i)va}  ‘where?’

MM: Nakanai  
\textit{-ve}  ‘where?’

MM: Tigak  
\textit{ve}  ‘where?’

MM: Kara (East)  
\textit{fa}  ‘where?’

MM: Nalik  
\textit{fa}  ‘where?’

MM: Tabar  
\textit{ve}  ‘where?’

MM: Lihir  
\textit{he}  ‘where?’

MM: Sursurunga  
\textit{ai, ai(ə)}  ‘where?’

MM: Patpatar  
\textit{he}  ‘where?’

MM: Minigir  
\textit{va}  ‘where?’

MM: Tolai  
\textit{ve}  ‘where?’

MM: Ramoaaina  
\textit{(ə)wai}  ‘where?’

MM: Teop  
\textit{(ha)ve}  ‘where?’

MM: Banoni  
\textit{vai}  ‘where?’

MM: Uruava  
\textit{vei(a)}  ‘where?’

MM: Lungga  
\textit{pai}  ‘where?’

MM: Roviana  
\textit{(pa)vei}  ‘where?’
MM: Kia  
MM: Gela  
SES: Longgu  
SES: Lau  
SES: Kwaio  
SES: Arosi  
SES: Bauro  
NCV: Raga  
NCV: Uripiv  
NCV: Lonwolwol  
NCV: Paamese  
NCV: Lewo  
NCV: Namakir  
Mic: Chuukese  
Mic: Puluwatese  
Mic: Satawalese  
Mic: Carolinian  
Mic: Woleaian  
Fij: Bauan  
Fij: Wayan

Also found are forms which appear to reflect *pea, *pia and, in Polynesian, PPN *fē. These probably reflect POc *pai-a (cf Numbami aia, Sursurunga aiə, Uruava veia above), together with vowel sequence reductions which have occurred independently but in parallel. The step from POc *paia to *pea is an obvious one. In a number of languages the height distance between the vowels of *pea has been maximised, giving *pia. And in Polynesian, an innovation which is regular in Tongic and sporadic in some other Polynesian languages apparently produced *fē as an alternant to *fea (< *pea < *paia). The forms are listed below. Where a reconstruction is preceded by a question mark, the forms beneath it may be the result of parallel developments.

? POc (N LOC) *pea ‘where at?’
Adm: Mussau  bea  ‘where?’

? PNCV (ADV) *vea, *bea
NCV: Mota  vea  ‘where?’
NCV: Kiai  vea  ‘where?’
NCV: Tamambo  (a)bea  ‘where?’

PPn (ADV) *[i] fea ‘where at?’
Pn: Tongan  fē  ‘where?’
Pn: Niuean  fē  ‘where?’
Pn: Samoan  fea  ‘where?’
Pn: Anutan  pea  ‘where?’
Pn: E Futunan  fea  ‘where?’
Pn: E Uvean  fea  ‘where?’
Pn: Tikopia  fea  ‘where? what? when?’
3 Directional verbs

Directional verbs can be conveniently divided into verbs of deictic direction (‘towards speaker’, ‘towards addressee’, ‘away from speaker and addressee’) and verbs of geographic direction, and especially vertical direction (‘go up’, ‘go down’).

3.1 Some Proto Oceanic serial verb constructions

Directional verbs play an important role in certain serial verb constructions in Oceanic languages, and they evidently did so in POc, to judge both from the wide distribution of such constructions today and from grammaticised versions of these constructions (Ross 2003).

Verbs of deictic direction occur in serial verb constructions of deictic direction, where they follow a verb of locomotion (transitive or intransitive) or a verb of geographic direction. The examples below are from Yabem (NNG). In both the first two examples, the deictic directional verb is -yà ‘go away from speaker and addressee’. In the first example it follows the locomotion verb -lob ‘fly’, in the second the geographic directional verb -pi ‘go up’.

\[
\text{balosi ge-lob ge-yà lo?}
\]

\[
\text{dove S:3SG-fly S:3SG-go:3 mountain}
\]

‘The doves flew off to the mountain.’
"ke-pi lom ge-yà."  
S:3SG-go.up men’s.house  S:3SG-go:3  
‘He climbed up to the men’s house.’

Verbs of geographic direction also occur in serial verb constructions of geographic direction, where they follow a locomotion verb (transitive or intransitive). In this example, the locomotion verb is *-pwane?* ‘insert’, the geographic directional verb *-sep* ‘go down’.

"ya-pwanε mɔ e-sep aò-ʔ-suŋ  
S:1SG-IRR:insert taro S:3SG-IRR:descend mouth-P:1SG-hole  
‘I’ll put the taro into my mouth.’"

Commonly the two constructions are combined, giving a sequence of locomotion verb, geographic directional verb and deictic directional verb, e.g. *-ne* ‘sink’, *-sep* ‘go down’ and *-yà* ‘go away from speaker and addressee’ in this example.

"way ge-ne ke-sep gweʔ ge-yà  
canoe S:3SG-sink S:3SG-descend sea S:3SG-go:3  
‘The canoe sank into the sea.’"

Directional verbs, both deictic and geographic, also occur in sequential serial verb constructions, where the first verb is a directional verb expressing ‘go [up/down] and …’ or ‘come and …’, the second a verb expressing the main event of the predication. This example is from Bali (MM):

"Hizi mi=ri zio ki vahi-aŋa ihaŋa.  
they IRR=HYP:3 go.down SEQ:3 get-PL fish  
‘They will go and catch fish.’"

### 3.2 Grammaticisations of serial verb constructions

Directional verbs are grammaticised in a number of ways in Oceanic languages (Lichtenberk 1991). Three of these grammaticisation paths give rise to morphemes expressing location and direction. Reflexes of directional verbs which have undergone these grammaticisations occur in the cognate sets below, and for that reason are described here.

In the first type of grammaticisation, a directional verb in a serial verb construction loses its subject proclitic/prefix and becomes a directional adverbial enclitic (glossed DIR in cognate sets). In the two Sisiqa (MM) examples below, the directional enclitics =me and =la reflect the POc deictic directional verb forms *ma* ‘come’ and *la* ‘go:2’ (§3.4) respectively. Each is preceded by a locomotion verb (‘carry’, ‘walk’), reflecting an earlier serial verb construction of deictic direction.

"ra ko-gisu=me kavia kuda  
I S:1SG:REAL-carry=hither some coconut  
‘I have brought some coconuts.’"

"yöi ma-zo=la Susuka  
s/he S:3SG:IRR-walk=thither Susuka  
S/he is going to Susuka village.’"
In this Manam (NNG) example there is a sequence of locomotion verb (‘take’) and two directional enclitics, -ra?e ‘up, to one’s right when facing sea’ (< geographical directional verb POc * sake ‘go up’, p.273) and -la?o ‘away’ (< deictic directional verb POc *lako ‘go:3’, p.287) reflecting an earlier three-verb sequence (Lichtenberk 1983:576–582).

\[Ogi\ i-do?-i-ra?e-la?o.\]

axe S:3SG-take-O:3PL-upward-away
‘He took the axes away upward.’

In the second type of grammaticisation, described by Pawley (1973) and Durie (1988), a directional verb in a serial verb construction is reanalysed as a preposition or a relator (see below) and comes to form a constituent primarily with the following locative expression. Prepositional reflexes of POc *mai ‘come’ occur in Polynesian languages. In Samoan, for example, we find (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992:147):

\[Na\ oso\ i\ lalo\ le\ tama\ mai\ le\ solofanua\ ...
\]

PAST jump PREP down ART boy PREP ART horse
‘The boy jumped down from the horse …’

In Meso-Melanesian languages of New Britain and New Ireland and in Longgu (SES), the deictic directional verbs *mai ‘come’ and *ua ‘go:2’ have become respectively ablative and allative relators (Ross 2003). I use the term ‘relator’ for a preposition-like morpheme which differs in its distribution from a preposition in that it precedes either a prepositional phrase or a local noun. This distribution reflects its verbal ancestry: a POc deictic directional verb could be followed by a locative expression consisting of a local noun or a prepositional phrase. Hence in Longgu, vu is the allative relator reflecting *ua:

\[...\ m-ara\ la\ mai'a\ vu\ masu?u\]

and-S:3PL go PERFECTIVE R bush
‘… and they went into the bush’

\[amalu\ ho\ la\ vu-ta-na\ malaba-i\ ni\ um\ yan-i-a\]

D:1EP IRR go R PREP-P:3SG garden-SG in.order.to weed-O:3SG
‘we will go into the garden to weed it’

In the third, least widespread, grammaticisation type, the deictic directional verb in a sequential serial verb construction becomes a pre-verbal clitic indicating the location or direction of the event in relation to the speech act participants. In the best described case, Sinaugoro (PT) (Tauberschmidt 1999:31–32), the clitics are enclitics to the preverbal subject/aspect/mood marking complex. In this example =ma reflects POc *ma ‘come’.

\[Si=ma\ yan-i-yani.\]

S:1IPL=near.me ITR-eat
‘Let’s eat here.’

### 3.3 Geographic directional verbs and enclitics

Geographic direction verbs occurred both independently and in geographic directional serial verb constructions. From the latter usage, they have often developed into enclitics or adverbs marking geographic direction.

The main semantic domain of geographic direction verbs is that of vertical direction, downward and upward. Vertical direction terms have developed two kinds of secondary
meanings in Oceanic languages, and these were probably present in Proto Oceanic. First, ‘downward’ and ‘upward’ often have the secondary horizontal senses ‘to the northwest’ and ‘to the southeast’. Second, because Oceanic speakers often dwell on mountainous islands, in some languages ‘downward’ also means ‘seaward’, and ‘upward’ also means ‘inland’ or, from the sea, ‘landward’.

A pair of antonyms occurred in POc. These were the generic verbs of movement down and up:

*\textit{sipo} ‘go downward’

*\textit{sake} ‘go upward’

As I noted earlier (p.229), POc apparently had a subsystem of geographic direction which was based on a river valley and had an up/down axis and a transverse axis with one directionally neutral (‘across the valley’) term. The terms used for ‘down the valley’ and ‘up the valley’ were evidently *\textit{sipo} and *\textit{sake}. The transverse term was possibly *\textit{pano}, which also served as a verb of deictic direction and is reconstructed on p.289. However, there are no known Western Oceanic or Southeast Solomonic reflexes of *\textit{pano} with this sense, so this may be a later innovation.

Recent work by François (2003, 2004) suggests strongly that this subsystem was also applied metaphorically to directions at sea. The two cardinal directions at sea were evidently provided by the major winds, POc *\textit{apaRat}, the northwest storm wind, and *\textit{raki}, the southeast trade wind, as the reflexes below (repeated from Chapter 5, §4.2) suggest:

POc *\textit{apaRat} ‘west monsoon’ (Dempwolff 1938, ACD)

POc *\textit{raki} ‘southeast trades’ (probably also ‘dry season when the southeast trades blow’)
After examining the sea-based directional systems of a sample of Oceanic languages, François concludes that in POc ‘go down’ apparently had the secondary sense ‘go northwest’, whilst ‘go up’ had the secondary sense ‘go southeast’. More tentatively, he suggests that *pANO may have been used for movement across the northwest–southeast axis. He suggests that the basis of this metaphor was that sailing into the wind felt to the sailors like going uphill.

In Ross (1995a) I suggested that *sake ‘go up’ and *sipo ‘go down’ were used by POc speakers to denote ‘east’ and ‘west’, i.e. the locations of sunrise and sunset. This inference was based on the fact that the glosses for their reflexes in many Oceanic languages are given as ‘east’ and ‘west’ (this is also true of some of the sources that François 2004 cites). However, François argues in his detailed account of Mwotlap directional systems that this is semantically implausible, as reflexes of *sake and *sipo are used for ‘go southeast’ and ‘go northwest’ respectively, and it is hard to see how these meanings—or ‘go east’ and ‘go west’—could be derived from ‘go to the place where the sun rises/sets’ (François 2003). In François (2004) he also presents the systems of a number of languages which display the ‘go up/southeast’ and ‘go down/northwest’ correlations. I find his reconstruction of a terminological subsystem corresponding to the major wind directions convincing, and I think it likely that systems which are oriented to the rising and setting of the sun are probably more recent developments.

François (2004) is a reconstruction of a POc terminological subsystem, i.e. a system of meanings and the relationships among them. The languages in his sample by no means all use reflexes of *sipo and *sake for ‘go downward’ and ‘go upward’, and he makes no attempt to reconstruct the POc forms, assuming that the relevant POc etyma were *sipo and *sake. I return briefly to the reconstruction of *sipo and *sake as directions at sea in §3.3.3 below.

### 3.3.1 Downward movement

Three possible verbs of downward movement are reconstructed below. They are:

- POc *sipo ‘go down, downwards’
- POc *sobu ‘go downward, dive down’
- POc *surup ‘(?) enter, penetrate; go down’

The most widely reflected of these is *sipo, the generic verb of downward movement. POc *sobu seems also to have carried the meaning ‘dive down’, as several of its reflexes have to do with action in the sea. I also include POc *surup ‘enter, penetrate, go down’ here on account of reflexes with the gloss ‘go down’, but the latter are found only in Meso-Melanesian and Southeast Solomonic languages, and I question whether it had this sense in POc.
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POc *sipo ‘go down, downwards’

Adm: Mussau  
sio  ‘go downward’
(la-)sio  ‘go down (to)’
(la-)sio(-kasu)  ‘come down (from)’ (kasu ‘go from’)  
NNG: Kove  
(i)ðio  ‘go downward’
NNG: Bariai  
(ga)dio  (DIR) ‘downward’
NNG: Gitua  
zio(vave)  (DIR) ‘downward’
NNG: Tuam  
(i)zi(la)  ‘sink’
NNG: Yabem  
siʔ  (DIR) ‘downward’
NNG: Bing  
siy  ‘come’
NNG: Takia  
-s(-la)  ‘go seaward, move downhill; land, arrive (of a boat)’
NNG: Manam  
-ria  (DIR) ‘downward; to one’s left when facing sea’
NNG: Kaiep  
(a)si  (DIR) ‘downward’
SJ: Sobei  
-si  (DIR) ‘downward’
PT: Tawala  
-hi  (DIR) ‘towards addressee’
PT: Sinaugoro  
(va-)(ri)yo  ‘go down’ (-riyo occurs as the second element of verbal compounds)

MM: Kia  
hi(nae)  ‘go down’
MM: Laghu  
hi(nae)  ‘go down’
SES: Lengo  
ðivo  ‘go down’
SES: Longgu  
sivo  ‘go down’
SES: Kwaio  
sifo  ‘go down’
SES: Sa’a  
siho  (DIR) ‘downward’
NCV: Merei  
sio  ‘move downward/seaward’
NCV: Tamambo  
jivo  ‘go down’
SV: Sye  
-sep, -hep  (DIR) ‘downward’
yep  ‘go down’

NCal: Xârâcùù  
βē  (DEM) ‘coming down’
Mic: Kosraean  
-ye  (DIR) ‘downward’
Mic: Mokilese  
-ti  (DIR) ‘downward’
Mic: Puluwatse  
-tiw  (DIR) ‘downward, west’
Fij: Wayan  
ðivo  (DIR) ‘downward’
Fij: Bauan  
ðivo-ðivo  ‘wind sweeping down from hills’
Fij: Yasawa  
ðivo  (DIR) ‘downward’
Pn: Tongan  
hifo  (DIR) ‘downward’
Pn: Samoan  
ifo  (DIR) ‘downward’
Pn: Pileni  
ifo  (DIR) ‘downward’
Pn: Rennellese  
iho  (V, DIR) ‘downward; seaward; northward, westward’
PEMP *sobu ‘go downward’ (Blust 1978a)

POc *sobu ‘go downward, dive down’

PT: Gumawana -sou ‘move down’
PT: Tawala -hopu ‘go down’
PT: Saliba dobi ‘go down’
SES: Gela sovu-sovu ‘splash about in sea’
Fij: Wayan sovu ‘go down’
Fij: Bauan sobu ‘go down’, (DIR) ‘downward’
Fij: Boumaa sobu ‘go down’, (DIR) ‘downward’
Fij: Rotuman jopu ‘dive, swim under water’
Pt: Rarotongan òopu ‘(boat or stone) sink, (sun) set, fade away’

PMP *surup ‘enter, penetrate’ (ACD)

POc *suru ‘enter, penetrate; go down (?)’

MM: Barok su ‘downwards’
MM: Konomala sup ‘(sun) set’
SES: Bugotu horu ‘go down’ (-o- for expected *-u-)
SES: Gela horu ‘go down’ (-o- for expected *-u-)
Fij: Bauan duru ‘enter’
Fij: Rotuman suru ‘enter’
Pt: Tongan hū ‘enter’
Pt: Samoan ulu ‘enter’
Pt: Marquesan u?u ‘enter’

The forms listed below also seem to constitute a cognate set, but, as the questions implicit in the reconstruction *[s,j]u[(a,u)] indicate, their history is not fully understood. The New Caledonian reflexes suggest a contrast between a directional adverbial form in *j- and a verb in *s-, but this contrast is not reflected elsewhere in the set.

POc *[s,j]u[(a,u)] ‘go down vertically, fall’

NNG: Sio due ‘downwards’
NNG: Mangap -su ‘go down’
NNG: -su(-la) ‘go down away from speaker’
NNG: Tami su? ‘downwards’
NNG: Lukep du ‘go down’
NNG: Malasanga (i)rua ‘(sun) set’
NNG: Roinji ru ‘(sun) set’
NNG: Mindiri du(lau) ‘(sun) set’
NNG: Gedaged -du ‘go down’
NNG: Megiar -du ‘go down’
NNG: Takia (i)du(man) ‘downwards’
NNG: -du ‘go down, fall’

20 A possible non-Oceanic cognate is Kéo (CMP) ndua ‘go down’. The fact that some items here are simply glossed ‘(sun) set’ may be an artifact of data collection. They may well denote downward movement more generally.
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SJ: Sobei -so (DIR) ‘downward’
MM: Tigak (i)sua ‘go down’
MM: Notsi (bi-)dū (adverb) ‘from below’
        (ta-)dū (adverb) ‘from the west’
SES: Longgu su ‘dive, (sun) set’
SES: Lau sū ‘dive, (sun) set’
SES: Arosi sū ‘dive, (sun) set’
NCal: Nêlêmwa du (DIR) ‘downward’
        tu ‘go downward’
NCal: Nyelâyu -du (DIR) ‘downward’
        tu ‘go downward’

POc *wau ‘go seawards’ and *bala ‘move downward (?)’ are also tentatively reconstructed, but they are not well supported.

POc *wau ‘go seawards’
NNG: Bam wau(la) (DIR) ‘downward’
NNG: Sissano eu (DIR) ‘downward’
PT: Gumawana -iwo ‘move seaward’
Mic: Puluwatese -wow (DIR) ‘seaward’ (contrast -waw ‘towards addressee’)
Mic: Woleaian wai (DIR) ‘seaward’

POc *bala ‘move downward (?)’
NNG: Manam bala ‘move down, move to one’s left when facing sea’
MM: Tolai ba (DIR) ‘downward’
PT: Gumawana -bala ‘move across’
Fij: Nadrogā bale (DIR) ‘downward’

3.3.2 Upward movement

The generic verb of upward movement was POc *sake ‘go upward, go southeast’, also used, for example, of boarding a canoe.

POc *sake ‘go upward’
Adm: Mussau sae ‘go upward’
        sae(-mae) ‘come up (from)’
        (la-)sae ‘go up (to)’ (la ‘go away from speaker’)
NNG: Kove -dae ‘go upward’
NNG: Gitua -zage ‘(sun) rise’
NNG: Tami sai ‘go up to’

21 The two Notsi ablative adverbs form a paradigm with the locative/allative adverbs bi-lū ‘down below, downward’ and ti-lū ‘to the west, westward’. It is unclear to me how to interpret the -dū/-lū contrast historically, and this may indicate that -dū does not reflect POc *jua.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word A</th>
<th>Word B</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Mangap</td>
<td>-se</td>
<td>‘go upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Yabem</td>
<td>-sa</td>
<td>(DIR clause-final) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Gedaged</td>
<td>-sa</td>
<td>‘(plant) grow’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Takia</td>
<td>-s(-da)</td>
<td>‘move up, be high, be full, go up, rise, board (a canoe)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Manam</td>
<td>-ra?e</td>
<td>‘move up, move to one’s right when facing sea’; (DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Ali</td>
<td>-ha</td>
<td>‘(sun) rise’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Sissano</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ: Sobei</td>
<td>-sa[s]</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Tawala</td>
<td>-gae</td>
<td>‘go upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Saliba</td>
<td>-sae</td>
<td>‘go upward, eastward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Sinaugoro</td>
<td>-raye</td>
<td>(second element of verbal compounds) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Motu</td>
<td>-dae(roha)</td>
<td>‘(sun) rise’ (roha ‘to come in sight’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Bali</td>
<td>zaye</td>
<td>‘(sun) rise’; (DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Nakanai</td>
<td>sahe</td>
<td>‘climb’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Meramera</td>
<td>sa?e</td>
<td>‘climb’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tigak</td>
<td>(i)sa</td>
<td>‘go upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Halia (Haku)</td>
<td>sei</td>
<td>‘(sun) rise’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Teop</td>
<td>hae</td>
<td>‘board (canoe)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Banoni</td>
<td>sai</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Mono-Alu</td>
<td>sae</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Roviana</td>
<td>saye(la)</td>
<td>‘go up’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Hoava</td>
<td>saye(la)</td>
<td>‘go up’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Kia</td>
<td>haye</td>
<td>‘board (canoe)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Kokota</td>
<td>hage</td>
<td>‘go up; go landward; go east’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Gela</td>
<td>haye</td>
<td>‘enter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Longgu</td>
<td>ta?e</td>
<td>‘ascend, go up, stand up, get into canoe’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Kwaio</td>
<td>ta?e</td>
<td>‘embark, rise’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Sa’a</td>
<td>ta?e</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘up, inland’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Arosi</td>
<td>ta?e</td>
<td>‘go upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Merei</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>‘move upward/landward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Araki</td>
<td>sa[ha]</td>
<td>‘go up, go inland, go eastward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Tamambo</td>
<td>sahe</td>
<td>‘go upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Lenakel</td>
<td>(a)hak</td>
<td>‘(sun) already risen’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: SW Tanna</td>
<td>-hak(ta)</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Sye</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>‘go up, go upstream, (tide) rise’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kosraean</td>
<td>-ek</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Marshallese</td>
<td>tak</td>
<td>‘(sun) rise’; (DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Mokilese</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Puluwatese</td>
<td>-tæ</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upward’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mic: Woleaian tax (DIR) ‘upward, eastward’
Fij: Bauan ðake (DIR) ‘upward, eastward’
Fij: Wayan ðake ‘climb up, mount’
Pn: Tongan hake ‘go upward, esp. from the sea to the land’;
  (DIR) ‘upward’
Pn: Samoan a?e (DIR) ‘upward’
Pn: Pileni -ake (DIR) ‘upward’
Pn: Marquesan a?e ‘upwards, distant in time’

Some or all of the forms below probably also reflect POc *sake ‘go upward’, but they all reflect unexplained anomalies. The New Caledonian forms reflect the same contrast between an adverb in *j- and a verb in *s- as was noted above with regard to POc *[s,j]u[(a,u)] ‘go down vertically, fall’.

NNG: Takia -(s)da ‘move up, be high, be full, go up, rise, board (a canoe)’
NCal: Nêlêmwa da (DIR) ‘upward’
NCal: (o-)da ‘go upward’ (o ‘go’)
NCal: Nyelâyu -da (DIR) ‘upward’
NCal: Nemi -da (DIR) ‘upward’
NCal: Cèmuhi da (DIR) ‘upward’
NCal: Tinrin qa(-ju) ‘go up’
Fij: Wayan ða(va) ‘ascend, go up a slope’
  ða(dra) (DIR) ‘upward’

3.3.3 *sipo and *sake as directions at sea

Above I noted François’ (2004) reconstruction of POc speakers’ use of terms for ‘go downward’ and ‘go upward’ for ‘go northwest’ and ‘go southeast’, i.e. directions corresponding with those of the major winds. François assumes that the relevant POc terms were *sipo and *sake, reconstructed in §§3.3.1–3.3.2. As these were the generic terms for ‘go downward’ and ‘go upward’, his assumption is probably correct, but it is not particularly well supported by the available data, as the sets below show. In fact, all supporting data for both terms in these meanings come from Eastern Oceanic languages. The Yabem and Motu reflexes of *sipo have ‘wrong’ directions in their glosses. This may mean that this use of *sake and *sipo was an Eastern Oceanic innovation, but it may also mean that insufficient Western Oceanic (and Admiralties) systems have been carefully recorded. In a number of Western Oceanic languages, ‘east’ and ‘west’ are translated as ‘place where the sun rises’ and ‘place where the sun sets’, but these phrasal expressions may be modern renderings of English ‘east’ and ‘west’.

POc *sipo ‘go downward, go northwest’

NNG: Yabem -sep ‘go down, go east’
PT: Motu diho ‘south, south wind; down; go down, descend’
NCV: NE Ambae hivo ‘move downward/seaward/northwestward’
NCV: Araki  
   *si[vo]  ‘go down, go seaward, go westward’

SV: Anejom  
   *-se[\text{h}] (DIR) ‘down, north, west’

Mic: Woleaian  
   *tiw (DIR) ‘downward, westward’

Pn: Rennellese  
   *iho (V, DIR) ‘downward; seaward; northward, westward’

POc *sake ‘go upward, go southeast’ (Dempwolff 1938)

NCV: Mwotlap  
   *hag (DIR) ‘(on land) eastward, (at sea) south-eastward’

NCV: NE Ambae  
   *hage ‘move upward/landward/southeastward’

NCV: Araki  
   *sa[\text{h}] ‘go up, go inland, go eastward’

SV: Anejom  
   *-lai (DIR) ‘upward, southward, eastward’

Mic: Kiribati  
   *rake ‘(sun) rise’; (DIR) ‘upward, eastward’

Mic: Woleaian  
   *tax (DIR) ‘upward, eastward’

Fij: Bauan  
   *dake (DIR) ‘upward, eastward’

Pn: Rennellese  
   *ake (V, DIR) ‘upward; inland; southward, eastward’

François also alludes to members of the Polynesian sets below. However, these are clearly locative nouns, and may just as well reflect an orientation to sunset and sunrise, as Biggs (1994:25) implies.

PPn *si-sifo ‘(N) west’ (Biggs & Clark 1993)

Pn: Tongan  
   *hihifo ‘west’

Pn: Niuean  
   *hiho ‘go west’

Pn: Samoan  
   *sisifo ‘west’

Pn: Tokelauan  
   *sisifo ‘west’

PPn *sa-sake ‘(N) east’ (Biggs & Clark 1993)

Pn: Tongan  
   *ha-hake ‘east’

Pn: Samoan  
   *sa-sa ̄e (ADV) ‘in the east’
   *(ŋa-ŋ)a ̄e (ADV) ‘eastward’

The important point about François’ reconstruction is that the equation of ‘go downward’ and ‘go upward’ with ‘go northwest’ and ‘go southeast’ occurs widely, suggesting that the equation itself should be reconstructed for POc, even if the forms themselves are hard to reconstruct. Except for Wayan, the terms listed below are drawn from François (2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Saliba</td>
<td>*sae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES:</td>
<td>Longgu</td>
<td>*alaʔa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV:</td>
<td>Mwotlap</td>
<td>*hag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV:</td>
<td>NE Ambae</td>
<td>*hage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV:</td>
<td>Anejom</td>
<td>*-lai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal:</td>
<td>Nemi</td>
<td>*-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic:</td>
<td>Woleaian</td>
<td>*-tiw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij:</td>
<td>Wayan</td>
<td>*vua i rā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij:</td>
<td>Bauan</td>
<td>*sobu ‘go down, west’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.4 Geographic direction adverbs derived from verbs

In a scattering of Oceanic languages, the verbs POc *sipo ‘go downward’ (p.271) and POc *sake ‘go upward’ (p.273) are also reflected as (or as the roots of) locative and/or allative adverbs. These are distinct from directional adverbials in that they often form part of the locative demonstrative paradigm, with meanings like ‘down below’ and ‘up here’. These reflexes are sufficiently well distributed to arouse the suspicion, at least, that this was also one of their POc functions.

The meanings of the items listed below overlap substantially with reflexes of the POc local nouns *tanoq ‘down below’ (p.241) and POc *atas ‘top; space above’ (p.243). There are also a few reflexes below of *sipo and *sake which function as nouns, but it seems certain that these are the results of locally restricted developments.

POc *sipo ‘go downward’, (ADV) ‘downwards, down below’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kove</td>
<td>sio</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘down below’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Lusi</td>
<td>sio</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘below, down there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Bariai</td>
<td>(ga)dio</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘downward’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Kwaio</td>
<td>(i)a)sifo</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘downwards, northwesterly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Merei</td>
<td>(ai)sio</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘down here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Araki</td>
<td>sivo(su)</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘down there’ (=-su DEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Sye</td>
<td>(ye)hep</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘down here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Samoan</td>
<td>si-sifo</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘in the west’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ŋa-na)iifo</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘westward’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POc *sake ‘go upward’, (ADV) ‘upwards, up top’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau</td>
<td>sae-sae(na)</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘upwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Lusi</td>
<td>sai</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘on top, above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Bariai</td>
<td>(ga)dae</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Tuam</td>
<td>(i)za</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘upwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Gitua</td>
<td>sage</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Motu</td>
<td>dae-</td>
<td>(N) ‘above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Siar</td>
<td>sai(gali)</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up there, over there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Label</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(u)sa</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘upwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Minigir</td>
<td>(ke-na)sa</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Merei</td>
<td>(ai)sa</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Araki</td>
<td>saja(su)</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Paamese</td>
<td>(ne)sa</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘up, above, on top’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Sye</td>
<td>(ya)hay</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘up here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Iaai</td>
<td>(e)õõ</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘upward, inland’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kiribati</td>
<td>rake</td>
<td>‘up, above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Wayan</td>
<td>õake</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘upwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Bauan</td>
<td>õake</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘up, above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Tongan</td>
<td>ha-hake</td>
<td>(N) ‘east’, (ADJ) ‘eastern’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Samoan</td>
<td>sa-sa’e</td>
<td>(N LOC) ‘east’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ŋa-ng)a’e</td>
<td>(ADV) ‘eastward’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Deictic directional verbs and enclitics

3.4.1 A note on deixis in Oceanic

Proto Oceanic deixis was person-oriented. That is, there were forms with the meanings ‘near speaker’, ‘near addressee’ and ‘distant from both speaker and addressee’. This pattern is well represented in Oceanic demonstrative forms right across the Pacific. Individual languages may lose a member of the paradigm, finishing up with a proximal/distal system. Some languages have reinterpreted the three-way system in terms of orientation to the speaker alone (‘near speaker’ vs ‘an intermediate distance from speaker’ vs ‘far from speaker’), but such languages are by no means as widespread as the person-oriented system. A good many languages have added members to the system, distinguishing, for example, between referents that can and cannot be seen by the speech act participants, or adding a member for referents the speaker points at, but none of these additions can be reconstructed as a POc category.

A reconstruction of POc demonstrative forms is beyond the scope of this chapter, but a sample of person-oriented systems is given below. The forms given are those used adnominally, except where shown (they may also have other language-specific uses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>near speaker</th>
<th>near addressee</th>
<th>distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau</td>
<td>toko</td>
<td>o[ia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Lukep (Pono)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Yabem</td>
<td>ta-ne?</td>
<td>ta-naj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Kairiru</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Gapapaiwa</td>
<td>we-ni</td>
<td>na-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Gumawana</td>
<td>ake</td>
<td>moe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Sinaugoro</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>mani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Bali</td>
<td>-ani</td>
<td>-ina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tigak</td>
<td>gara</td>
<td>gara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Roviana SG</td>
<td>hie</td>
<td>isa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Bugotu</td>
<td>ani, eni</td>
<td>ñeni, ari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Araki</td>
<td>ne, kesi</td>
<td>ho-ni, vá-ha-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Lewo</td>
<td>nini</td>
<td>namwā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Also nene ‘near speaker and hearer’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>also nene ‘near speaker and hearer’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV: Anejom PRO SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Tinrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Iaai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kosraean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Ulithian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Boumaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Wailevu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Tongan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Pileni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Marquesan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person-oriented system of deixis was manifested not only in demonstratives, but also in the system of deictic directional verbs. POc had a system with at least three members: ‘come to[wards] speaker’, ‘go/come to[wards] addressee’ and ‘go to a point
away from both speaker and addressee’, glossed here as ‘come’, ‘go:2’ and ‘go:3’ respectively. There were possibly two ‘go:3’ verbs, however. One licensed a location expression, i.e. its basic meaning was ‘go to’. The other simply meant ‘go away (from speaker)’ and did not license a location expression. Thus in Kele (Adm) there is a contrast between la ‘go to’ and aw ‘go away’ (Ross 2002f). This suggests that POc had a four-member system, and I will assume this here. Against this is the fact that I have found no language in which a four-member system is preserved.

Three-member deictic directional verb systems are found right across Oceania, and a sample is given below. Some are reflected as directional enclitics, rather than as verbs. It is sometimes difficult to tell from a source whether the third member should be assigned to ‘go:3’ or ‘go away’. However, in languages where deictic directional verbs have become directional enclitics, the ‘go:3’ form has lost its capacity to license a location expression and inevitably means ‘go away’. Note that the two systems from the Admiralties make the contrast between ‘go:3’ and ‘go away’ which supports the reconstruction of a four-member system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>come</th>
<th>go:2</th>
<th>go:3</th>
<th>go away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Loniu</td>
<td>mɛ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>yaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Kele</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>aw (also doh ‘come from’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Yabem</td>
<td>-mɛɛ</td>
<td>-wɛɛ</td>
<td>-yɛ</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Gumawana</td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td>-wɛɛ</td>
<td>-nɛ</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Hoava</td>
<td>-mɛɛ</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae</td>
<td>vanɛɛ</td>
<td>vanɛɛ</td>
<td>vanɛɛ</td>
<td>vano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Kosraean DIR</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Mokilese DIR</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-ɛɛɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Bauan DIR</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>yani</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>tani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fij: Wayan DIR</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>ati</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>dei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Tongan DIR</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>atu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>aŋɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Samoan DIR</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>atu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>aŋɛese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Pileni DIR</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>atu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>aŋɛ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2 Reconstructing Proto Oceanic deictic directional forms

The main deictic directional forms of POc, which account for the majority of the forms listed above, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>directional adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mai, *ma</td>
<td>‘come’ ‘towards speaker’ (p.281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ua</td>
<td>‘go towards addressee’ ‘towards addressee’ (p.283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*watɛ</td>
<td>‘go towards addressee’ ‘towards addressee’ (p.286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lako, *la</td>
<td>‘go (to)’ ‘away from speaker’ (p.287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pano, *pa</td>
<td>‘go away’ ‘away from speaker’ (p.290)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 There are also a fair number of languages that have reduced the three-member system to a two-member system of ‘come to[wards] speaker’ and ‘go away (from speaker)’. The latter is usually descended from one of ‘go:2’, ‘go:3’ or ‘go away (from speaker)’.

Note that I reconstruct these POc forms as both verbs and directional adverbs. In §3.2 I briefly discussed the grammaticisation of deictic directional verbs as directional adverbs. This process raises the question, Were there already directional adverbs in POc, or are modern Oceanic directional adverbs the outcomes of independent parallel developments? The answer appears to be: both. Directional adverbs are so widespread in Oceanic languages that one may infer that they were already present in POc, otherwise we would not find such a plethora of reflexes of verbs as enclitics in modern Oceanic languages. On the other hand, there are cases where it is clear that the development of the directional adverb is more recent because it reflects not just the verb root but also accretions to it that have occurred in the history of the particular language.23 The Sobei (SJ) directional enclitics -ema ‘towards speaker’ and -ewo ‘away from speaker’ transparently reflect the verbs -ma ‘come’ and -wo ‘go’ with a fossilised third person singular subject marker e-. The Sye (SV) directional adverb mpelom ‘towards speaker’ is transparently derived from the verb velom ‘come’. This must be a late development, since ve-lo-m seems itself to reflect the concatenation of three roots, *pano/*pa ‘go away’, *lako/*la ‘go’, and *ma ‘come; towards speaker’.

Three of the verbs listed above, *mai/*ma, *lako/*la and *pano/*pa, have long and short forms. It is difficult to reconstruct the distribution of the long and short forms with any certainty, as they do not correspond with the division between verb and enclitic. However, there seem to be two contexts in which the short forms may have emerged, both of them in serial verb constructions. One was as the final verb of a deictic directional serial verb construction. The other was as the first verb of a sequential serial verb construction (the gloss V AUX is used to label these below). POc *watu and *ua look superficially like a long/short pair, but they are regionally distributed, unlike the other three pairs (p.286).

Two other verbs seem to have been used as deictic directional verbs, but probably not as directional enclitics, in POc. They are less well attested than the verbs reconstructed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>*pwati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go:3/go away</td>
<td>*[y]aku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is unclear whether *[*y]aku meant ‘go (to)’ or ‘go away’.

I also reconstruct the prepositional verb *tani ‘(go) away from’ below (p.293). It was not deictic, but it overlaps semantically with the verbs reconstructed in this section.

### 3.4.3 ‘Come towards speaker’

Blust (ACD) reconstructs PAn *aRi, which in its root form was used imperatively as ‘come on’, ‘let’s go’ (Paiwan [Formosan] ari ‘let’s go!’) and apparently survives in the Takia interjection aria with the same meanings.24 The indicative form was PAn *maRi ‘come’ (from *um-aRi, where *um is the actor focus infix; vol. 1, p.29), and this form is well reflected in Formosan and WMP languages. However, it seems likely that the variant *mai existed from the earliest times, as Blust notes Favorlang (Formosan) mai and Yami (WMP) mai, and that *mai ousted reflexes of *maRi throughout the Central/Eastern Malayo-Polynesian grouping (e.g. Manggarai, Sikka, Rotinese mai) to which POc belonged.

---
23 For a more detailed examination of this issue, see Pawley (2003b).
24 The interjection aria is widespread in Melanesia, and it is impossible to track its history accurately.
There is just one Oceanic reflex, Mangap (NNG) -mar ‘come towards speaker’, which appears to reflect *maRi rather than *mai. However, the fact that Mangap has a distinction between -mar ‘come towards speaker’ and -ma ‘come towards addressee’ suggests that a pre-Mangap reflex of *ma expanded its use from ‘towards speaker’ to ‘towards us, speaker and addressee’, and that a further morpheme, perhaps a demonstrative, was then suffixed to it to disambiguate ‘towards speaker’, giving -ma-r.

Also reconstructable is the POc form *ma, reflected in WOc and CEOc languages. There is no reconstructable functional distinction between *-mai and *-ma, as reflexes of both occur as verbs and as directional enclitics, and both should probably be glossed in POc as (V) ‘come’ and (DIR) ‘towards speaker’. In many languages, a reflex of *mai or *ma occurs as the second element of one or more compounds, and these are taken to be reflexes of an earlier final verb of a serial construction or reflexes of a directional enclitic (it is impossible to tell which). A number of these are listed below. A number of these are listed below.

**PAAn**: *maRi, *mai ‘come’ (ACD)
**PCEMP**: *mai ‘come’
**POc**: *mai, *ma ‘come’, (DIR) ‘towards speaker’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adm:</th>
<th>Mussau</th>
<th>mae</th>
<th>‘come’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sio)mae</td>
<td>‘come down (from)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm:</td>
<td>Loniu</td>
<td>-me</td>
<td>‘come’; (DIR) ‘towards speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm:</td>
<td>Aua</td>
<td>-mai</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘towards speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Mangap</td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td>‘come towards addressee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>-ma(r)</td>
<td>‘come towards speaker’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>(-le)-ma</td>
<td>‘come inside’ (-le ‘enter’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Yabem</td>
<td>-mè(g)</td>
<td>‘come’ (-g is a suffix of unknown origin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Sio</td>
<td>mɔ</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Tuam-Mutu</td>
<td>(ka)miai</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Gitua</td>
<td>(la)m</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Manam</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>‘move towards speaker from neither up nor down’; (DIR) ‘towards speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG:</td>
<td>Kairiru</td>
<td>-myai</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ:</td>
<td>Sobei</td>
<td>-(e)ma</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘towards speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Tawala</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘towards speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Gumawana</td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Saliba</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘hither’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Sudest</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘towards speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Sinaugoro</td>
<td>(iayo)ma</td>
<td>‘come’ (iayo ‘go’ &lt; POc *lako)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ma</td>
<td>(preverbal clitic) ‘near speaker’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ma(riyo)</td>
<td>‘come down’ (-riyo ‘downward’ &lt; POc *sipo occurs in verbal compounds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT:</td>
<td>Motu</td>
<td>-mai</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 This is an enclitic to the preverbal tense/aspect/mood marker. It marks the location of the action relative to the speaker and addressee. To judge from its preverbal position, it reflects the use of a deictic direction verb with the sense ‘come and …’ in the initial slot of a sequential serial verb construction.
MM: Vitu  mai  ‘come’
MM: Bali  mai  ‘come’
MM: Bulu  mai  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
MM: Harua  mai  ‘come from’
MM: Tigak  (i)ma  ‘come’
MM: Notsi  (kala)me  ‘come’
MM: Selau  (la)ma  ‘come’
MM: Taiof  (o)ma  ‘come’
-ma  ‘first/second person object enclitic’ 26
MM: Banoni  ma  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
(tai)ma  ‘come’  (tai ‘go’)
MM: Mono  (lao)ma  ‘come’
MM: Babatana  me  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
MM: Hoava  mae  ‘come’
MM: Kokota  mai  ‘come’
SES: Bugotu  mai  ‘come’;  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
SES: Gela  mai  ‘come’;  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
SES: Longgu  mai  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
SES: Kwaio  mai  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
(leka)mai  ‘come’  (leka ‘go’)
NCV: Mwotlap  me  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
NCV: NE Ambae  -mai, -mei, -ai  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’ 27
NCV: Merei  ma  (DIR) ‘towards addressee’
NCV: Araki  ma  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
NCV: Tamambo  mai  ‘come’
NCV: Sakao  (la)m  ‘come’
SV: Sye  (ve-lo-)m  ‘come’  (ve ‘go’)
(-mpe-lo-)m  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
SV: Anejom  -(pa)m  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’  (pan ‘away from speaker’)
(ha)m, (apa)m  ‘come’  (han, apan ‘go’)
NCal: Nêlêmwa  me  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
NCal: Nyelâyu  -me  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
NCal: Xârâcùù  mê  (DEM) ‘near speaker’
NCal: Iaai  (jê)m  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Mic: Kosraean  -ma  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Mic: Kiribati  mai  ‘come’
Fij: Nadrogaa  mā, mei  (DIR) ‘towards speaker’

26 In Taiof the first/second person object marker, except for first person inclusive plural, is -ma. I suspect this was originally the ‘towards speaker’ directional. (The third person/first person inclusive plural form is -i-nil.)
27 These forms occur as a fossil in van-ai ‘move across towards deictic centre’ (cf vano ‘move across’), ha-mai ‘move upwards towards deictic centre’ (hage ‘move upwards’) and hi-mei ‘move downwards towards deictic centre’ (hivo ‘move upwards’).
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Fij: Wayan mai (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Fij: Bauan mai (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Fij: Boumaa mai (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Pn: Tongan mai ‘come’; (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Pn: Samoan mai (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
Pn: Marquesan mai (DIR) ‘towards speaker’

In a number of languages POc *mai/*ma is reflected as a preposition or a relator. However, the reflexes listed below are probably the result of parallel innovations in different groups of languages, and it is unnecessary to reconstruct a preposition or relator usage for POc *mai/*ma (cf. §3.2).

POc *mai, *ma ‘come’, (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
PT: Tawala mei (PREP) ‘like, resembling’
MM: Meramera ma?- (R-) ablative
MM: Lamasong ma- (R-) ablative
MM: Madak me- (R-) ablative
MM: Barok mu- (R-) ablative
MM: Konomala mə (R) ablative
MM: Patpatar ma- (R-) ablative
MM: Label mi- (R-) ablative
MM: Tolai ma-, ma-ma- (R-) ablative
SES: Longgu mi (R with placename or local noun) ablative
Fij: Bauan mai (PREP) ablative

One other POc morpheme with the same meanings as *mai may be reconstructable. This is *pwati. Note, however, that most reflexes are in the South New Ireland grouping of MM, and that the POc status of this reconstruction is dependent on the Arosi reflex alone.

POc *pwati ‘come’, (DIR) ‘towards speaker’
NNG: Wogeo (e)wot ‘come’
MM: Minigir (vana)uti ‘come’
MM: Tolai pot ‘come’
MM: Tolai–Nodup (le)poti ‘come’
MM: Label (la-m)ut ‘come’
MM: Bilur vot ‘come’
MM: Kandas (uan)pat ‘come back’
SES: Arosi boi ‘come’

3.4.4 ‘Go towards addressee’

Two alternant forms, POc *ua and *watu, mean ‘go towards addressee’, (DIR) ‘towards addressee’.
It is just possible that POc *ua reflects PAN *kuSa ‘go’. However, no reflexes of PAN *kuSa have been found in non-Oceanic languages outside Taiwan,\(^{28}\) and it is more likely that the Taiwan and Oceanic sets reflect different etyma, the more so as no member of the Oceanic set reflects PAN *k-.

Some of the reflexes of *ua can be confused with those of POc *pa and *ba. That there is a contrast between *pa and *ua is attested by the pairs Adzera fa ‘go’ (p.291) and wa?-‘go out’ (p.286) and Kiriwina va (PREP, p.292) and wa (VF, below).

POc *ua ‘go towards addressee’, (DIR) ‘towards addressee’

Adm: Seimat -wa (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
SJ: Sobei -(e)wo (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
-wo ‘go’
PT: Saliba -wa (DIR) ‘thither’
PT: Kiriwina -wa ‘go (to addressee)’
PT: Sudest -wo (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
wa ‘go’
PT: ’Ala’ala -ovo (DIR) ‘away’
MM: Bali ua ‘go’
MM: Tolai vue (DIR) ‘away’
MM: Halia wa (DIR) ‘towards (a specified destination)’
(Ross 1982:44–45)
Fij: Nadrogaa wā (DIR) ‘thither’
Fij: Wayan ā (DIR) ‘thither’

In a number of languages POc *ua is reflected as a preposition or a relator (cf. §3.2).

POc *ua ‘go towards addressee’, (DIR) ‘towards addressee’

Adm: Yapse  u (PREP) locative, ablative
PT: Tawala  u (PREP w N LOC) locative, allative
PT: Kiriwina  o (PREP w N LOC) locative ‘in, into’
PT: Muyuw  u, wa (PREP) locative, allative
MM: Bulu  o (PREP w PLC) locative
MM: Nakanai  o- (VF formative) locative
MM: Meramera  u- (R-) allative
MM: Lamasong  u- (R-) allative
MM: Madak  u- (R-) allative
MM: Barok  u- (R-) allative
MM: Sursurunga  u(r) (R) allative
MM: Tangga  ua, u (R) allative (ua w DEM, u elsewhere)
MM: Konomala  uə (R) allative
MM: Patpatar  u- (R-) allative
   u (PREP w PLC) allative
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Proto South Vanuatu *un-*, which forms locative nouns from common nouns (Lynch 2001:132), may also belong here.

Longgu vu appears to be cognate with forms in the Malaita/Makira subgroup (SES) that reflect Proto Malaita/Makira *vua* or *vuni*. Lichtenberk (1985) attributes all these forms to POc *pani* (V) ‘give’, (PREPV) ‘beneficiary case-marker’. The Malaita/Makira forms certainly have benefactive meanings, but Longgu vu is clearly allative, and the best account of both its form and meaning is given by attributing it to *ua*—although this means assuming that initial *v-* has arisen by epenthesis. But what are we to do with the Malaita/Makira forms? The best explanation seems to be that there was a conflation of pre-Proto Malaita/Makira *vua* ‘allative relator’ (cognate with Longgu vu and reflecting POc *ua*) and *vani* ‘beneficiary prepositional verb’ (reflecting POc *pani*), resulting in *vua* with a benefactive function and *vuni* with a form cobbled together from both items but in benefactive function.

This interpretation is supported by the Longgu dative verbal preposition wini-*, which takes an object pronoun suffix when it governs a first or second person referent, e.g. wini-o DATIVE-O:2SG ‘to you’, but assumes the allomorph wa- with a possessor pronoun suffix when it governs a third person, e.g. wa-na DATIVE-P:3SG ‘to it/him/her’. As Hill (1992:245) points out, wa- overlaps semantically with vu (< POc *ua*). It appears that wini reflects POc *pani* and wa- POc *ua*, but the two form a single paradigm in Longgu. This inference would also explain the non-etymological initial *v-* of vu: it is inherited from pre-Proto Malaita/Makira *vua*, where it resulted from ‘infection’ by *vani*.

The Bauan Fijian forms are tentatively included in the set above. The form vuā again has epenthetic v-, but its meaning and the parallel with the prepositional use of mai suggest that it reflects *ua*. More specifically, vuā apparently reflects pre-Fijian *vua-i-a* (go.towards-TR-O:3SG) and means ‘to/for/from/him/her’. The form vei is more problematic. It may reflect either *vua-i* (go.towards-ART) or *pa-i* (go.away-ART). Either way, *i* is the personal article. Semantically, it is also possible that *pani* ‘give’ has played a role in the history of these forms, as they have a dative function.

Other reflexes of *ua* apparently occur as demonstratives in a number of languages.

POc *ua* ‘go towards addressee’, (DIR) ‘towards addressee’, (DEM) ‘away from speaker’, anaphoric

29 The possessor pronoun suffix was apparently acquired by analogy with the preposition ta-.
Forms reflecting POc *watu are listed below. It is tempting to reconstruct this as *uatu in view of its probable relationship to *ua, discussed below. However, the reflexes listed below point to POc *watu, even if this perhaps reflects pre-POc *uatu.

Irregular loss of initial *w- is reflected in New Caledonian and Central Pacific (Fij and Pn) languages, which reflect *atu for expected **watu. POc *w is lost regularly in all positions in Hoava and Roviana, word-initially in Gela and Bugotu, and sporadically in Mota and NE Ambae and other NCV languages.

POC *watu ‘go towards addressee’, (DIR) ‘towards addressee’

Adm: Aua -wau (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
NNG: Yabem -wà? ‘go (to addressee)’
NNG: Adzera wa?- ‘go out’
PT: Motu vasi ‘go:2/3’
MM: Hoava atu ‘go (to addressee)’
MM: Roviana atu-atu (INTERJECTION) implying movement away, of speaker or addressee

SES: Gela (g)atu (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
SES: Bugotu atu (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
SES: Kwaio ka[?]u (DIR) ‘thither’
SES: Lau kou (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
SES: Longgu hou (DIR) ‘thither’
SES: Arosi wou (DIR) ‘thither’
SES: Sa’a wau ‘there’
NCV: Mota at ‘outwards or away from speaker’s point of reference’
NCV: NE Ambae -atu ‘towards addressee, towards past/future deictic centre’ (lexicalised in some compounds)

NCal: Nemi -ec (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
Mic: Kiribati wati (DIR) ‘away, hence’
Mic: Kosraean -ø (DIR) ‘towards addressee’
Mic: Marshallese wac (DIR) ‘towards addressee’
Mic: Mokilese -we (DIR) ‘towards addressee’
Mic: Puluwatese -waw (DIR) ‘towards addressee’
Fij: Wayan ati (DIR) ‘away from speaker towards addressee or elsewhere’
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Fij: Nabukelevu *atu* (DIR) ‘outwards or away from speaker’s point of reference’
Pn: Tongan *atu* (DIR) ‘away from speaker towards addressee or elsewhere; onward in time’
Pn: Niuean *atu* (DIR) ‘away from speaker towards addressee’
Pn: Samoan *atu* (DIR) ‘away from speaker towards addressee’

Reflexes of *ua* and *watu* have a distribution which roughly matches major subgroups: *ua* is found throughout Western Oceanic, *watu* elsewhere. But the distribution is imperfect. Possible reflexes of *ua* occur in Southeast Solomonic and Fijian (and apparently as demonstratives in Micronesian). Reflexes of *watu* occur in a few Western Oceanic languages. And reflexes of both forms appear in the Admiralties. Despite these imperfections, however, the distribution of the two forms is quite different from that of the other deictic directional verbs, where geography plays no significant role. It seems legitimate to suggest that both forms occurred in POc, and that as POc broke up and diversified, one form or the other tended to win out on an areal basis.

Why did POc have the two forms *ua* and *watu*? Evidently, as hinted by Blust (ACD, under the entry for PAn *-Cu ‘near addressee’), *watu* represents an innovation whereby the POc demonstrative morpheme *-tu ‘near addressee’ was added to *ua*, stretching it to the canonical CVCV shape of POc morphemes. An obvious alternative suggestion is that *ua* represents the short form of *watu* in the same way as *ma* and *la* represent the short forms of *mai* (p.281) and *lako* (see below). This is unlikely, however, as the external evidence indicates that the inherited POc form was *ua*, and the fairly neat geographic distribution of *ua* and *watu* is very different from the scattered, interlaced distributions of *mai* and *ma* and of *lako* and *la*.

3.4.5 ‘Go away to’

Just as POc *mai* ‘come’ had a short form *ma*, so POc *lako* ‘go’ had the short form *la*. Again, reflexes of both occur as verbs and as directional enclitics, and each probably had both functions in POc, viz. *mai*, *ma* glossed as (V) ‘come’ and (DIR) ‘towards speaker’ and *lako*, *la* glossed as (V) ‘go (to)’ and (DIR) ‘away from speaker’. In some languages, a reflex of *lako* or *la* occurs as the second element of one or more compounds, and these are again taken to be reflexes of an earlier final verb or directional enclitic.

PMP *lako* ‘go’
POc *lako*, *la* (V) ‘go (to)’, (DIR) ‘away from speaker’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>&quot;lako&quot; or &quot;la&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Go away to&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>(DIR) ‘away from speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Mussau</td>
<td><em>lao</em></td>
<td>‘go to’ (la in compounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Loniu</td>
<td><em>-la</em></td>
<td>(DIR) ‘away from speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Loniu</td>
<td><em>-le</em></td>
<td>‘go to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Kele</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>‘go to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Gitua</td>
<td><em>lago</em></td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Mangap</td>
<td><em>-la</em></td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Mangap</td>
<td><em>-sa-la</em></td>
<td>(VF) ‘ascend away from speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Sio</td>
<td><em>lɔ̃</em></td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Takia</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>‘move away from speaker’, ‘go round the island’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is reasonable to expect that the processes that have created prepositions and relators from the deictic direction verbs *mai/*ma ‘[come] towards speaker’ and *ua ‘[go] towards addressee’ may also have created them from *lako/*la ‘go (to)’, (DIR) ‘away from speaker’. Although there are a good many prepositional reflexes, many of them are problematic because they have more than one possible source. In the set below, it is probable that some items reflect POc *lalo-/*lo- (N LOC) ‘inside’ rather than POc *lako, *la ‘go (to)’, (DIR) ‘away from speaker’.

30 This is an enclitic to the preverbal tense/aspect/mood marker. It marks the location of the action relative to the speaker and addressee. To reflects the use of *la with the sense ‘go and …’ in the initial slot of a sequential serial verb construction.
1. POc *lako, *la ‘go (to)’, (DIR) ‘away from speaker’ (p.287)
2. POc *lalo-, *lo-, *la- (N LOC) ‘inside’ (p.246)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm: Loniu</td>
<td>lɔ</td>
<td>(PREP) ‘in’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Arawe</td>
<td>lu-O, li-O:</td>
<td>(PREP N PERS, PRO PERS) locative, allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNG: Mamusi</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>(PREP) general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT: Motu</td>
<td>lalo</td>
<td>‘the inside, the mind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tigak</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(PREP N COM, N LOC) locative, temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tiang</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(PREP) locative, temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Kara</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>(PREP) locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Nalik</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>(PREP N LOC) locative, temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Notsi</td>
<td>la(n)</td>
<td>(PREP) locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Tangga</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(PREP N PERS, PRO PERS) locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Konomala</td>
<td>lɔ</td>
<td>(PREP N COM, N LOC) locative, temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Label</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>(PREP N LOC) locative, temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Bilur</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>(PREP N LOC) locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mota</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(PREP) ‘in, inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Tasiko</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(PREP) ‘in, inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mwotlap</td>
<td>Iv-</td>
<td>(PREP prefixed to N LOC) locative, allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(PREP N LOC) locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Maewo</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>(PREP) ‘in, inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Lenakel</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>(PREP) locative, allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Marshallese</td>
<td>(i)lɔ</td>
<td>(PREP) locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic: Puluwat</td>
<td>le-</td>
<td>(PREP) ‘in, because of’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formally, items reflecting *lo presumably reflect *lo-, one of the short forms of *lalo-. It is tempting to attribute all forms reflecting *la to the short form of *lako, but there is evidence against this. In Lihir (MM), la is a short form of lilie- ‘inside’ (reflecting *lalo-), as we find phrases like the one below where la must be a (relational) noun:

```
i la liom
PREP inside house
’in the house’
```

Semantically, all the reflexes listed above are locative, which sits better with a derivation from *lalo- ‘inside’ than one from *lako ‘go (to)’, from which one would expect an allative. But it is possible that some reflexes represent a conflation of the two etyma.

### 3.4.6 ‘Go away’

POc *pano, reconstructed below, perhaps had two uses. Firstly, it was a deictic directional verb meaning ‘go away (from speaker), depart’. Evidence for this meaning is also widespread in non-Oceanic languages (Blust, ACD). Reflexes of both *lako/*la and *pano occur as directional enclitics with the meaning ‘away from speaker’. However, there is evidence that as verbs they had different meanings. Most verbal reflexes of *lako ‘go (to)’ have a valency which implies or requires a destination (expressed, for example, as a prepositional phrase), whilst those of *pano are intransitive.
As noted in §3.3, some reflexes of POc *pano indicate that it was also a geographic directional verb meaning ‘move in a transverse direction’, contrasting with ‘go up, go inland’ and ‘go down, go seawards’. However, it is not entirely clear whether this usage occurred in POc. On one hand, there is a non-Oceanic reflex with this meaning, namely Aralle-Tabulahan (South Sulawesi) pano (DIR) ‘along the level’ (McKenzie 1997). On the other hand, within Oceanic the meaning ‘move in a transverse direction’ is reflected only in North–Central Vanuatu and New Caledonian languages. There are two interpretations of these data: either there were independent parallel innovations in South Sulawesi and Remote Oceanic, or this usage was inherited into POc but happens to have been lost in Western Oceanic and Southeast Solomonic.

PMP *panaw ‘go away, depart, leave on a journey’ (ACD)

POc *pano ‘go away’, (DIR) ‘away from speaker’; ? ‘move in a transverse direction’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM: Vitu</td>
<td>vano</td>
<td>‘go (away)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM: Harua</td>
<td>mano</td>
<td>‘go away’ (see text below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Bugotu</td>
<td>vano</td>
<td>‘go, come’; (DIR) ‘thither’; (used in comparisons:) ‘beyond, more’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Gela</td>
<td>vano</td>
<td>‘away, further off; to go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: Arosi</td>
<td>hano</td>
<td>‘make a journey, set out; go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mota</td>
<td>van(o)</td>
<td>‘go, come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Mwotlap</td>
<td>van</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘thither’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: NE Ambae</td>
<td>vano</td>
<td>‘move in transverse direction’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Merei</td>
<td>va, van(a)</td>
<td>‘move in transverse direction’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Tamambo</td>
<td>vano</td>
<td>‘go away from speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: Lonwolwol</td>
<td>van</td>
<td>‘go, pass (and so also of time); continue (to do s.t.); (DIR) ‘away’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV: SE Ambrym</td>
<td>haen</td>
<td>(N) ‘going, departure’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Lenakel</td>
<td>-pan</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘distant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vən, (a)vən</td>
<td>‘go, walk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: Anejom</td>
<td>-pan</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘away from speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>han, (a)pan</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Nêlêmwa</td>
<td>ve</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘in a transverse direction’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Nyelâyu</td>
<td>-van</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘in a transverse direction’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>van</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Nemi</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘in a transverse direction’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hen</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Tinrin</td>
<td>(à)va</td>
<td>‘there, the other side of stream’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Xárâcuû</td>
<td>ùe</td>
<td>(DEM) ‘away from speaker’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCal: Iaai</td>
<td>hāŋ</td>
<td>(DIR) ‘away from speaker crosswise’³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Niuean</td>
<td>fano</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn: Samoan</td>
<td>fano</td>
<td>‘(of time) be gone, past; perish’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³¹ It is possible that Iaai hāŋ does not belong here but is cognate with PPN *ange ‘along; away from speaker and addressee’
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Pn: Nanumean  fano  ‘go’
Pn: Rennellese  hano  ‘go; depending on, according to; on and on; little by little; one by one’
Pn: Maori  ano  ‘go, proceed; lead, of a road; verge towards; be on the point of; act, behave’

The Harua form mano appears to reflect the application of the PMP Actor focus morpheme *\(\text{um}\) to the root *panaw (vol. 1, p.29), suggesting that an alternation between *pano and *mano may have survived in POc.

POc *pano evidently had a short form *pa, giving a pair analogous to *mai/*ma and *lako/*la (pp.281, 287).

POc *pa ‘go away; move in a transverse direction’; (V AUX) ‘go and …’

NNG: Lukep (Pono)  pa  ‘go’
NNG: Adzera  fa  ‘go’
PT: Sinaugoro  va(\(\text{riyo}\))  ‘go down’
PT: Motu  ha  (V AUX) ‘go and …’
SES: Gela  va  (V AUX) ‘be going to …’
NCV: Mota  va  ‘go, come’; (V AUX) ‘go on …-ing’
NCV: Araki  \(\text{va}\)  ‘go; go in a direction other than north or south’
NCV: Lonwolwol  va  ‘go’
NCV: SE Ambrym  ha  ‘go, leave, depart’
NCV: Paamese  vā  ‘go’
NCV: Nguna  vā  ‘go’ (short form of vano, Clark 1996)
SV: Sye  -mpe  (DIR) ‘away from speaker’
     -ve  ‘go’

The meanings of reflexes of *pa agree with those of *pano, and the function of the Motu, Sinaugoro, Gela, and Mota reflexes of *pa (in three different subgroups) as a preverbal auxiliary is similar to that of the Sinaugoro reflexes of *ma and *la above. Clark (1996) notes that Nguna vā ‘go’ is also described as a short form of vano. Paton (1973) describes Lonwolwol va as a short form of van ‘go, pass’, and therefore as a reflex of POc *pano, but Blust (ACD) argues that his inference is unjustified since original medial nasals are otherwise retained in Lonwolwol. If, however, va reflects POc *pa, the objection disappears.

This leaves a loose end. Blust (ACD) takes the cognate set above to reflect PCEMP *ba ‘go, go away, walk’. Clark (1996), on the other hand, infers that the set above and PCEMP *ba are etymologically separate. It is true that the forms attributed to POc *pa above could reflect PCEMP *ba; there is no phonological objection to this. But there are just a few Oceanic forms which reflect a POc locomotion verb *ba ‘go’ (Tolai [MM] ba ‘tread, go’, Talise [SES] ba ‘go’), and it seems likely that this *ba reflects PCEMP *ba, whilst POc *pa is the short form of *pano.

There are a number of apparent prepositional reflexes of *pano/*pa ‘go away’, but most are very problematic, as there are two other possible sources of the items listed.

32 Unlike Sinaugoro -ma ‘towards speaker’ and -a ‘away from speaker’, which still survive as preverbal auxiliaries, Sinaugoro va occurs only in lexicalised compounds.
These are POc *pani ‘give’, (PREPV) ‘benefactive’ and PWOc *pwa (PREP) ‘instrumental, comitative’.33 There is also evidence of conflation.

The clearest piece of evidence that *pano/*pa played a role in the history of some of the items in the set below is that Hoava pa behaves as a relator, i.e. it occurs before a preposition.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ria} & \text{pu} \\
\text{tata} & \text{mae} \\
\text{pa} & \text{tani} \\
\text{sa} & \text{gato}
\end{array}
\]

D:3PL REL close come R PREP:3SG ART:SG tree
‘they who come close to the tree’

Relators reflect erstwhile deictic directional verbs (Ross 2003), and so *pano/*pa is the most likely candidate for the ancestor of Hoava pa. Other probable straightforward reflexes of *pano/*pa are the Kiriwina, Roviana and Nguna forms, and perhaps the Label locative preposition ha, as it contrasts with instrumental pa (from PWOc *pwa).

The NNG items below, all from the Vitiaz Strait area, probably reflect conflation of the POc benefactive prepositional verb *pani and a PWOc instrumental preposition *pwa (Ross 1988:106–108, 112–115).

Bound items below are shown with the suffix paradigm that they take, one of object (O.), disjunctive (D:) or possessor (P:). The gloss of each item is formulated as carefully as the data allow, but should not be treated too seriously, as there are likely to be gaps in the glosses.

1. POc *pano, *pa ‘go away; move in a transverse direction’ (p.289)
2. POc *pani ‘give’, (PREPV) benefactive (Pawley 1973, Lichtenberk 1985)
3. PWOc *pwa (PREP) instrumental, comitative

\begin{tabular}{lll}
NNG: & Kove & pa, pa-O: \\
NNG: & Bariai & pa-O: \\
NNG: & Malai & pa-D: \\
NNG: & Gitua & pa-O: \\
NNG: & Malalamai & pa-O: \\
NNG: & Lukep & pa-O: \\
NNG: & Malasanga & pa-O: \\
NNG: & Roinji & pa-P:/O: \\
NNG: & Sio & pa-O: \\
NNG: & Tami & pa, pa-D: \\
NNG: & Mangap & pa, pa-O: \\
NNG: & Rauto & pa \\
NNG: & Sio & pa-O: \\
PT: & Kiriwina & va \\
MM: & Tiang & pa-P: \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
& (PREP) locative, temporal, allative, ablative
& (PREP) locative, allative, ablative, beneactive
& (PREP) allative, instrumental
& (PREP) allative, temporal, benefactive, ablative, instrument
& (PREP) allative, benefactive
& (PREP) allative, benefactive
& (PREP) allative, benefactive
& (PREP) temporal, benefactive
& (PREP) locative, benefactive, ablative, instrumental
& (PREP w N PERS) locative, allative
& (PREP w N COM, PRO PERS) locative, allative, instrumental
& (PREP) ‘in the direction of’
& (PREP) locative, instrumental, comitative
\end{tabular}

33 As well as the data given here, the reconstruction of *pwa is supported by three Meso-Melanesian reflexes from New Ireland which only have instrumental and comitative uses: Tigak pe, pa-P; Kara pa-P; (both instrumental, comitative), and Label pa (comitative). The PWOc instrumental preposition *pwa was reconstructed for some interstage later than POc as *pa by Ross (1988:106).
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MM: Nalik  pana (PREP) locative, instrumental, comitative
MM: Label  ha (PREP) locative
MM: Roviana  pa (PREP) locative, allative
MM: Hoava  pa (R, PREP w PLC, non-human N) locative, allative
NCV: Nguna  pa(ki) (PREP w PLC) allative

Functionally and semantically the members of the small cognate set below resemble reflexes of POc *lako, but phonologically they do not reflect it. The medial consonant is reconstructed on the basis of Yabem low tone, which reflects the loss of a Proto Huon Gulf voiced obstruent, probably either *v or *y; lenis reflexes of POc *p or *k. Of these, both are lost intervocally in Takia, but only *k is lost in the Admiralties languages.

POc */yjaku ‘go (to)’, (DIR) ‘away from speaker’

Adm: Loniu  yaw (DIR) ‘away’
Adm: Kele  aw ‘go away’
Adm: Titan  aw ‘go away, leave’
NNG: Yabem  -yà ‘go (to her/him/them)’
NNG: Takia  -au ‘go (from the speaker)’

3.4.7 ‘Away from a specified point’

POc *tani was a prepositional verb, reconstructed by Pawley (1973). It was not deictic, i.e. not oriented with regard to speaker or hearer, and so strictly does not belong here. It was transitive, and the object of the verb was the point of orientation from which movement takes place. I include it because its reflexes have become deictic directional adverbs in a few languages.

POc *tani (PREPV) ‘(go) away from’

PT: Motu  tani (PREPV) ‘away from’
PT: Mekeo (East)  -ani ‘away from’ (in compounds: fossilised DIR)
NCG: Merlav  dani- (PREPV) ‘away from’
NCG: NE Ambae  dene (PREPV) ‘away from’
NCG: Sesake  deni- (PREPV) ‘away from’
Fij: Bauan  tani (DIR) ‘away, elsewhere’
Fij: Boumaa  tani (DIR) ‘away’

A note on sources

In addition to the sources of lexical items listed in Appendix 1, a number of grammars and other grammatical sources were consulted during the research on which this chapter is based. Other than my fieldnotes, these are: NE Ambae (Hyslop 2001), Anejom (Lynch 2000b), Araki (François 2002), Arosi (Lynch & Horoi 2002), Awad Bing (Bennett & Bennett 1998), Bali-Vitu (Ross 2002a), Banoni (Lynch & Ross 2002), Bariai (Gallagher 1998), Bauan Fijian (Churchward 1973, Schütz 1985), Boumaa Fijian (Dixon 1988), Bugotu (Ivens 1933, author’s fieldnotes), Cēmuhi (Lynch 2002a), Drehu (Moyse-Faurie 1993), Erromangan (Sye) (Crowley 1998), Gapapaiva (McGuckin 2002), Gela (Crowley 2002a), Gumawana (Olson 1992), Halia (Allen 1987), Hoava (Davis 1997), Iaai (Ozanne-