Evidence from Puyuma for only a single clitic-pronoun paradigm in Proto Austronesian
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Abstract: Like others before him, Ross (2006:532) reconstructed two paradigms of enclitic pronouns in Proto Austronesian (PAn), conventionally labeled nominative (NOM) and genitive (GEN). Since then, Ross (2009, 2012) has proposed only four primary subgroups of Austronesian: Tsou*(ic), Rukai, Puyuma, and all remaining languages within Nuclear Austronesian (NucAn). Most recently, he has argued that the differences between these paradigms result from innovations only in NucAn, and that in PAn there was only one enclitic paradigm serving both functions (Ross 2015, forthcoming). Here we bolster this latest claim using data from the three non-NucAn branches. In Tsou, the same paradigm of clitic pronouns is used for both functions; only 3.Invisible forms show a case distinction (Zeitoun 2005:277; cf. Ross 2015:120). There is also relatively little evidence for separate bound-pronominal paradigms that can be reconstructed for Proto Rukai (Ross 2013). As for Puyuma, from which all of our new data come, though Ross (2015:117) and Teng (2008:61, 2009:825) claim that among clitic pronouns a distinction is made between NOM and GEN, the cross-dialect Puyuma data (Teng 2009:826, 2011/2013) show relatively few differences in the pronominal forms between these cases. Namely, all clausal 1SG, EXCl1PL, INCl1PL, and 2PL forms are listed as syncretic: invariably ku, mi, ta, and mu (respectively). Only two (types of) forms—namely, 2SG (NOM ju, GEN nu) and 3 (NOM Ø, GEN tu or taw)—show a case distinction. The main difference between Teng’s NOM and clausal-GEN sets is direction of leaning: enclitic NOM as opposed to proclitic GEN. (Slightly different pronominal inventories for these non-NucAn languages, including four Rukai dialects, appear in Huang et al. 1999:170–172.) We show that in the Nanwang dialect it is possible to explain the 2SG and 3 allomorphy positionally rather than in terms of a case distinction. Namely, if proclitic, use nu= and tu=; otherwise, use =ju or Ø (respectively). In Rikavung, we show that case cannot account for the allomorphy, only positioning can do so (and argue that even in the Nanwang dialect a positioning analysis is slightly more advantageous). We also report variation in 1SG and 2PL forms not reported by Teng. We demonstrate elsewhere (Jiang & Billings 2014a, 2014b, 2014c) that in Rikavung and Tamalakaw ta(w) ~ tu is an inverse marker, not a 3.GEN pronoun. Finally, we reconstruct all intermediate protolanguages between PAn and the modern Puyuma dialects as having had a single, caseless paradigm of clitic pronouns.
• Two sets of pronominal clitics in many Austronesian languages

(1) a. Katripul: clitic-pronoun clustering (called the *clitic-sequencing construction* in Ross 2015, forthcoming)

\[ ku = nu = kəʐəŋ-aw \]
\[ 1SG = 2SG = pull-TR1 \]
‘I pulled you out.’

b. Katripul: verb-sandwiching clitic pronouns (called the *split-clitic construction* in Ross, forthcoming)

\[ ku = kəʐəŋ-aw = u \]
\[ 1SG = pull-TR1 = 2SG \]
‘I pulled you out.’

[Ross 2005:113, forthcoming, both citing Teng 2013; our transcription and glosses]

• Two ordering types in Puyuma: Rikavung (and at least three villages not exemplified here: Tamalakaw, Pinaski, and Ulivelivek), dominated by clustering, and Nanwang, dominated by sandwiching. Only Katripul (and nearby Kasavakan, not exemplified here) shows the mixture of these two types.
• Most of our talk will deal with the clustering type, using data only from Rikavung.

(2) Clitic-pronoun inventory in Rikavung Puyuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. ku (~ ka)</th>
<th>b. mi (~ niam)</th>
<th>c. ta</th>
<th>d. u ~ nu</th>
<th>e. mu (~ nmu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXCL1PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>INCL1PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG/EXCL1PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• We’ll discuss only three of these, in yellow: INCL1PL (2c), EXCL1PL (2b), and 2SG (2d) in Rikavung, in turn.
• S-argument clitic pronouns can be described as having Wackernagel positioning:

(3) Rikavung, intransitive
   a. s<əm>ənaj =ta
      <INTR>sing =INCL1PL
      ‘Did we sing?’
   b. ha(zi) =ta s<əm>ənaj
      NEG =INCL1PL <INTR>sing
      ‘Didn’t we sing?’

• A-argument clitic pronouns invariably appear right before the lexical verb.

(4) Rikavung, transitive
   a. ta= sukun-anaj
      INCL1PL= push-TR3
      ‘Did we push {her/him/them}?’
   b. ha(zi) =ta sukun-an
      NEG =INCL1PL push-TR3.DEP
      ‘Didn’t we push {her/him/them}?’

• P-argument clitic pronouns invariably also appear right before the lexical verb.

(5) Rikavung, transitive, also showing that /taw/ plus /ta/ do not comprise a portmanteau.
   \[\text{taw} = a = \text{ta} = \text{sukun-anaj} \]
   \[\text{INV} = \text{IRR} = \text{INCL1PL} = \text{push-TR3} \]
   ‘{She/He/They} would like to push us.’
• As the S argument, the EXCL1PL clitic pronoun can only take the form /mi/:

(6) a. s<əm>ənaj = {mi/*niam}
   <INTR>sing = EXCL1PL
   ‘We sang.’

   b. ħa(z) = {mi/*niam} s<əm>ənaj
   NEG = EXCL1PL <INTR>sing
   ‘We didn’t sing.’

• As the A argument, the EXCL1PL clitic pronoun can take both forms, but only in the affirmative:

(7) a. {mi/niam} = sukun-anaj
    EXCL1PL = push-TR3
    ‘We pushed {her/him/them}.’

   b. ħa(z) = {mi/*niam} sukun-an
    NEG = EXCL1PL push-TR3.DEP
    ‘We didn’t push {her/him/them}.’

• As the P argument here, the EXCL1PL clitic pronoun can take both forms:

(8) taw = a = {mi/niam} = sukun-anaj
    INV = IRR = EXCL1PL = push-TR3
    ‘{She/He/They} would like to push us.’
(9) a. $s<əm>ənaj = \{u/nu\}$
    $<\text{INTR}>\text{sing} = 2\text{SG}$
    ‘Did you sing?’

b. $hə = \{u/nu\}$ $s<əm>ənaj$
   $\text{NEG} = 2\text{SG}$ $<\text{INTR}>\text{sing}$
   ‘Didn’t you sing?’

c. $həzi = \{u/nu\}$ $s<əm>ənaj$
   $\text{NEG} = 2\text{SG}$ $<\text{INTR}>\text{sing}$
   ‘Didn’t you sing?’

(10) a. $\{u/nu\} = \text{sukun-ənaj}$
    $2\text{SG} = \text{push-TR3}$
    ‘Did you push {her/him/them}?’

b. $hə = \{u/nu\}$ $\text{sukun-an}$
   $\text{NEG} = 2\text{SG}$ $\text{push-TR3.DEP}$
   ‘Didn’t you push {her/him/them}?’

c. $həzi = \{u/nu\}$ $\text{sukun-an}$
   $\text{NEG} = 2\text{SG}$ $\text{push-TR3.DEP}$
   ‘Didn’t you push {her/him/them}?’

(11) $\text{taw} = a = \{u/nu\} = \text{sukun-ənaj}$
    $\text{INV} = \text{IRR} = 2\text{SG} = \text{push-TR3}$
    ‘{She/He/They} would like to push you.’
• So-called NOM vs. GEN paradigms in Nanwang Puyuma

(12) Clitic-pronoun inventory in Nanwang Puyuma (Teng 2013, unlike her 2008:61, 2009:826)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>EXCL1PL</th>
<th>INCL1PL</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>=ku</td>
<td>=mi</td>
<td>=ta</td>
<td>=ju</td>
<td>=mu</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>ku=</td>
<td>niam=</td>
<td>ta=</td>
<td>nu=</td>
<td>mu=</td>
<td>tu=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13)a. s<əm>ənaj = {ju/*nu}
  <INTR> sing = 2SG
  ‘Did you sing?’

  b. {*ju/nu} = sulud-anaj
  2SG = push-TR3
  ‘Did you push {her/him/them}?’

  c. ku = sulud-anaj = {ju/*nu}
  1SG = push-TR3 = 2SG
  ‘I pushed you.’

• Productive vs. restrictive possessed forms in Nanwang Puyuma (based on Teng 2011/2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenominal 2SG possessor (productive)</th>
<th>Postnominal 2SG possessor (irregular)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nu = wadi ‘your younger sibling’</td>
<td>ba = Ɂ ‘your older sibling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu = təmuwan ‘your grandchild’</td>
<td>təmu = Ɂ ‘your grandparent’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion
This paper has demonstrated that in Rikavung Puyuma there must be only a single paradigm of clitic pronouns. Despite plenty of variation among clitic pronouns, no case distinction can be made. We also argue against competing analyses of other Puyuma dialects (Cauquelin 1991; Teng 2008, 2009, 2011/2013; Tsuchida 1980).
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