

## THE NEW HEBRIDEAN OUTLIERS

ROSS CLARK

### INTRODUCTION

Three of the 100 or so indigenous languages of the New Hebrides are members of the Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian:

- 1) Mae, with about 150 speakers,<sup>1</sup> on Emae Island in the Shepherd Group;
- 2) Mele-Fila (MF), with about 1,400 speakers, in Mele village and on Fila Island, near the town of Vila;
- 3) Futuna-Aniwa (FA), also known as West Futuna, with about 550 speakers, on the islands of Futuna and Aniwa east of Tanna.

The distance from Emae south to Mele and Fila is about 75 km., and from Mele and Fila south-east to Aniwa about 210 km. Futuna is another 70 km. south-east of Aniwa. The Mae and Mele-Fila speakers are part of a culture area including Efate, its offshore islands, and the small islands to the north as far as Epi, and as such they share a number of traditions, and were probably in some degree of contact in pre-European times.

Despite numerous minor differences between Mele and Fila, and between Futuna and Aniwa, it is clear that there are only three languages involved. There is a small degree of mutual intelligibility between them, as between almost any two Polynesian languages, but this is of little practical consequence. They share between 50 and 60 percent cognates on the 200-item Swadesh list.

Because of their location outside the geographical bounds of Polynesia, these languages (and a dozen or so others) have been known as 'Polynesian Outliers'. Their origins have been the subject of much speculation and argument ever since their existence was first noted.<sup>2</sup>

The limited purpose of this paper is to reconsider the position of these three languages within the Polynesian family (and thus also relative to each other) in the light of data which has become available in the last ten years.<sup>3</sup>

#### PREVIOUS STUDIES

In his pioneering descriptions of these three languages, Capell expressed some opinions as to their relations - for example, that MF and FA formed a subgroup together with Pileni of the Santa Cruz group, and that Mae was clearly to be separated from the other two (Capell 1958:165-7) - but without providing enough data or rigorous argument to convince the sceptical. This was particularly true with respect to his belief that MF, FA and some of the other Outliers had split from the Triangle languages at a very early stage - a claim associated with the historical view that the Outlier communities were founded by 'drop-outs' from the original migration into Polynesia, rather than 'throw-backs' from the Triangle.

Bayard (1966), in a general study of the Outlier problem, drew the guarded conclusion that the three New Hebridean Outliers were the result of a single basic settlement from East Futuna, with possibly some secondary influence on Mae from East Uvea. (Bayard 1976:53-4; see also Chapter VI of this version for revised conclusions.) Uvea of the Loyalty Islands (West Uvea) was included with the New Hebridean Outliers, and this southern group showed some evidence of a possible link with Tikopia and Anuta. Bayard considered Mae the most likely locus of primary settlement, presumably on independent geographical grounds. The strength of his conclusions was severely limited, however, by the fact that they were based almost solely on lexicostatistical computations, with subadequate lists (less than 150 items) for all three languages. The other two criteria used in his study (kinship and material culture) were applied only to FA (data for Mae and MF being unavailable), with inconclusive results.

Though his data were no more adequate, Pawley (1966, 1967) applied different methods and was able to draw some more confident conclusions. These took the form of a series of proposed subgroups of Polynesian, each of which was supported by a set of shared innovations - mainly grammatical, but some lexical and phonological. Pawley's proposals have become the generally accepted view of Polynesian subgrouping, and the following sections will consider them as they apply to the New Hebridean Outliers.

## NUCLEAR POLYNESIAN AND SAMOIC-OUTLIER

The largest of Pawley's subgroups is Nuclear Polynesian, which includes all Polynesian languages except Tongan and Niue. The evidence for this group is reasonably clear, and need be only briefly reviewed here, as it applies to the New Hebridean Outliers. All three show loss of Proto-Polynesian (PPN) \*h, and merger of PPN \*l and \*r, the two chief phonological innovations of Nuclear Polynesian. Among the morphological innovations, they also show: reduction of the non-singular second person pronouns (e.g. PPN \*kimo(u)rua 'you two' >> PNP \*koulua: Mae korua, MF koorua, FA a-korua); emergence of a zero plural marker in demonstrative and possessive determiners (e.g. PNP \*taʔaku 'my (dominant, singular)', \*aʔaku (plural): Mae raaku/aaku, MF taaku/aaku, FA tiaku/iaku); and irregular vowel changes in the singular indefinite article (PPN \*sa >> \*se: Mae, MF se, FA se/sa) and the word for 'one' (PPN \*tasa >> PNP \*tasi: Mae, MF, FA tasi).<sup>4</sup>

Pawley's demonstration that all Outlier languages belong to a subgroup which includes some (in fact, most) Triangle languages would appear to settle the historical issue decisively in favour of the 'throwback' as against the 'dropout' theory of the Outliers, and this conclusion has been generally accepted by Polynesian linguists.

Nuclear Polynesian divides into two major subgroups: Eastern Polynesian is amply supported by linguistic evidence, and will not concern us here. Pawley proposes a Samoic-Outlier subgroup to include all the remaining Nuclear Polynesian languages - the Outliers and the 'Samoic' group of Samoan, Tokelau, (East) Futuna, (East) Uvea, Tuvalu, Niuafou'ou and Pukapuka.

The evidence for the Samoic-Outlier subgroup is less convincing than that for the two subgroups previously mentioned. Pawley lists 16 proposed innovations, but none of them is unequivocally reflected by all members of the group. Table 1 shows the evidence of these innovations in the New Hebridean Outliers. Although only four innovations are shared by all three languages, the total picture is enough to indicate that they share some common history independent of the Eastern group, and in common with a large group of other Outlier and Samoic languages.

TABLE 1  
Samoic-Outlier Innovations in Mae, MF and FA

	Mae	MF	FA
1) *te'e > *se'e 'not'	see	s-	se-
2) > *ŋaa- prefix to local nouns	ŋa-one <sup>1</sup>	ga-roto <sup>2</sup>	ŋa-uta <sup>3</sup>
3) > *soko- 'only'	sukwia <sup>4</sup>	soko-	soko-
4) *ŋa > *na (pl. definite article)	[ŋa]	na <sup>5</sup>	[ŋa-]
5) *mourua > *oulua (2nd non-sg. pronouns)	-	-	-orua
6) > *ni (pl. indefinite article)	ŋi	ne	-
7) > *te maatou fale etc.	-	-	-
8) > *kai 'and then'	kaie	-	kai(e)
9) > *koi present progressive, 'still'	-	-	ko(i)
10) > *noko past or progressive	-	noko	noko(i)
11) *toko- > *toka- (human numeral prefix)	-	[toko-]	-
12) *taatou > *tou (subject and possessive)	-tu	tau <sup>6</sup>	-
13) > *'isi 'some'	isi	-	-
14) > *a (generic or pl. article)	a	a	a
15) > *sina (quantitative article)	-	sina <sup>7</sup>	-
16) > *na(a)i (diminutive article)	-	-	-

For details of the innovations see Pawley 1967:274-81. One or two of Pawley's forms have been eliminated, and several others corrected or added, on the basis of new data. Except where otherwise indicated, throughout the paper, MF forms are Mele dialect, and FA forms Futuna dialect.

Notes: (1) 'beach', cf. one 'sand'; (2) 'trunk, midsection', cf. roto 'middle'; (3) 'inland, bush'; (4) 'alone'; (5) indefinite du. or paucal article; (6) intimate possessive. This, and the corresponding forms mau and rau, are probably not from the same innovation; (7) indefinite sg. diminutive article.

The forms in square brackets are positive evidence that the language has not undergone the putative innovation.

### THIRD-ORDER SUBGROUPS

The next question is whether there is linguistic evidence to connect one or more Outliers with specific Samoic languages. Pawley proposed two such subgroups, but emphasised that his evidence was far from conclusive. The data is mainly lexical - irregular sound changes and formal accretions, shifts of meaning, and the appearance of lexical items without known origin. The worker in this area is faced with a bewildering array of overlapping isoglosses, and the limited lexical information available on most Samoic-Outlier languages makes it very risky to propose that an item is uniquely shared.<sup>5</sup> In what follows, I first consider Pawley's evidence for a subgroup including East Futuna and the

New Hebridean Outliers, and then add a few items of my own which seem to be shared by one or more New Hebridean Outliers with a subset of the Samoic languages. The purpose is not to propose any hypothesis, but to show the confusing and sometimes contradictory nature of the data. It is to be hoped that future large-scale studies on the basis of more complete lexical data will reveal some clear patterns, but it is quite conceivable that wave-type differentiation, multiple settlement, and inter-island borrowing have hopelessly obscured whatever evidence there may once have been.

Pawley (1967:288) listed seven apparent innovations tending to support a subgroup including East Futuna together with Tikopia, Pileni, Mae, MF, FA and West Uvea - the six southernmost Outliers.

- 1) PPN \*meʔa 'thing' >> \*neʔa. Reflected by Tikopia, Mae, MF, FA, WUV nea and EFU neʔa. (Pileni form unknown.)
- 2) PPN \*ko- >> \*ku- in the base to which the demonstrative morphemes \*-nei, \*-naa, \*-laa are attached to form locationals ('here, there'). EFU and FA agree in having ku- with -nei but ko- elsewhere. For Tikopia, Durrad gives konei and kora (kura), but Cashmore has all three forms with ku-. The other southern Outliers lack comparable forms. Note, however, that Niue shows the same change in kunaan (beside konei).
- 3) The 'ligative article' a, occurring between certain determiners and a following noun, is shared by EFU and FA (e.g. FA tioku a rima 'my hand'). Capell (1942:157) sees the same particle in Fila te fare a fatu 'stone house', but this is quite a different syntactic context, and my informants rejected this example. In any case, this is unlikely to be an innovation, in view of the existence of a closely comparable 'ligative' a in Niue, and possible cognates even further afield.
- 4) EFU toʔetoʔe 'short, small' (pl. totoʔe) and WUV totoe 'short' have no apparent cognates elsewhere, though it is tempting to compare MF toetoe, tootoe 'long'.
- 5) The form numai 'come' is shared uniquely by Mae and WUV. This is in all probability from \*(h)ano mai, and convergent development seems quite possible.
- 6) MF rakina 'for, purposive' is compared with Pileni takina (Elbert and Kirtley), gina (Ray) and Tikopia kinia 'because'. But both the formal and semantic agreements are only approximate, and the MF form seems quite likely to have been borrowed from Efate (cf. Nguna raki-nia 'for it').

- 7) Pileni *nofini* 'old woman' (Ray), *nofine* 'wife' (Cashmore), Tikopia *nofine* (*noafine*) 'woman, wife', MF *nufine* (Mele), *nufune* (Fila) 'old woman, wife', FA *nofune* (Futuna), *nafune* (Aniwa) 'old woman'. These forms are clearly related to PPN \**fafine* 'woman, wife', but with a unique prefix of unknown origin.

Thus of Pawley's seven proposed innovations, only (1) is shared by nearly all languages in the group. The others define various subsets of from two to four languages. Below I note a few additional features which seemed like promising evidence for subgrouping the New Hebridean Outliers, but in most cases have been weakened by the same sorts of complications.

- 8) Mae, MF *vaavaa* 'rope' may represent a common semantic shift from PPN \**waawaa* 'intestines' (Fijian *waawaa*, EFU, Luangiua *vaavaa* 'intestines', Tikopia *vava* 'umbilical cord'), or a reduplicated derivation from PPN \**waa* 'vine' (Niue *vaa* 'climbing plant', EUV, EFU *vaa* 'vine'). Note, however, Fijian *waa* 'coconut fibre string'. FA has *vava* 'intestines', but also *vava shoe* 'latchet of shoe', *vavaponi* 'creeper for tying'.
- 9) Mae, FA *feiava*, MF *feiova* 'harbour, landing-place' are from PPN \**awa* 'channel, harbour', with a prefix of uncertain origin. The same prefix, however, is reflected in Rennellese *ha'iaba* 'beach area', and possibly Nukuoro *haiava* 'road, path; ocean liner' and Maori *whaiawa* 'river-bed'. The change from a to e could be a shared innovation, but would be of only slight evidential value.
- 10) Mae *makakai*, MF *majikai*, FA *mtakai* 'sharp' apparently reflect PPN \**mata* 'point' + \**kohi* 'sharp', with a common irregular vowel change. Cognates are Tikopia *matakai*, Luangiua *maka'ai* 'pointed', and perhaps Pileni *matakha* 'raised in points', Samoan *ma'ai* 'sharp'.
- 11) Mae, MF *tuukere*, EFU *tuukele* 'ground dove' reflect a compounding of the original PPN term \**tuu* (Tongan, Samoan, Rennellese *tuu*) with PPN \**kele* 'ground, earth'. FA has *tuu*.
- 12) Mae, FA *see* 'flower' agree with Tikopia, EFU and Fijian *see*.
- 13) Mae *soria* 'give' agrees with Tikopia *sori*, WUV, EFU and Fijian *solu* 'give', and possibly MF *soria* 'sell', FA *soria* 'carry'.

Because the previous two items involve clear Fijian cognates, they can only be proposed as local innovations within Polynesian if some borrowing is assumed. This may not be a completely arbitrary assumption, in view of the 'strong tradition links' between Futuna (EFU) and Cikobia-i-Ra in Fiji. (See Biggs 1974, Biggs and Biggs 1975.)

- 14) Mae ano 'go (singular)' is an irregular development from PPN \*fano which seems to be shared only by EFU 'ano (coexisting with fano).
- 15) The change of t to a liquid in the singular definite article, PPN \*te, is found only in Mae (re), Samoan and EFU (le). In Mae the same change applies to the tense marker of the same form (Mae re, Samoan te, no reflex in EFU), while in Samoan and EFU an unexpected liquid is found in the negative marker (Samoan lee, EFU le'e, Mae see), though whether the latter is immediately from t or s is unclear.
- 16) Mae muna 'speak, word, speech, language' is a semantic generalisation from PNP \*muna 'speak privately (grumble, murmur, whisper)'. This innovation is shared by Nukuoro, Rennellese, Tikopia and the southern Tuvalu dialect (Vaitupu).
- 17) Mae maka 'rock, stone' is a semantic generalisation from PPN \*maka 'sling, sling-stone, throw with sling', replacing PPN \*fatu 'stone'. This innovation is shared by Tongan, Niue, EUV and Samoan. As with (12) and (13) above, if this is an innovation (which seems clear), some borrowing must be involved.
- 18) Mae nounou 'short' is uniquely shared with Tongan and EUV (cf. PNP \*potopoto), though whether this is an innovation or a retention from PPN is not clear.
- 19) Mae sui 'bone' also raises problems. Tongan, Niue hui together with numerous non-Polynesian cognates indicate a PPN \*sui or \*hui. Virtually all Nuclear Polynesian languages show reflexes of PNP \*iwi, which suggests a progression from PPN \*hui via \*\*ui or \*\*hiwi (loss of PPN \*h being regular). Mae is the only Nuclear Polynesian language to retain the original vowel sequence, but its s does not accord with direct inheritance from PPN \*h. Cognate sets implying PPN \*s/\*h doublets are fairly common, however. Borrowing by Mae from a non-Polynesian source is also a possible explanation.

After a few hours' work with this sort of data, the pessimist will conclude that this entire method of reasoning is futile; and the best that the optimist can do is to hope that when comprehensive dictionaries are available for all the languages concerned, and a sufficiently broad-based study can be undertaken, some clear conclusions will emerge. At the moment it would be mere wishful thinking to see strong evidence for any subgrouping hypothesis in the above.

## MELE-FILA AND FUTUNA-ANIWA

It is a pleasure to be able to end this paper on a more positive note by reporting that the subgrouping of MF with FA, suggested by Capell (1942:153), for which Pawley (1967:288-91) provided some evidence, is further confirmed by the improved data now available. I will first discuss Pawley's 13 proposed shared innovations - many of which must now be rejected or weakened - and then a number of new points.

- 1) An alternation *ta/ti/te* in the singular definite article, conditioned by the following segment, occurs in FA, *ta* apparently being the basic form. Capell (1942:155) cites a few examples of an apparently similar alternation in the Fila dialect, but I was able to confirm only one of these (*ti-afi* 'the fire'). Elsewhere in both Mele and Fila dialects *te* is the invariable form (though the *e* is phonetically [ə] before *u*). It is possible that such an alternation existed in the past in MF, and that analogy has restored *te* almost everywhere - but the evidence is very slender.
- 2) MF and FA both have pre-verbal particles of the form *ro*, which have no apparent cognates elsewhere in Polynesian, and similar enough functions to suggest a common origin.
- 3) MF, FA *roro* 'go (plural)' seems to be a uniquely shared formal innovation, as other Polynesian languages reflect PPN \*oo, \*olo or \*loo.
- 4) In both MF and FA, a small group of kin terms indicate singular possessors by means of suffixes. The following is probably an exhaustive list:

MF	FA	
tama-	tama-	'father'
atna-	šina-	'mother'
tupu-	pua-	'grandparent'
makupu-	tamupu-	'grandchild'
figo(a)-		'parent/child-in-law'
	fugo-	'woman's brother, child of male parallel cousin'
tai-		'sibling of same sex'
	tošina-	'mother's brother'

This pattern of possessive marking is widespread in Oceanic languages, but seems to have been wholly or largely lost in Polynesian, where possessors are normally marked by separate words. A number of Polynesian kin terms, however, show a lexicalised third person



singular possessive suffix - e.g. PPN \*tamana 'father', and the etyma of most of the other terms above. The existence of some suffixed possessive marking in a few Outlier languages (MF, FA, Mae, Tikopia, Pileni, Rennellese) may represent a marginal survival in PPN, or may be a structural borrowing from non-Polynesian sources. In either case its value as subgrouping evidence is relatively weak. The rather good agreement between MF and FA in the particular lexical items involved, however, adds some weight.

- 5) MF kua 'why?' and FA kua 'how?' are undoubtedly cognate, but probably borrowed from a non-Polynesian source. Pawley (1972:79) cites forms from Fiji, the Solomons and the New Hebrides (Nguna) to support the reconstruction of Proto-Eastern Oceanic \*kuya.
- 6) Pawley cites the irregular change \*a >> u in MF, FA tuku 'my (singular intimate)' and tukua 'say, tell'. The latter form should be corrected to Mele takua, Fila tokua. Grammatical evidence suggests that tuku is from \*toku rather than \*taku. This would still leave a shared vowel shift of \*o >> u. But such minor vowel changes are so numerous in both languages that individual cases are of little value as evidence.
- 7) Another irregular vowel change, \*i >> u in the word for 'old woman, wife'. (For the correct forms see item (7) in the preceding section.) The change is reflected only in the Fila dialect of MF, and for the reasons just mentioned it is of little value.
- 8) Pawley mentions some shared instances of vowel elision in MF and FA. As with minor vowel changes, a demonstration of agreement in overall pattern would be of interest, but one or two individual cases have very little significance.
- 9) Pawley here shows what appear to be detailed similarities in the article systems of MF and FA. The vowel alternations in the singular article have been discussed under (1) above. The dual and plural articles of the form ru and a, respectively, occur in a number of other Samoic-Outlier languages. The only remaining uniquely shared feature is the existence of a distinctive trial article, MF o, FA taka. It is hard to see how these could be formally cognate. Moreover, Capell's example (o ku kave 'my three sisters') is rejected by both Mele and Fila informants, and I have found no other trace of a trial article in MF.
- 10) MF, FA avau 'I, me' derives from PPN \*a (personal article) + \*au 'I, me', with epenthesis of v. However, as Pawley points out, an

intrusive *w* or *v* occurs before \**au* in some Eastern languages (Hawaiian *wau*, Tahitian *vau*). The form *avau* is also given for Tikopia by Durrad, so that the value of this item is somewhat weakened. The other item mentioned here by Pawley is MF, FA *afa* 'what?', but this is a retention from PPN \**hafa*, shared by Nukuoro and the Eastern languages, and hence of no subgrouping significance.

- 11) An 'intrusive' *-ŋa-* occurs before demonstrative morphemes in both languages, but may not have a single origin. In FA it is restricted to plurals (*aŋanei* 'these'), and should be compared with noun plurals such as *a-ŋa-tama* 'the children', the *ŋa* being from PPN \**ŋaa*, a plural marker (see Clark 1976:50-4). In MF *gaa-* occurs in the Fila dialect only, apparently in free variation with unmarked demonstratives: *t'matuuna raa* or *t'matuuna gaaraa* 'that thing'. This may be a variant of the anaphoric *gani*, or it may be compared with the *ŋaa-* cited in the previous section as a Samoic-Outlier innovation prefixed to locational nouns.
- 12) Pawley cites MF, FA *fe-* 'desiderative prefix', from PPN \**fia-*. But this form is found in the Fila dialect only, while Mele preserves *fia-*.
- 13) The correct forms of the verbs in question are MF *kaamo* 'pick up, hold, carry' and FA *amo* 'get, have' (Capell 1968) or 'take' (Dougherty, p.c.). These may reflect a common semantic shift from PPN \**?amo-a* 'carry on shoulder', but the accretion of *ka-* in the MF form remains to be explained.

Thus of Pawley's proposed innovations, only (2), (3) and (13) seem fairly strong, though (1), (4), (5), (10) and (11) may have some value. I now present some additional arguments based on new data.

- 14) The most striking shared feature is an innovation in the personal pronoun system. The forms are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
Independent Personal Pronouns of MF and FA

MF:	avau	maaua	maateu	meafa
	-	taaua	taateu	teafa
	akoe	koorua	kooteu	kouafa
	aia	raaua	raateu	reafa
FA:	avau	akimaua	akimatau	akimea
	-	akitaua	akitatau	akitea
	akoe	akorua	akautau	akaua
	aia,eia	akiraua	akiratau	akirea

It will be seen that the first three columns reflect the forms reconstructed as singular, dual and plural, respectively, for PPN. Both MF and FA have added a fourth column to form a new largest number category, an innovation unique in Polynesian.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the similarity of MF *Ceafa* and FA *-Cea* seems close enough to make a common origin likely.<sup>7</sup>

- 15) MF *ggoro*, FA *hgoro* 'sing', from PPN \**loloŋo* by metathesis. Loss of original unstressed short vowels between identical consonants is regular in both languages (and in some other Outliers), resulting in MF geminates and FA pre-aspirated consonants. It is interesting that this uniquely shared metathesis leaves the reflex of reduplication in initial position.
- 16) MF, FA *fura*, plural of *tere* 'run'. The singular is PPN, but the suppletive plural seems to be unique. Possible cognates are Nukuoro *hulo*, Kapingamarangi *hula* 'go (plural)'
- 17) MF, FA *pua* 'back (of person)', perhaps connected with PPN \**tuʔa*.
- 18) MF *aretuu*, FA *aratu* 'tomorrow'. Most likely source for these is PPN \**ʔata* 'shadow, dawn' or \**ara* 'wake up' + \**tuʔu* 'stand'. Maori *atatuu* 'sunrise' may be cognate, but the specific form and meaning of the MF-FA items are still unique.
- 19) The word for 'old woman, wife' discussed under item (7) in the preceding section is shared with Tikopia and Pileni. But the corresponding male term, MF *nuaane*, FA *nuane* 'old man, husband' is not.
- 20) In both MF and FA, PPN \**i*, a locative preposition, has fused with locational nouns, as in the following MF examples:<sup>8</sup>

Aia eenofo Imere	<i>'He lives at Mele'</i>
Tu teeroro gaia Imere	<i>'Let's go to Mele'</i>
Imere kuuwora	<i>'Mele (village) has grown'</i>

A number of other items shared by MF and FA appear to be of Efate origin:

- MF, FA, Efate pamu *'shoulder'*
- MF, FA, Efate pua *'grandparent'*
- MF, Efate matarau *'clan'*, FA matarau *'wing of an army'*
- MF tafuu *'mountain, hill'*, FA tafu *'forest, hilltop'* cf. Efate tava *'mountain'*

While fairly weak as evidence of a specific connection between MF and FA, these do indicate a history of linguistic contact between FA and Efate.

One final piece of linguistic evidence with probable historical implications should be mentioned. In the neighbouring Melanesian village of Pango, the Mele and Fila people are traditionally referred to as Naftun, which, with normal South Efate vowel elision, could well represent \*Na-Futuna.

#### SUMMARY

The New Hebridean Outliers belong to the Nuclear Polynesian subgroup of Polynesian, as Pawley has shown. If we say that they are also members of a 'Samoic-Outlier' subgroup of Nuclear Polynesian, it must be with the understanding that the membership of this subgroup, and its characteristic innovations, have yet to be precisely defined. There is as yet no clear evidence for subgrouping the New Hebridean Outliers with any other Outliers or with any specific languages in the Samoic group. On the other hand, the case for a subgroup consisting of just Mele-Fila and Futuna-Aniwa has been considerably strengthened by newly available data.

N O T E S

1. The figures are those given by Tryon (1972). Dougherty (1977:207) puts the number of FA speakers at about 800.

2. The Outlier Pileni was apparently the first Polynesian language to be recorded by Europeans - a single word, by Mendaña in 1595 (Ray 1919:169). But it was not until Cook's second voyage that the Outlier phenomenon was recognised, in the form of the unexpected resemblance of FA to Tongan (Beaglehole 1955, vol.2:504). By the end of the 19th century all the Outliers had been identified. Sydney H. Ray compiled the available information on them in a series of articles between 1912 and 1921 in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. The term 'Outlier' was apparently coined by Sir Peter Buck (1938:47). For a recent survey of comparative studies on the Outliers see Bayard 1976.

3. Both Bayard (1966) and Pawley (1967) relied on the three descriptions published by A. Capell (1942, 1958, 1962) for all their information on the New Hebridean Outliers. None of these descriptive sketches was based on first-hand *in situ* fieldwork. The paper on MF drew on work with a single young informant at school in Fiji. Those on FA and Mae relied mainly on missionary sources, though Capell worked with some Mae informants in Vila and elsewhere.

Samuel Elbert visited Mele and Fila in 1957 and compiled a type-written vocabulary of several hundred words. Most of this was included in Biggs' lexicon (1975), which also included all available published material and the results of Biggs' own brief fieldwork in 1974. Hiroshi Kuki also worked on the Fila dialect in the early 1970s (Kuki 1976). My major source for MF is my own fieldwork at Mele during 1974-76, some preliminary results of which have appeared in working papers (Clark 1975a,b).

Janet Dougherty has been kind enough to provide me with answers to a number of questions about FA, based on her own stay of more than a year on Futuna. I have also used a typescript dictionary of FA by Capell (1968). For Mae I still rely mainly on Capell 1962, though a few additions and corrections are based on work with Pastor Fred Timakata in Vila in January 1978. In addition to standard dictionaries, my sources for other Outliers included Cashmore, Durrad, Elbert and Kirtley, and Leverd.

4. The last two innovations as described here differ slightly from Pawley's account. For the reasons see Clark 1976:50. The alternation between *se* and *sa* in FA appears to be a secondary development conditioned by following vowels, and paralleled in part by the *ti-te-ta* alternation in the definite article (Capell 1958:88-9). Here and throughout, > indicates an irregular change.

5. The evidence for third-order subgroups is not neatly separable from the evidence adduced by Pawley for Samoic-Outlier itself. Of his 16 proposed innovations, none are positively reflected by all of the 18 languages in his sample, and most are reflected in fewer than half. The range is from 13 languages (article \**ni*) to as few as three (particle \**na*l). Moreover, in three cases (1, 4 and 11) there are languages which show positive evidence of not having undergone the putative innovation, thus indicating that the evidence actually defines a proper subgroup of Samoic-Outlier.

6. In FA the original plural series is *trial* and the new series plural. In MF the distinction is less clear, but the new series is clearly larger and more comprehensive than the original plural. It is worth noting that of the neighbouring non-Polynesian languages, those of Tanna and the southern islands have a four-category pronominal number system, while Efate and its neighbours to the north have only singular-dual-plural.

7. The precisely parallel first and third person forms, differentiated by *m-* (1st exclusive), *t-* (1st inclusive) and *r-* (3rd) are a Polynesian characteristic, and the 2nd person base *kou/kau-* is Nuclear Polynesian. The origin of *-ea(fa)*, however, is not at all clear. Similar suffixes are found in plural pronouns in some Tanna languages, e.g. *-aha* in Isiai (Tryon 1976). One ought also to keep in mind the similarity of

PPN \*faa 'four' and \*afe 'thousand', in view of the derivation of PPN dual and plural suffixes from \*rua 'two' and \*tolu 'three', respectively.

8. John Lynch informs me that a similar development has taken place in Tanna languages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAYARD, Donn T.

- 1966        *The Cultural Relationships of the Polynesian Outliers.*  
M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- 1976        *The Cultural Relationships of the Polynesian Outliers.*  
Otago University Studies in Prehistoric Anthropology 9.  
(Revised version of Bayard 1966.)

BEAGLEHOLE, J.C., ed.

- 1955        *The Journals of Captain James Cook on his Voyages of  
Discovery.* Cambridge: Hakluyt Society.

BIGGS, Bruce G.

- 1974        'A Drift Voyage from Futuna to Cikobia'. *JPS* 83:361-5.
- 1975        *A Mele-Fila Vocabulary.* Te Reo Monographs. Auckland:  
Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

BIGGS, Bruce G. and Mary V. BIGGS

- 1975        *Na ciri kalia.* WPDA 42.

BUCK, Peter H.

- 1938        *Vikings of the Sunrise.* New York: Frederick A. Stokes.

CAPELL, A.

- 1942        'Notes on the Fila Language, New Hebrides'. *JPS* 51:153-80.
- 1958        *Culture and Language of Futuna and Aniwa, New Hebrides.*  
OLM 5.



- 1962 *The Polynesian Language of Mae (Emwae), New Hebrides. Te Reo Monographs.* Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- 1968 A Dictionary of the Futuna and Aniwa Languages (New Hebrides). Typescript. (To be published as PL, C-56).
- CASHMORE, Christine
- 1972 *Vocabularies of the Santa Cruz Islands, British Solomon Islands Protectorate.* WPDA 17.
- CLARK, Ross
- 1975a *Mele Notes.* WPDA 40.
- 1975b *Two Mele Texts.* WPDA 44.
- 1976 *Aspects of Proto-Polynesian Syntax.* Te Reo Monographs. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- DOUGHERTY, Janet W.D.
- 1977 'Reduplication in West Futuna'. JPS 86:207-21.
- DURRAD, W.J.
- 1926-27 'A Tikopia Vocabulary (edited by H.W. Williams)'. JPS 35:267-89; 36:1-20, 99-117.
- ELBERT, S.H. and B.F. KIRTLEY
- 1966 'Seven Pileni Tales'. JPS 75:348-72.
- KUKI, Hiroshi
- 1976 'Field Report on Fila, the New Hebrides'. *Oceanic Studies* (Tokyo) 1:82-6.
- LEVERD, A.
- 1922 'Polynesian Language of Uvea, Loyalty Islands'. JPS 31: 95-103.
- PAWLEY, Andrew
- 1966 'Polynesian Languages: a Subgrouping Based on Shared Innovations in Morphology'. JPS 75:39-64.

- 1967 'The Relationships of Polynesian Outlier Languages'. *JPS* 76:259-96.
- 1972 'On the Internal Relationships of Eastern Oceanic Languages'. *Studies in Oceanic Culture History* 3:1-142. *Pacific Anthropological Records* 13. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- RAY, S.H.
- 1919 'Polynesian Languages of the Santa Cruz Archipelago'. *JPS* 28:168-77.
- 1921 'A Vocabulary of the Pileni Language'. *JPS* 30:103-18.
- TRYON, D.T.
- 1972 'The Languages of the New Hebrides: A Checklist and General Survey'. *Papers in Linguistics of Melanesia* No.3. PL, A-35:43-84.
- 1976 *New Hebrides Languages: an Internal Classification*. PL, C-50.