I. Manambo: A Background
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preserves a number of typical features of Ndu languages, among them two genders (masculine and feminine), three numbers (singular, dual and plural) and switch-reference marking on verbs. The language is predominantly suffixing and agglutinating, with just a few prefixes.

The Manambu people are known for their traditional warfare and tendency to expand their territories at the expense of other, non-Ndu speaking people. As a result of the substrata from such unrelated languages (whose speakers the Manambu had subjugated and subsequently absorbed; see: Aikhenvald 2008; 2009), the language is in many ways more complex than other Ndu languages. Manambu is also more innovative than its relatives: it has undergone a number of phonological mergers (in the sense of Trask (2000: 210)). The Proto-Ndu contrast of word-final voiceless stops (p, t and k), the nasal n and the rhotic r has been lost in Manambu, all five segments merging as r. As a result, Manambu has a high number of morphemes with a similar form. Some of these appear to be semantically linked. But their history is often different.

We now turn to one highly versatile form, used as a suffix and as a free pronoun.

2. One form, many meanings: the versatile (-)bər

The form (-)bər is highly frequent in Manambu. It is pronounced as [ⁿbəɾ] — like most languages of New Guinea, stops in Manambu are phonetically prenasalized. The free form bər combines the meaning of the second and third person dual personal pronoun:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON/GENDER</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 feminine/masculine</td>
<td>wun</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>ñan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 feminine</td>
<td>ñan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 masculine</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
<td>gwur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 feminine</td>
<td>iœ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 masculine</td>
<td>œœ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Personal pronouns in Manambu

Personal pronouns are optional, and are typically used only for emphasis and disambiguation. This is the case in many languages of the world with obligatory cross-referencing of person, number and gender on the verb.

Third person pronouns also appear as markers of agreement on adjectives and demonstratives, as shown in Table 2 (which features the adjective numa ‘big’). The plural agreement form -di is a contraction of the third person plural pronoun day.

200 speakers (also see: Laycock 1965); (3) Gala, or Ngala, spoken by about 150 people; (4) Abela-Wosera, a dialect continuum with over 40,000 speakers, also known as Ambulas (see: Wendel 1993: 1—5; Wilson 1980); (5) Boiken (also known as Boikin, Nucum, Yangoru and Yengoru) spoken by over 30,000 people [Freudenburg 1976; 1979].
The suffix -par marks dual number agreement on some adjectives and demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Par</th>
<th>Par-</th>
<th>Par-</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Agreement markers used with num, big.

Table 3. Subject markers on verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num-pa</td>
<td>num-pap</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num-dl</td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These morphemes can also mark non-subject participles, see Chapter 3 of this volume.
(B) The suffix -bar marks third person dual subject on the verb (see Table 3):

(2)  
  tækw  kra-bar  
  woman  take-3duSUBJ  
  ‘(They two) got married’ (lit. took woman)

(C) The suffix -bar participates in marking dual number of the subject on the verb (see Table 3), as part of first person dual subject marker -bər-an and as part of second person dual subject marker -bər-bar. An example is in (3).

(3)  
  tækw  kra-bərbar  
  woman  take-2duSUBJ  
  ‘(You two) got married’ (lit. took woman)

(D) The suffix -bar marks plural on a few kinship terms, e.g. asa:y ‘father’, asa:y-bər ‘fathers, classificatory fathers, men of generation of one’s father’, awa:y ‘maternal uncle’, awa:y-bər ‘maternal uncles’. That these forms have plural referents is corroborated by the plural agreement on verbs and other modifiers:

(4)  
  a-di  awa:y-bər  ata  ya-di  
  that-pl  maternal.uncle-pl  then  come-3plSUBJ  
  ‘Then those maternal uncles came’

Using dual agreement form on the demonstrative ‘that’ or on the verb would result in an ungrammatical sentence.

(E) The suffix -bar marks associative non-singular, with the meaning of ‘X and associate(s)’ (cf. English The Smiths). This meaning only surfaces when the suffix is used with personal names (see Moravcsik 2003, for a typological overview of associative plurals), e.g. Leo-bər ‘Leo and his associates (e.g. friends, family, etc.)’, Gemaj-bər ‘Gemaj (female name) and her associates’. An associative in Manambu may refer to two people, as in (5) (where Leo-bər referred to Leo and one of his children):

(5)  
  Leo-bər  ata  ya-bər  
  Leo-ASS.NSG  then  come-3duSUBJ  
  ‘Leo and his child (them two) are coming’

Or it may refer to more than two people — (6) describes Leo arriving with his wife and several children:

(6)  
  Leo-bər  ata  ya-di  
  Leo-ASS.NSG  then  come-3plSUBJ  
  ‘Leo and his associates (wife and children: many of them) are coming’

Table 4 summarizes the meanings of the versatile morpheme (-)bar as a free and as a bound morpheme.
One can thus establish the following semantic chain of grammatical development:

Non-singular marking on a personal noun often has an associative reading, as it does in English (e.g. the singing undergrowth, the singing student). Yet it is well known that nouns with singular marking are more likely to be verbalized markers for plural than nouns of other types (see: Nichols, 1997). And it is well known that nouns within human reference set are more likely to be verbalized markers for singular than nouns of other types (see: Nichols, 1997). This has happened in Mambamu—Table 2 illustrates that a kind of non-singular number that has happened in Mambamu.

### Syntactic Plausibility Versus Historical Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The meanings of</th>
<th>-er(-)</th>
<th>-er(-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meanings of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-er(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-er(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. The meanings of -er(-) in Mambamu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Non-noun</th>
<th>Bounded</th>
<th>Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-er(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-er(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-er(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. The meanings of -er(-) in Mambamu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Non-noun</th>
<th>Bounded</th>
<th>Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The seven meanings of -er(-) cover:

- Associative - non-singular number marker: meaning (vii)
- Plural number marker: meaning (viii), (vii), and (vii)
- Second person and dual marker: meaning (v) and (vii)
- Full number marker: meaning (vii), (vii), and (vii)
- Third person dual number marker: meaning (vii), (vii), and (vii)
- Dual number marker: meaning (vii), (vii), and (vii)
- Plural number marker: meaning (vii), (vii), and (vii)
**Scheme 1. Putative links between various meanings of Manambu (-)hör**

non-singular -> dual 3rd person/2nd person marker
\[ \ddot{b} \quad \dddot{b} \]
plural marker on kinship terms associative non-singular

That is, synchronically, (-)hör can be viewed as one morpheme with a general meaning of ‘non-singular’.

However, comparison with other Ndu languages and subsequent reconstruction tell us a different story. Proto-Ndu had three formally and semantically different morphemes, each of which gave (-)hör in Manambu as a result of a phonological merger of word-final voiceless stops, dental nasal and rhotic mentioned in § 1. (Further discussion of phonological correspondences between Manambu and Proto-Ndu is in Aikhenvald (forthcoming)).

These Proto-Ndu morphemes are as follows:

**(A)** Proto-Ndu 'bön(e) 'second person dual’, attested in Wosera beni, Abelam béné, Gala ben (see: Chapter 22 of Aikhenvald 2008; some forms are also in Laycock 1965: 152), Iatmul bit Staalsen, Staalsen 1973, bi’k (Jendraschek p. c.), Boiken ple Freudenburg 1979, Manambu bör ‘second person dual’. (Note that Manambu gwur ‘2pl’ corresponds to Wosera, Abelam guni, guné, Gala gun, Iatmul guk, Boiken kle, from Proto-Ndu *gun(e)*).

The morpheme 'bön(e) 'second person dual’ could be further analyzed into *-bör-* ‘dual’ and *-n(e) ‘second person’. Along similar lines, *gun(e) ‘second person plural’ could be analyzed as *-gu-* ‘plural’ and *-n(e) ‘second person’. The morpheme -gu ‘plural’ is found in restricted contexts, in Manambu -Vgw (see: Chapter 6 of Aikhenvald 2008), and also in Wosera -(n)gu, Abelam -gu (Wilson 1980: 46), where it is restricted to kinship nouns.

This analysis presupposes that number marking is followed by person marking. This is indeed the case in Ndu, as can be seen from Manambu cross-referencing markers -do-wun (-masc.sg-1sg) ‘first person singular masculine subject’, or -di-gwur (-pl-2pl) ‘second person plural subject’ (see Table 3, and discussion in § 2). The morpheme *bör ‘third person dual’ can be analyzed as consisting of *-be ‘dual’ and *-d ‘third person’.

**(B)** Proto-Ndu 'bör ‘third person dual’, attested in Abelam bét, Wosera ber (also see Laycock (1965: 152), Gala bal, Iatmul bit (Staalsen and Staalsen 1973), bi’k (Jendraschek p. c.), Boiken ple (Freudenburg and Freudenburg 1979), Manambu -bör ‘third person dual independent pronoun and bound pronoun; dual agreement marker’. Note that the syncretism of second and third person in dual forms is found in Iatmul, Manambu and also in Boiken.

**(C)** Proto-Ndu *-bere ‘plural’, attested in Abelam béré ‘pluralizer, associative plural marker’ [Wilson 1980: 36], e. g. du béré taakwa béré (man PL woman PL) ‘men (and) women’ (Kundama, Sapayé and Wilson 2006: 14). In its meaning of associative plural, this marker appears to occur on personal names (e. g. Warétarat béré ‘Waretarat and his
The vowelless form (**)ər** in Mannambu can be synchronically described as one polyvalent nominal.

### 4. Typological plausibility versus reconstructed history

(from (ii) to (vii), (viii) and (x)) which is a highly common path.

- **Subject agreement marker**
- **Personal nouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal nouns</th>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>(vii)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| non-thematic (y) personal noun | (v) plural on kinship and other nouns (c) `tere, plural`
| thematic personal noun | (vii) plural (c) |

- **Subject–subject agreement marker**

| Subject–subject agreement marker | (v) plural on kinship and other nouns (c) `tere, plural`
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(vii) plural (c) <code>tere, plural</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Preverb (n)-dhu to Mannambu (for)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverb (n)-dhu to Mannambu (for)</th>
<th>(c) to Mannambu (for) and their verbal meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 5 summarizes the historical developments from the Proto-Ndu form (v)</td>
<td>(c) to Mannambu (for) and their verbal meanings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vowelless form (**)ər** in Mannambu can be synchronically described as one polyvalent nominal.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) to Mannambu (for) and their verbal meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(v) plural on kinship and other nouns (c) <code>tere, plural</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) plural (c) <code>tere, plural</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarizes the historical developments from the Proto-Ndu form (v) to the vowelless form (**)ər** in Mannambu (for) and their verbal meanings.

The vowelless form (**)ər** in Mannambu can be synchronically described as one polyvalent nominal.

The vowelless form (**)ər** in Mannambu can be synchronically described as one polyvalent nominal.

---

*Typological plausibility and historical reconstruction*
shows that this analysis is spurious, from a historical perspective. This one form came about as a result of a phonological merger of three different Proto-Ndu morphemes. That the meanings of the erstwhile ancestors of the Manambu \((-)bor\) are intertwined to an extent of being relatable to one another can be described as a semantic merger.

This is an example of how a diachronic analysis can provide additional perspective for solving synchronic conundrums in a language with pervasive polysemy and homonymy of forms. Historical reconstruction provides an ultimate proof for the limits of typological plausibility — or a typologist’s imagination.

A final word is in order. The extreme genetic diversity among the non-Austronesian (or Papuan) languages in New Guinea, with numerous families interspersed with isolates, remains a puzzle for comparative linguists. The Sepik River Basin (which includes East Sepik and Sandaun Provinces) is the most complex linguistic area within New Guinea. The Sepik River Basin displays cultural as well as linguistic diversity and fragmentation, perhaps more so than any other area of New Guinea. Reasons for this include geographic diversity, inaccessible terrains, patterns of language contact and language attitudes (see: Aikhenvald 2004; Aikhenvald, Stebbins 2007), and also frequent migrations in search of further hunting and fishing grounds and sago fields. The average size of language communities is significantly lower than in the New Guinea Highlands. The area boasts about 200 languages, an extreme language density unparalleled anywhere else in the world.

A case study like this one is only possible for a language with established genetic relatives. In this way, Manambu is a lucky language. Only further descriptive and comparative studies will help solve similar puzzles for other languages in the Sepik domain.
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SOME COMMON FUNCTIONS OF THE DATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, AND LOCATIVE CASES

I have proposed earlier that the attested Indo-European dative, accusative, instrumental and locative cases were originally not very clearly morphologically differentiated. As a typological example of the expression of what Indo-Europeanists might consider the use of a single case with multiple meanings (direct and indirect object) I would quote the Georgian example supplied by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov in their path-breaking work on Indo-European [1984: 286]. In Georgian the direct and indirect object (from the Indo-European point of view) can both be expressed by the same case (-s): k'aci az'levs c'ign-s bavišvas ‘the man gives the book (c'ign-s) to the child (bavišvas).’ In this paper I will focus primarily on the similarity of the functions of the Indo-European dative and accusative cases.

I hold the view that the Indo-European case endings derive primarily from the addition of particles with locative meaning to stems of various kinds. The meanings of these particles were not very clearly defined and the resulting cases only came to have relatively clear separate meanings in the course of time. I have written elsewhere [Schmalstieg 2000: passim.; 2004: 5—8] that for the *-o stem nouns and adjectives in Balto-Slavic there is evidence of an etymological particle *-m(-) in the dative, accusative, instrumental and locative singular. Expanding on my earlier view I would now say that in the Indo-European noun the functions of these cases derive from the assignment of different meanings to various sequences of the stem vowel plus the particles ‘(-)m(-) and/or ‘(-)i(-) and/or ‘(-)u(-) when attached to a root. The etymological identity of these cases is to be found in the fact that the same meaning can frequently be expressed by several cases, a phenomenon which Hopper [1991: 23] has characterized in the following way: ‘The Principle of Layering refers to the prominent fact that very often more than one technique is available to serve similar or even identical functions. This formal diversity comes about because when a form or a set of forms emerges in a functional domain, it does not immediately (and may never) replace an already existing set of functionally equivalent forms, but rather that the two sets of forms co-exist.’ Thus as the single etymological general oblique case was split into dative, accusative, instrumental, and locative cases, the old identity has left traces not only in the partial

---

1 I should like to thank herewith Prof. P. Baldi for advice on Latin and Greek and Prof. V. Vasiliauskienė for advice on Lithuanian. Neither of these individuals should be held responsible for the views expressed or any errors in this paper.
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