The Yap Language: Whence and How?

Joseph C. Finney

The Yap language is so strange and different that its position within Malayo-Polynesian (MP) has been a mystery. It is not closely related to any of its neighbors. It is a member of the Austronesian (AN) language family and descends from the hypothetical Proto-Austronesian (PAN). It belongs to the majority subfamily (MP), and descends from the hypothetical Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP). All the AN languages agreed to be non-MP are on Formosa, which is generally accepted as the ancient homeland of PAN. The Oceanic (OC) group, descended from Proto-Oceanic (POC), a sub-sub-division of MP, is the essentially Melanesian group and includes some very well-studied languages of Fiji and Polynesia in the Central Pacific group, and the (nuclear) Micronesian languages. Geographically, the term Micronesian includes three major groups whose language is not Micronesian (Yap, Palau, Chamorro).

Yap, in the western Caroline Islands, is best known for its stone money. To its west, before the Philippines, is Palau; to its north, Chamorro; and to its east (roughly) the linguistic Micronesians.

If Yap is an Oceanic language, here is a plausible prehistory of its people.

The Yap settlers separated early from the main body of Proto-Oceanic speakers who lived on the north coast of New Guinea (and/or islands off the north coast) and at the time still had mostly Malayan genes. They went directly north and settled Yap. They had no further contact with other Oceanic speakers till many centuries later, when the (nuclear) Micronesians completed a long counterclockwise movement from the Solomons to the Gilberts to the Marshalls to Ponape to Truk to Woleai and Ulithi. The small population and the absence of any neighboring mutually-comprehensible dialects allowed some rapid and radical changes to take place in the Yap language.

At the time of separation, Proto-Oceanic *-ia words had formed the five lenition levels, and, most importantly, the dra-

matic formation of the -ee demonstratives, which are spelt "-ea" in Yap today. So the Yap settlers took with them the words ea, nea and ngea (beside nia and nya -> nga), rea, and kea, and may have innovated bea. They may (or may not) have lacked a *tea form, which may (or may not) show that POC was late in developing *tia and leniting it. Note the cha- forms mentioned later in this paper, which may be from *tia, avoiding the regular change to *tea.

It was in isolation from other Oceanic speakers that the Yap language, by grammaticalization and reanalysis, developed the greatly altered and specialized uses of the words ea, nea, ngea, rea, kea, and bea. They also developed preposition riy/roo from the POC casemarked demonstrative *ria, and continued with the lenition and grammaticalization of forms from POC *nia. They had PCM ko in the same form as Central Pacific ko but with uses more like Central Pacific and Oceanic ki.

In or around their new home, the Yap speakers encountered speakers of Palau or Chamorro or both, and conquered them. The lower castes on Yap may descend from such conquered peoples.

After Ulithi was conquered and settled by (nuclear) Micronesian speakers, the Yap people conquered Ulithi (or reconquered it) without resettling it. That explains why the people of Yap today regard the Ulithians as members of the lowest castes of Yap.

Evidence examined in this study suggests that Yap is an Oceanic language, though an odd one. Robert Blust, perhaps the leading expert on PAN, is inclined to agree (oral communication).

The sources used for this study were Yapese Reference Grammar (1977) and Yapese Dictionary (1979), both by John Thayer Jensen. My only two days of field work in Yap were the 4th and 5th of June, 1963, when my informant was a member of the fifth of the nine castes.

The present essay is part of an ongoing investigation centering on the ancient casemarking of AN. The prepositions and casemarkers (PCMs), in AN as in other families, tend to be fairly conservative, persisting for thousands of years. All four of Yap's prepositions have cognates throughout the AN family.

1. Prepositions / Casemarkers

The central focus of my research now is the study of true prepositions and casemarkers (PCMs) throughout the Austronesian (AN) language family. Excluded are preposition-like words derived fairly recently from locative nouns, from possession-classifying nouns (such as o̲ and a̲ in Polynesian), or from serial verbs. The goal is to trace the diachronic development of PCMs from Proto Austronesian (PAN) down. Almost all the attested forms are monosyllabic, even monomoraic, of CV form. There is a surprising degree of consistency and conservation of such particles throughout the AN family.

These monosyllables all begin with members of a small set of initial consonants: zero, n̲, k̲, s̲, t̲, and (not in Formosa) d̲. Though PCMs are notorious for having multiple meanings and for shifting meaning, each of these initials has kept an old core meaning to a remarkable degree. Those with zero initial serve as the unmarked Case 1, often called nominative, absolutive, subject, or focus. There is also a locative with initial zero. Those with initial n̲- (Case 2) are typically genitive ("of"), and in many languages serve also as the marked agent, the Doer that is not the syntactic subject, in constructions called passive or ergative. The particles with initial k̲, t̲, d̲, and s̲ may all have originated as allatives ("to", "toward"), and we'll call them Case 3. Also note s̲i, Case 1 for persons in some languages. The Case 3 forms compete with one another in various languages, and survive in niches. In Tagalog, for example, the official language of the Philippines, for Case 3, impersonal nouns are marked with s̲a, personal names with k̲a̲y̲, personal pronouns with k̲a̲n̲, and demonstrative pronouns with d̲(i̲)-.

Yap prepositions show four initials: zero, n̲, k̲, and r̲ < *d̲.

The vowels of the PCMs are most commonly -i̲, and next most commonly -a̲. One Oceanic language, Arosi on San Cristobal Island in the Southeast Solomons (Fox, 1978), shows all six initials with the -i̲ vowel, if we accept *t̲i̲ merging into either *i̲ or *s̲i̲, a sporadic form of s̲a. Some Formosan languages show PCMs in -a̲ for impersonal nouns and -i̲ for personal nouns and perhaps personal and demonstrative pronouns. For such pronouns, in Phil-

ippine as well as Formosan languages, the -i PCMs meld with the pronouns (especially those from PAN *-iya, third person and demonstrative pronoun) to form left-sided case inflections.

In many Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, and more so in Oceanic, the distinction between impersonal -a and personal -i forms breaks down, and -i tends to be used for both. That's true of Arosi, where all five -i forms occur and all the -a PCMs are lost.

In Paiwan, a Formosan language (Ferrell, 1982), we find three n- forms glossed "of": nu, ni (for persons only), and na or nua (for things only); and na or nua is explained as nu + a. Likewise, in Chamorro, a (possibly) Western MP language (Topping, 1973, 3), the n- PCM occurs as nu, nu i, and ni, and Topping says clearly (and correctly) that ni is a contraction of nu i. So it's clear that the oldest identifiable PAN genitive PCM was nu, and it was contracted later with a (surely an article for non- persons) and i (surely an article for persons). Blust, who earlier surmised the same thing, confirms this (personal communication). It is possible that the same process occurred and caused the vowel alternations with other initial consonants.

Yap has only four prepositions, and they show four of the five classical initials, though with differing vowels, as follows:

PAN / PMP	Intermediate	Attested Yap
"n" case 2:		
*nu + i + *iya	*nia > *nya	nga "to, for"
"k" case 3 allative:		
*ku + *a/*i	*kua/*ku	ko "for"
"d" case 3 locative:		
*du + *a/*i	*dua/*di	roo/riy "of, from, for"
zero case 3 locative:		
*u (+ *i ?)	*u	u "at, from"

PMP *d appears as *r in Proto Oceanic (POC) and also in some Western MP languages that are not Oceanic. Yap is a nominative-accusative language, with zero casemarking for nominative and accusative. Person and number of subject or object is shown by suffixes on verbs, in a system not shared by other AN languages. The basic order is VSO for the outer clause, the nouns. Yap has totally lost the "focus" system of verbal prefixes, suffixes, and infixes, so prominent in Formosan and Philippine languages, and this is one of the aspects Yap shares with the Oceanic languages. The semantic roles of the four prepositions depart from PAN a bit more in Yap than in many other AN languages.

2. Phonology

Most major words in PAN and in the conservative attested languages are: C1-V1-C2-V2-C3. Most Oceanic languages, including Fijian, Polynesian, and Tungaru (Gilbertese, the most conservative of the Micronesian languages) have lost C3 and are CVCV. Other (nuclear) Micronesian languages are further lenited to CVC. Yap shows CVC (i.e., C1-V1-C2) and in most words has lengthened the vowel; and very often has changed its quality.

Yap vowel changes are more striking than consonant changes. PAN *maCa ("eye"), mata in PMP and many Oceanic languages, appears in Yap as miit, with the expected consonant but totally unexpected vowel, found in no other language. Jensen gives many pages of instructions on synchronic ("morphophonemic") vowel changes from the synchronic underlying forms, but those underlying forms seem also to have undergone diachronic changes that have not been defined. The spellings used in his dictionary and in sentences in his grammar are the phonetic/phonemic ones and not the "underlying" forms, which are often differ severely, especially in the vowels.

Consonant correspondences are not always apparent. Ancestral initial *k appears as k or g in Yap for no apparent reason. It is not clear why initial *t in the words for father, mother, and excrement appears as t, while in the word for three it appears as d. And where several Philippine languages have ta preposition "because

of", conjunction "because", and Chamorro has sa´, Yap has chaan, "N PSD SENT ADV. Cause of, purpose of, reason of, why". Yap ch represents ancestral *R, as in nguchey, "vein, nerve, tendon", where Tagalog has ugat, Chamorro gugat, Malay urat, and Palau ngurd.

3. The "ea" vowels

The "*-ia" demonstratives and their vicissitudes

Unlike the Philippine languages, which together seem to give us a clear picture of PMP demonstratives from iya prefixed with various casemarkers, Yap is a language far down the line, and its descendants of PAN *iya are an incomplete set consisting of morphs occupying odd niches not selected for any obvious reason.

While the Philippine languages formed prefixed demonstratives and/or pn3s (such as niya) from PCMs (such as ni) and PAN iya(n), only a few, such as Ilokano, lenited them, and even then, seldom to anything but a or i. The Eastern Oceanic languages innovated a later -ee lenition grade of the -ia words. The -ee lenition applied to demonstratives, for example, after the articles had already become -a and -i. Yap has a similar set of forms that appear to be ia descendents, with a vowel that Jensen spells "ea", noting that the sound is not a diphthong but a digraph for a long lax (open) vowel that has no palatalizing influence on consonants, unlike "ee".

With the lenition to -ea, ancestral *iya appears in Yap as ea and *diya as rea. Their uses are not alike. In Philippine languages and in the hypothetical PMP, rea's ancestor, diya < di + iya, means "at it". In Oceanic languages the case-prefixed pronouns descended from iya have tended to lose their case meanings. In Malay and Indonesian, too, dia is used as third singular nominative case. Yap shares the loss of case meaning in the ancestrally casemarked demonstratives, but also makes more drastic changes in the meaning and use of the -ea forms.

The ea form is called a "noun phrase connector" and may be considered an article (Jensen, 1977, 157). It marks the left edge

of most types of noun phrases. A noun phrase (NP) normally contains also a determiner for singular, dual, or plural, and the usual word for singular is <u>rea</u>. So the <u>ia</u> and <u>ria</u> forms don't compete, but often appear together.

da-buu-g   ea   rea roowroow niie
not like my the   SG red   there
"I don't like that   (shade of) red there."
Literally, "My dislike (is) the (SG) red there."

The <u>rea</u> < *<u>ria</u> < *<u>dia</u> is also used as a left half of a compound deictic. In such words, common in many parts of AN, the left half is a neutral demonstrative, while the right half distinguishes "this here" from "that there", usually in three degrees. The example shows it with a noun between the halves:

rea   piin   neam
the (SG)   woman   there

as in Tuvalu, a typical Polynesian outlier language:

te   fafine   naa

Or Mae Polynesian:

re   fafine   na

Or Samoan:

le   faafine   naa

With such close correspondence, morpheme for morpheme, it is hard not to consider Yap Oceanic.

The *<u>iya</u> pronoun is also represented in Yap as the preverbal inner nominative pn3sg <u>i</u>.

The *<u>nia</u> pronoun has lenited differently to <u>ni</u> and is used as a relative pronoun, as in Chamorro. The same structure is used for general subordinate clauses "that", purposive infinitives, and adverbial phrases "for" (purpose, benefactive). The relative pronoun combines with <u>u</u> "at/from" making <u>nuu</u>, for which Jensen gives the example:

giirdiiq   nuu   [= ni u]   Waab
the people who   (are) at/from Yap
"the people of Yap"

The pronoun _ni_ < *nia is also a general "indefinite pronoun" glossed "somebody".

```
ka        ni          feek
past      somebody    take it
```
"it was taken, somebody took it."

The old case 2 *ni-iya demonstrative seems to have entered Yap both as POC *nia, Yap _ni_, and as POC *nya, Yap _nga_, _ngea_. The latter shows both contraction and "palatalization" as noted by Blust (1977).

The possessive pronoun suffix is -_n_ from *nia for 3sg, but -_y_ from *ia for the indefinite pronoun. These were case 2 (ergative-genitive) *ni-ia and case 1 (absolutive-nominative) *i-ia, respectively, in the old PMP case system.

The lenited form _nea_ seems to be used only in a right-half deictic, shown by Jensen (p 239), _rea piin neam_, already quoted for its left half.

That takes care of *iya, *nia, *dia. What of *kia, *tia, *sia?

Yap also has demonstratives _chaaq_ and _chaaq-neey_, evidently from *tia < *ti ± *ia. Yap's _ch_ normally descends from *R, but that ancestral phoneme is not found in demonstratives. Chamorro also shows at least one word (_cha´_, don't) in which _cha_ is from the homonymous *tia word "not". I'll use the term "Yap _ti_ break" for the change from *tia to _cha_. Yap _chi_ (POC *tiqi), noted later here, is similar.

No *tia nor *sia form was identified with certainty, though there are clues for possible *tia, which is used for the number one in some Oceanic languages such as Nguna (Schütz 1969, 66, as _tea_). Jensen (p. 156) shows _ta-_ for one. This is cognate with Geraghty's (1983, 32) grammaticalized (article to predicate nominative casemarker) _tia_ in Fijian dialects.

The *kia and *pia forms, as well as the *nya form, have been grammaticalized to tense-aspect markers, which are _ka_ "perfect", _nga_ "inceptive", and _ba_ "present", not to mention _baey_ "definite future". An example of the kia form, page 204:

```
Kea        yaen    nga    Donguch    ea     dabag
PERF-he    go      to     Donguch    the    day
```
"He has gone to Donguch today."

Jensen explains (p. 205):
Note that ka changes its pronunciation in combination with subject pronouns according to the operation of various morphophonemic rules. Ka plus gu "I" is pronounced kug. Ka plus mu "you sg" is pronounced kam. Ka plus i "he" is pronounced kea... These combinations are sometimes written as they are pronounced.

Forms in *pia are not found in languages other than Yap. An interesting feature of Yap is the finding of several function words beginning with labials: pi, plural marker; ba, indefinite article; ba, bea, present progressive tense-aspect marker (TAM); beay, definite future TAM; beay, "existential word"; beaq, someone; bi, one, non-human; fa, definite article; fa pi, those (human).

Those words are compatible with lenition from *p- plus demonstrative, but no other language has the labial series. It could be related to the preposition-like *pa- which Ross (1988, 106) reconstructed as an instrumental and locative particle in Western Melanesian languages.

The possible *pia/*bia form is grammaticalized, like the *kia form, to a TAM, merging with the inner nominative pronoun as bea (pn3sg form).

Jensen, as quoted, explains creation of kea from ka plus pronoun i by synchronic unspecified morphophonemic rules. No doubt it would be possible to do so in a synchronic generative grammar. But diachronically, what is consistent with the theory and the evidence all the way back from the Philippine languages, is that the k- PCM combined with iya or ia to a form that entered POC as *kia. Then, within POC, came the innovation of the lenition cline that included kee. These -ee forms, with their various consonantal prefixes, came down to languages throughout the Oceanic group. Yap is extremely Oceanic in having attested -ee forms with five different prefixes, written ea, ngea, rea, kea, and bea, used where the syntax calls for keeping a pronoun, element 3, after the particle; and otherwise further lenited to -a forms.

If Yap's demonstrative chaaq descended from demonstrative *tia (PMP casemarker *ti + demonstrative *ia), the change must have taken place before the lenition of *-ia to *-ea and so avoided

that vowel change. Similarly, in Arosi (Fox, 1978) and some other Cristobal-Malaita languages in the Solomons, it looks like early change of preposition *ti > *tci > si, and of demonstrative/article *tia > *tca > sa- (fossilized prefix to nouns) avoided the normal lenition of t to zero (to be discussed elsewhere).

In Yap, an infinitive phrase such as in "Help me TO DO IT" is introduced by the article i, identified as the inner nominative third singular pronoun i, which exists and is a lenition of *ia.

The pronoun ni from *niya < *ni + *iya is also used as an indefinite pronoun, glossed "one" or perhaps "somebody" or "people". Relative pronoun *ni, occurring in Chamorro as well as some Oceanic languages, is only one use of its many homologs.

It is very possible to regard the Yap ea forms as examples of the Oceanic ee lenition from PAN -ia or -iya forms. A problem, however, is the fact that among unquestionably Oceanic languages such forms occur only in Eastern Oceanic languages, and, so far as we know, the Eastern Oceanic dialect developed late in the POC period and perhaps only in a band that had already migrated to the Southeast Solomons. So, relating Yap to Eastern Oceanic would be inconsistent with the scenario suggested that the Yap ancestors broke off early on the north coast of New Guinea or islands north of it.

4. Oceanic "palatal" n from *nya

A characteristic of Oceanic is the change of *nya < *ni + *ia (preposition with demonstrative) into a so-called "palatal" that later becomes a velar nasal in some Oceanic languages while merging back into dental nasal in others. The Yap preposition nga fits the pattern for the word.

5. The old and new syntax

A striking feature of Oceanic, including Yap, is its total abandonment of the Philippine ("old") syntax (sometimes considered AbErg), its three or four cases, and its complex system of prefixes, suffixes, and infixes to the verb, which assigned semantics to the cases in each sentence. Instead, Proto Oceanic has a Nom

Ac system relying heavily on (often shortened) nominative pronouns before the verb and accusative pronouns suffixed to the verb (henceforth the "new" syntax).

The new syntax of Proto Oceanic is curious in having a clause within a clause. The inner clause can stand alone as a sentence. For Yap, Jensen describes it well as follows:

"Sentences have three basic elements: the verb phrase, the subject, and the object. Verb phrases themselves have three basic elements (other than tense markers), which are the subject pronouns, the verb (or head of the verb phrase), and the object pronoun suffix. Thus verb phrases are, in a sense, miniature sentences. Both sentences and verb phrases have subjects, and both have objects. Furthermore, the head of the verb phrase (which may be a verb, an adjective, or other elements...) may be called the predicate of the verb phrase, and the verb phrase itself is called the predicate of the sentence."

Following Finney (1983), we'll designate the essential elements of the inner or basic clause as: element 3, the nominative pronoun; element 4, the predicate (verb or equivalent); and element 5, the accusative pronoun. Element 2 is the tense-aspect marker. Any nouns added to form the outer clause will be element 1 or 6. Locative and other adverbial phrases (including agent phrases in passive or ergative sentences) have a PCM as element 7 and a NP as element 8, regardless of whether the phrase is considered a complement or an adjunct.

6. Possessed Nouns and Recursive Prepositional Phrases

In Fijian, but not most Polynesian languages, the supplemental addition of nouns (as if an afterthought to clarify ambiguity) occurs also for possessors. The nouns are not preceded by genitive prepositions. Milner (1967) calls this construction "Their custom, the Fijians". Diachronically, the possessive pronoun "their" comes from a pair of morphemes: "of them". So we'll consider it "Custom of them, the Fijians". It is interesting to see that the same occurs in Yap, where Jensen confusingly calls it the "construct construction" (p. 187). His example (with my hyphens and glosses) is:

tafea   -n   ea   rea piin   neam
house of-her NP-marker the woman that-there

    Yap, along with Palau, has a category of possessed nouns, i.e., nouns that must have a possessor suffix derived ultimately from PAN preposition *ni ("of") + a personal pronoun. Such a suffix may be lenited (in Palau, Yap, and Oceanic languages) to a single phoneme, such as first person singular -k "my" from *ni-aku, or third person singular -n "his, her, its" from *ni-ia. These are genitive PCM ni plus personal pronouns. Palau distinguishes three classes of nouns: those in which the suffix is disallowed, is optional, or is required even when the pronoun possessor is to be further specified by a noun.

    Many AN languages, including Yap and Oceanic, resemble English in making heavy use of the "on top of" construction, in which a genitive PP is created recursively under a locative PP:

A   B   C   D
on   top   of   (it, the box, etc.)

In this construction, A+B is a locative PP, B is a locative noun, and C+D is a genitive PP hanging from B. Yap uses both prepositions u and nga for the A slot regardless of the type of word used in the B slot. The preposition in slot C is ko if a noun follows, but when B is a possessed noun, the C+D phrase consists of the n- preposition merged with a pronoun, and the whole C+D phrase is severely contracted, often to a single phoneme. For first person singular the C+D phrase contracts earlier *ni+aku to -g ("of me"), seldom followed by a noun. For third person the C+D phrase contracts earlier *ni+iya to -n ("of it, of him, or her"), often followed by a noun in apposition.

    Yap is curious in having two classes of locative nouns for the B slot (requiring a difference in syntax): class 2 locative nouns which are obligatorily possessed by pronoun suffixes, and class 1 locative nouns for which such suffixes are forbidden. Some concepts have nouns in each class. The concept "top" has class 1 locative noun laeng/laang (typically lunga in Oceanic languages), and class 2 locative noun dakea-n. (Jensen inappropriately calls the class 1 locative words [such as m'oon in the following ex-

ample] "adverbs"; but the object of a preposition must be a NP.)
Here is an example from Jensen, p. 236, using a class 1 word in
slot B:

A	B	C	D	
u	m´oon	ko	waey	roo-g
in	front	of	basket	of me

"in front of my basket"

On the same page Jensen shows the construction used for
class 2:

A	B	C	D	noun copy of D	
u	laanggii	-n		ea waey	roo-g
in	inside	of	it	the basket	of me

"inside of my basket"
(Since Jensen chooses to make it "my" basket, not "the" basket,
he actually gives us three PP, but ignore the final roo-g "of me".)

All this looks complicated, and seems to have no logic to it.
The key to seeing it as simple and logical is to see each word in
terms of its ancestry.

With a class 1 locative noun, m´oon, we fill the genitive slot
C with ko "of". Even with the ABCD diagram, it may not be
obvious that the two syntactic structures correspond with each
other, point to point. With class 2, the obligatorily possessed loca-
tive noun laangii, the -n suffix fills both slot C and slot D. That's
a lot for one phoneme to do. The key is to remember that
diachronically the -n represents slot C preposition ni, "of", plus
slot D pronoun ia, "it". Think of n as ni + ia, shrunken down to a
single phoneme by three steps of lenition.

Now be aware that the class 2 system does everything first in
pronouns, and then can add a noun in apposition with the pro-
noun, thus copying slot D. "Custom of them, the Fijians." Why
not copy the whole phrase CD, preposition as well as noun? That
would be: "Custom of them, of the Fijians". The danger is that it
could be misinterpreted as not an apposition of a synonymous
phrase but an embedding of a new PP. So the safer procedure is
to copy only the NP, not the whole PP.

What is interesting here is that in order to make sense of the
synchronic process it is necessary to refer to the diachronic, by

decomposing the suffix -n to its two-word ancestry, ni ia, "of it". That makes a pronoun, to which a noun can be added in apposition (as if an afterthought). This analysis is based on Jensen's text, but it is not Jensen's belief. Jensen is stronger in synchronic phonology than in syntax.

7. List of Oceanic-like characteristics in Yap

In summary, we have found the following Oceanic-like characteristics in Yap, and have given discussions of some of them:

• Total loss of the old Formosan and Philippine syntax, with its three or four clearly defined cases and its complex system of affixes on verbs.

• Reflection of POC *d as r.

• Lenition clines from the prefixed -ia demonstratives, with the innovation of lenitions to -ee, which is written -ea in Yap.

• Assignment of the maa- prefix to verbs as resultative; no longer used as a Philippine-type verbal affix.

• Presence of tense-aspect markers, nearly all beginning with the same consonants that prefix the -ia demonstratives, which are n-, r-, k-, t-, as well as zero. (But Yap adds p- and b-.)

• Presence of the singular diminutive article chi, reconstructed in Oceanic as ti'i by Pawley (1966) and found in West Futuna by Dougherty (1983, 23, 496, 510).

• Full adoption of the POC syntax, including:

All declarative main clauses consist of at least four elements, as follows:

2. tense-aspect marker (TAM), which may be zero.

3. inner nominative pronoun.

4. verb.

5. (if transitive) inner accusative pronoun.

The elements come in that order, which is SVO, except that if the tense-aspect marker is zero, the verb comes first, with the inner nominative pronoun suffixed to it.

Nouns, other NP, and adverbial PP, are outside the inner clause. If a noun is used as nominative subject or accusative object, it does not replace the inner pronoun,

but supplements it, in apposition to it. Position of the nouns, before the inner clause as element 1, or after it as element 6, is of no great importance.

Incorporated object construction with a noun replacing the suffixed object pronoun as element 5 and verb left in its "intransitive" form.

The conclusion is that Yap shows convincing evidence of being an Oceanic language.

8. Epilog

While presenting a related paper at the 7th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics in August, 1994, I alluded to the present paper, which was in preparation, mentioning the tentative conclusion that Yap is Oceanic, and the scenario of direct migration. Malcolm Ross commented that Yap's Oceanic status was unclear, and discussed the matter with me briefly. He was stimulated to launch his own investigation, which he presented in July, 1995, at the Second International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics (SICOL). In it, he confirmed my conclusion and related Yap closely to a specific Oceanic subgroup in a location that supports my scenario that the Yap ancestors separated early from the main Oceanic body on the north coast of New Guinea or islands north of it, and migrated directly north to Yap. Ross's paper can be expected to appear in the Proceedings of SICOL.

Some other matters remain open. (1) The Yap lenition of the ancestral -ia third person/demonstrative pronouns/articles to -ea (lax /ee/), is in common with Central Pacific and Micronesian. Since Yap does not appear to belong to the Eastern Oceanic group, it is puzzling to find this change shared only with some Eastern Oceanic languages. Perhaps this change in Yap is coincidental, and is part of the set of striking vowel changes in pre-Yap whose diachronic course is yet to be traced. (2) The Yap ti break may be related to the "theta accretion" of the Cristobal-Malaita group (Lichtenberk, 1994).

References

Blust, Robert A., 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping: a preliminary report. *Working papers in linguistics* 9:1-15. Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Dempwolff, Otto, 1938. *Vergleichende lautlehre des austronesischen wortschatzes*. 3. Band: Austronesisches Worterverzeichnis. Beihefte zur zeitschrift fur eingeborenensprachen. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer; and Hamburg; Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co.

Dougherty, Janet W. D., 1983. *West Futuna-Aniwa*. Berkeley: U. of California Pr.

Ferrell, Raleigh, 1982, *Paiwan dictionary*. *Pacific Linguistics* C-73.

Finney, Joseph C., 1983. Nanumanga verbal syntax, a study in variation, with implications for Proto-Polynesian. *J. Polynesian Society* 92:107-115.

Fox, Charles E., 1978. *Arosi dictionary*. *Pacific Linguistics* C-57. Canberra: Australian National Univ.

Geraghty, Paul, 1983. *The history of the Fijian languages*. Oceanic *Linguistics* Special Publication 19. Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Jensen, John Thayer, 1977. *Yapese reference grammar*. Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Jensen, John Thayer, 1979. *Yapese dictionary*. Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Josephs, Lewis S., 1990. *New Palauan-English dictionary*. Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek, 1994. Reconstructing heterogeneity. *Oceanic Linguistics* 33,1:1-36.

Milner, George B., 1967. *Fijian Grammar*, second edition. Suva, Fiji Government Printing Department.

Pawley, Andrew K., 1966 . Polynesian languages: a subgrouping based on shared innovations in morphology. *J. Polynesian Soc.* 75:1:39-64.

Rau, Der-Hwa Victoria, 1992. *A grammar of Atayal*. Taipei: Crane.

Ross, Malcolm, 1988. *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia. Pacific Linguistics* C-98. Canberra: Australian National University.

Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes, 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar.* Berkeley, U. of California Pr.

Schütz, Albert J., 1969. *Nguna grammar.* Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Topping, Donald M., 1973. *Chamorro reference grammar.* Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.

Topping, Donald M. et al., 1975. *Chamorro-English dictionary.* Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Pr.