LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS IN MELANESIA

Benefactive constructions:
A comparative study of the Huon Peninsula languages

Edgar Suter
University of Cologne
esut@sunrise.ch

==

Benefactive constructions:

A comparative study of the Huon Peninsula languages

Edgar Suter
University of Cologne
esut@sunrise.ch

Abstract

There are three different benefactive constructions in the Huon Peninsula family of Papuan languages. I study the distribution of the three constructions and reconstruct the grammatical morphemes expressing benefaction for various nodes of the family tree. It is shown that benefactive auxiliaries are the oldest construction and that the benefactive case is a rather recent innovation. Benefactive pronouns are a unique innovation of the geographically separate language Kovai. All three constructions have other functions besides benefaction. I describe those functions with equal care and analyze their diachronic relationship to benefaction. Benefactive auxiliaries may extend their function to object indexation. The benefactive case derives from a case that combines genitive and causal functions. The Kovai benefactive pronoun gave rise to purposive subordinate clauses. The study concludes with some thoughts on grammatical change and grammaticalization.

Keywords: comparative syntax; morphological reconstruction; grammatical change; grammaticalization; Papuan languages; benefactive

1 Introduction[1]

When we do things, we often do them for other people. In a market economy, it is not always clear who benefits from our work. We only know that there are beneficiaries who are willing to pay. In a traditional Melanesian village, nobody got money for their work. Rather, there were mutual obligations. People knew who they had worked for and who was working for them. In the words of Bernard Narokobi (1983: 13), "Giving and taking is an integral part of Melanesian society. Co-operation and mutual support, especially in times of need and crisis, are part of our

---

==

living experience. Confrontation and competition are kept to a minimum." In a face-to-face community it is possible to keep track of each other's needs. That is no longer possible in a large-scale society.

Despite such differences between societies, and between the different spheres of economic activity that co-exist in contemporary Melanesia, doing things for others is a cultural universal. In language, it finds expression in benefactive constructions. There is a bewildering variety of benefactive constructions in the languages of the world (Zúñiga 2010). What they have in common is that they relate a benefactor to a beneficiary. The beneficiary is introduced as an additional participant into a clause whose subject is the benefactor. Zúñiga and Kittilä (2010: 2) characterize it as follows: "The beneficiary is a participant that is advantageously affected by an event without being its obligatory participant (either agent or primary target, i.e. patient). Since normally only animate participants are capable of making use of the benefit bestowed upon them, beneficiaries are typically animate."

Within the Huon Peninsula language family, three different benefactive constructions can be found. They are illustrated in (1) to (3). The Kâte example (1) shows the benefactive auxiliary *-jale* 'for them' (cf. the object-inflected verb form *jale* 'give them') suffixed to the verb *hafe* 'tie' that is the head of the clause. In the Mesem example (2) we see the benefactive case enclitic *-gə* attached to the personal pronoun *gə̃* 'you'. The pronominal form *gə̃-gə* 'for you' is a beneficiary adjunct of the verbal predicate *zəsike* 'pray'. Finally, the Kovai example (3) shows the benefactive pronoun *inog* 'for you' that also serves as a beneficiary adjunct in its clause. The three constructions are, then, a benefactive auxiliary verb (1), a case enclitic that can have benefactive function (2), and a kind of benefactive personal pronoun (3).

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

1   *Saʔ   hafe-jale-po.*
     fence   tie-3PL:BEN-F.PST:1SG
     'I made a fence for them.'
     (Pilhofer 1933: 42)

Mesem (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

2   *Nĩ   gə̃-gə   zəsike-juŋ.*
     1PL   2SG-BEN   pray-N.PST:1PL
     'We prayed for you.'
     (Vanaria and Vanaria 1996: 35)

==
Kovai (Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

3   *In-og*   *t-em.*

    BEN-2SG:POSS take-NON.PST:2SG

    'Take some for yourself.'

    (Brown 1992: 34)

The topic of this paper is the history of the three benefactive constructions introduced in (1) to (3). For this purpose, I compare the Huon Peninsula languages with each other and study the geographical and genealogical distribution of the constructions. Morphological reconstructions have already been published in Suter (2018). I start out from them and complement them with a deeper diachronic analysis of the morphemes used in benefactive constructions. The syntax of benefaction is described in as much detail as the often fragmentary data permits. I highlight syntactic differences between languages using the same type of benefactive construction and try to interpret them diachronically. All morphemes used in benefactive constructions have other functions besides expressing benefaction. I give those functions equal attention and try to bring them into a chronological order with the benefactive function. In the discussion sections, some methodological and theoretical conclusions are drawn from the findings of this study. Throughout the paper, IPA transcription is used.

The Huon Peninsula languages are spoken in Morobe Province in the northeast of Papua New Guinea. They cover the whole Huon Peninsula with the exception of strips of land along the coast where Oceanic Austronesian languages are spoken. Their nearest relatives are the languages spoken in the adjacent Finisterre Range reaching into Madang Province. The genealogical unity of the Finisterre-Huon languages was recognized by Kenneth McElhanon (1970a). The standard comparative treatment is McElhanon (1973). The Finisterre-Huon stock with upwards of 60 member languages is one of the largest Papuan language families that have been safely established so far. It has been included in all versions of the Trans-New Guinea phylum.

At present count, there are 21 Huon Peninsula languages. They are grouped in two first-order subfamilies and four second-order subfamilies (see Table 1). The Eastern Huon family covers, as the name says, the eastern part of the Huon Peninsula up to the coast; the Western Huon family covers the interior some way into the Saruwaged Range. The Kalasa family comprises two languages spoken on the northeastern coast of the peninsula. The Trans-Vitiaz family has two geographically separated subfamilies. One of them is the Kovai language, spoken on Umboi Island on the other side of the Vitiaz Strait at some distance from the New

==
Guinea mainland. The other is the Huon Tip family, spoken in the easternmost part of the Huon Peninsula. The two Western Huon subfamilies cover a larger area than the Eastern Huon family. The Rawlinson family is situated on both sides of the Rawlinson Range in the southern half of the peninsula. The Cromwell family lies north of the Cromwell Mountains and is separated from the north coast by a narrow band of Oceanic Autronesian languages.

Table 1:   **Classification of the Huon Peninsula languages**
                      (Suter 2018: 5)

Huon Peninsula (HP) family
    Eastern Huon (EH) family
        Kalasa family
            Sialum, Ono
        Trans-Vitiaz family
            Kovai
        Huon Tip family
            Sene, Migabac, Momare, Kâte, Mape
    Western Huon (WH) family
        Rawlinson family
            Pindiu family
                Dedua, Mongi, Tobo, Borong, Somba-Siawari
            Sankwep family
                Mesem, Nabak
        Cromwell family
            Dallman family
                Nomu, Kinalaknga, Kumukio
            Kabwum family
                Komba, Selepet, Timbe

This article is structured as follows. Section 1 introduces the Huon Peninsula language family as well as the topic and the goals of this study. In Section 2, benefactive auxiliaries and object indexing constructions that derive from them are surveyed. Section 3 is a diachronic analysis of the descriptive facts presented in Section 2. Section 4 is devoted to the genitive-causal case. The different functions of this case are described, including, in some languages,

===

the benefactive function. In Section 5, the benefactive pronouns of Kovai are introduced. Section 6 is a diachronic analysis of the grammatical constructions presented in Sections 4 and 5. In Section 7, the results of this study are summarized and some conclusions are drawn.

2 Benefactive auxiliary verbs

All Huon Peninsula languages, with the exception of Kovai (see Section 5), have a benefactive construction in which an auxiliary verb follows the lexical verb that has a beneficiary. The auxiliary verb indexes the person and the number of the beneficiary. It is one of the object verbs (Section 2.1) of a language. In two of the languages the benefactive auxiliary is connected to the lexical verb through clause chaining (Section 2.2), in most other languages the auxiliary has become a suffix attached to the lexical verb (Section 2.3). In Section 2.4 we cast a glance on the expression of malefaction and in Section 2.5 the divergent benefactive construction of the Sankwep subfamily languages is presented. Section 2.6 summarizes the etymological affiliations of the benefactive auxiliaries of the Huon Peninsula languages. In Section 2.7 the function of designated object verbs to serve as object indexes is briefly introduced. Then we study the use of benefactive auxiliaries as object indexes in the Huon Tip subfamily (Section 2.8) and in the Western Huon subfamily (Section 2.9).

2.1 Object verbs

For the core syntactic relations subject and object there is only one case marker in the Huon Peninsula languages, an optional ergative that combines case marking and information structure (Suter 2010). The optional ergative frequently occurs on transitive subjects and occasionally on intransitive subjects. Object noun phrases are generally unmarked. Final verbs and different subject medial verbs are obligatorily inflected for person and number of the subject. For the object relation there are two different coding patterns on the verb. There is a closed class of verbs that take pronominal object prefixes. Following Pilhofer (1933) I call this type of verb "object verbs". There are transitive as well as ditransitive object verbs and object inflection on them follows a secundative alignment pattern (Haspelmath 2015), i.e. in ditransitive verbs with two objects it is the object with a human referent that is indexed. Verbs that cannot take pronominal object prefixes are inflected differently. They are suffixed with a designated object verb which loses its lexical meaning in this construction and serves as an object person-number index (see Section 2.7).

Object verbs are a feature not only of the Huon Peninsula languages but also of the related Finisterre languages and further language families generally assigned to the Trans-New

===

Guinea phylum (Suter 2012, Windschuttel 2018). The individual Huon Peninsula languages have between a single and two dozen object verbs, only Kovai lacks them altogether. The Eastern Huon (EH) language Ono and the Western Huon (WH) language Somba have rich sets of object verbs; 14 of them have been attested for Ono and 20 for Somba. Table 2 presents the object person-number forms of the verbs with the meanings 'give' and 'hit' in the two languages. The object verbs with the meaning 'hit' in Ono and Somba are cognate with each other, the object verbs with the meaning 'give' are not. Suppletion is sometimes encountered in object verbs, and Ono excels in this respect. The verb 'give' has three different roots in Ono: -*in* in the first and the second person singular, *man* in the third person singular, and *-pon* (dual) and *-bon* (plural) in all non-singular forms. The consonant alternation between *p* and *b* in the non-singular forms marks the opposition between dual and plural number. Therefore, the alternating consonant is a part of the pronominal prefix. But the alternating consonant is also a part of the verb root, as a comparison with the dual and plural forms of the verb 'hit' shows. The consonants *p* and *b* thus belong both to the prefix and to the root. This is a sign of fusion, which is often found in object verbs, particularly in the Eastern Huon subfamily.

Table 2:   **The forms of the object verbs 'give' and 'hit' in Ono and Somba**

(Phinnemore and Phinnemore 1985: 96; Olkkonen and Olkkonen 2007,

s.v. *waŋgiza*, *qeza*)

	Ono (EH)		Somba (WH)	
gloss	'give'	'hit'	'give'	'hit'
1SG:OBJ	nin	neku	niŋgi	nuŋgu
2SG:OBJ	gin	geku	giɣi	guɣu
3SG:OBJ	man	gbe	waŋgi	kʷe
1DU:OBJ	ŋepon	ŋetku	netki	netku
2DU:OBJ	ŋipon	ŋitku	etki	etku
3DU:OBJ	epon	etku	etki	etku
1PL:OBJ	ŋebon	ŋengu	neŋgi	neŋgu
2PL:OBJ	ŋibon	ŋingu	eŋgi	eŋgu
3PL:OBJ	ebon	engu	eŋgi	eŋgu

All object verbs can be used as main verbs, some of them also have grammatical uses. The Ono and Somba verbs meaning 'give', for instance, can serve as benefactive auxiliaries

==

(see Section 2.2). Somba *niŋgi* 'give'[2] can, in addition, be used to index object referents (see Section 2.9). When object verbs are put to grammatical use their lexical meaning is attenuated or lost. The Ono and Somba verbs meaning 'hit' have no grammatical uses. They are purely lexical items.

2.2 Chained benefactive constructions

In Ono and in Somba there are clause chaining constructions involving the object verb 'give' that introduce a beneficiary into the clause. The verb 'give' follows another verb in a clause chain and serves as a benefactive auxiliary. In (4) Ono *nin* 'give' is used as a main verb with its literal meaning. The verb is ditransitive and governs a recipient (*na* 'me') and a theme (*ŋara* 'food'). In (5) the same verb is used as a benefactive auxiliary. It is preceded by the verb *gbetut* 'sew' in same subject medial verb form. The auxiliary *nin* raises the number of participants of the transitive verb *gbetut* 'sew' from two to three, introducing a beneficiary. It indexes the person and number of the beneficiary.

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

4   *Ikop*   *ŋara*   *na*   *nin-nom*   *ne-we.*
     quickly   food   1SG   1SG:OBJ.give-2SG:DS   eat-IMP:1SG
     'Give me food to eat quickly.'
     (Phinnemore and Phinnemore 1985: 43)

5   *Na-ŋane*   *takot*   *[gbetur-e*   *nin-nom].*
     1SG-GEN   shirt   sew-SS   1SG:OBJ.give-IMP:2SG
     'Sew my dress for me.'
     (Phinnemore and Phinnemore 1985: 53)

In the benefactive construction *gbetur-e nin-nom* 'sew for me' the two verbs are connected by the same subject medial verb suffix *-e ~ -Ø* SS. The allomorph *-e* occurs after verbs ending in a consonant, the allomorph *-Ø* after verbs ending in a vowel (P. Phinnemore 1990: 11). In other words, syntactically the two verbs form a clause chain. Semantically, however, they are a unit. There is only one lexeme in this chained unit, the benefactive auxiliary adds grammatical information.

---

[2] I use the first person singular form as citation form for object verbs.

==

Somba has a similar benefactive construction making use of the object verb *niŋgi* 'give'. In (6) we see two forms of this verb used as main verbs, to wit *niŋgi* 'give me' and *giɣi* 'give you'. The benefactive construction in (7) exceptionally consists of three verbs because the lexical unit that expresses the meaning 'sew' is a collocation of two verbs, *u* '?' and *me* 'make'. Both these verbs carry the suffix *-m,* called an infinitive by Olkkonen and Olkkonen (1983: 18-19). The suffix *-m* occurs after vowels and has an allomorph *-Ø* after verbs ending in a consonant. It is in all likelihood cognate with the Komba and the Selepet same subject medial verb suffixes *-m ~ -Ø* SS and *-m ~ -mɔ* SS, respectively. Like the Ono construction discussed above, the Somba benefactive construction must have started out as a regular clause chaining construction. Then the range of uses of the former same subject suffix *-m ~ -Ø* was narrowed so that now it is only extant in three constructions: in benefactive constructions, in causative constructions, and in completive constructions (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1985: 33-35). In free syntactic use *-m ~ -Ø* was replaced by the new same subject suffix *-ba ~ -a ~ -da.*

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

6   *Sou   kun   niŋgi-get-ka   giɣi-mam.*
    knife   another   1SG:OBJ.give-3PL-DS   2SG:OBJ.give-FUT:1SG
    'If I receive another knife, I'll give it to you.'
    (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 2007, s.v. *waŋgiza*)

7   *Opo   [u-m   me-m   niŋgi-tsal].*
    cloth   sew-INF   make-INF   1SG:OBJ.give-PRS:1SG
    'I sew clothes for myself.'
    (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 38)

The Ono benefactive construction can be ambiguous, as the clause chain in (8) shows. The chain is made up of five verb forms, three same subject medial verbs, one different subject medial verb, and a final verb. The subchain *mir-e man-gi* cook-SS give.him-3SG:DS can be read as consisting of two main verbs and must then be translated as 'she cooked it and gave it to him' as in (8). As Phinnemore (1988: 19) herself noted, however, it would be equally possible to give the second of those verbs the reading of a benefactive auxiliary so that a proper translation would be 'she cooked it for him'. Similar ambiguity can be observed in Somba. Consider the clause chain made up of six verbs in (9). Again, it is the subchain *taweŋ oɣo-ba niŋgi-i-ga* taro cook-SS give.me-3SG-DS that appears to be ambiguous. The two verbs are

===

connected by the productive same subject medial verb suffix *-ba* SS, hence a reading as two main verbs is certainly possible. But the Olkkonens do not translate the passage as 'she cooked taro and gave it to me' but rather offer the translation 'to cook taro for me', i.e. they read the second verb as a benefactive auxiliary. Apparently, the synchronically productive same subject suffix *-ba ~ -a ~ -da* SS can substitute for the fossilized same subject suffix *-m ~ -Ø* in benefactive constructions. Presumably, the subchain in question in (9) can for this reason also be interpreted as a benefactive construction.

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

8	*Ŋara*	*ma*	*sari*	*mir-e*	*man-gi*		*n-ike.*
	food	take.SS	come.SS	cook-SS	3SG:OBJ.give-3SG:DS		eat-N.PST:3SG

'She brought and cooked food, and gave it to him to eat.'
(P. Phinnemore 1988: 119)

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

9	*Ka-ba*	*nam-naŋ-gə*	*dzi-al-ga*	*taweŋ*	*oyo-ba*
	come-SS	mother-1SG:POSS-CSL	say-1SG-DS	taro	cook-SS

	niŋgi-i-ga	*ne-mbaələw-ak-a*		*kunbuk*	*an-al.*
	1SG:OBJ.give-3SG-DS	eat-SS	good-become-SS	again	go-PST.1SG

'At home I asked my mother to cook taro for me. As I ate, I felt good and went again.'
(Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1985, text 6)

In contradistinction to many other languages for which benefactive constructions with an auxiliary verb have been described, the benefactive constructions of Ono and Somba are not serial verb constructions. The lexical verb of the construction carries a same subject medial verb suffix. In Ono it is the productive suffix, in Somba it is a fossilized version with a limited range of uses. We find instances of ambiguity in both languages. The combination of a lexical verb and 'give' can either be interpreted as regular clause chaining with both verbs having their lexical meaning or as a benefactive construction in which the verb 'give' has the grammatical function of a benefactive marker.

==

2.3 Suffixed benefactive auxiliaries

Ono and Somba are the only well-documented Huon Peninsula languages with a chained benefactive construction (Section 2.2). Sialum, Ono's nearest relative, may qualify as well, but there is not enough syntactic data to be certain. Somba stands alone among its nearest relatives. The remaining four Pindiu languages do not have a benefactive construction involving clause chaining. Instead, in those languages the forms of the object verb 'give' are suffixed to the lexical verb, followed by the subject-tense endings of the lexical verb. This is the majority pattern in the Huon Peninsula family. Not only the Pindiu languages except Somba, but also the Huon Tip languages and the Kabwum languages have benefactive constructions of this type. For the Dallman languages there is no syntactic data, and the Sankwep languages are discussed in Section 2.5.

The languages in (10) through (15) have a benefactive construction that consists of one grammatical word. A form of the object verb 'give' is suffixed to another verb between the verb root and the medial or final verb inflection. In Migabac (10) the auxiliary is *nele* 'give', in Kâte (11) it is *nale* 'give' (third person singular benefactive form *-ʔne*), in Dedua (12) *neŋ* 'give' (first person plural benefactive form *-nemme*), in Mongi (13) *nəŋ* 'give' (third person singular benefactive form *-mi*), in Komba (14) *ni(ɣ)* 'give', and in Selepet (15) *niɣi* 'give' (third person singular benefactive form *-waŋgi*). In all the example sentences, the participant frame of a transitive verb is raised from two to three by the introduction of a beneficiary. Unambiguously intransitive verbs that take a benefactive auxiliary are hard to find in the data.[3] It is an open question whether the benefactive construction is restricted to transitive verbs in some languages. The linguists describing them did not have this question in mind and do not offer any statements about it.

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

10	*Ga*	*homoŋ*	*ŋani-nele-meʔ*[4]	*me*	*mijaʔ?*
	2SG	tobacco	see-1SG:BEN-N.PST:2SG	or	not

'Did you watch the tobacco for me or not?'
(McEvoy 2008: 306)

---

[3] See, however, the elicited Kâte example (89) in Section 4.6.

[4] I emended *ŋani-nele-me* to *ŋani-nele-meʔ*.

==

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

11   *Opɔ   fia-ʔne-kaʔ.*

    water   scoop-3SG:BEN-PRS:3SG

    'He scoops water for him.'

    (Pilhofer 1933: 42)

Dedua (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

12   *Je-ŋ   joaʔjoaʔ   a-nemme-u   je-goʔ   taʔ-dimbe.*

    3SG-ERG   talk   do-1PL:BEN-SEQ:3SG.DS   3SG-COM   sit-PRS:1PL

    'He talked with us when we sat with him.'

    (Ceder and Ceder 1990: 122)

Mongi (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

13   *Imu-aʔ   dimu-huʔ   wam-mi-wiŋ?*

    that-CSL   what-like   do-3SG:BEN-FUT:1PL

    'Therefore what shall we do to the one?'

    (Lee 1993: 159)

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

14   *Ekap   kwat-ni-βan.*

    leaf   do-1SG:BEN-F.FUT:2SG

    'Write a letter for/to me.'

    (Southwell 1979: 68)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

15   *Hawat jawuɔk   kɔmet-baŋgi-ŋetɔ   benŋe ɔlipŋeɔk   man-mɔ   ari*

    magic thus   plant-3SG:BEN-3PL:DS then   well   live-SS   go

    sombo ot-mɔ ...

    old   become-SS

    'They performed (planted) magic for him and then he lived well into old age …'

    (McElhanon 1970a: 332)

===

In the benefactive constructions illustrated in (10) to (15) the forms of the object verb 'give' serve as person-number indexes of the beneficiary in the clause. They do not have any obvious verbal properties, such as being able to be inflected for tense or aspect. Any tense or aspect inflections suffixed after them clearly belong to the lexical verb root that is the nucleus of the word. I use the term "auxiliary" for them only because they are the same forms as those of the object verb 'give' and because a generic term is needed for these suffixed beneficiary indexes and the indubitable benefactive auxiliaries of Ono and Somba presented in Section 2.2. But even the identity of the beneficiary indexes and the forms of the object verb 'give' has exceptions. In some languages, the forms diverge in the third person singular. Thus, in Kâte the object verb form of the third person singular is *lɔʔne* 'give him/her' whereas the beneficiary index is *-ʔne* 3SG:BEN, and Selepet has *waŋ* 'give him/her' and *-waŋgi* 3SG:BEN. This partial dissimilarity testifies to the fact that the object verb 'give' and the beneficiary indexes are perceived as two different paradigms in contemporary Kâte and Selepet. Furthermore, the benefactive constructions in (10) to (15) are not ambiguous. For none of the six languages concerned has a descriptivist pointed out the possibility of two readings, one in which the suffix is read as a beneficiary index and another in which it is read as a form of the verb 'give'. Rather, the suffix is always a beneficiary index. Verb forms with the meaning 'give' can only appear in initial position in the verb word.

2.4 Malefaction

Benefaction can be seen as having a positive or a negative effect. Usually, the benefactive event is understood to be beneficial so that the beneficiary profits from it. It is possible, however, that a benefactive event is understood to be detrimental to the beneficiary. We can then speak of malefaction rather than benefaction. Benefactive constructions with a malefactive interpretation are scarce in the data for the Huon Peninsula languages. But the following two examples (16) and (17) from Migabac and Selepet are clear cases.

In the story from which (16) is taken a man hangs up a piece of tobacco next to a fire so that it can dry. He then asks his son to watch the tobacco before he goes on an errand. In the free translation by McEvoy both benefactive constructions in this passage are passed over. A more literal translation is: "You must watch it for me. For if after a while the wind throws it into the fire, it will burn on me." The benefactive verb form *lobe-nele-daiʔ* 'it will burn on me' describes an undesirable outcome. In the Selepet example (17), too, the free translation passes over the benefactive construction. A more literal translation is: "Because he had taken a woman from him they used to fight." The beneficiary of the benefactive verb form *me-waŋgi-mu* 'he

==

took her from him' is adversely affected by the action. (16) and (17) are clear examples of benefactive constructions with a malefactive sense.

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

16   *ŋani-nele-dameʔ,*   *ga-ʔgu*   *gbeloŋ ba*   *wiʔ-ke-me*
      see-1SG:BEN-HORT:2SG   be-DUR.SS   wind   take   throw-3SG:OBJ-SEQ:3SG.DS

      daʔ-ka   *lobe-nele-daiʔ,*   *ileʔ.*
      fire-LOC   cook-1SG:BEN-HORT:3SG   therefore
      'You must watch it. Make sure the wind does not throw it into the fire and burn it.'
      (McEvoy 2008: 304)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

17   *Imbi*   *me-waŋgi-mu*   *jaŋak*   *ayo-mini-wi.*
      woman   take-3SG:BEN-3SG:DS therefore   fight-HAB-F.PST:3PL
      'Because (a man) stole a woman they used to fight.'
      (McElhanon 1970a: 337)

There are languages that have a special malefactive construction, separate from the benefactive construction (Zúñiga 2010: 280-300). That does not appear to be the case for the Huon Peninsula languages. I am not aware of a dedicated malefactive construction in any of the well-documented languages. Rather, the regular benefactive construction can adopt a malefactive interpretation if the context suggests that the beneficiary is negatively affected by the event.

2.5 The benefactive auxiliary verb *ne* 'leave' in Nabak

In his study of the GIVE event in Papuan languages Reesink (2013: 248-251) found nine languages, among them Selepet, that use the verb 'give' as a benefactive auxiliary. In addition, he found two languages that use a verb meaning 'leave' as a benefactive auxiliary, namely Hua (Gorokan family) and Nabak. In fact, the two Sankwep languages Mesem and Nabak stand out in the Huon Peninsula family as the only languages not using the verb 'give' as a benefactive auxiliary. Instead, they have a benefactive auxiliary which means 'leave' when used as a main verb. This is illustrated with examples (18) and (19) from Nabak. There are two instances of the object verb *ne* 'leave' in (18), the medial verb forms *nde-mti* 'leave us' and *inde-mti* 'leave

===

them'. These forms conclude a motion sequence beginning with the verb *ti* 'take sb, pick sb up'. In (19) the phonologically identical first person plural form *-nde* 1PL:BEN follows a verb root and serves the function of a beneficiary index.

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

18   *...*   *nda-ti-mti*   *mot*   *Helsba*   *ka-inda*
              1PL:OBJ-take-SS   ascend Heldsbach   SPEC-over.there

        nde-mti   *naman*   *kot*   *nodnaŋ*   *inda-ti-mti*
        1PL:OBJ.leave-SS   then.later   come   some   3PL:OBJ-take-SS

        met   *inde-mti ...*
        go   3PL:OBJ.leave-SS
        '[The driver] took us and went up far over there to Heldsbach. He came again and took some [more] and he went [to Heldsbach] and he left them [there].'
        (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 402f)

19   *Nin-gat*   *luanza-nde-p.*
        1PL-BEN   carry-1PL:BEN-N.PST:3SG
        'He carried [it] for us [all].'
        (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 96)

     Even though the object verb *na* 'give' is not used as a benefactive auxiliary in Nabak, it does have a grammatical use. When prefixed to another verb it indexes the object referent of that verb. An example of this can be seen in (18). The transitive verb *ti* 'take' is inflected for an object of the first person plural in the medial verb form *nda-ti-mti* 'take us'. The prefix *nda-* 1PL:OBJ is identical with the form *nda* 'give us' of the object verb *na* 'give'. Prefixation of forms of the object verb *na* 'give' as object indexes in Nabak is an innovation that may have been induced by language contact. Neighboring languages of the Erap and Uruwa subfamilies of the Finisterre family use preposed or prefixed object verbs to index object referents.

===
Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

20   *Leli-mpe-ja.*

stir-3SG:BEN-N.PST:1SG

'I stirred it for him.'

stir-3SG:OBJ.leave-N.PST:1SG

'I stirred it and left it.'

(Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 49)

Nabak benefactive constructions may be ambiguous. Consider the final verb form *leli-mpe-ja* in (20) which can mean either 'I stirred it for him' or 'I stirred it and left it'. In the first interpretation *-mpe* is understood to be a beneficiary index, in the second interpretation it is taken to be a form of the object verb *ne* 'leave'. Note that no such ambiguity has been observed in the languages that use the object verb 'give' as a suffixed benefactive auxiliary (Section 2.3). The difference between Nabak (and Mesem) and those languages appears to be that Nabak has what Bruce (1986) called "serial verb root constructions" whereas the other languages lack them. In a serial verb root construction two or more verb roots take the place of a single verb root as the nucleus of the verb word. The inflections of the verb then apply to all serialized verb roots and the roots are taken to denote a sequence of events. In the Nabak grammar by Fabian, Fabian and Waters (1998: 17) serial verb root constructions are only briefly alluded to in the chapter on stems.

2.6 Etymology of the benefactive auxiliaries

As we have seen in Section 2.2 to 2.5, all Huon Peninsula languages (with the exception of Kovai) have a head-marking benefactive construction in which an object verb takes on the grammatical function of indexing the beneficiary. The question arises whether such a benefactive construction can be reconstructed to Proto-Huon Peninsula. Table 3 summarizes the phonological form, the meaning and the etymological affiliation of the object verbs that serve as benefactive auxiliaries in the Huon Peninsula languages. Four languages have been omitted from the table owing to a lack of syntactic data: the Kalasa language Sialum and the three Dallman languages Nomu, Kinalaknga, and Kumukio.

The Eastern Huon languages all use a verb meaning 'give' as benefactive auxiliary. However, whereas the verbs in the Huon Tip family are cognate with each other, the Kalasa language Ono has a different verb. The Ono verb *nin* 'give' is etymologically unrelated to the synonymous verbs of any of the other Huon Peninsula languages. In the Western Huon family,

===

we find three different cognate sets. There is a match between Somba *niŋgi* 'give' and Proto-Kabwum *niɣi 'give'. The correspondence across the two first-order subfamilies Rawlinson and Cromwell allows us to reconstruct Proto-Western Huon *neŋgi 'give'. The two other cognate sets within the Western Huon family are innovations. The Sankwep cognate has the meaning 'leave' and is evidently not related to the Proto-Western Huon etymon meaning 'give'. The cognate reflected by Dedua, Mongi, Tobo, and Borong does not descend from Proto-Western Huon, either. There is a good chance that it is related to the Somba object verb *nəme* 'take sb, marry, have sex'. The original meaning of this Proto-Pindiu cognate must have been 'take (sb)'. The meaning then narrowed in Somba and shifted to 'give' in the other Pindiu languages.

Table 3:   **Object verbs used as benefactive auxiliaries in Huon Peninsula languages**
              (Suter 2018: 24)

EASTERN HUON				WESTERN HUON			
language	1SG:OBJ	etym.	gloss	language	1SG:OBJ	etym.	gloss
KALASA				PINDIU			
Ono	nin	1	'give'	Dedua	neŋ	3	'give'
HUON TIP				Mongi	nəŋ	3	'give'
Sene	nɔte	2	'give'	Tobo	nəm	3	'give'
Migabac	nele	2	'give'	Borong	noŋ	3	'give'
Momare	nale	2	'give'	Somba	niŋgi	4	'give'
Kâte	nale	2	'give'	SANKWEP			
Mape	nale	2	'give'	Mesem	ne	5	'leave'
				Nabak	ne	5	'leave'
				KABWUM			
				Komba	niɣ	4	'give'
				Selepet	niɣi	4	'give'
				Timbe	niŋ	4	'give'

The answer to the question of whether a benefactive auxiliary can be reconstructed for Proto-Huon Peninsula is therefore no. Such a reconstruction is only possible for Proto-Western Huon. In the Eastern Huon subfamily there are two different etyma meaning 'give' and neither of them matches the common Western Huon etymon. Of course, this finding does not exclude

===

the possibility that Proto-Huon Peninsula had a benefactive auxiliary. But we lack strong evidence in the form of a reconstructible etymon.

2.7 Object verbs serving as object indexes

In Section 2.1 we learned that the Huon Peninsula languages have a small closed class of verbs with pronominal object prefixes. The word class verb is open and has several hundred members in the Huon Peninsula languages. Accordingly, there are many more transitive verbs that can have human object referents of all three grammatical persons than just the small number of object verbs. There is another morphological construction to index the object referents of such verbs. In each language, at least one of the object verbs does double duty as a lexical item and an object index. The object indexes are usually suffixed between the verb root and the subject-tense endings of the verb, just like the beneficiary indexes. Only Mesem and Nabak have productive prefixes deriving from an object verb that serve as object indexes (see Section 2.5). Different languages choose a different object verb for the purpose of object indexation, as can be seen in (21) and (22). In Ono, it is the object verb *nan* 'see' (21a) that serves as an object index. The verb *geliŋ* 'leave' does not accept object prefixes but indexes human object referents with suffixed forms of *nan* 'see' (21b). In Kâte, the object verb *nu* 'hit' (22a) is used for object indexation. Forms of this object verb are suffixed to verbs that cannot take object prefixes, like *behe* 'leave' (22b). The lexical meaning of the object verb is lost when it does duty as a suffixed object index.

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

21a   *...*   *ge*   *mi*   *nan-nom-rap*
                 2SG   not   1SG:OBJ.see-2SG-CNTF
        'You could not have seen me.'
        (T. Phinnemore 1985: 17)

21b   *Na*   *moka*   *geliŋ-nan-e*   *ari-u ...*
        1SG   before   leave-1SG:OBJ-SS   go-3PL:DS
        'They left me a long time ago.'
        (P. Phinnemore 1988: 112)

==

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

22a   *Jaŋe   nu-ŋgopieŋ.*

        3PL   1SG:OBJ.hit-PRS:3PL

        'They beat me.'

        (Pilhofer 1933: 40)

22b   *beheʔ-nu-tso*

        leave-1SG:OBJ-INF

        'to leave me'

        (Flierl and Strauss 1977, s.v. *behezo*)

Ono and Kâte only have a single object verb that is used for indexing object referents with other verbs, to wit, Ono *nan* 'see' and Kâte *nu* 'hit'. Selepet has more than that. In his Selepet grammar, McElhanon (1972: 37-41) describes three classes of transitive verbs that differ in the choice of object verb used for object indexation. He labels these object indexing classes with the Roman numerals I, II, and III. As can be seen from the Selepet dictionary (McElhanon and McElhanon 1970), in which the object indexing class of every transitive verb is noted, class II is marginal, having only a handful of members. The bulk of transitive verbs is divided between classes I and III. The verbs of class I, like *ɔle* 'lust for' (23b), use the object verb *nek* 'see' (23a), the verbs of class III, like *ek* 'tell' (24b), use the object verb *noɣo* 'hit' (24a) as object index.

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

23a   *Gek-sap.*

        2SG:OBJ.see-N.PST:3SG

        'He saw you.'

        (McElhanon and McElhanon 1970, s.v. *nek-*)

23b   *ɔle-ɣek-san.*

        lust-2SG:OBJ.I-N.PST:1SG

        'I lust for you.'

        (McElhanon and McElhanon 1970, s.v. *âle-*)

===

24a   *Goyo-ap.*

2SG:OBJ.hit-N.PST:3SG

'He hit you.'

(McElhanon and McElhanon 1970, s.v. *n*)

24b   *ɔlɔ-ŋe*   *ki*   *ek-goyo-ap?*

who-ERG   not   tell-2SG:OBJ.III-N.PST:3SG

'Who did not tell you?'

(McElhanon 1970b:12)

The transitive verbs that belong to object indexing class I or III do not appear to have any semantic features in common. It is arbitrary under which class a particular verb falls. It is therefore appropriate to speak of conjugation classes. Selepet and its immediate relatives Komba and Timbe (see Section 2.9) as well as Nabak (see Section 2.5) and Mesem have two productive object conjugation classes. The classes are well-documented only for Selepet; in none of the other languages concerned is the object indexing class membership of transitive verbs recorded in a dictionary. The majority of Huon Peninsula languages, like Ono and Kâte, uses only one object verb for indexing the object referent with other verbs. A more detailed description of object indexation in Huon Peninsula languages can be found in Suter (2018: 9-24).

2.8 Benefactive auxiliaries as object indexes with verbs of speaking

Benefactive auxiliaries may encroach upon the functional domain of the object relation. This can be seen in the Huon Tip family as well as in most languages of the Western Huon family. In Section 2.8 the Huon Tip languages are compared with the Kalasa language Ono, in Section 2.9 we turn to the Western Huon languages.

The Huon Peninsula languages have several *verba dicendi*, verbs of speaking that are often followed by reported speech. These verbs may or may not be object verbs. In the Huon Tip languages Kâte and Migabac an interesting development can be seen when such verbs change from the object verb class to the class of regular verbs. The Kalasa language Ono boasts twice the number of object verbs that the Huon Tip language Kâte has. The verb with the meaning 'call' is an object verb in Ono (25) but a regular verb in Kâte (26). In (25) we see a ditransitive use of the Ono object verb *nora* 'call'. Its primary object is the prefixal index for the second person singular, the secondary object is the noun phrase *eŋet-ŋoŋe* 'your name'. The

==

Kâte verb *wila* 'call' in (26) is transitive, though the addressed participant is encoded by a beneficiary indexing suffix rather than an object indexing suffix.

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

25   *Eŋet-ŋone*   *gora-maike.*

      name-2SG:POSS   2SG:OBJ.call-PRS:3SG

      'He calls you by your name.'

      (Wacke 1931: 176)

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

26   *Wila-nale-kaʔ.*

      call-1SG:BEN-PRS:3SG

      'He calls me.'

      (Pilhofer 1933: 41)

Not only Ono has an object verb with the meaning 'call', but also for Proto-Western Huon such an object verb can be reconstructed (Suter 2018: 74). Although the Ono and the Proto-Western Huon verbs do not appear to be cognate, it is likely that Proto-Eastern Huon, too, had a verb with this meaning given that Proto-Eastern Huon had a set of object verbs at least as large as that of any of its descendants. While it is only likely that the Kâte verb *wila(-nale)* 'call (me)' replaces an earlier object verb, there is proof that Migabac *mi(-nele)* 'tell (me)' (28) does so. In his morphological survey of the languages of the eastern Huon Peninsula Pilhofer (1928: 221) recorded the Migabac object verb *nedo* 'tell', which is cognate with Kâte *natsa* 'tell' (27). By the time McEvoy (2008) collected his Migabac data, this object verb had become obsolete, *mi(-nele)* 'tell (me)' taking its place.

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

27   *Gatsa-mbiŋ-jaha*   *natsa-ʔ.*

      2SG:OBJ.tell-F.PST:3PL-EMPH 1SG:OBJ.tell-PRS.IMP:2SG

      'Tell me exactly what they told you.'

      (Pilhofer 1933:79)

==

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

28 *Iŋuʔ*   *mi-jele-me*   *jeŋe*   *hegile-iboŋ.*

   like.that   say-3PL:BEN-SEQ:3SG.DS   3PL   leave-F.PST:3PL

   'After he said to them like that, they left.'

   (McEvoy 2008: 278)

       Regular verbs with benefactive inflection have replaced earlier object verbs in

Kâte and Migabac. This has been shown for 'call' (26) and 'tell' (28) above. In fact, all verbs

of speaking in those Huon Tip languages are constructed with a benefactive auxiliary encoding

the addressee. This also holds for the verbs meaning 'ask' in Migabac (30) and Kâte (31). Here,

however, the synonym in Ono is not an object verb but a regular verb taking suffixal object

inflection (29).

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

29 *Don   kisi   mane   det-maile,   ea   gbeson-gan-be   det-maine?*

   speech story   one   know-PRS:1SG that   ask-2SG:OBJ-1SG:DS   know-PRS:2SG

   'That story I know, I'll ask you about it, do you know it?'

   (T. Phinnemore 1985c: 6)

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

30 *Ai-me*   *madec-ine*   *uwa-ʔno-weʔ, ...*

   do-SEQ:3SG.DS   boy-3SG:POSS ask-3SG:BEN-F.PST:3SG

   'Then he asked his boy, …'

   (McEvoy 2008: 306)

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

31 *Wio-nale-jeʔ.*

   ask-1SG:BEN-N.PST:3SG

   'He asked me.'

   (Pilhofer 1933: 41)

       In Ono, some verbs of speaking, like *nora* 'call' and *nolat* 'tell', are object verbs, others

are regular verbs. The regular verbs, like *gbeson(-nan)* 'ask (me)', encode the addressed

participant with object indexing suffixes, not with benefactive auxiliaries as Migabac and Kâte

==

do. In Ono, the function of the benefactive auxiliaries is restricted to the expression of benefaction. In the Huon Tip languages Migabac and Kâte, it has been extended to the addressees of verbs of speaking. This is undoubtedly an innovation. The Ono chained benefactive construction is both formally and functionally conservative.

Remarkably, a benefactive auxiliary with the function of indexing the addressee of a verb of speaking and a benefactive auxiliary with the function of indexing the beneficiary can be included in one and the same verb word. This is shown in the Kâte example (32), where two benefactive auxiliaries are attached to the verb *wio* 'ask'. The second of these auxiliaries, *-nale* 'for me', indexes the beneficiary of the event. The first auxiliary, *-ʔne* 'him', indexes the addressee. It lines up paradigmatically with the object indexing suffixes, as can be seen in (33). Here the verb *ŋetsiʔ* 'protect' carries an object indexing as well as a beneficiary indexing suffix. The object index *-jopa* 'them' precedes the beneficiary index *-nɔle* 'for us', just like the addressee index *-ʔne* 'him' precedes the beneficiary index *-nale* 'for me' in (32).

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

32   *ŋiʔ   wemoʔte   mi   wio-ʔne-nale-mbiŋ?*
      Man   why   not   ask-3SG:BEN-1SG:BEN-F.PST:2PL
      'Why didn't you ask the man for me?'
      (Pilhofer 1933: 127)

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

33   *ŋokaʔ-kpitseʔ   ŋetsiʔ-jopa-nɔle-ndzepieŋ.*
      Woman-head   protect-3PL:OBJ-1PL:BEN-FUT.IMP:2PL
      'You must protect the old women for us.'
      (Pilhofer 1933: 127)

For the reason given above, the addressee indexes of verbs of speaking in Migabac and Kâte had best be treated and glossed differently from the beneficiary indexes in a synchronic description, despite their homonymity. They are a second kind of object indexes.

2.9 Benefactive auxiliaries as general object indexes

In Section 2.8 we saw how object indexing suffixes sprang forth from the benefactive auxiliaries for a small group of verbs, the verbs of speaking. This innovation can be observed in well-documented Huon Tip languages. The extension of benefaction to the object relation

==

goes further in the Western Huon languages. In them, there is no semantic restriction of the verbs affected. The benefactive auxiliaries do double duty as beneficiary indexes and as general object indexes.

Examples (34) through (37) show a verb with benefactive inflection where the beneficiary index refers to the object referent of the verb. Examples from the same languages, in which the benefactive inflection expresses benefaction, were given above and are here briefly cross-referred to. In Mongi, the object verb *nəŋ* 'give' (third person plural form *ənəʔmi*) serves both as a beneficiary index (13 in Section 2.3) and as an object index (34). All transitive verbs that are not object verbs index their human object referents in this manner. In Somba, the object verb *niŋgi* 'give' (third person dual form *etki*) is used as a benefactive auxiliary (7 in Section 2.2) and to index objects (35). The indexation of human object referents on the verb is not obligatory in Somba, as it is in Mongi, Nabak, and Komba. In (35) the object indexed is exceptionally not human. It seems that the salient duality of heaven and earth invites indexing in the dual number. Note that the Somba object indexing construction, like the benefactive construction, involves clause chaining morphology (see Section 2.2); the "infinitive" suffix *-m* links the lexical verb to the object indexing verb stem carrying the subject-tense inflections. In Nabak, the object verb *ne* 'leave' (third person plural form *inde*) serves both as a beneficiary index (19 in Section 2.5) and as an object index (36). Whereas in Mongi and Somba there is only one way of indexing objects on regular verbs, in Nabak two different object verbs can perform that function. Besides suffixing forms of the object verb *ne* 'leave' there is also the option of prefixing forms of the object verb *na* 'give'. Only the former of these verbs also serves as a benefactive auxiliary. In Komba, the forms of the object verb *niɣ* 'give' (third person plural form *ziŋgʌ*) are used as beneficiary indexes (14 in Section 2.3) and as object indexes (37). *Niɣ* 'give' is not the only verb that can index human object referents; the object verb *noɣ* 'hit' also has that function.

Mongi (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

34	...	*doku*	*imi-ŋə*	*tə-ma*	*hoturu-ənəʔmi-ma*	*unu-ma*
		water	that-ERG	split-SS	cover-3PL:BEN-SS	3PL:OBJ.kill-SS

meleŋ-u ...
overturn-3SG:DS
'… the water broke through and covered and killed them and then overturned …'
(Lee 1993: 160)

==

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

35   *Anutu-nəŋ   suep   gəlme   miwikŋai-m   etki-jək.*

     God-ERG   sky   earth   create-INF   3DU:BEN-PST:3SG

     'God created the heaven and the earth.'

     (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983:125)

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

36   *Ekŋen sek-in   melesiŋ Anutu-aŋ   belak   mi-ti*

     3PL   body-3PL:POSS   whole God-ERG   nothing   do-SS

     ainzili-inde-je.

     hide-3PL:BEN-F.PST:3SG

     'God just took hold of the entire body of [each of] them and hid them.'

     (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 78)

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

37   *Kʌt-ŋʌ   ni-nziŋg-ip.*

     stone-ERG   eat-3PL:BEN-F.PST:3SG

     'The landslide swallowed them up.'

     (Southwell 1979: 90)

While in the Eastern Huon family object indexation and beneficiary indexation are expressed by different object verbs ('see' as object index and 'give' as beneficiary index in the Kalasa subfamily and 'hit' as object index and 'give' as beneficiary index in the Huon Tip subfamily) and are thus kept separate, in most Western Huon languages the two constructions have formally merged. The two exceptions are Dedua and Selepet. I argued in another paper that Dedua originally followed the pattern of the other Pindiu languages and used the object verb 'give' both as a beneficiary index and as an object index (Suter, forthcoming b). Owing to the areal influence of the Huon Tip languages, the inherited object verb 'hit' was recruited to serve as an object index and the verb 'give' lost that function. As a result, Dedua now follows the pattern of the Huon Tip languages in using 'hit' for object indexation and 'give' for beneficiary indexation.

Selepet is only an apparent exception. As we have seen in Section 2.7, Selepet has two productive object conjugation classes. However, a marginal third class did not escape

==

McElhanon's shrewd eye. A comparative look at the marginal object class II reveals that from a diachronic point of view it is, in fact, a residual class. Selepet's immediate sister languages Komba and Timbe both use the object verb 'give' to index beneficiaries as well as one of two classes of objects (see Table 4). The Selepet residual object class II also involves the object verb 'give'. One of the few verbs that McElhanon (1972: 40) assigned to this class has a counterpart in Komba. Both the verb root and the object-indexing suffix of Selepet *mambot-niɣi* 'await me' correspond to Komba *mambʌt-niɣ* 'await me'. Selepet *mambot* 'await' has alternatively been recorded as taking an object-indexing suffix from the productive class III (McElhanon and McElhanon 1970, s.v. *mabot-*). The most plausible interpretation of this variation is that the Selepet object class II is about to be abandoned and its members are being reassigned to one of the productive classes III and I.

Table 4:   Grammaticalizations of object verbs in the Kabwum languages

Proto-Kabwum	Komba	Selepet	Timbe
*niɣi 'give'	BEN, OBJ.I	BEN, (OBJ.II)	BEN, OBJ.II
*noɣo 'hit'	OBJ.II	OBJ.III	(only lexical)
*nek 'see'	(only lexical)	OBJ.I	OBJ.I

No less than three full-fledged object conjugation classes must be reconstructed to Proto-Kabwum. Selepet is the only daughter language that reflects all three of them, though the class built on the object verb *niɣi 'give' is disappearing. This class is attested in all three Kabwum languages, the other two classes are each only attested in two languages. Komba has lost the object conjugation class with *nek 'see' and Timbe has lost the object conjugation class with *noɣo 'hit'.

Dedua has recently shifted the object-indexing function from the object verb 'give' to the object verb 'hit' and Selepet is about to lose the object conjugation class built on 'give'. As a result, in Dedua and in Selepet the object verb 'give' is nowadays only productively used as a benefactive auxiliary. However, traces of the former use of 'give' as an object index can be found in both languages. We can therefore say that in all Western Huon languages beneficiary indexation is or was until recently formally conflated with object indexation.

==

3 Discussion 1: Benefactive auxiliaries

All Huon Peninsula languages with the exception of Kovai (see Section 5) use an object verb as benefactive auxiliary. Benefactive auxiliaries of this sort do not only occur in the Huon Peninsula family but are also widespread among the related languages of the Finisterre family. Nevertheless, no common object verb that served this grammatical function can be reconstructed to Proto-Huon Peninsula. In the following discussion, I focus on what can be inferred about the original benefactive auxiliary construction (Section 3.1), the genesis of benefactive auxiliaries (Section 3.2), and their functional extension to the object relation (Section 3.3).

3.1 Connection between benefactive auxiliary and lexical verb

There are formal differences between the benefactive auxiliary constructions attested in the Huon Peninsula languages. Four different constructions can be distinguished. In Ono (Section 2.2), the benefactive construction uses regular clause chaining morphology. The lexical verb preceding the benefactive auxiliary carries a same subject medial verb suffix. There is also a suffix on the lexical verb linking it to the benefactive auxiliary in Somba (Section 2.2), but it is not the productive same subject marker as in Ono. It can be shown, however, that the linking suffix descends from a same subject marker whose range of uses has been restricted to constructions consisting of a lexical verb and a grammaticalized verb, namely the causative construction, the completive construction, and the benefactive construction. Therefore, the Somba benefactive construction, too, goes back historically to clause chaining. Note that Ono and Somba represent the two first-order subfamilies of the Huon Peninsula family, Eastern Huon and Western Huon.

In Nabak (Section 2.5), we find verb root serialization as the frame into which the benefactive construction fits. Fully elaborated verb root serialization is only found in Mesem and Nabak within the Huon Peninsula family and has in all likelihood arisen through language contact. Neighboring languages of the Erap family, such as Nek (Linnasalo 1993: 142-149) and Numanggang (Hynum 1995: 102-103) have verb root serialization. The connection of the lexical verb and the benefactive auxiliary by serialization is undoubtedly an innovation of the Sankwep subfamily languages.

In the remaining languages (Section 2.3), we find a univerbation of the benefactive construction. The same subject suffix of the original chained benefactive construction is lost and the benefactive auxiliary becomes an inflectional suffix of the lexical verb. It has no further grammatical property than indexing the person and number of the beneficiary. Whereas in Ono,

===

Somba, and Nabak the benefactive auxiliaries still have some residual formal properties of a verb, in the other languages the only peculiarity that reminds of their verbal origin is the homonymity with an object verb meaning 'give'.

The relative chronology outlined above suggests that there has been a general trend towards univerbation of an original chained benefactive auxiliary construction in the Huon Peninsula family. Only Ono and Somba have eschewed the trend. Unfortunately, the same subject medial verb suffixes used in the Ono and the Somba benefactive constructions are not cognate. Therefore, and because the benefactive auxiliaries also do not match, a comparative reconstruction of the original benefactive construction is not possible. There are, however, other historical facts that throw a light upon the development of the benefactive auxiliary construction within the Huon Peninsula family. In the following section, we turn to the etymology of the benefactive auxiliaries.

3.2 Grammaticalization: From lexical verb to benefactive auxiliary

We saw from Table 3 in Section 2.6 that the object verbs used as benefactive auxiliaries in the Huon Peninsula languages belong to five different cognate sets. One of them, *neŋgi 'give', can be reconstructed to Proto-Western Huon. As a consequence, the two other cognate sets attested within the Western Huon family, Proto-Sankwep *ne 'leave' and Proto-Dedua-Mongi-Tobe-Borong *nəm 'give', must be innovations. There is evidence that Proto-Huon Tip *natë 'give', too, has become a benefactive auxiliary only in the reconstructible past. In what follows, I focus on the change of the three aforementioned verbal etyma into benefactive auxiliaries.

The Sankwep languages Mesem and Nabak stick out from the other Huon Peninsula languages in that the object verb that is used as a benefactive auxiliary in them has the meaning 'leave'. I have not been able to find cognates of Proto-Sankwep *ne 'leave me'/ *pe 'leave him/her/it' in other languages. Nevertheless, we can infer the grammaticalization process that led to the homonymous benefactive auxiliary. Before Pre-Sankwep *ne 'leave' could enter into competition with the inherited benefactive auxiliary derived from pWH *neŋgi 'give' and eventually oust it, it had to increase its valency. The patient of the transitive object verb *ne 'leave sb' became the recipient of the nascent benefactive auxiliary whose empty theme role absorbed the patient of the transitive lexical verb with which it was combined in a construction. In a second step, the object verb *ne 'leave' lost its lexical meaning and became a benefactive marker. At the same time, its object inflections with recipient function turned into beneficiary indexes and the theme participant reverted to a patient. Table 5 gives a schematic representation of the postulated grammaticalization process. Note that the object verb *ne* 'leave sb' in Mesem

==

and Nabak has remained transitive. Only the homonymous benefactive auxiliary underwent a valency increase in the course of its grammaticalization.

Table 5: **Valency increase in the grammaticalization of Pre-Sankwep *ne 'leave sb' and Pre-Trans-Vitiaz *nata 'take sb' into benefactive auxiliaries**

$$R_{pron}$$
$$|$$

A$_i$−vb(-SS)–P$_X$ & A$_i$–leave–P$_{pron}$ > A$_i$–vb–P$_X$ & A$_i$–leave–T$_X$ > A$_i$–vb-BEN:pron–P$_X$

'do it' & 'leave sb'   > 'do it & leave it to sb'   > 'do it for sb'

$$R_{pron}$$
$$|$$

A$_i$−vb-SS–P$_X$ & A$_i$–take–P$_{pron}$ > A$_i$–vb–P$_X$ & A$_i$–take–T$_X$ > A$_i$–vb-BEN:pron–P$_X$

'do it' & 'take sb'   > 'do it & take it to sb'   > 'do it for sb'

To unravel the history of the common Huon Tip benefactive auxiliary *-natë we must take its cognate in Kovai into consideration. Kovai has a verb that combines the meanings 'give' and 'take'. One wonders how such a synchronic state that is hardly diachronically stable has come about. Without pronominal object suffix the Kovai verb *ta* means 'take sth', with a pronominal object suffix it usually means 'give sb'. However, *ta* has also been encountered with a pronominal object suffix of the third person plural having the meaning 'take (things or dogs)'. Hence, object suffixation does not automatically select the meaning 'give'. Kovai *ta* 'take; give' has cognates in the immediately related Huon Tip family. The regular verbs Sene *ta* 'take' and Kâte *lo* 'take' match Kovai *ta* 'take' in form and meaning. Kovai *ta* 'give', on the other hand, corresponds to the object verbs Sene *nɔte* 'give' and Kâte *nale* 'give'. We may project the common Huon Tip object verb to Proto-Trans Vitiaz though Kovai has lost it, like all other object verbs. In the case of Proto-Trans Vitiaz *na-ta 'give' this must have happened by way of dropping the pronominal prefixes so that only the verb root *ta* was left. The truncated Kovai verb root *ta* 'give' is homonymous with the original verb root *ta* 'take'.

Readers may suspect that the Proto-Trans Vitiaz verbs *ta 'take' and *na-ta 'give sb' are themselves related to each other. In fact, there is good evidence that this is so. The object verb *nata 'give sb' has a suppletive third person singular form *tukna 'give him/her', which

==

is reflected in Sene *tene*, Momale *loʔne,* and Kâte *ləʔne* and probably, via the homonymous benefactive auxiliary, also in the Kovai third person singular object suffix *-tin*. Proto-Trans Vitiaz *tukna 'give him/her', I contend, is a residue from an earlier full paradigm of object verb forms meaning 'give' and serving as benefactive auxiliaries. The third person singular form is the only extant form of the paradigm, the other forms have disappeared. Furthermore, the original third person singular form of the object verb *nata was the unprefixed root *ta 'take sth or sb', which preserves the original meaning of this object verb. The paradigm of Pre-Trans Vitiaz *nata 'take me'/ *ta 'take him/her/it' is the starting point of the developments that lead to the attested reflexes (see Table 6).

Table 6: **The development of Pre-Trans-Vitiaz *nata 'take sb' and *(-)tukna 'give him/her'/-BEN:3SG**

	lexical			grammatical		
	1SG	2SG	3SG	1SG	2SG	3SG
Pre-TV	*na-ta 'take me'	*ga-ta 'take you'	*ta 'take him/her/it'			
Pre-TV	? 'give me'	? 'give you'	*tukna 'give him/her'	? BEN:1SG	? BEN:2SG	*-tukna BEN:3SG
Proto-TV			*ta 'take sth or sb'			
Proto-TV	*na-ta 'give me'	*ga-ta 'give you'	*tukna 'give him/her'	*-na-ta BEN:1SG	*-ga-ta BEN:2SG	*-tukna BEN:3SG

All forms of the Pre-Trans-Vitiaz object verb *nata 'take sb', except for the third person singular form, turned into benefactive auxiliaries. They replaced the unrecoverable forms that originally completed the auxiliary paradigm of *-tukna -BEN:3SG. The steps in the grammaticalization process were the same as in the case of Pre-Sankwep *ne 'leave sb' discussed above (see Table 5). The patient of the transitive object verb *nata 'take sb' became a recipient and the empty theme role of the newly ditransitive verb was filled with the patient of the lexical verb with which it formed a construction. Then *nata 'take' changed into a benefactive marker and its object inflections became beneficiary indexes. In contradistinction to Pre-Sankwep *ne 'leave sb', the lexical object verb *nata 'take sb' underwent the same

==

valency increase as the homonymous benefactive auxiliary. The result was a change of meaning from 'take sb' to 'give sb'. However, one form of the paradigm resisted the change. The third person singular form *ta 'take him/her/it' did not undergo the valency increase but split off from the paradigm thereby becoming an independent verb root. Its place in the new paradigm was already occupied by the old object verb form *tukna 'give him/her'.

The grammaticalization of an object verb meaning 'take sb' into a benefactive auxiliary has a parallel in the Pindiu subfamily. An object verb *nemə 'take sb' can be reconstructed to Proto-Pindiu (Suter 2018: 44). Its meaning was preserved in Somba nəmi 'take sb, marry, have sex' but changed to 'give' in the other Pindiu languages: Dedua neŋ 'give sb', Mongi nəŋ 'give sb', Tobo nəm 'give sb', and Borong noŋ 'give sb', all of them also used as benefactive auxiliaries. This came about in the same way as in the Huon Tip family. Somba retains the Proto-Western Huon object verb and benefactive auxiliary *neŋgi 'give sb/BEN'. The other Pindiu languages replaced it with Proto-Pindiu *nemə 'take sb'.

In the functional-typological literature, relationships between homonymous lexical and grammatical signs in one and the same language are often analyzed as a result of grammaticalization. The coexistence of Kâte nale 'give' and -nale BEN, for instance, would be described by saying that the Kâte verb nale 'give' had been grammaticalized into a benefactive auxiliary. As long as it is clear that this is only a way of speaking about the synchronic relationship between lexical and grammatical signs, there is nothing wrong with it. However, functional-typological authors sometimes assume that by capturing such synchronic relationships they have at the same time uncovered a historical event. That is a deceptive assumption. As we have seen above, the Kâte benefactive auxiliary -nale BEN is not the result of a grammaticalization of Kâte nale 'give sb' but rather of Pre-Trans Vitiaz *nata 'take sb'. From a diachronic point of view, grammaticalization is an event or a process that can be located in time. In comparative reconstruction, it can be given a position within the genealogical tree. In the event, a lexical sign changes its meaning and becomes a grammatical sign. It goes without saying that a careful comparative-historical investigation is often needed to detect a grammaticalization event. It is an illusion to believe that grammaticalization events can always be uncovered merely by inspecting the distribution of related lexical and grammatical signs in one language.

In sum, we have identified three grammaticalization events introducing a new benefactive auxiliary into a subgroup of the Huon Peninsula family. In all three cases there was already a benefactive auxiliary and the new etymon simply replaced it. Pre-Sankwep *ne 'leave sb' and Proto-Pindiu *nemə 'take sb' replaced Proto-Western Huon *neŋgi BEN, Pre-Trans

==

Vitiaz *nata 'take sb' replaced an auxiliary whose third person singular form was *-tukna. In all three instances, the verb that was grammaticalized was transitive and the crucial step in the grammaticalization process was a valency increase involving a shift of the pronominal patient of the verb to the recipient of the nascent benefactive auxiliary.

3.3 Functional extension: Benefactive auxiliaries used as object indexes

In the languages of the Western Huon family, the object verb that serves as a benefactive auxiliary is also used to index object referents with verbs that cannot take pronominal object prefixes (Section 2.9). In the languages of the Pindiu subfamily, there is only one way of object indexation, in the Sankwep and the Kabwum subfamilies, two different object verbs perform that function, one of which is identical with the benefactive auxiliary. Unfortunately, we have no detailed information about the meanings of the lexical verbs belonging to one or the other class in the languages with two object indexing classes. It is therefore not known whether the verbs that select the object indexing class identical with beneficiary indexing have any semantic features in common. It is likely that beneficiary indexing was extended to object indexing in the Western Huon family before other object verbs, such as 'hit' and 'see', turned into object indexes. Both grammatical functions are reflected in Somba as well as in the Kabwum family and can therefore be reconstructed to pWH *neŋgi 'give sb/BEN/OBJ'. The other object verbs serving as object indexes are confined to the Sankwep and the Kabwum subfamilies.

In the Pindiu languages, the extension of beneficiary indexation to object indexation has run its full course, affecting all eligible verbs. Those languages only have one grammaticalized object verb serving both as beneficiary index and as object index. The situation we find in the Huon Tip languages (Section 2.8) can be interpreted as an early stage in the extension of beneficiary indexing to object indexing. The verbs of speaking take benefactive inflection rather than object inflection to index their object referents. If verbs from other semantic fields join the verbs of speaking in the future, a full-fledged second object indexing class may emerge. At the present moment, it is a semantically motivated marginal class.

4 The genitive-causal case

The Huon Peninsula languages have half a dozen case enclitics that play an eminent role in clausal and interclausal syntax. They usually attach to the last word of a noun phrase. The enclitics can be divided in two groups, local cases and grammatical cases. To the latter belong the ergative-instrumental case, the genitive-causal case, and the comitative case. The ergative-instrumental case and the comitative case can be reconstructed to Proto-Huon Peninsula (Suter

===

2018: 255), for the genitive-causal case only an Eastern Huon (*-ta) and a Western Huon (*-gut) reconstruction is possible. Most languages have a full set of case enclitics, but Kovai has lost them all.

The genitive-causal case has two separate functions, hence its double name. It can establish an attributive relationship between two noun phrases like a genitive case and it can establish a relationship of reason or cause between a noun phrase or a subordinate sentence and the verbal predicate in the same clause. The latter function is that of a causal case. In Section 4.1 I survey the genitive function and in Section 4.2 the causal function of the genitive-causal case. The case can be further used to form oblique objects (Section 4.3) and temporal adverbials (Section 4.4). Section 4.5 presents the benefactive function of the genitive-causal case and Section 4.6 studies the interaction of it with the benefactive auxiliary construction (see Section 2). Finally, in Section 4.7 all functions attested for reflexes of the Proto-Western Huon genitive-causal enclitic *-gut are tracked and discussed.

4.1 The genitive function

The basic functions of the genitive-causal case are the same throughout the Huon Peninsula family. In Sections 4.1 and 4.2 the same five well-documented languages are used to illustrate the functions: Ono, Migabac, Somba, Nabak, and Komba. They represent the five subfamilies for which we have syntactic data. The sixth subfamily, Dallman, lacks syntactic data and is accordingly not represented.

The genitive case connects two noun phrases. The genitive enclitic establishes an attributive relationship between the noun phrase carrying it and another noun phrase. The noun phrase in the genitive case immediately precedes the head noun phrase. Not only nouns but also personal pronouns can fill a genitive phrase, but for the sake of uniformity all examples in (38) to (42) have a noun, with or without modifiers, as filler of the genitive phrase. In the Ono example (38) we see that the genitive enclitic *-wane* is attached to the last word of the noun phrase it governs, the demonstrative *ea*. The same can be seen in the Migabac example (39). The demonstrative *i* 'that' does not take the general genitive enclitic *-le ~ -te* but the allomorph *-leʔ* occurring on demonstratives. In the Somba example (40) the noun in the genitive carries a pronominal possessive suffix. The genitive noun *an* 'man' is modified by *ŋen* 'one, another' in the Nabak example (41). In (38) to (41) the head of the genitive construction is a simple noun. In the Komba example (42) the head noun *a* 'man' is copied, presumably because it is both plural and possessed and has the modifier *kʌtikŋʌ* 'strong'.

==

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

38   *[Eu   menam   ea-wane   wela-tk-ine]*   *ŋei   ŋerep*
     garden ripe   that-GEN   owner-DU-3S:POSS   man   woman

     sele   etke   ge-koit.
     old   two   be-F.PST:3DU
     'The owners of that garden were an old man and woman.'
     (P. Phinnemore 1982: 4)

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

39   *Ai-me   ŋiʔ   suguʔne   moniʔ je   eseʔne [maʔ   i-leʔ*
     do-SEQ:3SG.SS man   big   one   he   of.old place   that-GEN

     damoŋ]   ga-weʔ.
     leader   exist-F.PST:3SG
     'One important man was the leader of that place before.'
     (McEvoy 2008: 277)

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

40   *[Nam-naŋ-gə   nup]   mət-tsan?*
     mother-1SG:POSS-GEN   garden know-PRS:2SG
     'Do you know my mother's garden?'
     (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 66)

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

41   *[An   ŋen-gat   mka]   kilimba-ŋa-n*   *mam-be-nup.*
     man   another-GEN house   underneath-3SG:POSS-LOC   CONT-put-PRS:1PL
     'We put [the cut wood] underneath another man's house.'
     (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 435)

===

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

42   *[Kiap-kʌt   a-rʌp-ŋʌ   a   kʌtikŋʌ]*
     patrol.officer-GEN   man-PL-3SG:POSS   man   strong

     mʌsikʌ-ziŋgʌ-ne   sʌ-we ...
     ask-3PL:OBJ.I-DS:3PL   say-F.PST:3PL
     'The government men asked them about it and they said, …'
     (Southwell 1979: 242)

The attributive relationship between the genitive phrase and the head noun phrase is usually one of possession. Personal pronouns in the genitive stand in a paraphrase relationship to pronominal possessive suffixes. Particularly in the Western Huon languages, a personal pronoun in the genitive can co-occur with a possessive suffix of the same person and number on the head noun. This is illustrated in (43) to (45).

Mongi (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

43   *Iʔ   məŋ   eri-mi   i-mi   [nu-aʔ*
     man   one   over.there-SPEC   that-SPEC   1SG-GEN

     daʔ-na].
     elder.brother-1SG:POSS
     'A man over there, he is my elder brother.'
     (Lee 1993: 68)

Mesem (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

44   *[Nɘ-gɘ   na-n]   tu   piɘkŋ.*
     1SG-GEN   breast-1SG:POSS   water   none
     'My breast has no milk.'
     (Vanaria and Vanaria 1996: 72)

==
Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

45   *[nak   ja   je-ŋgɔt   top-jeŋ-an]*
       tree   that   3PL-GEN   base-3PL:POSS-LOC
       'at the bases of those trees'
       (McElhanon 1972: 24)

The pronominal possessor is redundantly expressed, both by a genitive pronoun and a possessive suffix. This shows that the genitive case and possessive suffixation have the same basic function. In a combination of a personal pronoun in the genitive and a head noun the pronominal possessor is more prominent than if the possessor is expressed by a pronominal possessive suffix on the head noun. Greater phonological prominence goes hand in hand with focus. It is not known what the effect of redundant possessor marking is on information structure.

In Section 4.2 we will see that the genitive-causal case in its causal function is particularly often used in complex sentences. The case can also be used on the interclausal level in its genitive function. However, complex sentences with a subordinate sentence in the genitive are relative constructions whereas a causal subordinate sentence is an adverbial type of subordination. In the Huon Peninsula languages, all kinds of subordinate sentences can be simple clauses as well as clause chains. For this reason, it is better to speak of relative sentences and adverbial sentences than of relative clauses and adverbial clauses.

In the Kâte example (46) the personal pronoun in the genitive *e-le* 'his' resumes *ŋiʔ* 'man' and connects the relative sentence with the predicate *hafe-jumbieŋ* 'they would bind' to the main clause noun *dzɔŋe* 'name'. The result is the relative construction 'They would continually say the name of the man they would bind.' The Selepet example (47) contains the resumptive demonstrative *ja-kɔt* in the genitive-causal case. The sentence is ambiguous depending on the interpretation of the genitive-causal enclitic. If the enclitic is given a genitive reading, the demonstrative *ja* 'that' resumes *lok kɔmbukŋe* 'the practitioner' and the sentence means 'They prepared the payment of the practitioner who planted the blessing.'. If the enclitic is given a causal reading, the demonstrative *ja* 'that' resumes the whole subordinate sentence and the overall meaning is 'Because the practitioner planted the blessing they prepared the payment.'

==

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

46   *ŋiʔ*   *hafe-jumbieŋ*   *e-le*   *dzɔŋe* *mu-huʔ-wɔʔ*

      man   bind-HAB.PST:3PL   3SG-GEN   name say-SIM:SS-too

    mu-jumbieŋ.

    say-HAB.PST:3PL

    'They would continually say the name of the man on whom they cast a spell.'

    (Pilhofer 1933: 146)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

47   *Lok*   *kɔmbukŋe*   *hawat* *kɔmel-op*   *ja-kɔt*

      man   forbidden   magic plant-F.PST:3SG   a) that-GEN / b) that-CSL

    delem *ɔlɔ*   *hɔre-wi.*

    shell   another   cut-F.PST:3PL

    a) 'They prepared the pay of the practitioner who planted a blessing.'

    b) 'The practitioner planted the blessing. Therefore they prepared the payment.'

    (McElhanon 1972: 94)

The ambiguity that arises in sentences like (47) shows that the genitive and the causal interpretation of the genitive-causal case are two separate functions. It is appropriate, therefore, to give the case the compound name "genitive-causal".

4.2 The causal function

In its causal function, the genitive-causal enclitic establishes an adverbial relationship between the noun phrase or the sentence to which it is attached and the verbal predicate of a clause. The causal phrase precedes the verbal predicate it modifies but it does not need not be contiguous with it. Unusual for a case enclitic, the causal case is more often found in complex sentence formation than in clause formation, i.e. it is more often attached to a sentence than to a noun phrase in discourse. For this reason, I start the description with complex sentences. Using English as the language of description, we note that causal subordinate sentences can have

==

either a causal or a purposive[5] sense. Depending on the tense or mood of the final verb of the subordinate sentence, a causal subordinate sentence can express the cause of the action of the main clause or the reason of its actor (causal sense) or the purpose of the main clause action or the intention of its actor (purposive sense). In the following examples (48) through (57), two complex sentences are given for each language, one in which the subordinate sentence has a causal sense and one in which it has a purposive sense.

The Ono example (48) shows that subordinate sentences may consist of more than one clause in the Huon Peninsula languages. The causal sentence is made up of the medial clause *osom ŋmane gbe* 'having killed a game animal' and the final clause *sarine* 'you came'. The tense of the subordinate sentence is near past. The subordinate sentence in (49) has a purposive sense and its final verb is in the future tense. The subordinate sentence in the Migabac example (50) has a causal sense and its final verb is in the far past tense. In (51) the final verb of the subordinate sentence is in the present imperative mood. This subordinate sentence with a purposive sense has the same subject as the main clause. But, while this allows the use of an infinite subordinate clause in English, in Migabac it has no significance for the grammatical structure. In the Somba examples (52) and (53) the genitive-causal enclitic *-gə(t)* is extended by the emphatic suffix *-a(p)*. This extension is seen very frequently when the enclitic has a causal function but is usually absent in the genitive function. The causal sense of the subordinate sentence in (52) goes hand in hand with a final verb in the past tense; the purposive sense of (53), with a final verb in the future tense. In Nabak, the genitive-causal enclitic has the allomorphs *-gat*, occurring after consonants, and *-jet*, occurring after vowels. The subordinate sentence with a causal sense in (54) has a final verb in the intermediate past tense. The final verb of the subordinate sentence with a purposive sense in (55) is in the far future tense. In the Komba examples (56) and (57) the genitive-causal enclitic *-gʌt* is assimilated to *-kʌt* following a voiceless stop consonant. The subordinate sentence in (56) has a causal sense and its final verb is in the near past tense. The final verb of the subordinate sentence with a purposive sense in (57) is in the far future tense.

---

[5] I avoid the traditional term "final clause" because this expression already has a technical sense in the grammar of the Huon Peninsula languages, being opposed to "medial clause". Instead of "final" I use "purposive".

==

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

48   [Osom   ŋmane gbe   sari-n-ane,]   ŋara   pota-kene?
       game   one   kill.SS come-N.PST:2SG-CSL   taro   dig.up-FUT:1PL
       'Should we dig up taros because you have killed a game animal and come here?'
       (Wacke 1931: 204)

49   Naso   mane-o   Zingo wela-kou-ne   ŋei   ŋerep
       day   one-LOC   Zingo inhabitants-PL-3SG:POSS   man   woman

       suaine eŋe   korop [eu   urata-ene   ma-kei-wane]
       big   3PL   all   garden work-3PL:POSS   do-FUT:3PL-CSL

       ari-ware-koi.
       go-all-F.PST:3PL
       'One day all the adult inhabitants of Zingo went to do their garden work.'
       (P. Phinnemore 1990: 21)

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

50   Noŋileŋ   [wiaʔ susugu i   daʔ-ka   lobe-jaʔke-weʔ-te]
       we.EMPH   thing all   that   fire-LOC   burn-all-F.PST:3SG-CSL

       ai-lu   jakuʔ-maʔ   moc   ga-gabeleŋ.
       do-SEQ.SS   now-little   without   exist-PRS:1PL
       'Because all those things completely burned on the fire, now we live without anything.'
       (McEvoy 2008: 164)

51   Ga-eboʔ-ka   Gemeŋ   ŋiʔ   jeŋe   biaʔ   [Saŋamu
       exist-SIM:3DU.DS-LOC Gemeng   man   3PL   already   Sangamu

       kwe-niŋ-te]   jowa   hefe-gaiŋ.
       shoot-PRS.IMP:3PL-CSL   talk   fasten-PRS:3PL
       'While they lived there, the Gemeng men planned to shoot Sangamu.'
       (McEvoy 2008: 82)

==

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

52   *[Moneŋ-ni   joŋgorə   me-ger-aŋ-gər-a]*   *Hagen*
      money-1SG:POSS   stealing   take-PST:3PL-NMZ-CSL-EMPH Hagen

      an-mam-gər-a   osi-tsal.
      go-FUT:1SG-CSL-EMPH   be.unable-PRS:1SG
      'Because they stole my money, I can't go to Hagen.'
      (Olkkonen 1990: 12)

53   *Uran   [bau   eri-bin-gər-ap]   arək-ŋ-e*
      Yesterday   pig   shoot-FUT:1PL-CSL-EMPH   bush-3SG:POSS-LOC

      an-in.
      go-PST:1PL
      'Yesterday we went to the bush to shoot a pig.'
      (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 120)

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

54   *[Met-zan-gat]   su-wap.*
      go-INT.PST:3SG-CSL   cry-F.FUT:1SG
      'Because he went I will cry.'
      (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 108)

55   *[Ka-pi   inda-damuŋ   mi-bep-gat]   mənep   notnaŋ*
      SPEC-this   3PL:OBJ-caring   do-F.FUT:3PL-CSL   money   some

      nin-galen   bet-en   be-senik.
      1PL-GEN   hand-LOC   put-N.FUT:2SG
      'In order that they [i.e. relatives] will take care of them, you [must] put some money into our hands later today.'
      (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 103)

==

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

56   *[Map   ga-ap-kʌt]*   *nep   birʌ-m*   *g-en.*
      rain   come-N.PST:3SG-CSL   work   leave-SS   come-N.PST:1PL

      'We left work and came here because the rain came.'

      (Southwell 1979: 196)

57   *A   kut-ziŋʌ*   *jatʌ*   *zo*   *pisuk patʌ*
      male   name-3PL:POSS   like.that   that   all   big

      [kubik-ziŋʌ-nat-kʌt]   *mi-nziŋ-en.*
      correct-3PL:OBJ.I-F.FUT:1PL-CSL   get-3PL:OBJ.I-N.PST:1PL

      'The boys named, we have gathered all of them for us to correct them.'

      (Southwell 1979: 367)

Three of the authors of a grammar of a Huon Peninsula language have noticed that the interpretation of subordinate sentences in the causal case depends on the tense or mood of its final verb. In his Kâte grammar, Pilhofer (1933: 146) noted, "Das Destinativ-Suffix *le, te* bildet Kausal- und Finalsätze ..." ['The genitive-causal case suffix *-le ~ -te* forms causal and purposive sentences …']. The examples of causal sentences he gives have their final verb in the near past, far past, or near future tense or in the future irrealis mood. Purposive sentences are defined by Pilhofer (1933: 148) as having a final verb in the present imperative mood. McElhanon's (1972: 98-105) description of the causal case in complex sentences in Selepet is very similar. He states that subordinate sentences in the causal case have a causal sense when their final verb is in any tense or mood other than the prohibitive and the imperative mood. In the latter case, they have a purposive sense. As far as the imperative mood is concerned, McElhanon also admits a causal interpretation. However, the only example he presents has an impersonal verb as the predicate of the main clause (see example 72 in Section 4.3). In such clauses, the causal phrase is arguably an object rather than an adverbial. Possibly, the rule that causal sentences in the imperative mood have a purposive interpretation is only valid for adverbial subordination. For Somba, Olkkonen (1990: 12) states that causal sentences in the past or present tense indicate a reason; causal sentences in the future tense or in the irrealis mood indicate a purpose. That Olkkonen does not mention the imperative mood is no oversight. According to his description, the imperative mood has disappeared from Somba, its function having been taken over by the future

==

and the past tense, though there is a relic form in the first person singular (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 23).

As the comparison between Somba, Selepet and Kâte shows, the rules for the interpretation of causal sentences are not the same everywhere. Selepet and Kâte are very similar in that only the imperative mood triggers a purposive interpretation. But in Somba it is rather the future tense and the irrealis mood that suggest a purposive interpretation. In the examples given above in (48) to (57), a majority of the languages have a future tense in the subordinate sentence with a purposive sense: Ono (49), Somba (53), Nabak (55), and Komba (57). Migabac (51) follows Kâte in that the subordinate sentence with a purposive sense has a final verb in the present imperative mood. All five languages agree on the tense found in subordinate sentences with a causal interpretation; it is always a past tense. Clearly, more research is needed before we can tell whether there are any rules that hold for the whole family. Many of the existing language descriptions lack precision and comprehensiveness. It is also an open question whether subordinate sentences in the genitive-causal case with a final verb in a particular tense or mood can have both a causal and a purposive interpretation in some languages. If it were possible to construct a sentence that is ambiguous between a causal and a purposive reading, that would be strong evidence for postulating two different functions, causal and purposive.

My working hypothesis is that no such ambiguous sentence can be constructed in any Huon Peninsula language. I assume that the distribution of subordinate sentences with a causal and a purposive interpretation is complementary and that their different interpretation depends on different tenses or moods of the final verb. Hence, the causal and the purposive interpretation do not reflect different functions. There is only one basic function of the causal case, which is the indication of reason or cause. The sentences given above with a purposive translation can also be translated with a causal subordinate clause. The Migabac example (51), for instance, was translated by McEvoy as, 'The Gemeng men planned to shoot Sangamu.' A more cumbersome but presumably more literal translation is, 'The Gemeng men made a plan because they wanted to shoot Sangamu.' Likewise, the Komba example (57) was translated by Southwell as, 'We have gathered all of them for us to correct them.' It might as well be translated, 'We have gathered all of them because we are going to correct them.' The translation with a purposive construction is simple and elegant, but it is not necessary. In fact, I believe that a causal translation more faithfully reflects the semantics of the source languages. Under this hypothesis, the apparent purposive sense of some causal subordinate sentences in Huon Peninsula languages is an artifact of translation into English or German.

==

Causal constituents that are made up of a noun phrase are harder to find in the data than causal sentences. Presumably, such clauses are rather infrequent in discourse. In the following examples (58) to (60) a causal noun phrase stands in an adverbial relationship to the predicate, just like the causal sentences in (48) to (57).

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

58   *Nɔŋe*   *hoe-le*   *ŋe-naŋmu.*
      1PL.EXCL   rain-CSL   sit-N.FUT:1PL
      'We'll stay at home because of the rain.'
      (Pilhofer 1933: 66)

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

59   *Papia*   *ketauŋi*   *ki*   *miaŋ-gər-ap*   *uru*   *ələwak*
      paper   big   this   that-CSL-EMPH   heart   goodness

      mət-tsal.
      feel-PRS:1SG
      'Because of this big paper I feel happy.'
      (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 128)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

60   *Kuk-gɔt*   *iliwet-mat.*
      anger-CSL   resist-HAB.PRS:2SG
      'You are resisting because of anger.'
      (McElhanon and McElhanon 1970, s.v. *-gât*)

Another non-sentential causal constituent is the question word for 'why'. All Huon Peninsula languages have such a question word. Usually it is composed of the question word for 'what' and the causal enclitic. Examples from the five languages representing the family are: Ono *onoka-wane* what-CSL 'why?', Migabac *oma-le* what-CSL 'why?', Somba *wanat-kər-ap* what-CSL-EMPH 'why?', Nabak *kuleki-jet* what-CSL 'why?', and Komba *wan-gʌt* what-CSL 'why?'. The examples (61) and (62) show this interrogative adverb in the context of a simple sentence.

===

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

61   *Oma-le   hoʔ-ti   holeʔ-nu-giʔ?*
      What-CSL   stone-INS   hit-1SG:OBJ-PRS:2SG
      'Why do you shoot me with a stone?'
      (McEvoy 2008: 286)

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

62   *Wan-gʌt   nan-gʌ   ku-at?*
      what-CSL   son-2SG:POSS hit-N.PST:2SG
      'Why did you hit your son?'
      (Southwell 1979: 178)

      Finally, there is a construction with a causal noun phrase that looks like an abbreviation of a causal sentence. A verb of motion is preceded by a noun phrase in the causal case specifying the goal of an errand. There is no subordinate verb specifying how the object is procured. Such a verb is redundant and can be inferred from the nature of the object. Thus, in (63) and (66) the object to be procured is animals that must be hunted and killed with a suitable weapon. In (64) the object is a vine that must be cut off with a knife and in (65) the object is water that must be scooped with a container. If a subordinate verb were spelled out, it would have to be in the imperative mood or in the future tense.

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

63   *Silom-go,   eŋe   ari-u-so,   eŋe   osom-wane*
      daytime-LOC   3PL   go-DS:3PL-and   3SG   game-CSL

      ge-mage-ke.
      go.about-HAB-PST:3SG
      'By day, when [people] were absent, he often went hunting (lit. went about for game).'
      (Wacke 1931: 206)

==
Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

64   *Ai-me*   *gba-ine*   *je*   *haseng-ka*   *muʔ-te*

do-SEQ:3SG.DSyounger.brother-3SG:POSS   3SG   jungle-LOC   vine-CSL

hike-weʔ.

go-F.PST:3SG

'Then his younger brother went to the jungle for a vine.'

(McEvoy 2008: 310)

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

65   *O-gət*   *an-mam.*

Water-CSL go-FUT:1SG

'I'll go to get water.'

(Olkkonen 1990: 11)

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

66   *Nemba ekŋen-aŋ*   *age-jet*   *met-o.*

child   3PL-ERG   bird-CSL   go-N.PST:3PL

'Children went [hunting] for birds.'

(Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 38)

The Western Desert language of Australia has a true (genitive-)purposive case. We find sentences exactly like (63) to (66) in Western Desert dialects (Pyle 2021: 120), save that the object to be procured is marked with the purposive case instead of the causal case of the Huon Peninsula languages. This parallel confirms the impression that the causal case has a purposive interpretation in such sentences. But note that this interpretation does not emanate from the causal enclitic but is rather triggered by the motion verb to which it is connected.

4.3 Causal objects

In some cases of its occurrence the causal case does not seem to freely modify a predicate but to be stipulated by the valency of the verb to which it is connected. Impersonal verbs expressing an experience or emotion are a case in point. These verbs lack a tangible subject and are always inflected for a third person singular subject. The experiencer is indexed by the object inflection. The object is the only obligatory participant, but sometimes it is necessary to spell out what

===

triggered the experience or emotion. This is done with a noun phrase in the causal case. The causal phrase is here best considered an oblique object of the impersonal verb. The examples (67) through (72) illustrate this construction with two example sentences for each of three languages from different subfamilies.

Ono (Kalasa, EH)

67   *Koma-wane   kaet-nan-maike.*
        Snake-CSL   fear-1S:OBJ-PRS:3SG
        'I am afraid of snakes.'
        (P. Phinnemore 1990: 115)

68   *Na   ge-ŋane   simin-nan-maike.*
        1SG   2SG-CSL   be.sweet-1SG:OBJ-PRS:3SG
        'I like you.'
        (P. Phinnemore 1988: 108)

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

69   *Oə-le   həwiʔ-ke-kaʔ.*
        crocodile-CSL fear-3SG:OBJ-PRS:3SG
        'He is afraid of the crocodile.'
        (Pilhofer 1933:17)

70   *Go-le   aaliʔ-nu-kaʔ.*
        2SG-CSL   be.angry-1SG:OBJ-PRS:3SG
        'I feel angry with you.'
        (Flierl and Strauss 1977, s.v. *aaric*)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

71   *Kəmet-mə   ba-m   ba-m   tep-gət   neləm-gu-mu*
        plant-SS   go-SS go-SS abdomen-CSL forget-3SG:OBJ.III-DS:3SG

===

> *janɔk*   *lɔm*   *ai-m*   *tel-op.*
> that-LOC-only   hole   dig-SS   defecate-F.PST:3SG
> 'After planting he walked on oblivious of his digestion. Then he dug a hole and relieved himself.'
> (McElhanon 1985: 19)

72   *Kiap*   *jiken*   *taka-m*   *eɣ-ɔk-gɔt*   *goro-niɣi-ap.*
>   patrol.officer   here   come-SS   see-IMP:3SG-CSL   worry-1SG:BEN-N.PST:3SG
>   'I am worried because the patrol officer plans to come here and see it.'
>   (McElhanon 1972: 105)

It is not clear how old this construction is. The languages of the Rawlinson subfamily seem to lack it. They may have lost impersonal verbs or else such verbs may have arisen several times independently when suffixal object indexation became obligatory.

There are other verbs that can take an oblique object in the causal case. I limit the presentation to one noteworthy example. Predicates meaning 'wait' are constructed with the causal case in several languages. In Kâte (73) the concept is expressed by a combination of the coverb *woŋeʔ* 'waiting' and the verb *ŋe* 'sit'. In the Somba example (74) the verb *mambɔt* 'wait' is chained to the verb *tat* 'sit', apparently a frequent collocation. In both cases the person waited for is expressed by a causal phrase.

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

73   *Go-le*   *woŋeʔ*   *ŋe-kopaʔ.*
>   2SG-CSL   waiting   sit-PRS:1SG
>   'I sit waiting for you.'
>   (Flierl and Strauss 1977, s.v. *woŋec*)

Somba (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

74   *Ala-ni*   *nə-ŋgə(r-ap)*   *mambɔt-a*   *tat-tsap.*
>   friend-1SG:POSS   1SG-CSL(-EMPH)   wait-SS   sit-PRS:3SG
>   'My friend is sitting and waiting for me.'
>   (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 79)

===

The Somba verb *mambət* 'wait' is cognate with Komba *mambʌt* 'await' and Selepet *mambot* 'await'. The etymon can be reconstructed to Proto-Western Huon. However, whereas the Somba verb is intransitive taking an oblique causal object the Komba and the Selepet verbs are transitive. They belong to the object conjugation class that indexes object referents with forms of the verb 'give' (see Section 2.9). In Somba, the object indexing construction applies to fewer verbs than in Komba and Selepet. That is in all probability an archaic state of affairs. It is therefore likely that the causal object construction of Somba *mambət* 'wait' goes back to Proto-Western Huon and that Komba and Selepet have innovated.

4.4 A minor function: temporal adverbials

There is another function of the genitive-causal case that deserves brief mention. In several Huon Peninsula languages temporal adverbials can be found that carry the genitive-causal enclitic. This is an exceptional or marginal phenomenon. Usually temporal adverbials behave like local adverbials, i.e. they carry the locative enclitic. But a few lexical items with a temporal meaning take the genitive-causal case instead. No local adverbials carrying the genitive-causal enclitic have been observed. The following examples from Kâte illustrate this usage. The noun *furiʔ* 'dawn, morning' in (75) inherently denotes a time span whereas *mosa* 'moon' in (76) does not. The genitive-causal enclitic highlights its temporal sense.

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

75   *Fuliʔ-te   wise-weʔ.*

        dawn-GEN   run.away-F.PST:3SG

        'At daybreak he ran away.'

        (Pilhofer 1933: 121)

76   *Mosa-le   kpowi-le   ju-paʔ.*

        moon-GEN   game-CSL   go.about-N.PST:1SG

        'I was hunting in the moonlight.'

        (Pilhofer 1933: 121)

In Mongi, the case enclitic *-guʔ* serves the same function, as can be seen in (77). Other temporal adverbs with this enclitic are *deguʔ* 'now' and *məŋguʔ* 'again' (*məŋ* 'one, another').

===

Mongi (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

77   *Oraŋ-guʔ*   *keŋ-maŋ.*

tomorrow-COM   go-FUT:1SG

'I will go tomorrow.'

(Lee 1993: 108)

Synchronically, *-guʔ* is a comitative case enclitic. Etymologically, however, it descends from the Proto-Western Huon genitive-causal enclitic *-gut (see Table 7 in Section 4.7). Its occurrence on temporal adverbs cannot be explained with the contemporary comitative function but must go back to a time when it still had genitive-causal function. The picture is complicated by the fact that the enclitic *-guʔ*, extended with the demonstrative root *i* 'that', has acquired the function of a locative case in Mongi. But the Dedua cognate *moŋgoʔ* 'again' (*moŋ* 'one') of Mongi *məŋguʔ* 'again' speaks against the hypothesis that the use of Mongi *-guʔ* on temporal adverbs has anything to do with the recently innovated locative enclitic *-iguʔ* LOC. Dedua *-goʔ* only has comitative function. The shared adverb Dedua *moŋ-goʔ*, Mongi *məŋ-guʔ* must have been formed at a time when its second part was still a genitive-causal enclitic.

Reflexes of pWH *-gut GEN/CSL have also been encountered on temporal adverbials in Nabak (78) and Komba (79).

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

78   *Dʒenueli-jet   tat-nɔ-mbep-walak.*

January-GEN   CONT-know-F.FUT:2PL-CONSEQ

'Consequently in January you will know.'

(Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 397)

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

79   *Sonda   karʌmbu-ŋa-ŋgʌt   ko   Gerʌun   Lama   Wanam*

Sunday   three-3SG:POSS-GEN   CNTR   Gerâun   Lama   Wanam

zo   zi-ŋ   tuu-bi.

those 3PL-ERG   make-F.FUT:3PL

'For the third week it will be Gerâun, Lama and Wanam villages' turn to work on it.'

(Southwell 1979: 277)

===

Interestingly, temporal adverbials in the genitive-causal case can also be formed from recent loanwords. Nabak *dʒenueli* 'January' (78) is a loan from English, perhaps via Tok Pisin, and Komba *sonda* 'Sunday, week' (79) is a loan from German *Sonntag* 'Sunday' via Kâte. These loanwords show that temporal adverbials in the genitive-causal case are a productive formation notwithstanding their marginality.

4.5 Genitive-causal phrases in benefactive function

The genitive-causal case has yet another function. In several Huon Peninsula languages it can have a benefactive function. This additional function is attested for two languages of the Huon Tip subfamily, both Sankwep subfamily languages, and two languages of the Kabwum subfamily. It is conspicuously missing from Ono and Somba. In Nabak, the benefactive function of the genitive-causal enclitic *-gat ~ -jet* is so prominent that the authors of the Nabak grammar baptized it "benefactive", though they also mention its "possessor" (see Section 4.1) and "purposive" (see Section 4.2) functions (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 75-78, 82-83). For Selepet, McElhanon (1972: 80-81, 93-94) describes the genitive-causal enclitic *-gɔt* as having "possessive" and "benefactive/causal" functions. On the other hand, the term "benefactive" is missing from the descriptions of the genitive-causal case in Ono and Somba. Phinnemore and Phinnemore (1985: 37, 50-52) only mention a "possessive" (see Section 4.1) and a "purpose" (see Section 4.2) function of the Ono genitive-causal enclitic *-wane*. Likewise, Olkkonen and Olkkonen (1983: 45, 61-64) describe only a "possessive" and a "purpose" function for the Somba genitive-causal enclitic *-gɔt*. The enclitic enlarged with the emphatic suffix *-ap* is said to have "purpose" (see Section 4.2), "objective" (see Section 4.3) and "addressative" function (i.e. it is used for the addressee of the verb *dzi-* 'say') (Olkkonen and Olkkonen 1983: 41-42, 46, 65). I have been unable to find in the data for Ono or Somba an example in which the genitive-causal enclitic has a benefactive function.

The following examples (80) to (82) show a personal pronoun in the genitive-causal case having a benefactive function. The personal pronoun refers to the beneficiary of the predication. Note that the case enclitic glossed BEN in these examples is identical with the enclitics glossed GEN in Section 4.1 and CSL in Section 4.2.

===

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

80   *No-le   sala-weʔ.*

    1SG-BEN   plant-F.PST:3SG

    'He planted it for me.'

    (Pilhofer 1933: 54)

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

81   *An   temaŋ-gat   mka   gɔ-gɔt   kwiti-ja.*

    man   big-GEN   house   2SG-BEN   buy-N.PST:1SG

    'I bought the important man's house for you.'

    (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 83)

Timbe (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

82   *Nɔ-ŋgɔt   ketuɣu-ɔp.*

    1sg-BEN   make-N.PST:3SG

    'He made one for me.'

    (Foster 1972: 99)

All three examples in (80) to (82) have a transitive verb as its predicate. In the Kâte example (80) and the Timbe example (82) the object has no syntactic representation, only in the Nabak example (81) is there an object noun phrase, *an temaŋgat mka* 'the important man's house'. The personal pronoun in benefactive function follows the object noun phrase in this clause. We find the same constituent order in the Mape example (83a). If the order of the object noun phrase and the beneficiary phrase is inverted, the genitive-causal enclitic gets a genitive rather than a benefactive reading (83b).

Mape (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

83a   *Gbabe webo Sakale-le   iga-jaʔ.*

    Gbabe bird   Sakale-BEN   shoot-F.PST:3SG

    'Gbabe shot the bird for Sakale.'

    (Sifuma 1997: 28)

===

83b *Gbabe Sakale-le   webo   iga-jaʔ.*

Gbabe Sakale-GEN   bird   shoot-F.PST:3SG

'Gbabe shot Sakale's bird.'

(Sifuma 1997: 29)

In Kâte, the situation seems to be somewhat different. The transitive clause (84b), whose constituent order corresponds to that of the Mape clause (83a) and the Nabak clause (81), is considered unacceptable by native speakers. If, however, the beneficiary phrase is made prominent by the postposed focus particle *hɔʔne* 'indeed' (84c), native speakers do accept the clause. In example (84a), with inverted constituent order, the genitive-causal enclitic has a genitive reading, much like in the Mape example (83b).

Kàte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

84a *No-le   opɔ   fia-kaʔ.*

1SG-GEN   water scoop-PRS:3SG

'She scoops my water.'

84b *?Opɔ   no-le   fia-kaʔ.*

water 1SG-BEN   scoop-PRS:3SG

84c *Opɔ   no-le   hɔʔne fia-kaʔ.*

Water 1SG-BEN   indeed scoop-PRS:3SG

'For me she scoops water.'

(elicited)

The fact that the addition of a focus particle with scope over the beneficiary phrase in (84c) makes the clause acceptable whereas the same clause without the focus particle (84b) is judged to be unacceptable lets me suspect that the reason for the unacceptability of (84b) is its non-neutral information structure. Without an appropriate context, the clause sounds odd. It is conceivable, though not certain, that the information structure of the Mape clause (83a) is equally non-neutral as that of the Kâte clause (84b) but that Sifuma, who is a native speaker of Mape, is more tolerant in his judgment than the Kâte speakers I consulted. The constituent order with neutral information structure is presumably identical with the order we find in the clauses (83b) and (84a). If this is so, these clauses may have two interpretations. Besides the preferred

==

reading of the genitive-causal enclitic as having genitive function there may be another reading in which it has benefactive function. Only somebody with native speaker intuition can confirm this hypothesis.

The following example (85) shows what the second reading would be like. Although the phrase in the genitive-causal case precedes the object phrase, Vanaria and Vanaria translate it as having benefactive function rather than genitive function. However, the Vanarias are not native speakers and it is likely that this is a free translation, which should not be interpreted as reflecting the syntactic structure of the source language.

Mesem (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

85   *Nə*   *Toni-gə*   *nini*   *bu-jap.*
      1SG   Tony-GEN/BEN   food   cook-PRS:1S
      'I am cooking food for Tony.'
      (Vanaria and Vanaria 1995: 88)

That ambiguity can arise between a genitive interpretation and a benefactive interpretation of the genitive-causal enclitic is shown by example (86) from Nabak. Ambiguity between a causal interpretation and a benefactive interpretation, on the other hand, can hardly arise. The reason is that causal phrases are non-human whereas beneficiary phrases are human. The parallelism between (87) and (88) is as close as we get to an opposition between the two constructions. The verb *met* 'go' can have a causal or a benefactive adjunct, but the adjuncts necessarily differ in their animacy.

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

86   *Nə-gət*   *tat-zin.*
      1SG-GEN   stay-PRS:3SG
      'Mine is here.'
      1SG-BEN   stay-PRS:3SG
      'He is here for me.'
      (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 27)

==

87   *Tep-gat*   *met-a.*

wood-CSL   go-N.PST:1SG

'I went for firewood.'

(Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 82)

88   *Nə-gɔt*   *met-ep.*

1SG-BEN   go-N.PST:3SG

'He went for me. (i.e. He went for my benefit.)'

(Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 83)

In the analysis of the Mape, Kâte, Mesem, and Nabak examples in (83) through (88) I pretended that the syntax of the four languages was the same. Yet it is possible that there are syntactic differences between some or all of them. Unfortunately, the limited amount of syntactic data available hampers the detection of differences. For a deeper analysis we need more detailed descriptions. This caveat also pertains to the following section. I have only found a small number of examples in which a benefactive auxiliary co-occurs with a beneficiary phrase in the same clause. Their analysis can only be tentative at the present stage of research.

4.6 Benefactive auxiliary and beneficiary phrase

In this section we return to the benefactive auxiliary verbs (Section 2) and look at them together with genitive-causal phrases in benefactive function (Section 4.5). Languages of the Huon Tip, Sankwep, and Kabwum subfamilies have benefactive constructions of both types. Examples of both constructions are juxtaposed in (89) and (90) for Kâte and Selepet. The (a)-examples contain a personal pronoun in the genitive-causal case with benefactive function, in the (b)-examples the verb is suffixed with a form of the benefactive auxiliary. As the translations indicate, the two constructions are synonymous.

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

89a   *Jesu-tsi*   *nəŋɔʔne-le*   *həmo-weʔ.*

Jesus-ERG   1PL.INCL-BEN die-F.PST:3SG

'Jesus died for us.'

==

89b   *Jesu-tsi*   *hɔmo-nɔle-weʔ.*

       Jesus-ERG   die-1PL:BEN-F.PST:3SG

       'Jesus died for us.'

       (elicited)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

90a   *Je-ŋgɔt*   *nɔŋgɔ-ŋetɔ ...*

       3PL-BEN   feel-DS:3PL

       'They were concerned for them.'

90b   *Juwu   nɔŋgɔ-jingi-wi.*

       thus   feel-3PL:BEN-F.PST:3PL

       'They were thus concerned for them.'

       (McElhanon 1970a: 310)

In (89) and (90) a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case and a synonymous form of the benefactive auxiliary occur in different clauses. The question arises whether they could co-occur in one and the same clause. As it turns out, there is no general answer to this question because the Huon Tip languages and the Western Huon languages of the Sankwep and the Kabwum subfamilies behave differently. Let us first have a look at the Huon Tip languages.

In the Migabac example (91) from a traditional story the benefactive suffix *-ʔno* -3SG:BEN agrees with the noun phrase *ŋiʔ suguʔne* 'old man'. The benefactive construction has a malefactive sense: The old woman's breaking his nose by biting it adversely affects the old man. In this clause, the beneficiary phrase is an unmarked noun phrase. The Kâte example (92) from Pilhofer's grammar shows the same syntax as the Migabac example (91). The benefactive suffix *-jale* -3PL:BEN agrees with the unmarked noun phrase *ɔgo-fɔʔ-jeŋiʔ* 'their friends'.

Migabac (Huon Tip, Trans Vitiaz, EH)

91   *We-naguʔ-gu*   *we-naguʔ-gu,*   *ŋigaʔ*   *suguʔne-di*

      strike-REFL-DUR.SS   strike-REFL-DUR.SS   woman   big-ERG

==

ɲiʔ   suguʔne   soge   hisoʔ-ke-ʔno-me …

man   big   nose   bite.break-3SG:OBJ-3SG:BEN-SEQ:3SG.DS

'They continued fighting and the old woman bit the old man's nose and broke it.'

(McEvoy 2008: 377)

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

92   Jaŋe   ɔgo-fɔʔ-jeŋiʔ   kpeŋ   kpa-jale-ŋgopieŋ.

3PL   friend-PL-3PL:POSS   conch.shell   hit-3PL:BEN-PRS:3PL

'They blow the conch shell for their friends.'

(Pilhofer 1933: 127)

The Migabac example (91) and the Kâte example (92) show that in both languages a noun phrase carrying no case enclitic can serve as beneficiary phrase agreeing with the benefactive auxiliary on the verbal predicate of the same clause. In Migabac, the genitive-causal case does not have benefactive function. We would therefore not expect an agreeing beneficiary phrase to be marked with the genitive-causal case. But in Kâte, the genitive-causal case does have benefactive function. Yet, no instance of a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case co-occurring with a benefactive auxiliary has been observed. We are fortunate to have grammaticality judgments that concern such a construction for another Huon Tip language. The Mape example (93a) shows a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case, and example (93b) shows a verbal predicate with a benefactive auxiliary. The attempt to combine both constructions in one clause leads to an unacceptable utterance (93c).

Mape (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

93a   Webo   Sakale-le   iga-jaʔ.

bird   Sakale-BEN   shoot-F.PST:3SG

'He shot the bird for Sakale.'

93b   Webo   iga-ote-jaʔ.

bird   shoot-BEN:3SG-F.PST:3SG

'He shot the bird for him.'

===

93c   *?Webo Sakale-le   iga-ote-ja?.*

bird   Sakale-BEN   shoot-3SG:BEN-F.PST:3SG

(Sifuma 1997: 31)

Before we draw any conclusions, we must consider another set of elicited sentences. The Kâte example (94a) shows a well-formed benefactive construction with a benefactive auxiliary of the first person singular. Both attempts to extend the construction with a beneficiary phrase fail. As expected, the addition of a personal pronoun in the genitive-causal case is judged to be unacceptable (94c). But surprisingly, the addition of an unmarked personal pronoun, too, is rejected by all consultants (94b).

Kâte (Huon Tip, Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

94a   *Sala-nale-we?.*

       plant-1SG:BEN-F.PST:3SG

       'He planted it for me.'

94b   *?No   sala-nale-we?.*

       1SG   plant-1SG:BEN-F.PST:3SG

94c   *?No-le   sala-nale-we?.*

       1SG-BEN   plant-1SG:BEN-F.PST:3SG

       (elicited)

It is difficult to tell why the Kâte example (94b) with an unmarked noun phrase as beneficiary phrase is judged to be unacceptable. Possibly, the fact that the beneficiary phrase is a personal pronoun plays a role. In Kâte, unmarked personal pronouns have subject function in the vast majority of their occurrences in discourse. The well-formed examples (91) and (92) from Migabac and Kâte have a beneficiary phrase with a noun as its complement. Further research is needed to determine the rules that license an unmarked noun phrase as beneficiary phrase in a clause with an agreeing benefactive auxiliary in Kâte and Mape. We can be more confident that beneficiary phrases in the genitive-causal case are illicit in clauses that also contain an agreeing benefactive auxiliary. No instance of such a construction has been found in

==

the data for any Huon Tip language and both Sifuma for Mape (93c) and my Kâte consultants (94c) reject clauses of that type.

Let us now turn to the Western Huon languages. It is not difficult to find examples of the co-occurrence of a benefactive auxiliary with a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case in the Nabak texts. Example (95) shows that an agreeing benefactive auxiliary can be freely added to a clause with a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case without changing the meaning or affecting the acceptability of the utterance. In the more limited data for Selepet, example (96) has been found. Here, a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case made up of a demonstrative with a personal pronoun of the third person plural in apposition agrees with the benefactive auxiliary suffixed to the verb heading the predicate of the clause.

Nabak (Sankwep, Rawlinson, WH)

95a   *Gɔ-gɔt*   *pu-jap.*
      2sg-BEN   carry-PRS:1SG
      'I am carrying [it] for you.'

95b   *Gɔ-gɔt*   *pu-ŋge-jap.*
      2sg-BEN   carry-2SG:BEN-PRS:1SG
      'I am carrying [it] for you.'
      (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 96)

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

96   *Ja___je-ŋgɔt*   *heroŋe*   *ot-jiŋgi-mini-wi.*
      those 3PL-BEN   friendliness   do-3PL:BEN-HAB-F.PST:3PL
      'They used to be well pleased with them.'
      (McElhanon 1972: 23)

In Nabak and Selepet, a beneficiary phrase in the genitive-causal case can co-occur with an agreeing benefactive auxiliary in the same clause. The same does not hold for the Huon Tip languages. Grammaticality judgments reveal that such a combination is not permissible in Kâte and Mape.

===

4.7 The functions of the reflexes of pWH *-gut GEN/CSL and *gut 'therefore'

It has become clear by now that the case enclitic described in the previous sections is polysemous. The genitive function (Section 4.1) and the causal function (Section 4.2) are inseparable. The two functions are enclosed in the same case enclitic in every Huon Peninsula language that has case enclitics. In some languages, the same enclitic also serves as a beneficiary marker (Section 4.5). This is, however, not the end of the story. To broaden our view, we must now turn from comparative syntax to comparative morphology. Table 7 shows the reflexes of the Proto-Western Huon genitive-causal enclitic *-gut in all daughter languages for which we have sufficient data. There are columns for five major case functions: genitive (GEN), causal (CSL), benefactive (BEN), ablative (ABL), and comitative (COM). The minor function of forming temporal adverbials (Section 4.4) is omitted from the table. For every language, the phonological form of all reflexes in all attested functions is given.

In Somba, both Sankwep languages and all three Kabwum languages, the reflexes of pWH *-gut have genitive as well as causal function. In Nabak and Timbe, there is allomorphy. Nabak *-gat* appears after stems ending in a consonant, *-jet* after stems ending in a vowel (Fabian, Fabian and Waters 1998: 82). A third allomorph, *-gət,* occurs in combination with personal pronouns. In Timbe, *-gət* appears after noun stems and *-et* after possessive suffixes (Foster 1972: 48). The variants in Somba are not morphophonologically conditioned. The simple reflex *-gə(t)* is normal in genitive function, but occurs only rarely in causal function. In the latter function, we usually find *-gər-a(p)*, with added emphatic suffix *-a(p)*. In genitive function, there is an emphatic variant *-gər-eŋ* (Olkkonnen 1990: 11-13). From a diachronic point of view, the distribution of variants in Somba can be seen as an incipient dissociation of the genitive and the causal function.

I reconstruct genitive and causal function for pWH *-gut since the two functions are reflected in all three second order subfamilies of Western Huon under consideration. The benefactive function is less widely distributed. Somba *-gə(t)* does not have benefactive function and I have also been unable to find a clear example of Komba *-gʌt* in benefactive function. Somba and Komba stand in a close contact relationship with each other and it is possible that this prevented the innovative benefactive function from spreading from Timbe and Selepet to Komba. The benefactive function is most prominent in the two Sankwep languages, Mesem and Nabak. If it originated in one place, then that must have been within the Sankwep family. But it is equally possible that it arose independently in the Sankwep and in the Kabwum family.

==
Table 7:   Reflexes of pWH *-gut GEN/CSL

	GEN	CSL	BEN	ABL	COM
PINDIU					
Dedua					-goʔ
Mongi					-guʔ
Tobo					-gu
Borong					
Somba	-gə(t), -gər-eŋ	-gər-a(p), -gə(t)			
SANKWEP					
Mesem	-gə(t)	-gə(t)	-gə(t)	(-a)-gət-n	
Nabak	-gat- ~ -jet	-gat ~ -jet	-gat ~ -jet	-gat-naŋ(-en)	
KABWUM					
Komba	-gʌt	-gʌt		gʌ-βʌ	
Selepet	-gɔt	-gɔt	-gɔt	gɔt-ŋe ORIG	
Timbe	-gɔt ~ -et	-gɔt ~ -et	-gɔt ~ -et	gɔt-ŋe ORIG	

The ablative case must be briefly mentioned. The ablative enclitic is often not monomorphemic but composite. In the Sankwep and the Kabwum languages, one of its components is the genitive-causal enclitic. In Mesem and Nabak, it is followed by the possessive suffix of the third person singular. Selepet and Timbe have a composite enclitic with the same structure. But while the combined enclitic has ablative function in Mesem and Nabak, it is an originative marker in Selepet and Timbe. Timbe *Jakop gɔtŋe* means 'those from Yakop' and stands beside the ablative *Jakop-ba* 'from Yakop' (Foster 1972: 42). The Komba ablative enclitic *gʌ-βʌ* is made up of the genitive-causal enclitic *-gʌt* and the suffix *-βʌ*, which on its own serves as ablative marker in combination with demonstrative roots, as in *zo-βʌ* 'from there' (Southwell 1979: 169). Reflexes of pWH *-gut can, thus, be found as one of the components in morphologically complex ablative enclitics.

Somba is the only Pindiu language that preserves pWH *-gut GEN/CSL in its original function. Borong has lost the enclitic altogether. In the remaining Pindiu languages its function has shifted to a comitative case. Example (97) shows the Dedua reflex *-goʔ* being used as a comitative enclitic.

===

Dedua (Pindiu, Rawlinson, WH)

97 *Paŋgino   medah-a-goʔ   jeri   edi   tar-oʔ.*
    Panggino   boy-3SG:POSS-COM   3DU   there   live-F.PST:3DU
    'The Panggino man and his son lived there.'
    (Ceder and Ceder 1990: 241)

In Section 4.4 we saw that the Mongi comitative enclitic *-guʔ* can be used to form temporal adverbs. This usage must go back to a time when the enclitic still had genitive-causal function and is evidence that Mongi *-guʔ* does not resemble the genitive-causal enclitics of other Western Huon languages by chance but rather because of a common origin. Moreover, there is a parallel development in the Eastern Huon family. The Sialum comitative enclitic *-ta* is most likely cognate with the Proto-Huon Tip genitive-causal enclitic *-të (Suter 2018: 255).

Hitherto, we have focused on case functions and looked at the phonological form of the enclitics that express them. Widening the scope of our investigation, we cannot fail to notice a discourse marker of the same sound shape as pWH *-gut GEN/CSL. I have found evidence for it only in the Kabwum family so far. In Komba, the inferential particle *gʌt* is always followed by the contrastive particle *ko*. Southwell (1979: 60) translates the combined particle *gʌt ko* as 'because of that, so then'. In example (98) it opens a sentence after the rhetorical question "Who will I live with?". Hearers know that all the speaker's relatives have died in the landslide. For that reason, the speaker, too, wants to die.

Komba (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

98 *Zet   ko   zʌi-m-ŋʌ   ʌtʌ-ŋ-andʌ*
    2DU   CNTR   ascend-SS-CMPL   elder.sister-3SG:POSS-ERG

    gat-ŋʌ   galem   u-pap.   ŋʌi   sot
    younger.sister-3SG:POSS   overseer   do-F.FUT:3SG   who   COM

    ʌndi-βat?   Gʌt   ko   nʌ   kʌr-ʌn   ari-a
    live-F.FUT:1SG   therefore   CNTR   1sg   stone-LOC   go-DS:1SG

===

ni-ni-βap.

eat-1SG:OBJ.I-F.FUT:3SG

'The two of you go up to the village and the elder will take care of the younger. Because I have no one left to live with, I will go to the landslide and it will take me too.'

(Southwell 1979: 211)

In Selepet and Timbe, the inferential particle *gɔt* is always suffixed with the contrastive marker *-ɔmɔ*. The complex particle *gɔr-ɔmɔ* has a similar function to *gʌt ko* in Komba. McElhanon (1970a: 332) translates Selepet *gɔrɔmɔ* with 'however, moreover, furthermore', Foster (1972: 41) glosses Timbe *gɔrɔmɔ* as 'therefore'. In the following example (99) from Selepet, *gɔrɔmɔ* is evidently used to draw an inference.

Selepet (Kabwum, Cromwell, WH)

99   *Konok ki   j-an.   Gɔrɔmɔ   bɔiŋe sɔ-mune   ek.*
     one   not   speak-N.PST:1SG   and.so   last   speak-DS:1SG see.IMP:2SG
     'I have not spoken [about] one [thing]. And so I will conclude and you take note!'
     (McElhanon 1970a: 333)

The inferential particle that can be projected to Proto-Western Huon as *gut is reflected in all three Kabwum languages. It has been reinforced with a contrastive marker in the contemporary languages. There is a parallel in the Eastern Huon language Ono. Beside the genitive-causal enclitic *-wane* Ono has an inferential particle *wane* 'therefore' (Suter, forthcoming a: 5). Like its Ono counterpart, the sentence-initial particle pWH *gut must have been used to draw a causal inference. There is no doubt that pWH *gut 'therefore' shares its etymological origin with the genitive-causal enclitic pWH *-gut.

5 Benefactive pronouns in Kovai

As so often in matters grammatical, Kovai steps out of line when it comes to benefaction. Whereas the Huon Peninsula languages spoken on the eponymous peninsula have a benefactive auxiliary (Section 2) and a genitive-causal case (Section 4) Kovai lacks both. The verbal morphology and the personal pronouns leave no doubt that Kovai is a member of the Eastern Huon language family (Suter 2018). The linguistic ancestors of the Kovai people must have left the Huon Peninsula at some time in the past. They found a new home across the Vitiaz Strait

===

on Umboi Island, where they are surrounded by speakers of Oceanic Austronesian languages. The influence of those unrelated neighboring languages on the grammar of Kovai is beyond the scope of this paper.

Kovai expresses benefaction with pronominal benefactive markers that fill a beneficiary phrase in the clause. In example (100) there is a coordinated beneficiary phrase combining the benefactive markers *inog* 'for you' and *inaŋin*[6] 'for me'. In (101) we see the first person plural form *inbin* 'for us' in the normal position for a beneficiary phrase after the verbal predicate.

Kovai (Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

100   *Sopol-im*   *lal-o,*   *in-og*   *o*   *inaŋ-in.*
       split-NON.PST:2SG   be.two-NON.PST:3SG   BEN-2SG:POSS and   BEN-1SG:POSS
       'Split it into two, (half) for you and (half) for me.'
       (Brown 1992: 34)

101   *Auguna*   *menaŋ* *il-it*   *in-bin.*
       there   food   make-NON.PST:2DU   BEN-1PL:POSS
       'Prepare the meal for us there.'
       (Brown 1992: 91)

Brown (1992: 34) calls the benefactive markers pronouns. That is an apt name given that they inflect for person and number. Kovai also has comitative pronouns (Brown 1992: 44) that perform the function executed by comitative case enclitics in the peninsular languages. Formally, however, the benefactive pronouns are inalienably possessed nouns. Table 8 juxtaposes the singular forms of the alienably possessed noun *pai* 'house', the inalienably possessed noun *mel ~ mil* 'hand' and the benefactive pronoun. It can be seen that the benefactive pronoun contains the same possessive suffixes as the inalienably possessed noun for 'hand'. The nominal root *in* only occurs in the forms of the benefactive pronoun. It is glossed as BEN because it encodes the benefactive function.

---

[6] The first person singular form *inaŋin* is a *hapax legomenon* occurring only in the example cited above as (97). In Figure 19 on the same page of the Kovai grammar (Brown 1992: 34), the first person singular form of the benefactive pronoun is given as *inain*. That form does not recur in the grammar, either.

==

Table 8:   Possession marking and benefactive pronouns in Kovai

          (Brown 1992)

Alienable possession	Inalienable possession	Benefactive pronoun
pai n-oŋ 'my house'	mil-in 'my hand'	inaŋ-in 'for me'
pai g-oŋ 'your house'	mel-og 'your hand'	in-og 'for you'
pai j-oŋ 'his/her house'	mel-on 'his/her hand'	in-on 'for him/her'

So far, we have only seen examples in which benefactive pronouns alone serve as beneficiary phrase in a clause. Of course, it is also possible for a common or a proper noun to fill the beneficiary phrase. In example (102) the noun phrase *Ase malabon* 'Ase himself' is the lexical filler of the beneficiary phrase. It is followed by the third person singular form *in-on* of the benefactive pronoun. The resumptive benefactive pronoun at the end of the beneficiary phrase marks the function of the phrase. The beneficiary phrase is in clause-initial position here because it is topicalized.

Kovai (Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

102   *[Ase   malabon   in-on]   oz-pai.*

      Ase   self   BEN-3SG:POSS husk-PST:1SG

      'I husked one for Ase himself.'

      (Brown 1992: 91)

Phrases with postposed *inon* are functionally more diverse than just indicating benefaction. In (103), an inanimate noun, *aul* 'lime', is the lexical filler of the beneficiary phrase. It is possible to interpret it as a real beneficiary: The lime benefits from the container in that it remains dry in it. But the phrase is only a small step away from a purposive interpretation, if the line has not already been crossed. In (104), the lexical filler is the kinship term *tob-an* 'his wife'. The wife is hardly affected by her husband's crying, particularly if she is dead. Rather than having a benefactive reading, the phrase with postposed *inon* has a causal reading here. The predicate *zuzur-j-e* 'it irked him' in (105) is an impersonal verb. In Section 4.3 we saw that in the peninsular languages impersonal verbs can take an oblique object in the causal case. In Kovai, the oblique object is a phrase with postposed *inon*.

===

Kovai (Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

103   *Kaŋkaŋ*   *il-ip*   [*aul*   *in-on*].

Lime.gourd   do-NON.PST:1SG   lime   BEN-3SG:POSS

'I'll make a container for the lime.'

(Brown 1992: 73)

104   *ŋa-i*   [*tob-an*   *in-on*].

cry-PST:3SG   wife-3SG:POSS BEN-3SG:POSS

'He cried for/because of his wife.'

(Brown 1992: 73)

105   *ŋail*   *kon*   *zuzur-j-e*   [*ge*   *atn-on*   *in-on*].

brother small   get.cross-3SG:OBJ-PST:3SG   pig   liver-3SG:POSS BEN-3SG:POSS

'My little brother got cross about the pig's liver.'

(Brown 1992: 73)

In most peninsular languages the question word for 'why?' is made up of 'what?' plus the causal case enclitic (see examples 61 and 62 in Section 4.2). There is evidence for a similar composition of that interrogative in Kovai (106). The question word *minon* 'why?' etymologically contains the third person singular benefactive pronoun *inon* plus the interrogative root *m-*. The same root occurs in the question word *mug* 'what?' (compare *ug* 'which?') and is probably cognate with Proto-Huon Tip **ma* 'who?, which?' > Migabac *ma*, Kâte *mo*.

Kovai (Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

106   *Minon* *ga-pe*   *lab.*

why   go-PST:2PL   water

'Why did you go to the river?'

(Brown 1992: 88)

Phrases with postposed *inon* are also found in complex sentence formation. The complement of *inon* contains a nominalized verb form and the whole phrase is a subordinate sentence with purposive function. In (107), the subordinate clause *lab toŋon inon* 'in order to get water' is a purposive adjunct of the main clause predicate *gupe* 'they were coming'. The verb

==

form *to-ŋon* get-GER in the subordinate clause is a so-called gerund, a kind of verbal noun (Brown 1992: 36). In (108), the verb *ga* 'go' in the subordinate clause carries the nominalizing suffix *-oŋ* (Brown 1992: 37). Both nominalization strategies are used in (109). The first verb form of the subordinate sentence is suffixed with the nominalizer *-oŋ*, the second carries the gerund suffix *-ŋon*. Example (109) illustrates the use of purposive subordinate sentences in the rendition of indirect speech (Brown 1992: 36). In purposive subordinate sentences like those in (107) to (109) the postposed *inon* has lost its connection with the paradigm of benefactive pronouns (see Table 6). No other form than the third person singular form can mark purposive subordination. For that reason, *inon* is written without morpheme break and glossed as PURP in these examples.

Kovai (Trans-Vitiaz, EH)

107 *Paŋgar*   *g-u-pe*   *[lab*   *to-ŋon*   *inon].*
     woman   ASP-come-PST:3PL   water   get-GER   PURP
     'The women were coming to fetch water.'
     (Brown 1992: 94)

108 *Ibao-pit*   *[g-oŋ*   *mot*   *inon].*
     run.away-PST:3DU   go-NMZ   village PURP
     'They ran away (wanting) to go home.'
     (Brown 1992: 94)

109 *Mam-in*   *me-g-e*   *[g-oŋ*   *amol-tin-ŋon*   *inon].*
     father-1SG:POSS   say-2SG:OBJ-PST:3SG go-NMZ   see-3SG:OBJ-GER   PURP
     'My father told you to go and see him.'
     (Brown 1992: 34)

The benefactive pronouns of Kovai most often fill the beneficiary phrase alone. If there is a lexical filler of the beneficiary phrase, a postposed benefactive pronoun of the third person resumes it. In this construction, there is presumably still variation between third person singular, dual, and plural benefactive pronouns depending on the number of the lexical beneficiary. The same construction can be used for nominal adjuncts with a causal function and for causal objects. Finally, postposed *inon*, etymologically the third person singular form of the

===

benefactive pronoun, can form purposive subordinate sentences. The verbs in those subordinate sentences are nominalized.

6 Discussion 2: Beneficiary phrases

Kovai has no benefactive auxiliary that indexes the beneficiary. Instead, it has benefactive pronouns that fill the beneficiary phrase. Several of Kovai's peninsular sister languages have two benefactive constructions, one of them head-marking, the other dependent-marking. Beside the head-marking benefactive auxiliary construction there is a dependent-marking construction with a benefactive case. The marker of benefaction is a case enclitic that otherwise has genitive-causal function. The history of that enclitic is traced in Section 6.1. In Section 6.2 we turn to the benefactive pronouns of Kovai and their historical development. In 6.3 the mechanisms of change that have been postulated throughout this paper are reviewed.

6.1 The genitive-causal case and its extension to benefaction

A genitive-causal case is attested in all languages spoken on the Huon Peninsula. It has two basic functions: genitive (Section 4.1) and causal (Sections 4.2 and 4.3). From a synchronic point of view, the genitive-causal case as well as the ergative-instrumental case can be, and are, often, considered two different cases that happen to be homonymous. Diachronically, however, the two functions of both cases are inseparable. If the optional ergative enclitic is replaced in a particular language or subfamily, not only the ergative case but also the instrumental case will acquire the new form. The same holds true for the genitive-causal case.

As shown in Section 4.7, there was a discourse marker *gut 'therefore' in Proto-Western Huon matching the genitive-causal enclitic *-gut. There is a parallel in the Eastern Huon language Ono. Beside the genitive-causal enclitic -wane Ono has a discourse marker wane 'therefore'. The case enclitic -wane GEN/CSL is innovative; it replaces Proto-Eastern Huon *-ta GEN/CSL. The sentence-initial particle wane 'therefore', I believe, was the source of the replacement. In dialogue, a discrepancy in the syntactic construal of wane 'therefore' between speaker and hearer must have occurred with some frequency. The speaker would make a pause after having begun a new sentence with the inferential particle wane 'therefore' because he had not yet finished planning the rest of the sentence. The hearer would interpret the pause as a signal of a sentence boundary and parse wane 'therefore' as belonging to the preceding final verb. As a result, the sentence preceding wane was construed as a causal subordinate sentence by the hearer rather than, as intended by the speaker, an independent sentence. In this way, wane acquired a new use as an enclitic marker of causal subordination. In this function, it entered

===

into competition with the old genitive-causal enclitic *-ta. It took on the other uses of a genitive-causal case, including the genitive function, and eventually ousted the old enclitic.

In all likelihood, pWH *-gut GEN/CSL derives historically from the sentence-initial particle *gut 'therefore', in the same way as postulated above for Ono -wane GEN/CSL. In Mesem, Nabak, Selepet, and Timbe, the reflexes of pWH *-gut GEN/CSL have developed a benefactive function (Section 4.5). Two conservative Western Huon languages, Somba and Komba, did not participate in the functional extension. In the Eastern Huon family, the same extension took place in Kâte and Mape, but not in Migabac and Ono. The erratic distribution of the new benefactive case across the family tree suggests that the extension took place more than once independently. The extension of a causal case to benefactive function is a natural grammatical change. Beneficiary phrases have human reference, causal phrases never have human reference when the complement of the enclitic is a sentence and only very seldom when the complement is a noun phrase. The crucial step in the extension from causal to benefactive function is the admission of nominal complements with human reference and particularly of personal pronouns.

All languages in which the genitive-causal case has benefactive function also have a benefactive auxiliary. The benefactive case is a redundant addition to the grammatical system. In the Huon Tip languages Kâte and Mape the new benefactive case has not yet been fully integrated with the pre-existing benefactive auxiliary construction (Section 4.6). A beneficiary phrase agreeing with a benefactive auxiliary in the same clause cannot be marked with the benefactive case in Kâte and Mape. In the Huon Tip language Migabac, where the genitive-causal case does not have benefactive function, a beneficiary phrase with a nominal complement agreeing with the benefactive auxiliary carries no case enclitic, just like an object noun phrase. The same marking strategy has been observed in Kâte. In the Western Huon languages Nabak and Selepet, on the other hand, beneficiary phrases agreeing with the benefactive auxiliary on the verbal predicate can be marked with the innovative benefactive case. It is not known whether the marking is obligatory. That would be the last step in the integration of the new with the old benefactive construction.

6.2 Development of the Kovai benefactive pronoun

The Kovai benefactive pronoun is a unique innovation within the Huon Peninsula family (Section 5). Morphologically, it is an inalienably possessed noun, like the relational nouns that specify locative relations. But while the lexical meanings of the relational nouns are generally transparent, the root to which the possessive suffixes of the benefactive pronoun are attached

==

has the grammatical function of a benefactive marker. Its etymology is unknown. Syntactically, the benefactive pronoun behaves like an oblique personal pronoun. Note, however, that the basic personal pronouns of the third person in subject function precede the noun phrase they resume whereas the benefactive pronouns follow it. The other personal pronoun that is postposed is the possessive pronoun for alienably possessed nouns.

We know that the Proto-Trans-Vitiaz object verb *nata 'give' was used as a benefactive auxiliary (see Section 3.2). The genitive-causal case did not have benefactive function in Proto-Trans-Vitiaz. Within the Huon Tip family, an innovative benefactive case is only attested for Kâte and Mape, but not for Migabac. It can therefore not be reconstructed to Proto-Huon Tip nor projected to Proto-Trans-Vitiaz. The Kovai benefactive pronoun arose when the inherited benefactive auxiliary was disappearing. Presumably, this happened when *nata 'give' lost its pronominal object prefixes and was reduced to the root *ta* 'give'. The invariable verb root could no longer be used to index beneficiaries across three persons and three numbers. Instead, a new benefactive pronoun that performed the same referential function was created.

If there is a lexical beneficiary, a third person form of the benefactive pronoun follows the lexical noun phrase and resumes it. This construction was the point of departure for further developments. It is tempting to assume that the genitive-causal enclitic still existed after the benefactive pronoun had established itself as the new benefactive construction. When subsequently the genitive-causal enclitic disappeared, like all other case enclitics, the lexical beneficiary construction was ready to adopt the causal function of the moribund enclitic. Remarkably, I have found only noun phrases with a causal sense in this construction, clauses and sentences always have a purposive sense.[7] When *inon*, etymologically the third person singular form of the benefactive pronoun, marks a clause with a nominalized verb as a purposive subordinate clause, it is no longer an inflectional form of the benefactive pronoun but an invariable conjunction.

6.3 Grammatical change

Functional changes of grammatical morphemes can be extensions or shifts. In a functional extension, the original function is retained and a new additional function is introduced. The extension of the causal function of the genitive-causal case to benefactive function (Section 4.5) and of the genitive function to temporal location (Section 4.4) are cases in point. In a functional

---

[7] It is not clear to me how causal subordination is expressed in Kovai. The grammar mentions the complex conjunction *erne inon* 'therefore' but presents only one example of its use (Brown 1992: 49).

===

shift, on the other hand, a grammatical morpheme gives up its original function and takes on a new function. An example is the shift of the Proto-Pindiu genitive-causal case to a comitative case in Dedua, Mongi, and Tobo (see Table 7 in Section 4.7). Note that a shift in grammatical function is synchronically invisible. It can only be detected in a comparative-historical analysis of two or more related languages.

There is a difference between renewal and creation in grammatical change. A renewal takes place when a grammatical morpheme is replaced by another one that has a different sound shape but acquires the same function. This happened, for instance, when the Proto-Pindiu benefactive auxiliary *neŋgi was replaced by *-nəm in Dedua, Mongi, Tobo, and Borong (Section 2.6) or when the Proto-Eastern Huon genitive-causal enclitic *-ta was replaced by -wane in Ono (Section 6.1). By contrast, the extension of the causal function of the genitive-causal case to benefaction was a creative change (Section 4.5). There was no benefactive case before, it came into being through that grammatical change.

The development of the Pre-Western Huon inferential particle *gut 'therefore' to a genitive-causal enclitic in Proto-Western Huon involved a change in bondedness (Section 4.7). An independent word became an enclitic. There was also an increase in bondedness in the development of the Pre-Trans-Vitiaz object verb *nata 'take sb' to a benefactive auxiliary in Proto-Trans-Vitiaz (Section 3.2). Here, an independent verb became a suffix. There is, however, a big difference on the semantic level between the two historical changes. In the case of *nata 'take sb' a verb lost its lexical meaning and became a grammatical marker. This is a case of grammaticalization. In the case of *gut 'therefore', the inferential particle and the case enclitic in its causal function arguably have the same semantic content. There was only a semantic change insofar as the case enclitic also acquired genitive function.

In Nabak, the benefactive auxiliary -ne is also used for object indexation (Section 2.9). It is a grammaticalization of the Pre-Sankwep object verb *ne 'leave'. Here, a grammaticalization was followed by a functional extension. In grammaticalization research, such sequences of change are called "grammaticalization chains" (Narrog and Heine 2021: 127-131). In such chains, multiple functions of a grammatical morpheme in a language are intuitively ordered according to their degree of grammaticality. Typological data can also be arranged in grammaticalization chains. Comparable functions found in unrelated languages are then ordered in a sequence, which supposedly has synchronic as well as diachronic significance. Since the chains are considered to represent "grammaticalization", the postulation of bidirectional developments is generally avoided. However, bidirectional developments of grammatical functions are well attested in language history. We have seen in this paper that the

==

causal function of the genitive-causal case was extended to benefaction in some Huon Peninsula languages (Section 4). In Kovai, on the other hand, forms of the benefactive pronoun developed causal and purposive functions (Section 5). Hence, grammatical change between benefactive and causal/purposive function can go in either direction. There is good reason to believe that changes from lexical item to grammatical item are largely unidirectional. But there is no reason to assume that changes between grammatical functions are as a rule unidirectional. The latter kind of grammatical change had therefore better not be subsumed under the notion of grammaticalization.

7 Conclusion

There are three benefactive constructions in the Huon Peninsula family. All of the languages spoken on the eponymous peninsula have a benefactive auxiliary. Kovai, spoken on Umboi Island, has benefactive pronouns. Some of the peninsular languages in addition have a benefactive case. In two of those three constructions the benefactive marker is pronominal. Benefactive auxiliaries index the person and number of the beneficiary, benefactive pronouns refer to the person and number of the beneficiary. Only the benefactive case is not a person-number paradigm. However, if one looks at the complements of the benefactive case enclitic in the data for this study, one cannot fail to notice that a high percentage of them are personal pronouns. In the introduction (Section 1) we started out from the working definition of beneficiaries by Zúñiga and Kittilä (2010: 2) saying that "beneficiaries are typically animate." I find this too weak a statement. At least in the Huon Peninsula languages, beneficiaries have a strong affinity with person deixis.

Benefactive auxiliaries are diachronically not very stable. Three instances of their replacement by a new form have been found in the history of the Huon Peninsula family. In the Huon Tip subfamily and in four languages of the Pindiu subfamily the new benefactive auxiliary is homonymous with an object verb meaning 'give', in the Sankwep subfamily it is homonymous with an object verb meaning 'leave'. A comparative-historical analysis of the grammaticalization process in the former two subfamilies shows, however, that the meaning the lexical verb had before it underwent grammaticalization was 'take sb' rather than 'give sb'. This historical fact cannot be detected in a synchronic study of the languages concerned. Benefactive auxiliaries are widespread not only among the Huon Peninsula languages but also among the related Finisterre languages. Taking into consideration that they are often formally renewed, which thwarts reconstruction at deeper levels, it is plausible to assume that already Proto-Huon Peninsula had a benefactive auxiliary construction. The original construction

==

involved clause chaining morphology to connect the lexical verb to the auxiliary verb. In more recent times, there was a trend toward univerbation so that the benefactive auxiliary has become an inflectional suffix of the lexical verb in the majority of the modern languages.

A noteworthy insight resulting from this study is that the Eastern Huon language Ono and the Western Huon language Somba are the morphosyntactically most conservative languages of the Huon Peninsula family. They are the only languages in which the original clause chaining syntax of the benefactive auxiliary verb construction has been preserved. Furthermore, both languages are also on the conservative side with respect to the benefactive case. They do not belong to the innovative group of languages that have extended the function of the genitive-causal case to benefaction. In the languages with a benefactive case there are two separate constructions with the same function. Synonymous clauses can be constructed containing either a beneficiary phrase in the benefactive case or a benefactive auxiliary.

The unique benefactive pronoun of Kovai has arisen in geographical separation from the remaining Huon Peninsula languages. I have tried to connect it historically to what is reconstructible for Proto-Trans-Vitiaz, the ancestral language linking Kovai to the Huon Tip languages. But it is likely that the history of the Kovai benefactive pronoun must be rewritten when the contact relationship with the surrounding Oceanic Austronesian languages is better understood. Apart from Kovai, contact influence has only been found to be at work in the Sankwep subfamily. Verb root serialization, which connects the lexical verb and the benefactive auxiliary verb, has probably been imported from the neighboring Erap languages. For the other grammatical changes reported in this study no influence from external languages has been noticed. The majority of them are renewals, i.e. replacements of a form with another form having the same function. Renewals leave the grammatical system intact. The proximity of languages of common descent on the Huon Peninsula is conducive to structural conservatism.

Abbreviations

*	reconstruction	BEN	benefactive
?	unacceptable utterance	CMPL	completive
1	first person	CNTF	counterfactual
2	second person	CNTR	contrastive
3	third person	COM	comitative
A	agent	CONSEQ	consequential
ABL	ablative	CONT	continuative
ASP	aspect	CSL	causal

==

DS	different subject	N.PST	near past
DU	dual	OBJ	object
DUR	durative	OBJ.I	object class I
EH	Eastern Huon	OBJ.II	object class II
EMPH	emphatic	OBJ.III	object class III
ERG	ergative	ORIG	originative
EXCL	exclusive	P	patient
F.FUT	far future	PL	plural
F.PST	far past	POSS	possessive
FUT	future	PRON	prononimal
FUT.IMP	future imperative	PRS	present
GEN	genitive	PRS.IMP	present imperative
GER	gerund	PST	past
HAB	habitual	PURP	purposive
HAB.PRS	habitual present	R	recipient
HAB.PST	habitual past	REFL	reflexive
HORT	hortative	SEQ	sequential
INCL	inclusive	SG	singular
INF	infinitive	SIM	simultaneous
INS	instrumental	SPEC	specifier
INT.PST	intermediate past	SS	same subject
IMP	imperative	T	theme
LOC	locative	TV	Trans-Vitiaz
N.FUT	near future	WH	Western Huon
NMZ	nominalizer		
NON.PST	non-past		

References

Brown, Alan 1992. *Kovai grammar essentials.* Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Bruce, Les 1986. "Serialisation: the interface of syntax and lexicon" *Papers in New Guinea linguistics* 24: 21-37. [PL A-70]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Ceder, Sune and Britt Ceder 1990. *Dedua grammar essentials.* Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

==

Fabian, Grace, Edmund Fabian and Bruce Waters 1998. *Morphology, syntax and cohesion in Nabak, Papua New Guinea.* [PL C-144]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Flierl, W. and H. Strauss (eds) 1977. *Kâte dictionary.* [PL C-41]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Foster, Michael 1972. Essentials for translation, grammar data, Timbe language. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Haspelmath, Martin 2015. "Ditransitive constructions" *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2015, 1: 19-41.

Hynum, David 1995. Numanggang grammar notes. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Lee, Yongseop 1993. Kube grammar essentials. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Linnasalo, Katri 1993. On Nek grammar. Grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

McElhanon, K. A. 1970a. *The Selepet language within the Finisterre-Huon phylum.* PhD thesis. Canberra: Australian National University.

McElhanon, K. A. 1970b. *Selepet phonology.* [PL B-14]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McElhanon, K. A. 1972. *Selepet grammar.* Part I: From root to phrase. [PL B-21]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McElhanon, K. A. 1973. *Towards a typology of the Finisterre-Huon languages, New Guinea.* [PL B-22]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McElhanon, K. A. 1985. Selepet stories. Unpublished manuscript. Canberra: Australian National University

McElhanon, K. A. & N.A. McElhanon 1970. *Selepet-English dictionary.* [PL C-15]. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McEvoy, Richard Steven 2008. *Grammar of narrative discourse in Migabac.* MA thesis. Dallas: Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics.

Narokobi, Bernard 1983. *The Melanesian way.* Boroko: Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.

Narrog, Heiko and Bernd Heine 2021. *Grammaticalization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olkkonen, Soini 1990. The clitics of the Somba-Siawari language. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Papuan Linguistics in Goroka, July 1st 1986. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Olkkonen, Soini and Kaija Olkkonen 1983. Burum grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Olkkonen, Soini and Kaija Olkkonen 1985. Burum interlinear texts. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

==

Olkkonen, Soini and Kaija Olkkonen 2007. Somba-Siawari (Burum-Mindik)–English dictionary. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Phinnemore, Penny 1982. Participant identification in Ono discourse. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Phinnemore, Penny 1988. "Coordination in Ono" *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 19: 97-123.

Phinnemore, Penny 1990. Ono verbs. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Phinnemore, Thomas R. 1985. Subordination in Ono. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Phinnemore, Thomas R. and Penny Phinnemore 1985. Ono grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Pilhofer, G. 1928. "Formenlehre von zehn Mundarten und Nachbarsprachen des Kâte" *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 18: 196-231, 298-313.

Pilhofer, G. 1933. *Grammatik der Kâte-Sprache in Neuguinea.* [Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 14]. Berlin: Reimer.

Pyle, Conor 2021. "Purposive case and semantic arguments in Australian Western Desert dialects" In: Robert D. Van Valin Jr. (ed.). *Challenges at the syntax-semantics-pragmatics interface.* A Role and Reference Grammar perspective. 113-133. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Reesink, Ger 2013. "Expressing the GIVE event in Papuan languages: A preliminary survey" *Linguistic Typology* 17: 217-266.

Sifuma, Dick 1997. *A description and analysis of the morphosyntax of Mape verbs.* BA honours thesis. Port Moresby: University of Papua New Guinea.

Southwell, Neville 1979. Komba grammar sketch. Manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Suter, Edgar 2010. "The optional ergative in Kâte" In: John Bowden, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Malcolm Ross (eds.). *A journey through Austronesian and Papuan linguistic and cultural space.* Papers in honour of Andrew Pawley. [PL 615]. 423-437. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Suter, Edgar 2012. "Verbs with pronominal object prefixes in Finisterre-Huon languages" In: Harald Hammarström and Wilco van den Heuvel (eds.). *History, contact and classification of Papuan languages.* [Special Issue 2012 of Language and Linguistics in Melanesia]. 23-58. Port Moresby: Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea.

Suter, Edgar 2018. *Comparative morphology of the Huon Peninsula languages (Papua New Guinea).* PhD thesis, Universität zu Köln.

===

Suter, Edgar (forthcoming a). "Comparative grammar of the Huon Peninsula languages" In: Nicholas Evans and Sebastian Fedden (eds.). *The Oxford guide to the Papuan languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suter, Edgar (forthcoming b). "Contact-induced morphological change in Dedua" In: Nicholas Evans and Sebastian Fedden (eds.). *The Oxford guide to the Papuan languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vanaria, Kathy and Neil Vanaria 1995. Mesem grammar essentials. Unpublished manuscript. Ukarumpa: SIL.

Wacke, K. 1931. "Formenlehre der Ono-Sprache (Neuguinea)" *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 21: 161-207.

Windschuttel, Glenn Alan 2018. *Object verbs: link from Timor-Alor-Pantar to Trans-New Guinea*. An exploration of their typological and historical implications. PhD thesis, University of Newcastle, Australia.

Zúñiga, Fernando 2010. *The grammar of benefaction*. A crosslinguistic study. Habilitationsschrift, University of Zurich.

Zúñiga, Fernando and Seppo Kittilä (eds.) 2010. *Benefactives and malefactives*. Typological perspectives and case studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.