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Papapana: who, where, what

- 99 fluent speakers in Bougainville, PNG
- Austronesian > Western Oceanic > Northwest Solomonic (NWS)
- Contact with Tok Pisin and Papuan languages (incl. Rotokas)
Papapana: the data

- Fieldwork 1: June 2011-March 2012
- Fieldwork 2: March-May 2013
  - 10.5 hrs ‘Texts’
    - custom descriptions, personal/traditional narratives, describing objects, procedural descriptions...
  - 48.5 hrs Elicitation + Fieldnotes
- Fieldwork 3: April 2018
  - 2.5 hrs Elicitation + Fieldnotes
Grammatical overview

- Nominative-accusative
- SVO and SOV
- ‘Verb Complex’: verb(s) + modifiers
  - Anaphoric verb agreement - subject proclitics, object enclitics
  - Postverbal subject-indexing enclitics (PSI) – NWS, reflects former possessor indexing, typically IPFV
- Preverbal negator *ae*
- Reduplication: prohibitives, reciprocal, habitual/continuous
- Tense: marked past and future
- Aspect: proximative, habitual, continuous, repetitive, completive
- Mood: hypothetical COND, counterfactual COND, optative, apprehensive
- TAM distinctions often realised by combinations of morphemes – exponence of TAM value is distributed
Don’t be fearful...
Prohibitives

- **Prohibitives** – “the speaker tries to make the hearer not realize some state of affairs” (Devos and Van Olmen 2013: 22)

- aka **negative imperative** - sometimes used when there is not a distinct negative marker
## Papapana verb complex

| SB | PST. IPFV | OPT COND | NEG APPR | PST | REP | ADV | DIR | VAL | VERB | DIR | COMPL | ADV | OBJ | IPFV | DIR | IRR |
|----|-----------|----------|----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|
| pei | eri | awa | aea | te | ara | vare | REDUP | osi | =PSI | =i |

Prohibitive clause
Prohibitives

- **ae**

10. \(\text{Mu=ae} \quad \text{va-vatan=i=a=i.}\)

\(\text{2PL.SBJ=NEG} \quad \text{RD=tell=TR=3SG.OBJ=IRR}\)

‘Don’t tell him.’ (1-T065)

11. \(\text{O=ae} \quad \text{o-to~‘oto} \quad \text{te=na=au} \quad \text{obutu}\)

\(\text{2SG.SBJ=NEG} \quad \text{RD=board} \quad \text{OBL=SPEC=CLII} \quad \text{canoe}\)

‘Don’t board the canoe’ (2-E026)

- **te**

12. \(\text{Mu=te} \quad \text{nao-nao=i}\)

\(\text{2PL.SBJ=APPR} \quad \text{RD=go=IRR}\)

“Don’t go/You’re not going”’ (1-T053)

13. “\(\text{Mu=te} \quad \text{atu-atun=i=a}\)

\(\text{2PL.SBJ=APPR} \quad \text{RD=attack=TR=3SG.OBJ} \quad \text{DEM} \quad \text{1SG.PSSR[CLI]=husband}\)

“Don’t attack my husband!”’ (1-T101)
Prohibitives: *ae* vs. *te*

- 2011-2013: speakers reported *ae* and *te* were interchangeable

14. $O=ae$  
   $2SG.SBJ=NEG$  
   $to\sim tonu$  
   RD~stand

15. $O=te$  
   $2SG.SBJ=APPR$  
   $to\sim tonu$  
   RD~stand  
   ‘Don’t stand up’ (2-E028-2)
Prohibitives: *ae* vs. *te*

- 2018: one speaker reported *ae* is used when action hasn’t begun yet:

16. O=ae vae~vaenc, o=te pu=i.
   2SG.SBJ=NEG RD~climb 2SG.SBJ=APPR fall=IRR
   ‘Don’t climb (that tree that you haven’t climbed yet), (or) you might fall.’ (3-E001)

- while *te* is used when prohibiting someone from doing something already commenced:

17. O=te vae~vaene, o=te pu=i.
   2SG.SBJ=APPR RD~climb 2SG.SBJ=APPR fall=IRR
   ‘Don’t climb (that tree that you’ve started to climb), (or) you might fall.’ (3-E001)
Prohibitives: *ae* vs. *te*

- **Traditional narrative**: people are running with bows and clubs to attack woman’s husband and she suddenly jumps down:
  
  18. “Mu=**te** atuhno=i a
  2PL.SBJ=APPR ND~attack=TR=3SG.OBJ DEM 1SG.PSSR[CLI]=husband
  “Don’t attack my husband!”” (1-T101)

- **Personal narrative (civil war)**: speaker and other women were travelling and stopped by soldiers who told them:
  
  19. “Mu=**ae** nai~nai tae=i, mu=**ae** nai~nai=i”
  2PL.SBJ=NEG ND~go up=IRR 2PL.SBJ=NEG RD~go=IRR
  “Don’t go up, don’t go/You’re not going up, you’re not going”” (1-T053)

- Women explained they were looking for some women (not just anybody), soldiers told them:
  
  20. “Mu=te nai~nai=i”
  2PL.SBJ=APPR RD~go=IRR
  “Don’t go/You’re not going”” (1-T053)
...lest it be undesirable
Apprehensives

- **Apprehensive** – possible, undesirable, best avoided
- A mixed modality...both epistemic and attitudinal... speaker’s degree of certainty and attitude (Lichtenberk 1995: 291)
- Various terms: *admonitive, evitative, monitory, negative purpose clauses, timitive mood* (Vuillermet 2018)

- **Functional subtypes** (Lichtenberk 1995):
  1. **Apprehensional-epistemic**: independent clause
  2. **Fear**: complement clause, predicate of fear
  3. **Precautioning**: precaution main clause + apprehension-causing subordinate clause
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBJ</th>
<th>PST.</th>
<th>OPT COND</th>
<th>NEG APPR</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>VAL</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>DIR</th>
<th>COMPL</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>IPFV</th>
<th>IRR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pei</td>
<td>eri</td>
<td>awa</td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>ara</td>
<td>vare</td>
<td>REDUP</td>
<td>osi</td>
<td>=PSI</td>
<td>=i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apprehension-causing clause
Precautioning sentences

- **Precaution (main) clause:**
  1. Declarative
  2. Imperative/Hortative $V (=i)$
  3. Prohibitive $ae/te + RD\~V (=i)$

  Expresses preventative action to take, to avoid the...

- **Apprehension-causing (adverbial) clause:** $te + =i$

1. “$Sa=nao$ tovoniti $nao=i, i=te$ moroko=$ira=i.$”

   1INCL.SBJ.HORT=go check thither=IRR 3PL.SBJ=APPR lie=1INCL.OBJ=IRR

   “Let’s go check, (in case) they might be lying to us.”

   (1-T034)
Precaution clause

- Imperative $V (=i)$

2. $O=nabe=i, \quad o=te \quad mate=i.$
   2SG.SBJ=swim=IRR 2SG.SBJ=APPR die=IRR
   ‘Swim, (otherwise) you might die.’ / ‘Swim, (so that) you don’t die.’
   (2-E028-2)

3. $Ta=na=au \quad dada \quad o=noe \quad a’aisi, \quad e=te \quad tuatuare=i.$
   but SPEC=CLII coconut.milk 2SG.SBJ=put many 3SG.SBJ=APPR burn=IRR
   ‘But put lots of coconut milk [on your hands], (otherwise) it will burn.’ / ‘But put lots of coconut milk [on your hands], (so that) it doesn’t burn.’
   (1-T036-8)

- Prohibitive $ae/te + RD\sim V (=i)$

4. $O=ae \quad ago\sim agos=i=a \quad pei \quad to’o\sim to’o, \quad e=te \quad tepe=i=o=i.$
   2SG.SBJ=NEG RD\sim hold=TR=3SG.OBJ part RD\sim cut 3SG.SBJ=APPR cut=TR=2SG.OBJ=IRR
   ‘Don’t hold the knife, (otherwise) it might cut you.’ / ‘Don’t hold the knife, (so that) it doesn’t cut you.’
   (2-E028)
Apprehensive clause: dependent

- Precaution clause and Apprehension-causing clause are usually linked asyndetically
- Apprehension-causing clause is syntactically dependent
  1. Evidence that subordinator can be employed
  2. No strong evidence that $te + V + =i$ can occur as independent clause
Apprehensive clause: subordinator

5. ...e=va-mamago=a pei tanga
   3SG.SBJ=CAUS-decorate=3SG.OBJ part hang
   tenava e=te uga poto=i...
   3SG.SBJ=APPR drown INTS=IRR
   ‘...she adorned him with the necklace, so that he didn’t drown...’/‘...she adorned him with the necklace, otherwise he might drown...’
   (1-T029)

6. O=tavia o’ogo=a=i, avosia saviako te ani o na=gono,
   2SG.SBJ=rub well=3SG.OBJ=IRR SUBR tapioca OBL 2SG or SPEC[CLI]=banana
   mata=au o=to atuma’as=i=a=i,
   what=CLII 2SG.SBJ=EMPH cook=TR=3SG.OBJ=IRR
   c=te ravarava=i
   3SG.SBJ=APPR black=IRR
   o=to Eri tatu=ina=mu=i.
   2SG.SBJ=EMPH OPT mash=3PL.OBJ=2SG.IP=IRR
   ‘You rub it well, so that your tapioca or the banana, whatever you cooked, won’t be black when you want to mash them.’
   (1-T036-8)
Apprehensive clause: independent?

- Only examples from one speaker in April 2018 when...
  - ...I elicited with Tok Pisin nogud ‘lest’

7. U=te  
   nao=i  
   Buka  
   natui  
   1SG.SBJ=APPR go=IRR Buka tomorrow 
   ‘Nogud bai mi go long Buka tumora’
   ‘I might go to Buka tomorrow’ (3-E002)

- ...we’d discussed the complex sentence first

8. O=te  
    mate=i  
    2SG.SBJ=APPR die=IRR  
    ‘you might die’ (3-E001)

- ...I provided context (shock/Tok Pisin lukaut ‘look out’)

9. Na=’oru  
    e=te  
    ani=o=i  
    SPEC[CLI]=snake 3SG.SBJ=APPR eat=2SG.OBJ=IRR  
    ‘the snake might/will bite you’ (3-E002)
Apprehensive clause: dependent

- Arguably the speaker was biased by Tok Pisin, especially as using English ‘might’ resulted in irreals $=i + bea$ ‘maybe’
- Arguably the speaker had Precaution clause in mind, c.f.
- **Diyari (Pama-Nyungan; Australia):** Implicit imperative/warning/suggestion and such sentences “may be regarded as structurally subordinate because it is always possible to add a main clause before them, although context may make it unnecessary” (Austin 1981:229)
- **Mwotlap (Austronesian, Oceanic; Vanuatu):** Implicit precaution which is reconstructed; context restores/implies precaution or semantic content inferable from speaker’s reaction (François 2003: 310-312)
Don’t be fearful, lest it be undesirable
APPR and PROH similarity

- Lavukaleve (E.Papuan; Solomon Islands): admonitive mood -n = admonitive, deleterious possibility, neg. imperative... (Terrill 2003)

- Rotokas (E.Papuan; Bougainville): APPR particle teapi ‘lest’, also as PROH, ‘don’t / mustn’t’ c.f. opeita ‘don’t’ (Robinson 2011)

- Tok Pisin (English-based creole; PNG): nogut ‘lest, don’t, else’

- Tukang Besi (Austronesian; Indonesia): conjunction bara ‘lest’, or ‘don’t’ in main clauses, c.f. ka’ulu ‘don’t’ (Donohue 1999: 453-454)

- Maori (Austronesian; NZ): monitory particle kei can also negate imperatives c.f. other negative imperative (Bauer 1993: 37, 465)

- Vatlongos (Austronesian, Oceanic; Vanuatu): overlap between APPR mood and PROH prefix paradigm, though prohibitives also require -ve clitic ti (Ridge 2019)
Polysemy?

- Aikhenvald (2010: 358) describes Tok Pisin *nogut* as polysemous.
  Also arguably the case for Lavukaleve, Rotokas, Tukang Besi and Maori – because “multiple senses of the same phonological word” which “are judged to be related” (Saaed 2016: 60).

- But in Vatlongos and Papapana – not polysemy because APPR and PROH constructions in each language are not identical.
  - Papapana – verbal reduplication in PROH (and irrealis =i optional).

- Instead, arguably diachronically related in Papapana:
  - *te* is formally identical in both, same syntactic position in VC.
  - Senses are similar: *te* marks the event as undesirable in both.
Development

- Pakendorf & Schalley (2007) find use of affirmative epistemic/apprehensive forms to express prohibitives rare and propose the grammaticalisation path:
  possibility → apprehension → warning → prohibition
  - Involves conventionalization of implicatures
    - Undesirability implicates warning > incipient prohibition

- Counter to proposed unidirectional development
  Deontic modality → Epistemic modality
Direction of development

- If PROH $te + RD^~V + (=i) \rightarrow$ APPR $te + V + =i$
- Then (a) both $te$ and $ae$ in PROH to begin with
  - But unusual for Oceanic languages to have two PROH morphemes
- Or (b) $ae$ began to negate IMP as well as DECL
  - Plausible as Oceanic tend to have distinct negators for IMP&DECL
    - (Lynch et al. 2002, Mosel 1999)
  - But why would $ae$ begin to negate IMP?
  - Given $te$ is restricted to ‘cease’, why would there not have previously been a way to express general prohibition?
- Creates new APPR category
  - Yet Oceanic languages often have apprehensives so how likely is it that one did not already exist?
- $2^{nd}$ person $> 2^{nd}$ and $3^{rd}$ person ??
Direction of development

- If **APPR** $te + V + =i \rightarrow PROH \ te + RD^\sim V + (=i)$

- Existing APPR category, typically Oceanic
- One PROH $ae + RD^\sim V + (=i)$, typically Oceanic
  - $ae$ is widespread negator and PROH with $ae$ 2 x more frequent than PROH with $te$ in text corpus

- But why would $te$ develop into PROH?
  - Perhaps a negative directive with apprehensive nuance or function of cessative/warning develops into new PROH strategy (see Devos and Van Olmen 2013: 45)
  - Intermediate directive puts the face-threatening act “off record”

- $2^{nd}$ and $3^{rd}$ person > $2^{nd}$ person restriction
Insubordination

- APPR subordinate clause → prohibitive main clause via
- Insubordination - “the conventionalized main clause use of what... appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (Evans 2007: 367)

1. Precaution ‘do/don’t’ + Apprehension-causing ‘let not/might’
2. Ellipsed precaution, reconstructed by hearer
3. Interpretation restricted to IMP/HORT/PROH > Apprehension-causing is associated with and implicates a command > associated with negative polarity due to te ‘let not/might’
4. Inference is conventionalized, PROH implicature semanticised
   - Verb reduplicated on analogy with existing PROH \(ae + RD\sim V + (=i)\)

- Anomalous April 2018 examples – intermediate stages
- Could also be motivated by contact with Rotokas and Tok Pisin
Deontic modality

- Papapana data supports Pakendorf & Schalley’s (2007) path but this is not necessarily counter to proposed unidirectional development Deontic modality → Epistemic modality
- Because prohibitives are not necessarily deontic
  - **Jussive (imperative/hortative/optative) modality** - speaker, as authority, asks the addressee to act as a proxy authority and change the world from its inertial path vs. deontic modality, “a general authority asks a proxy authority to act in one way” (Timberlake 2007: 329-330)
  - Permission and obligation should be analysed in speech act terms, as **directives** - “an attempt ... by the speaker to get the hearer to do something” (Searle 1976: 11)
  vs. deontic modality – “(degrees of) moral acceptability or necessity” (Nuyts, Byloo, and Diepeveen 2010: 16)
Concluding remarks

- Papapana prohibitives: $te + RD^\sim V (+ =i)$ ‘don’t, cease’
  
  $ae + RD^\sim V (+ =i)$ ‘don’t, refrain from’

- Papapana apprehensive clauses: $te + V + =i$

- Other languages where APPR&PROH morphemes are formally similar/identical (often polysemy) – perhaps not so rare after all

- Two functions of $te$ related diachronically, but not polysemous

- Papapana data supports Pakendorf and Schalley’s (2007) proposed pathway: apprehension → prohibition

- Not necessarily against deontic → epistemic

- Future – further support for April 2018 analyses? Diachronic source of $te$? Contact-induced change? Other languages showing similar development?
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