

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:
Adelaar, A

Title:
Dual *Kita in the history of east Barito languages

Date:
2019-12-01

Citation:
Adelaar, A. (2019). Dual *Kita in the history of east Barito languages. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 58 (2), pp.414-425. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2019.0014>.

Persistent Link:
<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/322033>

Squib

Dual *kita in the History of East Barito Languages

Alexander Adelaar

PALACKÝ UNIVERSITY

In many Philippine, northern Sulawesi, and northern Bornean languages, Proto Austronesian *kita ‘first-person inclusive plural’ became a first-person inclusive dual pronoun. Robert Blust and Hsiu-chuan Liao attribute this semantic change to drift (a change happening in various related languages independently). However, Lawrence Reid contends that it had already happened in Proto Malayo-Polynesian, and that the ensuing gap in the pronominal system of this ancestral language had been filled by the formation of a new first-person inclusive plural pronoun, which was based on *kita combined with a pronominal clitic (or “extender”) *=mu. The latter was a second-person plural pronoun in Proto Austronesian, but after it had lost its plural meaning in Proto Malayo-Polynesian, it was often combined with or replaced by other pronominal extenders.

In this squib I show that in East Barito languages (including Malagasy) the first-person inclusive plural pronoun also derives from a dual *kita with a second-person plural extender. Taken in conjunction with the fact that reflexes of *kita also have a dual meaning in various languages in northern Borneo, this suggests that *kita already had a dual meaning in the early history of the West Indonesian subgroup.

1. INTRODUCTION.¹ In this squib I argue that *kita was originally a dual in the East Barito languages of south Borneo and Madagascar, and I point out how this may be relevant for the early history of the West Indonesian subgroup.

The original meaning of PMP *kita is a matter of debate in Austronesian linguistics. Proto Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) *kita has reflexes in many Malayo-Polynesian languages, and most of these reflexes refer to the first-person plural inclusive. However, in most Philippine and northern Sulawesi² languages as well as in various languages in northern Borneo, they denote the first-person dual inclusive.

1. This publication was supported by the European Regional Development Fund Project “Sinophone Borderlands – Interaction at the Edges” CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000791. I am grateful to Lawrence Reid (Osaka), Antoinette Schapper (Paris, Leiden), and Erik Zobel (Frankfurt am Main) for their feedback on an earlier draft. They are not responsible for any errors in the current version.
2. Languages in northern Sulawesi are genetically closely related to Philippine languages (Blust 1991).

There are two competing explanations for the instances of this “dual *kita.” Robert Blust (2013) and Hsiu-chuan Liao (2008) consider them a post-PMP phenomenon that is the result of a convergent development or “drift” (a change that happened in various related languages independently: in the current case this was a change from plural to dual meaning). Lawrence Reid (2009, 2016), however, argues that already in a stage before PMP, *kita had acquired a dual meaning, and it needed *=mu, a clitic “extender” denoting the second-person plural, to express the first-person plural inclusive. This extender underwent further changes in some dialect forms of PMP and became replaced by other extenders in various PMP daughter languages. These competing views will be discussed in more detail in section 2.

The organization of this squib is as follows. Section 2 gives a summary of scholarly discussions about the history of dual *kita; section 3 is a very brief account of dual number as expressed in the languages of Borneo; section 4 stresses the typological importance of the difference between dual *kita and other forms of dual number in Borneo for the current argument; section 5 shows how East Barito first-person plural inclusive pronouns must have developed from dual *kita; section 6 contains some concluding remarks. A list of instances of dual *kita with various extenders is presented in table 1, at the end of the paper.

2. DUAL *KITA IN CURRENT DEBATES. According to Blust (2013:309), PMP (and PAn) *kita was originally a first-person plural inclusive. It was not a dual, and he considers its dual meaning in the Philippine, Sulawesi, and Bornean languages mentioned previously as the result of drift. He admits that the many dual instances in these languages suggest that *kita originally had a dual meaning but explains that, among other reasons, if *kita originally had a dual meaning, PMP would have lacked a first-person plural inclusive, a gap that would be difficult to account for. Blust contends that the shift from first-person plural inclusive to first-person dual inclusive is pragmatically predictable as the context in which a first-person plural inclusive pronoun occurs usually involves no more than a first-person singular and a second-person singular as participants. Once *kita had acquired a dual meaning, extended forms came into being to denote the first-person plural inclusive. They consist of *kita with another pronoun or “extender” (cf. Reid 2016:140)³ cliticized to it. At first sight at least, extenders seem to be of first, second, or third person and to be singular or plural (a matter not discussed further by Blust). Hsiu-chuan Liao (2008) writes that most extenders derive from one of the following four forms:

- *-mu ‘second-person singular’
- *-ku ‘first-person singular’
- *-yu ‘second-person plural’
- *-da ‘third-person plural’

3. Also called “expander,” a term used in Reid (2009).

**TABLE 1. REFLEXES OF FIRST-PERSON INCLUSIVE DUAL
AND FIRST-PERSON INCLUSIVE PLURAL PRONOUNS**

Language	First-person inclusive dual	First-person inclusive plural	Source
1. *kita + *-mu ‘second-person plural’			
Botolan Sambal	hitá	hitámo	(Blust 2013:319)
Iraya	kita	tamu	(Reid 2016:155)
Central Luzon languages	=ta (GEN.)	=tamu (GEN.)	(Liao 2008:12)
Samal	kita	kitam	(Blust 2013:319)
Bolinao	?ata	?atamu	(Reid 2016:147)
Casiguran Dumagat	sikita	sikitam	(Blust 2013:319)
Arta	tita	titam	(Kimoto 2017:154)
Yami	ta	tamo, takamo	(Reid 2009:12)
2. *kita + *-yu ‘second-person plural’			
Tagalog	kitá, katá	tayo	(Reid 2016)
Ilokano	=ta	=tayo	(Reid 2016:135)
Palawan Batak	kita (NOM.)	kitami (< *kita + *=mu + *=yu) (NOM.)	(Liao 2008:16)
3. *kita + *-ka’yu, *kita + -ku ‘second-person plural’			
Central Cordilleran	=ta (GEN.)	=taku (GEN.)	(Liao 2008:9)
Bontok (C. Cordill.)	cha-ita =ta	chataku =taku	(note: second-person plural is chakayu, =kayu) (see Reid 2011)
4. *kita + *-da ‘third-person plural’			
Northern Cordilleran Languages:			
Isnag	=ta (GEN.)	=tam, =tadá (GEN.)	(Liao 2008:8)
Malaweg	=ta (GEN.)	=tida (GEN.)	(Liao 2008:8)
Itawis	=ta (GEN.)	=téra (GEN.)	(Liao 2008:8)
Isneg	da?ta	da?tada	(Blust 2013:319)
Tagakaulo (Mansakan)	kita (NOM.)	kitadun (NOM.)	(Liao 2008:14)
5. *kita + other extenders (including nonpronominal ones)			
Tausug	kitah	kitaniuh	(Blust 2013:319)
	ta (GEN.)	taniyu (GEN.)	(Liao 2008:14)
Sinama Bajau	kita =ta	kitabi (< *kita + qabis ‘all’) =tabi	(Akamine 2011:386)
Kelabit (Borneo)	kitəh	tauḥ (*kita + ?)	(Blust 2013:318)
Tatana’ (Borneo)	(i)kita	(i)takau	(Dillon 1994:16)

She supports Blust’s position and gives some additional arguments in favor of drift rather than inheritance from PMP, or contact, for the extenders found in Philippine individual languages. According to her, these extenders cannot be the basis for the reconstruction of a Philippine proto-form because of their diversity, and also because (from the data available to her) none of them is spread widely enough among Philippine subgroups to qualify as a reflex for a PMP reconstruction (Liao 2008:23).

Reid (2009, 2016), however, argues that *kita had acquired a dual meaning even before PMP. Already at a “pre-MP” level, it had narrowed its plural meaning to that of a dual: it expressed the first-person plural inclusive only in combination with the clitic extender *=mu denoting the second-person plural. This situation persisted into PMP, but at this stage the extender had lost its plural meaning, and in dialectal forms of PMP, it was sometimes combined with the PMP second-person plural form =yu (resulting in *=mu-yu) or replaced by other extenders, such as *=kayú (> *=ku), *-da, or cliticized forms of the reflex of PMP *duha ‘two’ or another plural quantifier. These other extenders are observed in some MP daughter languages, the speakers of which recognized that it was inappropriate to have what to them was a singular =mu as an extender on a plural pronoun (Reid 2016:140).

Reid (2016) disagrees with drift as an explanation. Acknowledging that Proto Austronesian (PAn) *kita was a first-person inclusive pronoun, he argues that it became a dual pronoun in pre-MP, and this meaning was maintained in PMP and in Philippine and several northern Sulawesi and northern Bornean languages. The plural inclusive meaning in other languages is consequently the result of a post-PMP semantic shift. While Reid claims that alongside dual *kita, PMP also had a form *kita with extender *=mu to express the first-person plural inclusive, he is critical of the concept of “drift” because it only describes cases of repeated and independent change in several languages, without explaining them. He prefers to characterize the emergence of the various extenders in combination with *kita as the result of “paradigmatic instability”: in early PMP, *=mu was the only plural. But as some dialects of PMP equated the extender with a second-person singular pronoun, it was replaced by or extended with *-yu, the form Reid (2016:156) argues was the genitive second person plural pronoun in PMP. Other extenders in many Philippine and some other daughter languages in the region are also found.

Whereas Liao (2008) and Blust (2013) do not address the circumstance that some extenders seem to represent a first- or second-person singular pronominal clitic, Reid argues that the choice of extenders was not a random process but was limited to second- and third-person plural pronominal clitics. It is typologically very odd for a first-person or a singular pronominal suffix to function as the extender in a first-person plural pronoun. Reflexes of *=mu are currently almost invariably singular but were still plural at the pre-PMP level. Furthermore, the extender *=ku (found only in the Central Cordilleran languages, a subgroup of the northern Luzon languages) may be homophonous with PMP *=ku ‘genitive first-person singular’ but is in fact a contracted form of *=kayú, a nominative second-person plural clitic. In other words, both extenders derive historically from second-person plural pronouns, one a genitive pronoun, the other a nominative pronoun.⁴ By pointing this out, Reid brings them in line with general typological observations concerning pronominal extenders made by Greenberg (1988:347), who claims that outside the

4. *=mu was reconstructed as a genitive enclitic, and *=ku as a nominative one.

Philippines, extenders distinguishing a first-person plural inclusive pronoun from a first-person plural inclusive one are never singular, and almost always second or third person.

Reid also gives another reason why the extender $=ku$ is unlikely to reflect PMP $*=ku$ ‘first-person singular’ as the latter is always shortened as $=k$ following vowel-final words in the languages of the Central Cordilleran subgroup that happen to have the extender $-ku$. Historically, the clitics in question evolved as follows, without causing a homonymic clash:

PMP $*=ku$ ‘genitive first-person singular enclitic’	>	$=k$ (after a vowel)
PMP $*=kayu$ ‘nominative second-person plural enclitic’	>	$=ku$

In order to appreciate Reid’s reasoning it should be noticed that Reid and Blust tend to concentrate on different aspects of the internal classification of Malayo-Polynesian languages and the development from PAN to PMP. Blust is mostly concentrating on the phonological, word-structural, and grammatical innovations distinguishing PMP from other Austronesian major branches. One of these, the “politeness shift” from PAN $*=mu$ ‘second-person plural’ to PMP $*-mu$ ‘second-person singular’, is one of the defining criteria for PMP. He also claims that Philippine languages form a separate genetic subgroup within Malayo-Polynesian. Reid is particularly interested in the historical setting in which PMP came about as a separate non-Formosan branch of Austronesian. He proposes a dialect chain of Formosan languages from which PMP gradually split as a result of multiple migrations to the Philippines, and a possible closer association with what is today the East Formosan branch. He believes that PMP was formed in the north of the Philippines. As indicated above, in his analysis the shift from plural $*=mu$ to polite singular $*=mu$ did not happen in PMP but earlier, in pre-Malayo-Polynesian (Reid 2016:132). (This timing is a precondition for the presence of a dual $*kita$ and a plural $*kita=mu$ in PMP itself). Finally, Reid rejects Proto Philippine because this subgroup is based on lexical evidence only, with no exclusively shared innovations of a phonological or grammatical nature in support of it (Reid in press).

3. DUAL PRONOUNS IN BORNEO. As mentioned above, cases of dual $*kita$ matched by $*kita$ + pronominal extender as a first-person plural inclusive are also frequently observed among languages of northern Borneo. Bornean languages that have the pronouns in question belong to the Bisaya-Lotud, Dusunic, Paitanic, and Murutic subgroups (Reid 2016:141), which in turn are all part of Blust’s Greater North Borneo group (Blust 2010; see also Smith 2017a).

Other subgroups in the Greater North Borneo group neither reflect a dual $*kita$ nor use pronominal extenders for the first-person inclusive plural, although many among them do distinguish dual number with the use of lexicalized numerals. In western Borneo, Land Dayak languages and Malayic

languages such as Iban and Mualang have dual pronoun series involving the numeral ‘two’ (Richards 1981; Tjia 2007; Tadmor 2015), so does Melanau (Smith 2017b:64). Kelabit and Kayan also have an additional trial number, and some Kenyah languages and Punan languages from the Müller-Schwaner group in central Borneo (Indonesia) even have a quadral pronoun series (Smith 2017b).

In southern Borneo, some Southeast Barito languages distinguish a first-person dual inclusive pronoun. These languages are a subsection of the Barito subgroup, which was recently redefined as a linkage by Smith (2018). This Barito linkage is classified alongside the Greater North Borneo macrogroup rather than being part of it. The first-person dual inclusive pronoun in the Southeast Barito languages is derived either from a combination of a reflex of *kita with the numeral ‘two’ or from ‘two’ itself, yielding Ma’anyan *tarueh*, Dusun Witu *ueh* (Adelaar fieldnotes), and Bayan *tatarue* (Adelaar and Hoogervorst fieldnotes) ‘we two’ (< *kita + *rueh* ‘two’). In the West Barito subgroup, Ngaju Dayak has dual pronouns derived from *duä* ‘two’ with dedicated forms for first person (*koä*) and second person (*nduä*), but not for third person (*awen duä*) (Hardeland 1858:97).

These instances seem straightforward enough. However, in the Southeast Barito language group, there is “more than meets the eye” to the history of dual number.

Note incidentally that Reid (2009, 2016) also analyzes other (first- and second-person singular and plural) pronouns, which occur as free forms and clitics in nominative and genitive case. In what follows, I only discuss *kita and its extenders in Southeast Barito languages, and I limit the discussion to free forms. I do so to save space, to keep the argumentation transparent, and because the inclusion of other pronominal forms would not significantly alter my conclusions. In Southeast Barito languages, the first-person inclusive plural pronoun is always the same free form. As to Malagasy *itsika* ‘first-person inclusive plural’, it does not alter its shape when postcliticized except for dropping the initial *i*, which is a topic marker and not part of the pronominal core (see below), and for adding a general genitive marker *-N-*. These changes are totally regular and transparent.

4. DUAL *KITA IS TYPOLOGICALLY DIFFERENT FROM OTHER CASES OF DUAL NUMBER. Turning toward the first-person inclusive dual and plural pronouns in Southeast Barito languages in Borneo, two things are worth noting. On the one hand, their first-person dual inclusive pronouns are historically compounds involving a numeral. This is something they have in common with the dual pronouns in languages in western and central Borneo. On the other hand, they are paradigmatically isolated forms; that is, they are not part of a larger dual series including first-person exclusive, second person, and third person pronouns. In this respect they *do not* agree with dual pronouns in

languages in western and central Borneo but are rather similar to reflexes of *kita expressing dual number in northern Borneo, northern Sulawesi, and the Philippines, which are also paradigmatically isolated (although there are exceptions).⁵ This condition makes dual *kita typologically and historically different from other dual pronouns, as is also implicitly acknowledged in Blust's assessment that the dual meaning of *kita in various languages is a consequence of the pragmatic context in which it usually occurs.

5. EAST BARITO FIRST-PERSON INCLUSIVE PRONOUNS ARE HISTORICAL EXTENSION OF DUAL PRONOUNS. Where dual *kita is concerned, even more important for a possible alignment of Southeast Barito languages with Philippine, northern Sulawesi, and northern Borneo languages is the fact that their first-person plural inclusive pronouns also derive from *kita followed by a second-person plural extender. The extender is not a form of *-mu, *-yu, *-kayú, or *-da, but a cliticized form of the second-person plural pronoun *ikam,⁶ as follows:

*kita + *(i)kam 'second-person plural' > *(ki)ta=kam > Ma'anyan, Samihim, Dusun Witu *takam*, Dusun Malang, Bayan *taka* (Adelaar and Kikusawa 2014)

The historical analysis of these Southeast Barito pronouns is taken from Adelaar and Kikusawa (2014) and is not new. However, what is new is the insight that they can best be explained as having derived from an originally dual *kita. The fact that in Southeast Barito languages *kita had to be compensated with an extender strongly suggests that it originally had a dual meaning, as it had in languages of northern Borneo, northern Sulawesi, and the Philippines.

Note that cognates of *takam* and *taka* are also found in East Barito more widely, compare Taboyan *taka*, Luangan (Lawangan) *taka* in Northeast Barito languages, and Dusun Deyah *ta'am* (a Central-East Barito language; cf. item 188 in Hudson's [1967] wordlists). These instances show that *kita must also have had a dual meaning at the Proto East Barito level.⁷

5. Exceptions are, for instance, Kelabit (Blust 2013:320) and Iraya (Reid 2016:154–55), but note that in these languages the additional dual pronouns are formed with a numeral. They at least partly conform to a different pattern. In Kelabit this may be influence from surrounding languages having dual pronouns derived from 'two'.

6. Adelaar and Kikusawa (2014) were uncertain whether to reconstruct (Proto Southeast Barito) *(i)kam 'second-person plural' or *kam(u) (same meaning) as an extender to *kita. However, *(i)kam is more likely than *kam(u) as it has cognates in some neighboring languages: Paku *ikam* is a 'second-person plural' (Diedrich 2018), and Banjarese Malay *ikam* is a 'second-person singular' (the latter's singular meaning may be the result of a politeness shift). Reflexes of *ikam and *=kam 'second-person plural' are found in many other Barito languages (compare item 188 in the wordlists in Hudson 1967) and Bornean languages in general (including Kenyah *ikəm* and Kayan *ikam* 'second-person plural').

7. It would have been worthwhile to explore the Central and East Barito languages more systematically in this squib, but lack of reliable data made this impractical to do so.

Incidentally, note that *=ikam is a reflex of PMP *=kamu ‘second-person plural’ and that it has also cognates in the Central Cordilleran languages which are equally used as extenders. This is the pronominal clitic *=kamu as well as the complex pronominal clitics *=kamuyu ‘nominative second-person plural’ (< *-kamu + extender *=yu) and the complex pronominal clitic *=takamu ‘nominative first-person plural inclusive’ (< *(ki)ta + extender *=kamu).

Another Southeast Barito language is Malagasy. It subgroups most directly with Ma’anyan, Samihim, and Dusun Witu, three very closely related and mutually intelligible dialects. A similar reasoning can be upheld for the evolution of the Malagasy first-person plural inclusive pronoun *itsika*, although the phonological history of this pronoun and its dialectal forms is somewhat more involved.

Adelaar and Kikusawa (2014) reconstructed Proto Malagasy *(i) *tikaN ‘first-person plural inclusive topicalized nominative’, which is matched by a non-topicalized counterpart *tikaN. They explain that Malagasy first-person nominative pronouns still distinguish between topicalized forms which have the topic marker *(i) (from PMP *si) and non-topicalized ones which do not, hence the pair. *(i) *tikaN derives from the same source form as *takam* and *taka* in other Southeast Barito languages according to a series of changes as outlined below:

Proto Southeast Barito	(*(i) *kita *(i)kam > (*(i) *tika-kam (+ metathesis and loss of *(u)) > (*(i) *tikkam (+ *a syncope) > Proto Malagasy *(i) *tikaN (+ reduction of geminated *kk to <i>k</i> and nasal neutralization to <i>N</i>)
------------------------	--

These changes are explained as follows:

- The consonants *k and *t in *kita must have metathesized. This is not an isolated case: the tendency to metathesize a velar occlusive with a following coronal one is also seen in Old MLG *talùtukũ* ‘backbone’, which derives from PMP *talikuj ‘id.’, in Merina MLG *lika*, *dika* ‘to make a step, transgress’, which is a Bantu loanword eventually deriving from Common Bantu *kida ‘to make a step, transgress’ (Simon 2006:140) and between Merina Malagasy *fahandrianã* ‘kitchen’ and *fandrahuanã* (same meaning), which Webber (1855) labeled as a dialectal variant.
- Status and loss of *(i): *ikam is well attested as a second-person plural pronoun (see fn.8). It is likely that *=kam existed as a clitic form of *ikam, although the available information is insufficient to verify this. If it was, the extender was probably *=kam rather than *=ikam. A short but apparently free form of *ikam is found in Tunjung *kaam* and Luangan (Lawangan) *kam* (both Barito languages, see Hudson 1967).
- Syncope of *a: the loss of this *a between identical consonants must have been due to two factors: fast speech and a phonotactic tendency to avoid like syllables in words of more than two syllables.

- Reduction of geminated *kk to *k*. In Malagasy, *k became *h* in word-initial and intervocalic position. It remained *k* if it was geminated, glottalized, or prenasalized, or if it occurred in final position.
- Final nasal neutralization to *N. In most forms of Malagasy final nasals merged to a single one (either an alveolar *n* or a velar *ŋ*), although *n, *ŋ, and even *m are sporadically retrievable in individual dialects. However, in the case of (*i) *tikaN and its reflexes in Malagasy dialects there seems to be no way to find out the exact nature of *N at the proto Malagasy stage, and speculation was not attempted (Adelaar and Kikusawa 2014).

This proto-form underwent further changes in the individual dialects (Adelaar and Kikusawa 2014):

Proto Malagasy (*i) *tikaN >

Mahafaly <i>tika</i> :	absence of topic marker; loss of *-N
Tandroy <i>tikaŋe</i> :	absence of topic marker; (?) change of *-N to default <i>ŋ</i> ; addition of whispered vowel (<i>e</i>)
Merina <i>itsika</i> :	affricatization of *t before *I; loss of *-N
Vezo, Tankarana <i>atika</i> :	neutralization of antepenultimate topic vowel to <i>a</i> ; loss of *-N
Old NE coast <i>atsikan</i> :	neutralization of antepenultimate topic vowel to <i>a</i> ; affricatization of *t before *i; change (?) of *-N to <i>n</i> (Houtman van Gouda 1603);
Tsimihety <i>atsikaŋa</i> :	neutralization of antepenultimate vowel to <i>a</i> ; affricatization of *t before *i; (?) change of *-N to default <i>ŋ</i> ; addition of whispered echo vowel

The phonological changes that happened to (*i) *tikaN in the various dialects are explained in detail in Adelaar (2013) and Adelaar and Kikusawa (2014). Here follows a short summary:

- Neutralization of antepenultimate vowels to *a* is a strong tendency in words of more than two syllables (not counting final syllables with a whispered vowel).
- Affricatization of *t before and *i* is regular in central and eastern dialects but has not happened in western and southwestern ones, whereas in the northern dialects *t* is in a state of transition to *ts* in this environment.
- The loss of *-N in word-final position is regular in many western and southwestern dialects; while not regular in other dialects, it occurs more than sporadically in them (including Merina). If it is maintained, it takes the form of an alveolar nasal in Merina and some other dialects, and that of a velar nasal in most others. A very few dialects exhibit both final alveolar and final velar nasals, which is a historical distinction. In virtually all forms of Malagasy final nasals are followed by a whispered vowel, in agreement with the following rule.

- Almost all Malagasy dialects have acquired a whispered final vowel after final consonants. The color of this vowel can be *ǎ*, *ě*, or *ĩ*, and varies according to dialect; in northern dialects, it agrees with the coloring of the preceding vowel.

Note that Malagasy *itsika* (and its dialectal variants) is not the only pronoun originally constituting an earlier nonplural pronoun combined with an extender: Malagasy *hianàu* ‘second-person singular’ and *hianarèu* ‘second-person plural’ were also formed in this way. The development is still in process in the third-person plural compound *izi irèu*, which derives from *hiye ‘third-person singular’ (< *si-ia) + irèu ‘plural marker’; *irèu* was initially a third-person plural pronoun and derives in turn from *hire ‘third-person plural’ (< PMP *sida) + *(h)eu (+distal) (Adelaar and Kikusawa 2014).

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS. Reid made a strong case that in PMP, the first-person inclusive pronoun *kita had a dual meaning, and that the first-person inclusive plural was originally a combination of *kita with a second-person plural extender *=mu. Because the latter lost its plural meaning, it was often extended with or replaced by other second- or third-person plural extenders (or quantifiers) in individual languages. Reid showed that *=mu initially had a plural meaning and that *=ku (seemingly a first-person singular clitic) derives from *=kayú, a second-person plural clitic. In doing so he brought these extenders in line with pronominal extenders elsewhere in the world, which have as a rule second- or third-person plural pronominal values.

This by itself amply justifies serious attention to the possibility that PMP *kita was a first-person inclusive dual pronoun. But Reid’s claim is now further strengthened by the fact that first-person inclusive plural pronouns in East Barito languages can equally be analyzed as deriving from a complex form combining *kita with a cliticized second-person plural extender (*ikam). It is bolstered more so given that East Barito languages are neither Philippine languages nor do they belong to the Greater North Borneo group. They form a separate branch of the West Indonesian subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian, of which Greater North Borneo is another branch. With members in one branch of West Indonesian (Greater North Borneo) having reflexes of dual *kita, and members in another (Barito) having reflexes *kita + extender to express the first-person inclusive plural, it becomes worthwhile to investigate the semantic history of *kita in other West Indonesian languages and to keep an open mind about the possibility that it had a dual meaning in Proto West Indonesian.

REFERENCES

- Adelaar, Alexander. Fieldnotes on Ma’anyan and Dusun Witu (2010–18). Manuscript.
 Adelaar, Alexander. 2013. Malagasy dialect divisions: Genetic versus emblematic criteria. *Oceanic Linguistics* 52(2): 457–80.
 Adelaar, Alexander, and Tom Hoogervorst. Fieldnotes on Bayan (2010). Manuscript.

- Adelaar, Alexander, and Ritsuko Kikusawa. 2014. Proto-Malagasy personal pronouns: A reconstruction. *Oceanic Linguistics* 53(2): 480–516.
- Akamine, Jun. 2011. Sama Bajau. In *The Austronesian languages of South East Asia and Madagascar*, 2nd edition, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 377–96. London: Routledge.
- Blust, Robert. 1991. The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30:73–129.
- . 2013. *The Austronesian languages*, 2nd edition. Asia-Pacific Open Access Monographs. Canberra: College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University.
- Diedrich, Daniela. 2018. A grammar of Paku: A language of Central Kalimantan. PhD diss., University of Melbourne.
- Dillon, John Albert. 1994. A grammatical description of Tatana'. MA thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1988. The first person inclusive dual as an ambiguous category. *Studies in Language* 12(1): 1–18. DOI:[10.1075/sl.12.1.02gre](https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.12.1.02gre).
- Hardeland, August. 1858. *Versuch einer Grammatik der dajakschen Sprache*. Amsterdam: Frederik Muller.
- Houtman van Gouda, Frederick de. 1603. *Spraeck ende woord-boeck inde Maleysche ende Madagaskarsche talen met vele Arabische ende Turcsche woorden [...]*. Amsterdam: J.E. Cloppenburg.
- Hudson, Alfred B. 1967. *The Barito isolects of Borneo: A classification based on comparative reconstruction and lexicostatistics*. Southeast Asia Program, Data Paper no. 68, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kimoto, Yukinori. 2017. A grammar of Arta: A Philippine Negrito language. PhD Diss., Kyoto University.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2008. A typology of first person dual pronouns and their reconstructibility in Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47(1): 1–29.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2009. The reconstruction of a dual pronoun to Proto Malayo-Polynesian. In *Discovering history through language: Papers in honour of Malcolm Ross*, ed. by Bethwyn Evans, 461–477. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2011. Seidenadel's grammar of Bontoc Igorot: One hundred years on. In *Philippine and Chamorro linguistics before the advent of structuralism*, ed. by Emilio Ridruejo, Lawrence Reid, and Thomas Stolz, 141–61. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- . 2016. Accounting for variability in Malayo-Polynesian pronouns. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 6(2): 130–64.
- . In press. Revisiting the position of Philippine languages in the Austronesian family. *The Br. Andrew Gonzalez FSC (BAG) Distinguished Professorial Chair Lecture*, 2017, De La Salle University, Manila.
- Richards, Anthony. 1981. *An Iban-English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Simon, Pierre. 2006. La langue des ancêtres. (Ny fitenin'dRazana). *Une périodisation du malgache de l'origine au XVI^e siècle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Smith, Alexander D. 2017a. The languages of Borneo: A comprehensive classification. PhD Diss., University of Hawai'i.
- . 2017b. Reconstructing Proto Kenyah pronouns and the development of a true five number system. In *Issues in Austronesian historical linguistics*, ed. by Hsiu-chuan Liao. Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society Special Publication No. 1, 48–66. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 2018. The Barito linkage hypothesis, with a note on the position of Basap. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 11(1): 13–34.
- Tadmor, Uri. 2015. When culture grammaticalizes. The pronominal system of Onya Darat. In *Language structure and environment: Social, cultural and natural*

- factors*, ed. by Rik De Busser and Randy J. LaPolla, 77–98. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tjia, Johnny. 2007. *A grammar of Mualang. An Ibanic language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia*. PhD Diss., University of Leiden. Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap (Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics).
- Webber, J. 1853. *Dictionnaire malgache-français [Malagasy-French dictionary]*. Île Bourbon: Établissement Malgache de Notre-Dame de la Ressource.