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Aims of this talk

• New evidence for the Austronesian Bima-Lembata subgroup in eastern Indonesia: split of PMP *b

• Show that subgrouping is relevant to place morpho-syntactic innovations, such as the ‘reversed genitive’, in relative time
Overview

• The Bima-Lembata languages
• Earlier subgrouping work
• Evidence for Bima-Lembata
  – Shared innovations in the lexicon (Blust 2008)
  – Phylogenetic evidence (Gasser 2014)
  – Phonological evidence (Fricke 2019)
• Summary and conclusions
Bima-Lembata languages
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Earlier subgrouping work of the area
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Word order in the adnominal possessive construction
First potential evidence for Bima-Lembata (Blust 2008)

The primary purpose of this paper is to show that there is strong evidence for a Sumba-Hawu group, and more restricted evidence for a larger subgroup that includes many or all languages of western and central Flores, but that Bimanese can be included in this group only if many of the languages of Esser's “Ambon-Timor” group are included in it as well. (Blust 2008:48)
Innovations supporting Bima-Lembata

Blust 2008

Evidence for Sumba-Hawu + CW Flores

– Semanitic innovation
  • ‘needle’ -> ‘sew’
  • ‘cloud’ > ‘sky’
  • ‘Venus’ > ‘star’

– Functional innovation
  ?? • PMP *-mu ‘2sg.poss’ > non-genitive pronoun

Evidence for Bima Lembata

PMP *zaRum ‘needle’
-> Bima ndaʔu ‘sew’, Hawu d’au ‘sew’, Lewoinga Lamaholot daŋ ‘sew’

PMP *mantalaq ‘Venus’
-> Bima ntara ‘star’, Manggarai ntala ‘star’, Lio dala ‘star’, Western Lamaholot pə|tala ‘star’

Phylogenetic evidence for Bima-Lembata (Gasser 2014)

= Esser's Bima-Sumba

+ Flores-Lembata
Phonological evidence for Bima-Lembata

• Lexical data from the LexiRumah database (Kaiping et al 2019)

• Split of initial PMP *b > PBL *b/*w
  – 8 cognate sets with PMP *b -> b/ɓ mb
  – 13 cognate set with PMP *b -> w/ʋ/ʋ

• AN Timor languages also show splits of PMP *b but in different lexical items and with different patterns
8 sets with PMP *b -> b/b/mb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>PMP</th>
<th>P-Fl-Lem</th>
<th>Ende</th>
<th>Palu’e</th>
<th>Manggarai</th>
<th>Kambera</th>
<th>Bima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘(re)turn’</td>
<td>*bali</td>
<td>*gə</td>
<td>valik</td>
<td>bæe</td>
<td>palu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>beli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘divide’</td>
<td>*baqagi</td>
<td>*bagi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>bahi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>beri</td>
<td>bage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘pound’</td>
<td>*bayu</td>
<td>*bayu</td>
<td>wadʒu</td>
<td>padʒu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>bai</td>
<td>mbadʒu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heavy’</td>
<td>*bəRəqat</td>
<td>*bərat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pədʒa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mbotu (?)</td>
<td>bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘white’</td>
<td>*budaq</td>
<td>*budaʔ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pura</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>burahu(2)</td>
<td>bura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘flower’</td>
<td>*buŋa</td>
<td>*buŋa</td>
<td>woŋa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>buŋa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘wet’</td>
<td>*baseq</td>
<td>*basə</td>
<td>mbasa</td>
<td>paː</td>
<td>batʃa</td>
<td>mbaha</td>
<td>mbetʃa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘split’</td>
<td>*bakaq</td>
<td>*baka ‘bite’</td>
<td>beka(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>bəra</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Fricke 2019, (2) Onvlee 1984, (3) Rongga and Keo (also Central Flores)
13 set with PMP *b -> w/v/v

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>PMP</th>
<th>P-Fl-Lem</th>
<th>Ende</th>
<th>Palu’e</th>
<th>Manggarai</th>
<th>Kambera</th>
<th>Bima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘new’</td>
<td>*baqəRu</td>
<td>*vrəu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vrəu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘pig’</td>
<td>*babuy</td>
<td>*vavi</td>
<td>wawi</td>
<td>vawi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wei</td>
<td>wawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘stone’</td>
<td>*batu</td>
<td>*vatu</td>
<td>watu</td>
<td>vatu</td>
<td>vatu</td>
<td>watu</td>
<td>wadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘fruit’</td>
<td>*buaq</td>
<td>*vua</td>
<td>vua(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vua</td>
<td>wua</td>
<td>wua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘moon’</td>
<td>*bulan</td>
<td>*vulan</td>
<td>wua</td>
<td>vula</td>
<td>vulaŋ</td>
<td>wulaŋ</td>
<td>wura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘woman’</td>
<td>*bahi</td>
<td>*vai</td>
<td>hai (&lt;f)</td>
<td>vai</td>
<td>(ine) vai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘lips’</td>
<td>*biRbiR</td>
<td>*vivir</td>
<td>wiwi(2)</td>
<td>vivi</td>
<td>vivir</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘body hair’</td>
<td>*bulu</td>
<td>*vulu</td>
<td>fu(3)</td>
<td>vulu</td>
<td>vulu</td>
<td>wulu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foam’</td>
<td>*buqəq</td>
<td>*vuda</td>
<td>wora</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vusa</td>
<td>wura</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALSO: PMP *baraq ‘lungs’ (?); *beli ‘value, price’; *bubuŋ ‘ridge’; *buhek ‘hair’

(1) Ngadha (Central Flores); (2) Keo (Central Flores); (3) Nga’o (CF)
Summary of evidence for Bima-Lembata

1. Exclusively shared innovations in different domains
   - Sound change
     initial PMP *b > *w in a specific set of words
   - Semantic innovations
     PMP *mantalaq ‘Venus’ > ‘star’
     PMP *zaRum ‘needle’ > ‘sew’
   - Lexical innovations
     wəki ‘body; self’

2. Phylogenetic evidence (Gasser 2014)
Conclusions

- More and more evidence for Bima-Lembata as an innovation-defined subgroup
- More work to be done on internal divisions
- The structural similarities between the Flores-Lembata languages and the AN languages on Timor are not inherited from a common ancestor
Thank you!
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