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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

\textit{Proto Polynesian} *\textit{kainanga} ‘1. the general populace: commoners as opposed to people from chiefly families (*qariki), 2. matrilineal descent group’ provides important evidence in teasing out the details of social structure for Proto Oceanic Society, the more or less immediate ancestor of Proto Polynesian Society. This paper observes that similar Micronesian forms are probably due to common inheritance rather than borrowing from Polynesian or vice versa and that Proto Oceanic or Proto Eastern Oceanic *\textit{kainanga} ‘matrilineal descent group’ is thus implied.
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Introduction

This paper argues that Proto Polynesian and Proto Micronesian had the form *kainanga* which meant ‘matrilineal descent group’ but was, in Proto Polynesian, polysemous and had a more general meaning around Tonga and Samoa of ‘the general populace: commoners as opposed to people from chiefly families (*qariki)*’. The paper asserts that Ancestral Polynesian Society (= Proto Polynesian Society) had no single system of descent practised by all elements of its population. The general populace is modelled as having emerged into the cognatic (bilateral, nonunilineal, ambilineal) descent system that typifies most Polynesian societies today. But some elements of the population, probably those amongst whom seafaring was still most important, were still practising the matrilineality of their Proto Oceanic Society forebears and were perhaps still matrilocal as well. The consideration of Polynesian and Micronesian *kainanga* forms was becoming a major digression in another work (Marck ms) and I was happy to think I could offer this study separately in celebration of Andrew Pawley’s career.

Map 1 shows Polynesia in the Pacific and the distribution of the Polynesian subgroups. Figure 1 gives the subgroups of Polynesian. The Polynesian Outliers are inhabited by Polynesian speaking groups who arrived anciently from within Triangle Polynesia to localities in Melanesia and Micronesia stretching from West Uvea in the Loyalties (northeast of New Caledonia) through various Vanuatu and Solomon Island localities up to Nukuoro and Kapingamarangi southwest of Pohnpei in Micronesia. Along with Pukapuka, where there is a non-East Polynesian language in western East Polynesia, two of the Outliers will be of special interest here: Anuta and Tikopia.
which are in the southeasternmost area of the modern nation of the Solomon Islands (Map 2). The Outliers from Anuta and Tikopia south comprise the Futunic Outlier group, named due to their apparent origin in East Futuna (Bayard 1966, 1976, Pawley 1967) or perhaps East Uvea or both. The Outliers northwest of Anuta and Tikopia are known as the Ellicean Outliers (cf. Howard 1981), so-named due to the apparent origin of their speech in Tuvalu (called the Ellice Islands until independence).
Map 1: Polynesia in the Pacific and its linguistic subgroups
Notes: TO = Tongic, NP = Nuclear Polynesian, EC = Ellicean, EP = East Polynesian, CE = Central East Polynesian, TA = Tahitic, MQ = Marquesic, NMq = Nuclear Marquesic.
**Figure 1: Subgroups of Polynesian**
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Figure 1 shows that Polynesian languages fall into two primary groups: Tongic and Nuclear Polynesian. Proto Nuclear Polynesian disintegrated with the differentiation of Pukapukan (a non-East Polynesian language in western East Polynesia), East Uvean, East Futunan and thence the Futunic Outliers, and Ellicean (a group composed of Samoan, Tuvaluan, Tokelauan, the Ellicean Outliers and East Polynesian). The splits that will ultimately most concern us below involve the era of initial Nuclear Polynesian disintegration and the status of Pukapukan and two Futunic Outliers (Anutan and Tikopian) as they are the only Polynesian languages which retain a ‘descent group’ sense in their *kainanga forms. The splits are presently dated to the early first millennium AD in a process which continued the disintegration of a unified language around Western Polynesia from the Proto Polynesian period (Pawley 1996).

The Proto Oceanic Society social structure heritage

Proto Oceanic Society is defined as the society of the speakers of Proto Oceanic, who inhabited a network of interacting communities situated around the Bismarck Archipelago at about 1200 or 1000 BC. Proto Oceanic was ancestral to all Austronesian languages in the Pacific Islands except Chamorro and Palauan of Western Micronesia. Proto Polynesian Society and Proto (Nuclear) Micronesian Society were descended and transformed societies that existed, ca. AD 1-500 around Western Polynesia (Tonga, Samoa and the smaller islands around them) and Central Micronesia (Chuuk, Pohnpei, Kosrae and the smaller islands around them) respectively.
The only recent model of Proto Oceanic descent systems began with Hage (1998a; 1999) who asked if Proto Oceanic Society was matrilineal. His suggestion that it may have been matrilineal was based upon indices of matricentricity, lexical markedness and other factors. That suggestion soon intersected with studies of Polynesian’s human genetics which showed sex-biased gene flow typical of matrifocal residence from the period of their ancestors’ residence in Melanesia (Hage and Marck 2003, Kayser et al. 2006). Given Kayser et al.’s (2006) present interpretation of Polynesian mitochondrial and Y-chromosome DNA, I have suggested that average Polynesian ancestors’ unions with Melanesians per generation during their centuries in Melanesia were on the order of one in ten father per generation being an indigenous Melanesian but less than one in one hundred mother per generation being an indigenous Melanesian (Marck ms). Men, Kayser et al.’s interpretation suggests, were marrying “in” but women hardly did so at all, a pattern consistent with matrifocal rather than other forms of residence. This suggests that a child’s language/cultural learning through the Polynesian ancestors’ centuries in Melanesia occurred in a context where, on average, something like 95% of adults in their communities were native speakers of early Oceanic and likewise native culture bearers of early Oceanic Society (Marck ms).

As is typical of historic matrilocal societies (matrifocal residence with formal matrilines) and uxorilocal3 societies (matrifocal residence without formal matrilines),

---

2 Where Murdock’s (_____1949????_____ - confirm and add to list of refs) earlier notions of a cognatic Proto Oceanic Society are dismissed.

3 The terms ‘virilocal’ and ‘uxorilocal’ were introduced by Adam (1948) as truer to the Latin roots than ‘patrilocal’ and ‘matrilocal’ since one is attempting to specify residence in reference to spouses rather than their children. Many dictionaries of English and even dictionaries of anthropology maintain that ‘patrilocal’ and ‘virilocal’ remain synonyms as do ‘matrilocal’ and ‘uxorilocal’. However, Murdock (1967) used ‘virilocal’ to tag societies which had patrifocal residence in the absence of patrilineages and ‘patrilocal’ to refer to societies which had patrifocal residence in the presence of patrilineages. Similarly, he used ‘uxorilocal’ to denote societies which had matrifocal residence but no matrilineages.
Kayser et al.’s (2006) study and earlier work by Kayser and others summarised by Hage and Marck (2003) suggest that in Proto Oceanic Society there was simply little place for outside women while outside men presented no similar contradictions with respect to a ‘place’ for them in residence and inheritance practices. Outside men, like men from within the group, resided with their wives or in men’s houses and their children inherited their land rights from their mother rather than their father.

It is convenient to now mention a certain distinction in social organisation terminologies. This is the hard, fast and narrow definition of ‘clan’\(^4\). While indigenous Polynesians sometimes refer to their own ‘clans’, Polynesian societies are mainly without clans in the social organisation sense. In the parlance of social organisation studies, ‘clan’ always refers to unilineal (matrilineal or patrilineal) groups where membership is simply, completely and universally defined in terms of either one’s maternal or paternal line. Polynesian societies rarely calculate membership in their kin groups by unilineal criteria and most are classed as cognatic.

Firth (1957) has considered how the cognatic systems of Triangle Polynesia are sometimes profoundly patrifocal but patrilineality is rarely achieved since exclusive lines of men are never formalised into patrilines (the exceptions are Anuta, Tikopia, Rennell/Bellona and Pukapuka). As Firth explained and generations of Polynesianists have observed, the occasional daughter and her husband in even highly patrifocal Polynesian groups may raise their children on the land of that woman’s father or mother’s group, the children emerging as normal/ordinary members of that land and

\(^4\) See Sahlins (1958:139-141) for a consideration of how the ‘clan’ term had been used up until that time in Polynesianists’ literatures.
(nonunilineal) descent group depending on activation, by virtue of residence, of those as opposed to alternate residence and cognatic descent group options.

Of the four Polynesian societies which are formally lineal, three, Anuta, Tikopia and Rennell/Bellona, are Futunic Outliers and all three are patrilineal. Anuta and Tikopia have the *kainanga form and use it to refer to their patrilineal clans. Pukapuka, the fourth, has ‘double descent’ (both matrilineages and patrilineages) and one level of matrilineal sub-lineage is the keinanga, a matter that shall be reviewed presently in light of the agreement of that form and meaning with Micronesian *kainanga ‘matrilineal descent group’ forms. Double descent systems are one form of transition from matrilineality to patrilineality or vice versa and are rather rare amongst Oceanic speaking groups (Marck ms). I view the Pukapuka case as an example of matrilineal to patrilineal transition (or stasis). Pingelap in Micronesia is another double descent case, one which has clearly arisen out of a matrilineal past. The Pingelap *kainanga form specifies the patrilineages rather than the matrilineages, as would seem to have happened in the past of Anuta and Tikopia, *kainanga probably referring to both at some transitional stage.

Having considered how rare lineality is in Polynesian societies, I return to the subject of the Proto Oceanic descent situation. All subgroups of Oceanic other than Southern Oceanic (Southern Vanuatu and New Caledonia) are known to have daughters whose speakers’ societies include matrilineal groups (Marck ms). The appearance of absence for Southern Oceanic may simply be due to lack of description. Everywhere matrilineal societies existed upon earliest historical description amongst Oceanic

---

5 Kirch and Green (2001:212) give Bellona kakai ‘anga in their table of *kainanga forms but I do not consider it cognate.
speakers, their distribution seems be retreating or is in stasis rather than advancing. This distributional situation is very strong evidence in favour of the notion that Proto Oceanic Society was matrilineal/matrilocal rather than cognatic/uxorilocal (Marck ms). The distributional situation was mentioned in passing but not emphasised by Hage (1998a) and is the subject of special attention in Marck (ms).

Change in descent commonly follows changes in residence amongst human societies (Murdock 1949:____). Shifts in residence to matrifocal systems are commonly the result of the regular absence of men (seafaring, warrior societies, traders, herders) (Hage and Marck 2003:S123) and matrifocal residence is also a common adjustment to migration to new lands and conflict with the ‘others’ there encountered (Divale 1984). As the population was both seafaring and migratory, Proto Oceanic Society was composed of people who had two motives for matrifocal residence. Matrifocal residence rarely persists without the eventual development of formal matrilines (cf. Divale [1984] and also observe the general rarity [Murdock 1967] of uxorilocal systems in human societies compared to matrilocal societies). The demise of matrilocalism amongst Oceanic speaking societies is associated with abandonment of long-distance seafaring amongst local populations in Micronesia (Hage and Marck 2002), is universal in Polynesia\(^6\) and is common through Melanesia (Marck ms). The distributional argument notes that matrilineality is found amongst at least some speakers of perhaps all the Oceanic subgroups. This distribution is predicted to be retreating by the general model due to the decline of its original sources: matrilocal due to seafaring and migration. And matrilocal and matrilineality are, in fact, observed to be retreating nearly everywhere they are found (Marck ms).

\(^6\) Pukapukan society is patrilocal (Beaglehole and Beaglehole 1938:230).
Although all subgroups of Proto Oceanic other than Southern Oceanic are known to have daughters whose societies include matrilineal groups, the name for ‘matrilineal descent group’ or even just ‘clan’ is shared between no two Oceanic subgroups except in the case of Micronesian and Polynesian sharing *kainanga. The view taken here is that the Micronesian forms always meant ‘matrilineal descent group’ as does the Pukapukan form in Polynesia (where, specifically, it names matrilineal sub-lineages in the double descent system).

Although the Pohnpeic Micronesian forms have a shared irregularity, there is no apparent source for the irregularity through borrowing and no borrowing hypothesis has ever been published. From a social organisation perspective one might wonder why one need be looking for a borrowing explanation in any event. The ancestral society was matrilineal and matrilocal at the level of Proto Oceanic and any later common interstage ancestral to both Polynesian and Micronesian. Why would it be borrowed from Micronesia to Polynesia where lineality waned from such an early time? Why would it be borrowed from Polynesia to Micronesia when the source populations were shedding lineality and the target populations already had vigorous forms of matrilineality?

**History of ideas concerning *kainanga**

---

7 But see Chowning (1991:69) for some faint evidence of an early Oceanic *gapusa ‘clan’.
8 Another kith and kin term has a similar distribution, is also ancient, perhaps to the level of Proto Oceanic itself, and also involves an agreement limited to Micronesia and Fiji/Polynesia but for the exception of a single known Melanesian cognate from Buka immediately north of Bougainville (Blackwood 1935:56): *pasu ‘man’s sister’s child’ (Proto Micronesian *fasu ‘man’s sister’s child’, Proto Fijian *vasu ‘man’s sister’s child’, Proto Polynesian *fasu ‘privileges of a man’s sister’s child’).
The earliest source to speak to the ancient meanings of *kainanga seems to have been Goodenough (1955) who conflated reflexes of Proto Polynesian *kainanga and *kaainga, the former having to do with people in Proto Polynesian, the latter having to do with place. I have argued that the former has cognates in Micronesia due to common inheritance from early Oceanic while the latter has no apparent cognates outside Polynesian, Kiribati kainga, the only presently identified candidate, being best explained as a Polynesian loan (Marck 1996:205; Marck 2000:188-9). Goodenough mentioned Chuukic (Micronesian) cognates of Polynesian kainanga and considered them variants of *kaainga ~ *kainanga.

The next mention of *kainanga in the literature seems to be Koskinen (1960:157-8) where the Polynesian forms *kaainga and *kainanga were seen as distinct, the latter having to do with ‘populace of a place’ and the former possibly originating in “the verb kai ‘to eat’”. Koskinen noted that the *kaainga forms sometimes referred to just place and sometimes to both places and their people, a matter I will return to presently.

Koskinen (1967:95) again discussed *kainanga forms and may have erred in terminology when he stated that in ancient Polynesian society, “[l]ineage was the basic structure of the community.” Like ‘clan’, ‘lineage’ is a term reserved in social organisation usages to situations where there is unilineality (patrilineality, matrilineality or double descent) and it seems unlikely that Koskinen would have meant to imply that of the mainly cognatic Polynesians. More probably Koskinen used the term in the looser sense some Polynesianists occasionally have, subsuming cognatic systems for which there is no common equivalent term to ‘lineage’. In an
event, Pawley (1982:43) employed a more appropriate usage when he quoted Koskinen as I have above but in the next sentence speaks of Polynesian ‘descent groups’ when allowed the choice of words himself.

Goldman (1970:544) was aware the *kaainga word first had to do with place but, like Koskinen, wondered if it also anciently could have had to do with one’s descent group. But the ‘descent group’ meaning is limited to Western Polynesia and is now interpreted by Biggs and Clark (2006) as having been borrowed through that area after the dispersals to the Outliers and East Polynesia. Goldman didn’t discuss *kainanga forms in his conclusion though noting historic senses in some of his earlier chapters on individual societies. One of those chapters considers Pukapuka and mentions the matrilineal keinanga of Pukapukan society. Goldman (1970:392) puzzles that "[t]he keinanga are inexplicably exogamous, and have tended to take upon themselves the actual economic authority over the taro beds." Precisely the same is true of the *kainanga of the Chuukic speaking atolls of Micronesia (cf. Kuehling (ms) for Woleai). The model proposed here attributes those identities to common heritage from the early Oceanic era. It also attributes those identities to the societies of the interstages involved: Proto Micronesian, Proto Pohnpeic-Chuukic, Proto Pohnpeic and Proto Chuukic in the Micronesian line and Proto Central Pacific, Proto Polynesian and Proto Nuclear Polynesian in the Polynesian line.

Pawley (1982:44-45) considers *kainanga forms from Polynesia and Micronesia, suggesting there and again in Pawley (1985:96) that it was probably formed from the early Oceanic root *kai(n) ‘people of a place’. Verbal forms of the word apparently

* Except for the Futunic Outlier Pileni which has a ‘family’ sense in addition to its ‘village’ sense.
included *kai and *kakai ‘be inhabited, settled’ and *kainanga is seen to be formed of
*kaina-, a verbal construction, and *-nga, a Proto Oceanic nominaliser. Pawley
(1982:44) reconstructed Proto Polynesian *kainanga ‘land-holding descent group’ as
well as “subjects of a chief, the common populace as opposed to those of noble birth”
and three years later (Pawley 1985:96) reconstructed Proto Polynesian *kainanga
‘lineage or clan, people acknowledging same ancestor and chief”. Comparing
Micronesian and Polynesian data, Pawley (1985:96) concluded that an early Oceanic
*kainanga ‘high order descent group’ should be reconstructed.

The next consideration of *kainanga’s Polynesian past appears to have been Biggs
and Clark (1994) where a semantic reconstruction was made: “some social group,
perhaps commoners as opposed to aristocracy”. Two years later I reconstructed Proto
Polynesian meanings of “clan; worshippers of a deity; subjects of a chief;
commoners” (Marck 1996:204). I suggested that the various meanings developed over
time:

These senses become comprehensible in the context of Polynesian social and
religious practices whereby the most commonly worshipped deities were
family ancestors, and the most common kind of chief was the ranking male of
the kin group (however that group was constructed). Thus if PPn did have
clans called *kainanga, it is not difficult to imagine that they were subject to
the same chief, and gathered together to worship the same deities under the
leadership of that (clan) chief. The 'commoner' sense may have developed
over time as the most senior lineages of the *kainanga came to be remote
chiefly people and the old name for the group itself came to refer to the mass
of its members who were of common rank.

(Marck 1996:204, 2000:186-7)

That wording rescues me from many direct conflicts with my present opinion but only
just. I now view the Proto Polynesian (unilineal) ‘clan’ sense as a retention most
likely having to do with the populations of the smaller, more most isolated settled
islands around Western Polynesia\textsuperscript{10} (East Uvea and East Futuna, perhaps) and perhaps residually amongst specialist sea transport and fisher folk around Tonga and Samoa. This was occurring in a context which Pawley (1996) describes as Proto Polynesian’s drift into southern (Tonga) and northern (Samoa and the others) speech varieties around Western Polynesia rather than in sudden, definitive breaks in either linguistic or other cultural continuities. I did, however, err (Marck 1996:206-7, 2000:190) when I suggested that the social anthropologists would have to argue the nature of the Proto Polynesian clan and “[w]hether to reconstruct it as patrilineal, matrilineal, nonunilineal, ambilineal, or something else.” As I came to understand from the time I began working with Hage in 1999, it was wrong to use ‘clan’ and ‘nonunilineal’ or ‘ambilineal’ in the same breath. And, as I now believe, the word had two distinct senses in Proto Polynesian: 1. the general populace: commoners as opposed to chiefly families (*qariki) and 2. matrilineal clan in a mixed descent system.

The Proto Oceanic matrilineality model now implies that by Proto Polynesian times the drift to cognatic systems through Western Polynesia may have been advanced. However, the evidence of Pukapukan, Anutan and Tikopian is clear: at least some elements of the Western Polynesian Proto Polynesian speaking populations continued to calculate unilineal descent and to use *kainanga to refer to clans, lineages or sub-lineages.

Hage (1998a, 1998b) published what may now seem contradictory opinions. Citing my invitation to the social anthropologists mentioned above (to consider the kind of clan Proto Polynesian *kainanga was) he put forward the opinion that it was

\textsuperscript{10} The general area of Proto Polynesian speech (Pawley 1996).
patrilineal (Hage 1998b:189) based upon that sense being current in Anutan and Tikopian and due to the otherwise common patrifocal nature of descent groups amongst Polynesian societies. But after the publication of his Proto Oceanic Society matrilineality hypothesis (Hage 1998a) and especially after the human genetic evidence elevated the hypothesis to a firmer model (Hage and Marck 2003), he (personal communication11) came to the opinion that the earliest Polynesians were matrilineal and that most patrifocal cognatic Polynesian societies had become such in periods that emerged out of matrilineal rather than patrilineal ancestral societies.

Hage (1999:202-3) only touched upon existing ideas about *kainanga in the literature in his general overview of Proto Oceanic Society. He took the position that Proto Oceanic Society was lineal, either patrilineal or matrilineal, but did not press the (Hage 1998a) matrilineal case, mentioning it only in the final paragraph before the postscript, apparently due to publishing lag. Hage (1999) was developing the lineality hypothesis more than the matrilineality hypothesis as a lineality hypothesis was a necessary first step. Similarly, Hage and Marck (2002:151) only mention “Proto Oceanic” *kainanga ‘descent group’ and then consider its best definition in Proto Micronesian (“matrilineal descent group”) in that bottom up reconstruction of the Micronesian situation.

As did Hage (1998b), Kirch and Green (2001:211-218) took up my 1996 challenge to form a social organisation opinion of *kainanga’s meaning in Proto Polynesian that went beyond my tentative opinions based upon linguistic methods alone. They (Kirch and Green 2001:213) failed to recognise their Rotuman form/evidence as a Polynesian

11 Per Hage died in 2004 (Milicic 2006, Marck 2006) just as many of his opinions were evolving.
loan, but that does not impact on their most basic conclusion: that Proto Polynesian *kainanga meant “land-holding or controlling group tracing ascent from a common ancestor”. “We also infer that these groups were exogamous, and that they were likely to have been unilineal, although we cannot say with certainty whether the principle of ‘ascent’ was matrilineal (as in Pukapuka) or patrilineal (as in Tikopia)” (Kirch and Green 2001:214). As I do in the present report, Kirch and Green (2001:214) argue that “the term and its associated meanings underwent significant changes in both Western and Eastern Polynesia after the breakup of the PPN speech community.” The difference in my present report is that I allow that descent in Proto Polynesian Society was not necessarily of a homogenous form and that many of the changes surrounded elements of the society which were no longer matrilineal and seem to have been cognatic by Proto Polynesian times.

**Proto Polynesian *kainanga revisited**

First we must dismiss any notions that people with a homogenous language must have a homogenous descent system. We have no basis or method in linguistics to demand that such be the case and neither can we demand such from the perspective of synchronic studies of social organisation. Indeed, societies may have diverse descent systems along several axis. There are sometimes differences along the axis of rank as in the case of certain groups in the Admiralties:

*Chinnery (1925:52-54) includes materials on Aua and Wuvulu (Durour and Matty islands), the “Western Islands” of the Admiralties. He describes a situation where the commoners are matrilineal and matrilocal but the chiefs more ambilateral and the highest chiefs patrilineal.*

(Marck ms)
Similar to the Aua and Wuvulu differences along a rank axis, there are sometimes differences in South Asia along the axis of caste. The Nayar of Kerala, famously polyandrous\(^\text{12}\), are matrilocal but part of a larger regional society where other groups are not.

Geographical variability would be an obvious consequence of the vast geographical spread of Proto Polynesian speech (all of Western Polynesia settled at the time\(^\text{13}\)) and there seem to have been pan-Western Polynesian developments that affected the general populace in new ways while some smaller groups retained the old. I now posit geographical and perhaps occupational variation in Proto Polynesian Society’s descent systems whereby East Uvea or East Futuna or both were still matrilineal, as were perhaps some seafarer specialists on Tonga and Samoa. By Proto Polynesian times *kainanga* still meant ‘matrilineal clan’ to the populations that were still matrilineal but amongst the majority of Tongans and Samoans the word was no longer so clearly associated with descent and had come to designate the general population of commoners.

First there is the evidence that there was a Proto Polynesian sense of ‘matrilineal descent group’ retained from early Oceanic and that this meaning continued in at least the ancestor of Pukapukan and, perhaps from a different geographical area of Western Polynesia, the ancestor of Anutan and Tikopian. After most of ten years, Hage’s (1998a) Proto Oceanic Society matrilineality hypothesis has been elevated to a strong model due to the human genetic studies (Hage and Marck 2003, Kayser et al. 2006), is also strengthened by the distributional evidence (Marck ms) mentioned above, and is

---

\(^{12}\) A woman may have multiple husbands at the same time

\(^{13}\) It wasn’t, perhaps, until after Proto Polynesian times that Tuvalu and the Tokelaus came to be settled.
uncontested in the literature. Our task then becomes one of surveying the mainly
cognatic landscape of Polynesian societies for any vestiges of matrilineality. In
Pukapuka we find not only matrilineality but an early Oceanic word for ‘matrilineal
descent group’ in Pukapukan *keinanga ‘matrilneal sub-lineage’. We also find an
exact match for two of the *keinanga’s social functions (exogamy and ownership of
the taro swamps [above]) in Proto Chuukic *kainanga. So the presence of matrilineal
descent groups amongst elements of the population is demonstrated for Proto
Polynesian Society. As previously mentioned, the ‘patrilineal’ senses of Anuta and
Tikopia are then seen as the likely result of periods of double descent followed by the
abandonment of matrilines. I draw attention, again, to Micronesia’s Pinelap
*keinanga form which has come to mean ‘patrilineal clan’ out of a more
conspicuously matrilineal past than Polynesia’s Anuta and Tikopia.

I now turn to the second sense of Proto Polynesian *kainanga, that of ‘populace,
commoners’ and such related meanings as seen reconstructed in the literature
reviewed above.

Linguistic evidence suggests reconstruction of Proto Polynesian, Proto Nuclear
Polynesian, Proto Ellicean, Proto East Polynesian, Proto Marquesic and Proto Nuclear
Marquesic *kainanga ‘commoner, general populace’:

Tongan kainanga ‘populace, people without chiefly rank’, East Uvean14
kainanga ‘people not of chiefly rank’, Hawaiian maka-‘eina ‘commoner,
populace, people in general’, Marquesan mata-‘eina ‘people, gens, sujets’,
Mangarevan mata-kainanga ‘assembly, congregation of persons’.

14 The East Uvean *kainanga form has a meaning suspiciously identical to that of Tonga and may be a
loan. East Uveu was conquered by Tongans who came to reside there some centuries ago and the
language has a heavy overlay of Tongan loans (Biggs 1980).
Linguistic evidence also allow a second reconstruction not clearly attributable to Proto Polynesian or Proto Tongic but attributable to Proto Nuclear Polynesian, Proto Futunic, Proto Ellicean, Proto East Polynesian and Proto Tahitic: *kainanga

‘attendants and subordinates’:

Samoan ainaga ‘attendants and minister of the aitu (spirits, gods)’, Mae (a Futunic Outlier in Central Vanuatu) na-kainanga ‘titled person subordinate to a given person’, Tahitian einaa ‘female attendants of the queen or chief woman’, Tuamotuan keina’a ‘a group, band, body of followers, servants, people united by the same service, duties; the female attendants of a chieftainess’

Two distributional observations are notable. First, the living languages with the ‘commoner’ and ‘subordinates’ senses never use their *kainanga forms to name any sort or level of descent group and the living languages that have a ‘descent group’ sense never have a ‘commoner’ or ‘subordinate’ sense. A second distribution is also clear: although our evidence points to both ‘commoner, general populace’ and ‘attendants, subordinates’ meanings in Proto Nuclear Polynesian, Proto Ellicean and Proto East Polynesian, we observe that not a single living language retains both senses today. One or the other meaning has survived but never both. I take the ‘clan’ versus ‘commoner/subordinate’ distributions to be the result of geographical differences in meaning around Western Polynesia at Proto Polynesian times. The ‘commoner, populace’ versus ‘subordinate, attendants’ distributions presently seem more serendipitous and I leave the question of interpreting those distributions to another day. Our present task is to point out that the ‘matrilineal clan’ sense had come to mean ‘commoners, populace’ to most Western Polynesian populations by Proto Polynesian Society times.
As the extended quote from Marck (1996) indicates in the section on the history of ideas above, I felt since first examining the problem that the ‘commoner, subordinate’ senses emerged out of the ‘descent group’ sense. Three areas of progress in our general research now allow a more developed interpretation:

1. The emergence and current primacy of the Proto Oceanic Society matrilineality model.
2. Abandonment of the notion that Proto Polynesian speakers necessarily had a single system of descent.
3. The observation that *kainanga senses of ‘commoner, subordinate’ are in complementary distribution when compared to the languages that have the ‘lineal descent group’ sense.

I now posit that the cognatic elements of the population had gone through the middle and late Pre Proto Polynesian\textsuperscript{15} period first transforming the meaning of *kainanga to ‘cognatic descent group’, into a time when it meant ‘commoners of the cognatic descent groups’ and then, by Proto Polynesian times, shifting to just the ‘commoner’ sense along the lines I suggested in 1996 (in the extended quote above). The evidence of the living languages is unanimous in indicating that a ‘cognatic descent group’ sense was no longer current in Proto Polynesian times and that only the ‘commoner’ sense existed.

The subpopulations retaining the ‘matrilineal clan’ sense would at least have been the ancestral interstage society which spawned the earliest Pukapukans and, perhaps from a different source, the ancestor of Anutan and Tikopian for which we must postulate a ‘unilineal descent group’ sense but less certainly a ‘matrilineal descent group’ sense. The ravages of time leave us with data that offer no compelling support for only one interpretation or the other.

\textsuperscript{15} ‘Pre Proto Polynesian’ – that period between the divergence of Polynesian from all other Oceanic (ca. 900 BC [Burley and Dickinson 2001, Burley and Connaughton 2007]) and the last ‘moment’ of unified Polynesian speech, a less certain time in the AD 1-500 era.
The situation is confounded by the possibility that there may also have been variability in local populations such as residually matrilineal seafaring and transport folk on Tonga and Samoa and by our inability, linguistically, to specify a source for the origin of Pukapukan speech. Pukapukan is presently classified as a first order offshoot of Nuclear Polynesian and cannot be sourced to a particular place in Western Polynesia except that it would be seen as having emerged out of Samoa, East Uvea or East Futuna and not to have emerged out of Tonga or the northern atolls (Tokelau or Tuvalu).

The source of lineality for Anutan and Tikopian is similarly muddled. Although I offered a family tree of Polynesian that ignored the Futunic Outlier group (Marck 1999, 2000), that tree was meant to show what kind of groups could be supported solely on the basis of exclusively shared sporadic sound changes. But such changes only occurred once every century or two in the history of the average living Polynesian language (cf. Marck 2000:59). Things were happening faster than that when Proto Nuclear Polynesian diverged into its primary subgroups (Futunic, East Uvean, Ellicean and Pukapukan). It was in some narrow band of time that the languages retaining the ‘clan’ sense diverged from the others. But we can be sure the ‘clan’ sense was current in the immediate ancestor of Pukapukan, on the one hand, and Anutan and Tikopian on the other. In any event, the data force us to attribute a ‘matrilineal clan’ sense to at least some elements of both the Proto Polynesian and the Proto Nuclear Polynesian speaking populations.

Conclusion

By positing matrilineality (Hage 1998, Marck ms) and matrilocality (Hage and Marck 2003, Kayser et al. 2006) for the earliest Polynesians (ca. 900 BC) and diversity in descent systems by Proto Polynesian times\(^\text{17}\) (ca. AD 1-500), a coherent history for *kainanga can be suggested. Societies need not have homogenous descent systems. We need, therefore, have no single model of Proto Polynesian Society’s descent mechanisms and the lexical data more or less require that we do not. I posit a situation where the more sedentary elements of Proto Polynesian Society may have been operating under cognatic principles while at least some groups, perhaps those most active in long-distance seafaring, were still matrilineal and perhaps still matrilocal. A reconstruction of ‘matrilineal descent group’ for Proto Polynesian *kainanga is indicated by the agreement between Pukapukan and Pohnpeic-Chuukic from Micronesia, but it need not have been the primary sense to most people. For most, a status term (‘[one’s] descent group’) seems to have become a rank term: ‘the general populace: commoners as opposed to chiefly families (*qariki*)’.

Divale’s (1984) study suggested that societies which shift to matrilocality take an average of 1800 years to complete their return to patrifocal systems that have divested themselves of all formally matrilineal structures. This is roughly affirmed in the Polynesian instance where their ancestors in Melanesia were or became matrilocal in the 1400-1000 BC period and had, in the main, become cognatic and perhaps patrifocal in the AD 1-500 period. At that latter point in time, matrilineal

\(^{17}\) In Marck (1996) I was writing solely as a linguist and attempted to take linguistic methods to their logical limit, specifically avoiding the fine details of social organisation questions which were, in any event, to remain nebulous in the Pacific Island social anthropology literature until two years later with the publication of Hage’s (1998a) matrilineality hypothesis.
some way – probably amongst groups who continued to experience long absences of men due to seafaring.
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