

THE POSITION OF THE LANGUAGES OF EASTERN INDONESIA

ISIDORE DYEN

For the last few years I have been working on the classification of the languages of eastern Indonesia. Roughly these are the languages east of Sumbawa and Celebes in the south and in the north respectively, and at the eastern end, west of the western shore of Geelvink Bay. Again roughly the languages of interest are those assigned in my lexicostatistical study of 1965 to the Moluccan Linkage and the Bigic Cluster.

Three different propositions have been offered concerning these languages. The first is embodied in the Brandes Line which would divide these languages into an eastern and western group. According to Brandes the western boundary of the eastern group ran west of Roti in the south, and in the north, just west of the Sula Islands and thus east of Celebes and the Banggai Islands, and the Talaut and Sangir Islands. The basis of this division was the feature called 'the preposed genitive' which appears in languages east of this line. As an example Brandes cites Kisar *manu-keër* 'bird egg' (attribute plus head) as compared with Malay *telor ayam* '(egg chicken) chicken egg' (head plus attribute).

Kanski and Kasprusch (1931; hereafter *passim* KK) have reviewed the history of the discussion of the position of the languages of eastern Indonesia. After presenting Brandes' view, they point out (1931:883) that in terms of Brandes' criterion N. Adriani proposed that Banggai off Sulawesi should be included in this group. They themselves point out that Solorese on Flores must also be included. Furthermore Paulus Mitang, a Sikanese, has told me that Sika, or at least some dialects of Sika, must also be included. KK (1931:884) go on to recall that Schmidt interpreted the feature of the preposed genitive as a relic of a Papuan substratum with which mixture had occurred and they attribute to Jonker (citing Jonker 1914:4) the belief that Schmidt assigned the languages of Brandes' eastern group to the Melanesian languages.

Schmidt (1926) maintains Brandes' eastern group, but has Sika at its western end and the Tanimbar and Aru languages at its eastern end. Schmidt does not mention the Austronesian languages of south Halmahera, but presumably they are to be included here. He does however include the New Guinea coastal languages among the so-called Papua-mixed group which he places among the Melanesian languages. Perhaps the fact that these coastal languages also show a 'preposed genitive' led Jonker to conclude that Schmidt was extending the Melanesian boundary to include the eastern Indonesian languages.

However this may be, Jonker for his part (1914:263) recommends ignoring the division of the languages of Indonesia into an eastern and western group. He sees no basis for either division.

Kanski and Kasprusch (1931:884) on the other hand see the Brandes division justified on the basis that the eastern languages were influenced by the Papuan languages, not because of a radical linguistic difference from the western group nor because of an internal linguistic relationship within the eastern group. They claim that the eastern group constitutes a transitional group from the Indonesian languages to the Melanesian languages. They base their claim on an examination of the relations between the pronominal possessives in the languages. Their reasons for doing so is that these pronominal possessives together with the numerous further grammatical relations involved with them, are one of the strongest criteria for the classification of the Oceanic languages according to the best scholars of these languages. The statement of this claim is followed by the name Dempwolff in parentheses (1931:884) and he is presumably either among the scholars referred to or is the source of the opinion.

The three views that have thus far been proposed are then as follows:

- 1) The original Brandes grouping which treats the eastern Indonesian languages as an Indonesian subgroup. The various additions to the original Brandes grouping are simple subvarieties of the same view.
- 2) Jonker's view that there is no eastern subdivision. This is perhaps best interpreted as claiming that there is neither a western subgroup nor an eastern subgroup. The implication appears to be that we simply have a large set of coordinate languages.
- 3) The view of Kanski and Kasprusch that the eastern languages of Indonesia form a subgroup which is different from the western subgroup and is transitional to the Melanesian or Oceanic languages.

I agree with Jonker that the 'preposed genitive' should not be used as a criterion for distinguishing an eastern Indonesian subgroup. A

syntactic feature standing alone is almost inevitably a poor criterion. On the other hand my own lexicostatistical classification should also be subjected to some test to see how it fares. In what immediately follows I shall therefore effectively ignore earlier classifications of the languages of eastern Indonesia.

Nevertheless, as I have done in other instances, I will employ here a widely held hypothesis that all of the other Austronesian languages are to be assigned either to a western group, which I will call Hesperonesian, or to an eastern group which I will call Oceanic. Some might wish to insist that there is a third group, the Formosan languages of Taiwan, but the decision concerning this group plays no role in my discussion here.

On this basis we shall begin anew with the consideration of three alternatives:

- 1) The eastern Indonesian languages, either all together or in part, belong with the Hesperonesian languages, that is the languages of western Indonesia and the Philippines and perhaps also the Formosan languages.
- 2) The eastern Indonesian languages, either all together or in part, belong with the Oceanic languages.
- 3) The eastern Indonesian languages, either all together or in part, belong to neither the Hesperonesian languages nor the Oceanic languages, and constitute a subgroup or a set of subgroups with the other two. Presumably under this hypothesis they would appear most like a set of transitional languages between Hesperonesian and Oceanic.

My discussion here will be based almost entirely on published materials. It is my hope to bolster this evidence as soon as possible with evidence derived from primary sources. Furthermore I shall deal here only with languages of the Moluccan Linkage and the Bigic Cluster and in fact with relatively few of these.

Finally the evidence that I will bring will bear only on the second possibility; that these languages belong with the Oceanic languages rather than belonging with the Hesperonesian languages or being coordinate with both groups. There seems to be good reason to exclude the possibility that the eastern Indonesian languages are to be subgrouped with the Oceanic languages.

The evidence that I will offer is some lists of words which, if they are inherited, are cognate with words in the Hesperonesian languages, whereas Oceanic cognates have not been found or at least are not known to me. The words cited will in most cases be cognate with words found

in Dempwolff's (1938) *Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis* without a cited cognate from the Oceanic languages. In a few instances a Hesperonesian cognate set not given by Dempwolff will be used. In such cases a reconstruction will not be cited or, if cited, will not be assigned to Dempwolff. Dempwolff's reconstructions will be quoted after D. and cited in the form which I have usually used in the past.

Needless to say some of the instances cited will either ultimately or even immediately be found to have an Oceanic cognate. Such a finding should not be regarded as invalidating the remaining instances as evidence unless one is prepared to claim that some large portion of the remainder can be expected to turn out to have an Oceanic cognate. In the latter case, the evidence would be nullified. Since however I do not expect an Oceanic cognate to be found for more than a few of the instances, the magnitude of the number of the remaining instances will remain evidence against associating the eastern Indonesian languages with Oceanic. At the same time one should regard the following evidence as less than the totality of all instances since it can be expected that other instances might be found. It could thus easily prove true that any attrition due to the finding of new Oceanic cognates could be made up for, or more than made up for, by the finding of more instances associable only with Hesperonesian words.

We will consider three languages, two of them members of the Moluccan Linkage, one in the Bigic Cluster in my Austronesian classification and one in the Geelvink Hesion in the same classification. The first two are Kamarian of western Ceram and Yamden of Tanimbar, the third is Buli of southern Halmahera, and the fourth is Numfor in Geelvink Bay.*

The Kamarian instances are as follows:¹

- haru, Tag. ha:lo 'pestle', D. halu.
- ana, Tag. qanak 'child', D. anak.
- nawa, Mal. ěnaw 'aren-palm'.
- elan, Tag. hagdan 'ladder'.
- hahu, Tag. ba:boy 'pig', D. babuy.
- halawan, Tag. bula:wan 'gold'.
- huri, Tag. buqig 'cluster', D. buliR.
- nia, Maanyan anipè 'snake'.
- isi, Mal. isi 'contents', D. isi.
- unin 'k. of plant (Mal. kuning)', Jav. kunir 'turmeric', D. kuniJ.
- lahan 'companion, friend', Mal. lawan 'oppose', D. laban.
- nahu² 'to drop, throw away', Mal. laboh 'drop anchor', D. labuq.

* Abbreviations used: assim. - assimilation; Bug. - Buginese; D. - Dempwolff; Jav. - Javanese; Mak. - Makassarese; Mal. - Malay; Ngj. - Ngaju; Nmf. - Numfor; Tag. - Tagalog; Tbt. - Toba-Batak.

esun,³ Mal. lěson 'mortar', D. lesun.
 anaa-n 'k. of fruit', Mal. nangka 'jackfruit', D. nangka.
 maarinu 'acid, sour', Mal. ğilu 'toothache', D. ğilu.
 hala, Mal. padi 'rice', *pajey.
 mamori 'sacred, forbidden', Mal. pěmali 'taboo', D. pali.
 rihu-ni 'thousand', Mal. ribu 'thousand', D. ribu.
 sare-u 'lean on', Tag. sa:lig 'supported', D. saDeR.
 saru-t 'gutter', Mal. salor 'gutter', D. saluR.
 siut 'angle, corner', Jav. sikot 'elbow'.
 arun 'clothing, coloured cloth worn at festivities', Mal. saron
 'sheath, sarong', D. sarun.
 sepe 'to press, squeeze', Tag. si:pit 'pincers', D. se(m)pit.
 tapi 'sarong', Tag. tapi 'apron', D. tapiq.
 tohu 'ransom', Mal. těbos 'ransom', D. tebus.
 torun 'k. of fruit (Mal. terong)', Mal. těron 'eggplant', D. terun.
 n-oa, Jav. uwab 'steam', D. uqab.

The Yamden instances are:

yadi(n), Ilocano qadu 'many'.
 alas, Mal. alas 'forest', D. alas.
 anak, Mal. anaq 'child', D. anak.
 alu, Mal. (h)alu 'pestle', D. halu.
 kanit 'to skin', Tag. qa:nit 'skin'.
 yare, Mal. arañ 'charcoal', D. ajen.
 babi, Mal. babi 'pig', D. babuy.
 bare, Mal. bara 'glowing ember', D. baRa.
 burit 'back', Mal. buret 'rear', D. burit.
 sambur, Mal. campor 'to mix', D. ca(m)pur.
 daye 'land side, west', Tag. qi-la:ya 'interior', D. daya.
 nife 'large kind of snake', Maanyan anipè 'snake'.
 isi, Mal. isi 'contents', D. isi.
 mě-kafal, Tag. kapal 'thick', D. kapal.
 kéri 'tongue, command, promise', Ilocano kari 'to promise, vow'.
 kikir 'to file with sharkskin', Mal. kiker 'file', D. kikir.
 lan, Tag. lan 'only'.
 nésun (assim.), Mal. lěson 'mortar', D. lesun.
 lufe, Mal. lupa 'forget', D. lupa.
 nabuk, Mal. maboq 'drunk', D. mabuk.
 fase, Mal. padi 'rice', *pajey.
 kniye, Tag. pa:ni:ki, pani:kiq 'flying fox', D. pa[nñ]iki.
 smaŋat, Mal. sěmaŋat 'soul, spirit'.
 solat, Mal. sělat 'sea-strait, sound', D. selat.

nisik, TBt. sisik '*seek lice*', D. sisik.
 sisir, Mal. siser '*comb*', D. sisi[rD].
 tafal, Mal. tampal '*to patch*'.
 tébus, Mal. tebos '*to liberate, ransom*', D. tebus.
 tuak, Mal. tuaq '*palm toddy*'.

The Buli instances are:

awai '*swing arms in walking*', TBt. ambe '*swing arms*', D. a(m)bay.
 nau, Mal. ěnaw '*aren-palm*'.
 manai '*son-in-law*', Mal. anaq '*child*', D. anak.
 loan (with metathesis, from *ReZan), Tag. hagdan '*ladder*'.
 wawai '*child*', Jav. bayi '*suckling*'.
 palana '*pot to store medicinal roots*', Mal. balana '*jar*', D.
 b/al/ana.
 palas '*to pay*', Mal. balas '*to repay in kind*', D. bales.
 balat (a for u by analogy or assimilation) '*wind around, wrap*',
 Mal. balut, D. balut.
 bati '*border*', Mal. batas '*boundary*', D. bates.
 bibisil (si < *ti regular), Tagabili bitil '*hungry*'.
 lalan '*thousand*', Tag. daqan '*hundred*'.
 dāl '*to pretend, feign*', Mal. daleh '*pretext*', D. daliq.
 afa, Tag. qipa '*chaff*', D. epa.
 matatal (? < ma-ata-atal), Mal. gatal '*itch*', D. gatel.
 kakam-o, Tag. kamay '*hand*'.
 iwa-n '*to change, exchange*', Jav. ébah, éwah '*changed*', D. ibaq.
 lilis (? < *ililis), Mal. (h)ires '*to slice*', D. hiris.
 utan, Mak. kutanaŋ, Bug. utana '*to ask*'.
 loblob '*to flame*', Tag. l/ag/ablab '*a burst of flame*'.
 fa-rera '*to run away*', Mal. lari '*to run away*', D. laRiw.
 lapis (metathesis) '*away, free, loose, let go*', Mal. lēpas '*let go, free*', D. lepas.
 lusiŋ (metathesis), Mal. lěsoŋ '*mortar*', D. lesuŋ.
 mi-li-liŋ, Tag. li:naw '*clear (of liquid)*', D. li[nñ]aw.
 tabak (metathesis), Ilocano takab '*to cover*'.
 tapi, Jav. tawu '*to bail*', D. tabu.
 tokē, Mal. tēkeq '*gecko*', D. tekik.
 teŋa '*quiet, calm*' (metathesis), Mal. tēnaŋ '*calm*'.
 tēktēk '*a drop*', Mal. titeq '*a spot*'.
 atŋalo '*turn face upward, look up*', Mal. tēŋadah '*to look up*',
 D. [tT]iŋaDaq.
 uas, Tag. hu:gas '*to wash*', D. huRas.
 kaka-nin '*sour*', Mal. ŋilu '*toothache*', D. ŋilu.

fni, Tag. pa:ni:ki, pani:kiq 'flying fox', D. pa[nñ]iki.
 m-òmas 'to rub, scour, scrub', Mal. rama 'to massage'.
 s-lubi 'hundred', Mal. ribu 'thousand', D. ribu.
 smènit 'soul of dead (in heaven)', Mal. sěmañat 'soul'.
 sibu, Mal. sumbu 'wick', D. sumbu.
 smo, Tontemboan sěmur 'mouth'.
 seña (metathesis) 'happy, joyful', Mal. senañ 'content', D. se[ae]ñ.
 sima, Mak., Bug. sima 'counter-gift to dowry'.
 sisip-e, Mal. sisep 'to insert', D. sisip.
 taba 'gift to shaman', Tag. tambag 'wedding gift', D. ta(m)baR.

I offer here some comparisons which would appear to associate Numfor (and thus Biak) with western languages. Here we will cite probable cognates with eastern Indonesian languages as well since we are deeply concerned with the issue of the adherence of the Biakic languages:

Nmf. yaker 'to send off, see off', Tag. hatid 'conduct, accompany'.
 Nmf. bar-mor, Tag. бага? 'lung'.
 Nmf. waw, Bikol baw'o 'turtle'.
 Nmf. biser, Tagabili bitil 'hungry'.
 Nmf. wan-de 'landward', Tag. ?i-la:ya 'interior of country'.
 Nmf. prim, Mal. diñen 'cold'.
 Nmf. maker, Mal. gatal 'to itch'.
 Nmf. f-rar, Mal. lari 'to run'.
 Nmf. a-sri, Mal. lěsoñ 'mortar'.
 Nmf. mbrif, Sawu mari 'to laugh'.
 Nmf. ar-mum, Bima ka-mumu 'to gargle'.
 Nmf. naĩk 'sibling of same sex', West Sumban na?a 'brother (by sister)'.
 Nmf. m-niwěr 'wasp', Bima niwa 'bee'.
 Nmf. m-nir, Ngadha nilu 'sour'.
 Nmf. fas 'rice', Mal. padi 'unhusked rice'.
 Nmf. for 'taboo', Paulohi fori-e 'forbidden'.
 Nmf. fufer, Mal. pupol 'to pluck off'.
 Nmf. siwer, Kamarian tihar, Sapalewa tiwal 'drum'.
 Nmf. sor 'gutter', Mal. salor 'conduit'.
 Nmf. sau 'anchorage', Mal. saoh 'anchor'.
 Nmf. kpor 'thick, firm', Jav. těběl 'firm, stiff', Mal. těbal 'thick'.
 Nmf. kok 'to break off', Mal. tětaq 'to chop, hew'.
 Nmf. urěk 'hill', Paulohi ulat-e 'mountain'.
 Nmf. uti, Paulohi utu-ni 'hundred'.

With these can be considered the following though perhaps with greater chance of error:

Nmf. ek, Mal. na-eq 'to mount, ride on'.

Nmf. rares, West Sumban ka-laritu 'root'.

Nmf. a-sos 'small shellfish', Tag. suso? 'a kind of river snail'.

In addition it seems reasonable to add the following PAN etymology because the Nmf. cognate appears to agree with western languages in meaning:

Nmf. for 'to embrace, catch', Mal. pĕloq 'to embrace' (but e.g. Tonga ma-pelu 'bent').

The method in which exclusively shared cognate sets are used to obtain a provisional classification is best regarded as being of the quick-and-dirty variety. Until all of the Austronesian languages have been fully studied, some member of the cognate sets can be expected to cease to be exclusively shared when additional cognates are found. For this reason it is important that the collection of cognate sets used this way be large, though it is difficult without a great deal of experimentation to determine what a good minimum size would be. At present I am working with the assumption that a collection of 25-30 is large enough.

Since there are so many Austronesian languages, it is useful to use as a provisional assumption (or working hypothesis) the widely held hypothesis that there are two large Austronesian subfamilies: the Hesperonesian subfamily, and the Oceanic subfamily. There has been considerable difference of opinion as to the relation between the languages of eastern Indonesia and these two large families.

I assume, on the basis of experience, that Dempwolff scanned the few languages he worked with with exceptional care. Dempwolff's sets of cognates are basically of two types. All or nearly all have a Hesperonesian member cited. One type has in addition a cognate cited from an Oceanic language. The other type lacks a cognate cited from an Oceanic language.

In my experience, and here I can only speak for myself, it is quite unusual to be able to add an Oceanic cognate that Dempwolff missed in the Oceanic languages that he studied. Where the Oceanic languages not studied by Dempwolff are concerned, on the whole relatively few cognates from other Oceanic languages have been suggested for Dempwolff's cognate sets of Type 2 that concern us here.

A number of additional cognates have nevertheless been suggested to me by B. Biggs, R.A. Blust, and A. Chowning that have caused a certain amount of attrition in the lists originally presented at SICAL. Some new cognate sets also have since been introduced.

If for the moment we make the assumption that on the whole relatively few additional Oceanic cognates are to be expected to reduce the number of Type 2 cognates, then the argument offered here bears on whether we should regard the eastern Indonesian languages as probably either belonging with Hesperonesian rather than Oceanic, or at least not to be grouped together with Oceanic against Hesperonesian either as a sub-member of Oceanic or as a coordinate with Oceanic in a grouping such as the Eastern Austronesian proposed by Blust (1974, 1978).⁵

I used this method once before in an article entitled 'The Position of the Malayopolynesian Languages of Formosa' (*Asian Perspectives* 7:261-71 [1963]). There I attempted to show that, contrary to the lexicostatistical evidence, Atayalic probably fell into a single Formosan subgroup with the other two subfamilies of Taiwan. Ferrell (1969) was able to show that some number of the cognations I proposed as restricted to Formosan languages actually had cognates outside of Formosa. Out of 37 proposed sets he found eight with "immediately evident cognates in Tagalog, Ilocano, or Visayan" (1969:63). He seemed to imply that further study would increase the number. He concluded therefore that "the Formosan languages may in fact form a single family, but it will take more than superficial vocabulary resemblances to prove it ...". Here I believe we are to understand the term 'superficial vocabulary' as a redundant expression since it is evidently assumed that an argument based on vocabulary is necessarily superficial. Furthermore the use of the term 'resemblances' is obviously prejudicial since in each case a cognate relation was proposed. The claim that proposed cognates are either the result of borrowing or mere resemblances due to chance needs to be supported in each case. That Pazehe would borrow its word for 'eye' from Atayalic or that Saaroa would borrow its word for 'ear' from a Paiwanic language raises questions about the ease with which languages borrow basic vocabulary. We know that a dominated group not uncommonly makes such borrowings from the language of a dominant group so that Ferrell has perhaps unearthed a reflection of intertribal relations.

What is interesting is the conclusion reached by Tsuchida (1976:13) who made a more extensive study than Ferrell. Of the 37 I proposed as not having extra-Formosan cognates, Tsuchida found nine instances with extra-Formosan cognates, a result which corresponds rather nicely with Ferrell's, but on the other hand cannot be said to have increased the number with extra-Formosan cognates significantly. At the same time, however, Tsuchida offers five additional instances of cognate sets with an Atayalic member and no known extra-Formosan cognates. It follows

that Tsuchida's evidence tends to support the original hypothesis despite the fact that some of the original evidence has fallen by the wayside.

This turn of events has led me to feel that the procedure I have followed is justified, provided the collection of proposed cognates is relatively large and can not easily be discounted as perhaps due to borrowing. For anyone who wishes to discount the lists presented here in this way, we can only suggest that it is useful to remember that the mere existence of the possibility that an item of vocabulary was borrowed is not proof that it was borrowed. Furthermore to conclude that the evidence of proposed cognates which can not be discounted as due to chance resemblance is ineffective, the putative cognates must be attributed to borrowing under conditions which make borrowing at least as reasonable a hypothesis as common inheritance.

The results thus far reached seem clearly to militate against finding a next-of-kin relationship between the Oceanic languages and Kamarian, Yamden, Buli, or Numfor, and their immediate subgroups along with them. This weak inference is strongly supported and contradicts the hypothesis put forward by Blust (elsewhere in this volume) concerning the relationship of Buli.

On the other hand, these results also support the strongest inference that these languages and their subgroups have a relationship with the (?other) Hesperonesian languages. Necessarily the support for this stronger inference must be regarded as weaker. It is perhaps worthwhile noting that it contradicts the hypothesis implied by my lexicostatistical classification of 1965. There the Ambic subfamily to which Kamarian can be shown to belong was assigned to the Moluccan Linkage. The Moluccan Linkage is there assigned to the Malayopolynesian Linkage which itself is treated as a primary member of the Austronesian Linkage. The Ambonese languages, together with the Tanimbar languages, are thus treated as coordinate with the Hesperonesian Linkage within Malayopolynesian on the one hand and on the other with the Heonesian Linkage which most resembles the Oceanic of the widely accepted classification.

Buli on the other hand is in the lexicostatistical classification placed in the Bigic Cluster which is an immediate member of the Austronesian Linkage. In this sense it is there directly coordinate with both Hesperonesian and Oceanic taken together. Our evidence here however seems to suggest that the Bigic Cluster should be reassigned to be a member of Hesperonesian.

Furthermore evidence can now be presented that there is a closer relationship between the Bigic Cluster and the Geelvink Hesion than was indicated in any lexicostatistical classification. Such a closer

relationship was first suggested by Adriani and Esser who said (346) that the languages of South Halmahera form a closely knit group which "strongly exhibit the character of the North New Guinea languages ...". Blust elsewhere in this volume offers shared phonological innovations in support of this grouping.⁶ I call this group Bulic-Biakic.

The following is lexical evidence for a Bulic-Biakic:

- Nmf. yafen, Bul. yafan 'harpoon'.
 Nmf. as, Bul. yas 'to swim'.
 Nmf. ara, Bul. ala 'bait'.
 Nmf. beker, Bul. pagal 'to lean against'.
 Nmf. babara, Bul. babalai 'a skin disease'.
 Nmf. pari 'large kind of betelnut', Bul. paliu 'betelnut'.
 Nmf. mga pir, Bul. mta per-o 'eyelid'.
 Nmf. biw, Bul. peo 'seed'.
 Nmf. bis (wis) 'illness', Bul. pisi 'sick'.
 Nmf. bo (wob, bob, bow) 'bacon', bow 'pork', Bul. bou 'pig'.
 Nmf. bosbos 'sore', Bul. bos 'swelling carbuncle'.
 Nmf. mam, maïm 'to see', Bul. em, em 'to see'.
 Nmf. esen 'comb-shaped base of a banana cluster', Bul. esi 'a comb of bananas'.
 Nmf. faren 'nephew, niece', Bul. ta-falen 'great-nephew, great-niece', palen 'cousin twice removed'.
 Nmf. karar, Bul. gagli 'skinny'.
 Nmf. kro 'anus, buttocks', Bul. golo 'tail'.
 Nmf. ases, Bul. kasiso 'grasshopper'.
 Nmf. rib (also probably reb) 'to lick', Bul. lep 'to eat licking as a dog'.
 Nmf. mar 'loincloth (originally of pounded bark)', Bul. mal 'pounded bark, clothing of pounded bark'.
 Nmf. mambri, Bul. momole 'champion'.
 Nmf. mumes, Bul. mumis 'mosquito'.
 Nmf. abob 'pandanus box', Bul. opopi 'packet'.
 Nmf. ores, Bul. osal 'to stand'.
 Nmf. kaprer, Bul. pape-o 'tongue'.
 Nmf. obek, Bul. ubi 'coconut shell'.
 Nmf. arpiarek, Bul. pepera 'phlegm'.
 Nmf. saporarer, Bul. caparere 'to flounder, struggle'.
 Nmf. sar 'row in from river', Bul. sali 'to row, paddle'.
 Nmf. swor 'to soar, float in air', Bul. sawal 'to hang in air above ground', sau-sawal 'to hover'.
 Nmf. man-sisew, Bul. sayu 'hen-barrier'.

Nmf. syun, Bul. su 'to enter'.

Nmf. sba 'moon shaped bay', Bul. suo 'bay inlet'.

Nmf. swan, Bul. sawa 'crevice'.

Nmf. man-sowi, Bul. sou 'heron'.

Nmf. ka-bas 'to split', Bul. pas 'to split (coconuts)'.

Nmf. wam 'an inedible shellfish', Bul. uwam 'a kind of shellfish'.

It is perhaps worthwhile dealing with the Kanski-Kasprusch view that the eastern Indonesian languages can be viewed as transitional as between the western languages on the one side and the Oceanic languages on the other because of their treatment of pronominal possession. A number of the eastern Indonesian languages make a distinction between alienable and inalienable possession very much like great numbers of Oceanic languages. In general inalienable possessions are marked by the direct enclisis of the inherited Proto-Austronesian pronominal forms to the possessed noun. Alienable possessions are distinguished in some eastern Indonesian languages by the use of some additional word to which enclitic pronominal forms are added: e.g. Yamden (inalienable) ura-ŋu 'my sister' [ura- 'sister']; (alienable) yak ni-ŋ b/w/abi 'my pig' [yak 'I', ni-ŋ 'my owned object', babi 'pig'].

In Buli there are two types of alienable possession distinguished by the word to which the pronoun is attached: (1) ya-na-k piŋe 'my rice' [ya- 'I', -na- 'alienable possession a', -k 'my', piŋe 'rice'], (2) ya-ni-k ebai 'my house' [-ni- 'alienable possession b', ebai 'house']. Inalienable possession is here exemplified by ya-boboko-k 'my head', where the enclitic pronoun is attached directly to the noun it modified.

In the Ambonese languages on the other hand a different classification of substantives is made which has some resemblances to the alienable-inalienable distinction though with some peculiarities in the membership. Above all it is different because the distinction is carried out by placing the clitic pronoun after the noun in the more 'inalienable-like' class and before the noun in the more 'alienable-like' class: e.g. in Paulohi nala-mu 'thy name', mu-tita 'thy command'.

There is thus no general agreement among the languages of eastern Indonesia as to the manner in which the alienable-inalienable distinction, where it is found, is carried out. There is therefore little reason to regard the distinction as being anything but a series of independent developments. This is true despite the fact that in the case of Fordat, Yamden, and Kei there is good reason to regard the development as a single common innovation because the respective particles employed for alienable possession are cognate; but this is

only one of many features that link these languages. The 'pronominal possessives' therefore do not strengthen the claim made by Kanski and Kasprusch that the languages of eastern Indonesia are transitional.

In another paper presented at this conference (see pp.181-234 in this volume), Blust presents an attractive list of cognate sets linking Bulic-Biakic (his Halmahera-West New Guinea group) with Oceanic in a grouping which he calls Eastern Malayo-Polynesian. If evidence accumulated showing that the Bulic-Biakic group is linked on the east with Oceanic as well as on the west with Hesperonesian, it may prove necessary to regard Bulic-Biakic as transitional between Hesperonesian and Oceanic. Such a view would not be strictly identical with that of Kanski and Kasprusch, for it would be applicable only to Bulic-Biakic. At the same time Blust's list should not be accepted without considering seriously the reservations which he himself expresses.

The closer relationships between the Bigic Cluster and the Geelvink Hesion, first proposed by Esser in the form of the Halmahera-West New Guinea group, I regard provisionally as confirmed by the collection of cognate sets which they share exclusively, as far as I know. It is interesting that this relationship was not picked up in my lexicostatistical classification. On the other hand the same lexicostatistical classification did not assign either of these groups to Hesperonesian or to the groups now commonly referred to as Oceanic.

These points should be kept in mind in attempting to assess the success of a lexicostatistical approach to language classification. Lexicostatistics is a statistical procedure and it is fallible like other evidentiary procedures. We maintain that it is a valid procedure, not an infallible one. Its evidence is to be examined and tested just like any valid evidence. Often enough its evidence is sufficiently strong to carry the day. Here in the case of the eastern Indonesian languages contrary evidence appears to be developing that suggests that the entire matter of the external and internal relationships of these languages should be further investigated in terms of all the relevant evidence.

APPENDIX

There is a small amount of formal evidence that points to a closer relationship between the Bulic-Biakic languages and the languages of eastern Indonesia. Numfor exhibits a metathesis in its morphology which is comparable with one that appears in West Sumban (in Kabhubhaka at least), Letinese, and the Tanimbar languages (Fordat, Yamden, and Slaru). The originally last vowel of some preverbal pronouns was metathesised to a position after the initial consonant of a following verb: e.g. Numfor ker '*plant*', kwer '*thou plantest*', kyer '*he plants*'; Kabhubhaka 'reŋe '*hear*', 'rweŋe '*hear thou!*', 'ryeŋe '*hear ye!*'; Letinese lā '*go*', mluā '*thou goest*', mliā '*ye go*'; Fordat dawa '*seek*', mduawa '*thou seekest*', mdiawa '*ye seek*'. Buli does not show this feature, but a similar feature appears in Patani, one of the Bulic languages: Patani fan '*to go*', am fian '*thou goest*'. The Patani feature seems to be most simply interpreted as resulting from a metathesis post-dating the change of final *u to i. However it is not impossible that the Patani form was derived analogically from earlier forms continuing an original metathesis.

As far as I know, this metathesis is restricted to Biakic (or Bulic-Biakic) and certain eastern Indonesian languages. At its basis lies a peculiar regular phonetic change; that this is so is shown by the fact that in at least some languages the metathesis is not limited to pronoun-verb combinations: e.g. Kabhubhaka 'buulu '*Bulu!*' (a name as vocative), 'byuulu '*Bulu*' (same name in construction, from *i + 'buulu). Similarly one can explain Numfor kyor '*three*' as from *ikor and fyak '*four*' as from *ifak, and so perhaps also the difficult suru '*two*' as from *iduru. Since these different instances of metathesis seem to be subsumable under a single change that could hardly predate the dissolution of PAN, they constitute a reasonably strong argument for subgrouping together the languages exhibiting it. This subgrouping would then

explain the vocabulary agreements that Bulic-Biakic shows with eastern Indonesian and other languages to the west as a member of the Hesperonesian subgroup. This subgrouping would also obviate any necessity to regard Bulic-Biakic as a transitional subgroup between Hesperonesian and Oceanic. At the same time it is difficult to disregard the possibility that some number of different independent metatheses are involved, one of which might be that in Biakic.

The fact that this metathesis appears in West Sumban (Kabhubhaka) would confirm the hypothesis proposed in Dyen 1965 that Sumban (there East Sumban) is to be classed together with other languages of eastern Indonesia. This would imply that the so-called Bima-Sumba group proposed by Esser (to the extent that it is justified) is a subgroup that is not independent, but is a whole a member of a subgroup containing other eastern Indonesian languages.

N O T E S

1. In Kamarian as in many languages of Ambon and western Ceram the phonemes /l/ and /r/ are very close to being complementarily distributed.
 2. The /n/ is difficult to explain.
 3. The loss of *l is difficult to explain.
 4. The initial /h/ is difficult to explain.
 5. R.A. Blust has been most active in publishing such cognate sets. See the bibliography following.
 6. Not all of his arguments are of equal value. What follows concerns certain ones of his suggested unshared common innovations:
 - (1) The privately shared irregularity claimed for Buli siwi, Waropen siwi '*nine*' is also found in Bima ciwi '*nine*'.
 - (2) The interpretation of the agreement of Buli m-laman, Numfor ramen '*deep*' as exhibiting a privately shared irregularity should be considered in connection with Sawu me-rəma '*deep*'.
 - (3) A discussion of Buli pnu, Numfor menu '*village*', needs to refer to Memboro, Kolo manua '*village*'.
 - (4) The interpretation of the semantic agreement of Buli pa, Waropen awar-o '*carry on the shoulder*', as a private common innovation needs to be considered in connection with Leti ak-wara, Sika wara, Trukese jafar '*carry on shoulder*'.
- The difficulties here are inherent in premature treatment of innovations as privately shared. The same difficulty appears likewise in such a treatment of vocabulary. However vocabulary offers the advantage

that if the collection of suggested unshared (= private) common innovations offered in evidence is of good quality and sufficiently large, the number that remains after attrition might still be large enough to be persuasive. Where only qualitative arguments are offered before all languages have been examined thoroughly (i.e. are premature) and the number of such arguments is small and/or the arguments are (too) refined the risk is great that counter-arguments may appear in sufficient quantity to weaken or destroy the hypothesis. In point here is the argument presented in the Appendix.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADRIANI, N. and A.C. KRUIJT

- 1914 *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes*, vol.3:
Taal- en letterkundige schets der Bare'e taal en overzicht
van het taalgebied: Celebes-Zuid-Halmahera. Batavia:
Landsdrukkerij.

BLUST, Robert A.

- 1970 'Proto-Austronesian Addenda'. *OL* 9/2:104-62. (Also
published in *WPLUH* 3/1:1-107, 1970.)
- 1972 'Proto-Oceanic Addenda with Cognates in Non-Oceanic
Austronesian Languages: a Preliminary List'. *WPLUH* 4/1:
1-43.
- 1972 'Additions to "Proto-Austronesian Addenda" [*WPLUH* 3/1:1-
107] and "Proto-Oceanic Addenda with Cognates in Non-
Oceanic Austronesian Languages" [*WPLUH* 4/1:1-43]'. *WPLUH*
4/8:1-17.
- 1973 'Additions to "Proto-Austronesian Addenda" [*WPLUH* 3/1:1-
170] and "Proto-Oceanic Addenda with Cognates in Non-
Oceanic Austronesian Languages" [*WPLUH* 4/1:1-43]-2'.
WPLUH 5/3:33-61.
- 1974 'Eastern Austronesian: a Note'. *WPLUH* 6/4:101-7.
- 1978 'Eastern Malayo-Polynesian: A Subgrouping Argument'. See
pp.181-234 in this volume.

DEMPWOLFF, Otto

- 1938 *Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis*. ZES Beiheft 19.

DRABBE, P.

1926 *Spraakkunst der Jamdeensche taal.* VBG 67/2.

1932 *Woordenboek der Jamdeensche taal.* VBG 71/3.

DYEN, Isidore

1963 'The Position of the Malayopolynesian Languages of Formosa'.
Asian Perspectives 7:261-71.

1965 *A Lexicostatistical Classification of the Austronesian Languages.* IUPAL 19. IJAL Memoir 19.

EKRISS, A. van

1864-65 'Woordenlijst van eenige dialecten der landtaal op de
Ambonsche eilanden'. MNZ 8:61-108, 301-36; 9:109-36.

ESSER, S.J.

1938 'Talen'. In: *Atlas van Tropisch Nederland.* Amsterdam:
Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap.

FERRELL, Raleigh

1969 *Taiwan Aboriginal Groups: Problems in Cultural and
Linguistic Classification.* Academia Sinica Monograph 17.
Taipei: Institute of Ethnology.

HAAKSMA, Rémy

1933 *Inleiding tot de studie der ver-voegbe vormen in de
Indonesischen talen.* Leiden: Brill.

HASSELT, J.L. and F.J.F. van

1947 *Noemfoorsch woordenboek.* Amsterdam: J.H. de Bussy.

HUDSON, Alfred B.

1967 *The Barito Isolects of Borneo.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell
University.

JONKER, J.C.G.

1914 'Kan men bij de talen van den ind. Archipel eene westelijke
en een oostelijke afdeeling onderscheiden?' (Quoted in
Anthropos 26 by Kanski and Kasprusch.)

KANSKI, P. and P.A. KASPRUSCH

- 1931 'Die indonesisch-melanesischen Übergangssprachen auf den Kleinen Molukken'. *Anthropos* 26:883-90.

MAAN, G.

- 1940 *Boelisch-Nederlandsche woordenlijst met Nederlandsch-Boelisch register*. VBG 74/3. Bandoeng: A.C. Nix.

- 1951 *Proeve van een Bulische Spraakkunst*. VKI 10.

SCHMIDT, W.

- 1926 *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

TSUCHIDA, Shigeru

- 1976 *Reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic Phonology*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia & Africa Monograph Series 5. Tokyo.



WILHELM BONN
AUSTRALIA