11 *Verb sequences in Melayu Tenggara Jauh: the interface of Malay and the indigenous languages of Southwest Maluku*

AONE VAN ENGELENHOVEN

In memory of Jack Prentice, who introduced me to Tagalog and Malay linguistics. *Kalo malilianan ku, Jack!*

1 Introduction[1]

This paper focuses on the prevailing contact language in Southwest Maluku called *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*,[2] or 'Far Southeastern Malay'. Except for my short note in Adelaar and Prentice (1996:684), this is the first publication to provide any data about this language. Inspired by Bakker and Mous (1994), I intend to test the applicability of the term 'mixed language' to *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*, which has become the primary vernacular for interinsular contacts in the region.

1.1 The history of Malay in Southwest Maluku

Malay has spread throughout insular Southeast Asia. However, it penetrated only relatively recently in 'Southwest Maluku', the region off the easternmost tip of Timor, which

---

---

in 1999 became an independent Regency in Maluku Province (East Indonesia) (van Dijk 2000:25fn.2). Malay was probably introduced in the first half of the last century, when the Protestant mission held a huge Christianisation campaign in the region, which turned out to be a complete failure (Neurdenberg 1876, 1884).

The reason why Malay had apparently not been introduced earlier must be sought in the fact that the Southwest Maluku region had never been a link in any of the trade networks through which Malay spread rapidly throughout the entire archipelago. Since the fourteenth century, Banda had evolved into the primary centre of trade where cloth from India was bartered for Southeast Malukan products like mother-of-pearl and feathers, the latter probably in the form of dried parrots and birds-of-paradise (Meilink-Roelofsz 1962). Because the main route to Banda and East-Seram from the West went along the north coast of Timor and west of Wetar, nautical traffic was diverted from Southwest Maluku.

Although little is known about the Southwest Maluku region in the sixteenth century, it is obvious that around that time some kind of economic system must have existed between the islands. This is suggested by the presence of a local network, called *Nohpaikra-Raipiatatra* ('Guided Islands and Conducted Continents'). Local tradition has it that it was established by Luang islanders. In this economic alliance each island was assigned its own exclusive export product. Local ethnohistory mentions a special vernacular, which was not Malay and which was used between the islands in trade and warfare. Elsewhere I elaborate on how this mythical vernacular could transform into a register labelled *Lirasniara* (sung language), which is apparently used from Babar in the East to Roma in the West (van Engelenhoven in press).

1.2 The indigenous languages

Southwest Maluku comprises fifteen inhabited islands and some uninhabited islets, grouped into three administrative centres: Tepa in the East (Babar archipelago, Sermata and Luang), Serwaru in the middle (Leti, Moa and Lakor) and Wonreli in the West (Kisar, Wetar, Roma and Damar).

The Tepa district, on Babar Island, and the Wonreli district, on Wetar Island, are the most diverse from a linguistic point of view. On each island there are five different, although genetically closely related, languages. The Serwaru district is less diverse, with a dialect chain which extends into the Tepa district. On morphological grounds Leti (at the western end of the chain) and Wetan (at the eastern end) are to be considered languages in their own right, although there is as yet no consensus about this in the literature.[3]

The majority of indigenous Southwest Maluku languages belong to the Central Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian language family (Blust 1993). Oirata (in South Kisar) is a non-Austronesian isolate closely related to Fataluku in the tip of East Timor. Another apparent isolate, which is spoken on West Damar and referred to as Batu Mera[4] in local Malay, was identified as Austronesian by Taber (1993). On the basis of lexicostatistical findings, Taber divides the remaining languages into two groups, the Southwest Maluku group and the Babar group. In his classification, only the Southwest Maluku group is linked to the Austronesian languages of Timor. I propose some modifications to this picture and

---

[3]   In van Engelenhoven (1995b, 1997) I demonstrate a separate language status for Leti and Wetan. Taber (1993) considers them to be dialects of each other. Taber and Taber (1995, note 4), however, tend towards a different language status for Leti.

[4]   *Batu Merah* in Indonesian, *Amaya* in the indigenous language (see Pannell 1991).

analyse the languages on North Kisar, Roma (Jerusu), East Damar and the island chain from Leti to Wetan as descendants of one protolanguage, Luangic-Kisaric (van Engelenhoven 1995b).[5]

1.3 A working definition of 'mixed language'

According to Bakker and Mous (1994), it is very difficult to provide an airtight definition of the term 'mixed language'. They '... propose the term "language intertwining" for the process forming mixed languages showing a combination of the grammatical system (phonology, morphology, syntax) of one language with the lexicon of another language' (p.4–5).

While the majority of lexical items used is clearly Malay, *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* (henceforth MTJ) does not feature the sound shifts from final dental and labial nasal to velar nasal and from schwa to a central low vowel [a], which are typical in Malay in East-Indonesia (Nivens 1994:37–39). This is exemplified below by contrasting lexical items in Ambonese Malay with their counterparts in Colloquial Indonesian and MTJ.

1. *n, m > ŋ / _#* in East-Indonesian Malay

Gloss	Ambonese-Malay	Colloquial Indonesian	MTJ
'fish'	*ikaŋ*	*ikan*	*ikan*
'moon'	*bulaŋ*	*bulan*	*bulan*
'yesterday'	*kamareŋ*	*kəmarɛn*	*kemaren*
'night'	*malaŋ*	*malam*	*malam*
'not yet'	*balɔŋ*	*bəlum*	*blum*

2. in East-Indonesian Malay, *ə > a*
    in MTJ,   *ə > ø* between continuants and occlusives in non-final syllables
             ə > fronted *e* (elsewhere)

Gloss	Ambonese-Malay	Colloquial Indonesian	MTJ
'buy'	*bali*	*bəli*	*bli*
'k.o. boat'	*paraw*	*pəraw*	*praw*
'shoe'	*sapatu*	*səpatu*	*spatu*
'half'	*satɛŋa*	*sətəŋah/sətɛŋah*	*stɛŋa*

Many lexical items in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* are easily recognised as loans from East-Indonesian Malay, possibly Ambonese Malay, because they feature the typical lowering of schwa to /a/:

Gloss	Ambonese Malay	Colloquial Indonesian	MTJ	expected
'butter'	*mantega*	*məntega*	*mantega*	**mentega*
'pepper'	*marica*	*mərica*	*marica*	**merica*

---

[5]   The insertion of East-Damar in the Luangic-Kisaric branch is based on the rate of common vocabulary of this language with the Kisaric and Luangic isolects (55 per cent with each subgroup).

More research is needed before it can be determined what kind of words are typical loans and which are not. At first sight, most are taken directly from Ambonese Malay. Non-traditional food stuffs are usually indicated by Ambonese Malay words, whereas for traditional food indigenous terms are used:

Gloss	MTJ	< donor language	< source language
'k.o. liquor'	*arke*	< Luangic	< *arak* (Ambonese Malay < Arabic)
'biscuit'	*kuksi*	< Luangic	< *kukis* (Ambonese Malay < Dutch)
'maize'	*wɛtrai*	< βɛtraɪ (Leti)	
'k.o. cake'	*protu*	< pro:tu (Leti)	< *brood* [browt] (Dutch)

While the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* lexicon is largely derived, directly or indirectly, from Malay, the role of the local languages becomes apparent in comparing *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* morphosyntax with that of the languages of Southwest Maluku.

2   Clause combining

One of the most typical phenomena in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is extensive clause combining, which is formally distinguished in two types.

Coordination by means of a clitic 'then' iconically signals the chronological order of the messages encoded in the respective clauses, referred to here as *sequential coordination* or *sequencing*. Thus, the message in a coordinated clause is always subsequent in time to the message in the preceding clause. Reversing the order of sequenced clauses therefore imply a different proposition, exemplified by the underlined clauses in (1a) that are reversed in (1b).

(1) a.   *Mau ujan la   tante minta payong la   pi greja.*
         want rain then aunt ask   umbrella then go church
         'It is about to rain. Therefore I[6] <u>ask (your) umbrella</u> in order <u>to go to the church</u>.' (MTJ)

   b.   *Mau ujan la   tante pi greja   la   minta   payong.*
         want rain then aunt go church then ask   umbrella
         'It is about to rain. Therefore <u>I go to the church</u> in order <u>to ask (your) umbrella</u>.' (MTJ)

Clauses that are coordinated through adposition signal that the encoded messages take place at the same time, referred to here as *simultaneous coordination*. Clauses displaying this type of coordination thus constitute a single moment in the event line that is built up in the sentence. Because of that reversing the order of adposed clauses will rather effectuate a shift in focal point.

(2)   *Ai, tante pulang greja lupa payong!*
         hey aunt   go.back church forget umbrella
         'Hey, I came back from the church and forgot the umbrella!' (MTJ)

---

6   In *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* and the regional languages of Southwest Maluku 'indirect' reference through names or titles is preferred over first and second person 'direct' reference when the social statuses of the respective speech participants do not match.

Unlike the standard dialects of Malay, *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* makes use of prepositional phrases only to specify the location of the State-of-Affairs. Directional, instrumental notions and the like are rather encoded through clause-combining.

Same subject coordination: instrumental and directional constructions

In order to describe clause combining properly, core coordinations are best divided into same subject and different subject coordinations (van Engelenhoven 1995a:245). For a proper elaboration on same subject coordination the last part of the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* example (1b) is repeated once more as (3a).

(3) a.   *Tante pi greja   la   ø minta payong.*
        aunt go church then ø ask   umbrella
        'I go to the church in order to ask (your) umbrella.' (MTJ).

In same subject coordinations the subject of the second core is coreferentially elided (indicated in the example above as ø). All indigenous languages, except for Oirata, however, feature pronominal inflection on the verb to confirm that the subjects in both cores are identical, as displayed in the following Leti translation of the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* sentence.

(3) b.   *In-mu   l-la   krèi   po   ø n-vake paanu.*
        aunt-2sg 3sg-go church then ø 3sg-ask umbrella
        'I (lit. your aunt) go to the church in order to ask (your) umbrella.' (Leti)

In both the indigenous languages of Southwest Maluku and *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* there are 'instrumental constructions', as I refer to them here. In these constructions, same subject coordination is used to combine cores, whereby the object of one core refers to the instrument of the event encoded in the other core.

In *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* instruments are encoded as objects of 'to use' or 'to ascend', when referring to a means of transportation. The enclitic *la* 'then' (< Standard Malay *lalu*) coordinates both cores and iconically indicates that the event encoded in the first core precedes the event encoded in the second core in time (labelled 'sequencing' above). In a sequenced construction the instrumental object appears in the first core (4a), whereas in a juxtaposed construction it appears in the second core (4b).

(4) a.   *Kita pake glasi   la   minum arke.*
        we   use glass then drink arrack
        'We drink arrack in a glass.' (lit. 'We use (a) glass and then drink arrack.') (MTJ)

    b.   *Kita minum arke   pake glasi.*
        we   drink arrack use glass
        'We drink arrack in a glass.' (lit. 'We drink arrack use (a) glass.') (MTJ)

In the indigenous languages instruments are mostly encoded as the object of a verb meaning 'to carry'. However, the syntax of these constructions differs according to language subgroup. In Wetaric instrumental constructions, which are always juxtapositions, 'to carry' may occur in either core without any noticeable semantic differentiation (Hinton 1991:137).

In the Luangic-Kisaric languages, on the other hand, 'to carry' — and sometimes 'to take'[7] — is required in the initial core of the juxtaposition, as is in the following Leti example:

(5) a.   *R-odi   spou r-sòple la Rali'avan.*
          3pl-carry boat 3pl-sail go Timor:IND
          'They sail to Timor by boat.' (lit. 'They take the boat and sail to Timor.') (Leti)
          [van Engelenhoven 1995a:249]

Since juxtaposition is first of all the main device for simultaneous coordination in Luangic, the core messages of an instrumental construction are characterised as a single moment in the event line. In a language like Leti where sequential and simultaneous coordination are formally distinct, the insertion of a conjunction meaning 'then' adds a notion of intentionality.

(5) b.   *R-odi   spou po   r-sòple la   Rali'avan.*
          3pl-carry boat then 3pl-sail go   Timor:IND
          'They sail to Timor with the boat.' (lit. 'They take the boat and then sail to Timor.')
          (Leti) [van Engelenhoven 1995a:248]

In Southwest Maluku languages directional specification differs as to whether or not reference is made to the location of the speech participant. If such reference is made in this paper, I use the term 'speech-based orientation', and if not, I use the term 'non-speech based orientation'.[8] Speech-based orientation is common to most East-Indonesian languages. In these languages, terms meaning 'hither', 'thither' or another term connoting the position of the Speaker and/or Hearer are obligatorily added to any motion verb.

Melayu Tenggara Jauh directional constructions are less elaborate than those of Wetaric and Luangic-Kisaric. Whereas the indigenous languages feature three verbs, *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is confined to two, 'to come' and 'to go', which are encoded in the second core. 'To come', like in the indigenous languages, indicates movement towards the Speaker without reference to a source.

(6)   *Kita bawa yaklu datang.*
       we   carry top   come
       'We bring the (playing-) top (hither).' (MTJ)

An ablative notion is encoded in both Wetaric and Luangic by means of the verb 'to be from'. Whereas source or origin in Luangic is always referred to by the object of this verb, it is an argument of *dari* 'from' in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*, which is obligatorily sequenced in the first core.

(7)   *Kita (datang) dari   skola   la   bawa yaklu.*
       we   come   from school then carry top
       'We bring (along) the (playing-) top from school.' (MTJ)

---

7   The data consulted for this study suggest that in Luangic-Kisaric 'to carry' requires non-human objects. In Leti, arguments with a human referent can only appear as objects of 'to take', whereas non-human objects of 'to take' describe the event in the second core as a premeditated action (van Engelenhoven 1995a:249). A similar observation can also be made for Meher and Wetan (see de Josselin de Jong 1987:194).

8   Non-speech-based orientation ('up', 'down', 'asunder', etc.) is beyond the scope of this paper, because it is indicated by means of postpositions or adjuncts.

Whether 'from' has a verbal character or not in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is difficult to determine, because of the absence of subject agreement. As indicated by the brackets in the example above, verbs are optional with 'from'. 'To come' is ungrammatical when a source is already mentioned. Whereas 'to go' in the indigenous languages can appear intransitively, it requires an object in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* (8a).

(8) a. *Ongtua antar surat pi Ambon.*
         he(POL) carry letter go A.
         'He brings the letter to Ambon (himself).' (MTJ)

Being a same subject coordination, a directional construction with 'to go' implies that the subject is physically involved in the motion. If it is not, the location is encoded in a oblique phrase marked with 'at'. This is exemplified below with the verb 'to send', which excludes any physical involvement of the subject.

(8) b. *Ongtua kirim surat di Ambon.*
         he(POL) send letter at A.
         'He sends the letter to Ambon.' (MTJ)

Hinton's (1991) Tugun data provide the best insight in Wetaric directional constructions. Three direction verbs are reported, *nai* 'to be from', *la* 'to go' and *qoen* 'to go to.[9] Hinton points out that these verbs lack subject agreement when functioning as adjuncts to the predicate.

(9) *Fafata farua go   ru-sua   nai   meti.*
     woman two that 2d-go.inland be.from reef
     'The two women went inland from the reef.' (Tugun) [Hinton 1991:152]

This phenomenon, which he labels 'multiverb construction' (Hinton 1991:136) is equally observed in Luangic speech-based orientation, where the monosyllabic transitive allomorphs of the directional verbs 'to come', 'to go' and 'to arrive' are being grammaticalised into oblique markers. As such they are not inflected, and are equally subjected to metathesis, the morphological process of inverting consonants and vowels at morpheme boundaries (van Engelenhoven 1995a:70).

Directional constructions are juxtapositions that indicate the simultaneity of the core events in Luangic[10] as well in Kisaric. Kisaric, however, resembles *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* in that it confines speech-based orientation to motion towards and away from the Speaker, respectively by means of 'to come' (example 10a) and 'to go' (example 10b).

(10) a. *Enine m-odi   rana mai   here.*
          then 2sg-carry pot come[11] now
          'Then you bring the pot (hither).' (Meher) [Christensen et al. 1991:60]

---

[9] To this list he also adds *oi* 'to be at' (Hinton 1991:105–106).

[10] In Luangic, however, 'to be from' is an aberrant direction verb which requires sequential rather than simultaneous coordination. Whereas the other direction verbs are genuine motion verbs ('to come', 'to go', 'to arrive') that occupy the second (juxtaposed) clause, 'to be from' in a language like Leti is clearly derived from *dena* meaning 'to stay' plus the locative marker *lo* 'at' and occupies the first (sequentially coordinated) clause.

[11] Note that *mai* has no pronominal prefix. In Meher subject agreement markers can only be prefixed to verbs with initial vowels. For a discussion, see Blood (1992).

(10) b.   *Inhoi   n-odi   kude   la   oiri?*
          who   3sg-carry   horse   go   water
          'Who took the horse to the water?' (Meher) [Christensen et al. 1991:22]

Jerusu, being a Kisaric language, does encode speech-based orientation. However, the data suggest that its directional constructions are not same subject coordinations as in Meher. The subject agreement marker on the direction verb in the Jerusu example below refers to the object of 'to take' in the preceding core.

(11)   *Maine a pritu   luli   mw-ala   hiry-ei   n-mai   ttilu.*
       but   I   advise   taboo   2sg-take   man-DEM   3sg-come   up
       'But I tell you it is forbidden to get that man out (from the well).' (Jerusu)
       [Dirks et al. 1990:17]

2.2 Different subject coordination: comitative and causative constructions

Different subject coordinations are distinguished in comitative and causative constructions. The Jerusu sentence in (11) exemplifies the causative construction. The marker on the verb in the second core (*n-mai* 'he comes') agrees with the object (*hiry-ei* 'that man') in the preceding core. In comitative constructions, as exemplified in the Luang sentence in (13) below, the marker on the verb in the second core (*r-kakru* 'they cry') agrees with both the subject (*Gotlifa*) and the object (*Jakomina*) in the preceding core.

2.2.1 Comitative constructions

In all Southwest Malukan languages comitative constructions are made by means of a verb meaning 'to be with' (in the glosses indicated as 'with') in the first core whose arguments are identified as the subject of the verb in the second core. In *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* the comitative construction features *sama* 'to be with'. Its obligatory appearance in the first core confirms its verbal character, whereas the absence of a subject filler in the second core corefers to the arguments of 'to be with' in the preceding core.

(12) a.   *Ongtua   sama   pa'a   pi   Kisar.*
         he(POL)   with   brother   go   Kisar
         'He goes to Kisar with you.' (MTJ)

A reversed order, with *sama* in the second core, implies that the first core is nominalised, either through comma-intonation or deictic modification. This, however, is a topic-comment construction, rather than a comitative construction.

(12) b.   *Ongtua   pi   Kisar   tu   sama   pa'a.*
         [he(POL)   go   Kisar]   that   with   brother
         'When he goes to Kisar, he goes with you.' (lit. 'He goes to Kisar,
         it is together with you.') (MTJ)

In Luangic-Kisaric and Wetaric the cores are obligatorily juxtaposed, whereas the agreement marker on the verb in the second core refers to the arguments of 'to be with' in the preceding core. This is clearly displayed in Luang sentence (13). The plural marker in the second core refers to both the subject (*Gotlifa*) and the object (*Jakomina*) in the first core.

(13)   *Yahoam-de   Gotlifa   n-ora   Jakomina   r-kakru le-lera   mel-mela.*
       because-DEM Gotlifa 3sg-with Jakomina 3pl-cry RED-day RED-night
       'Because of this Gotlifa and Jakomina cried day and night.' (Luang) [Taber and
       Taber 1995:102]

Whereas 'to be with' is confined to the first core in Luangic, the order of the cores is less rigid in Kisaric. In Meher, at least, 'to be with' is also attested in the second core (see Christensen et al. 1991:50–51). Wetaric shows a similar tendency to fill 'to be with' in either core. This phenomenon has lead to a situation where the verb is being grammaticalised as a means for simultaneous coordination in Tugun and an adverbial adjunct in Iliun,[12] as exemplified by (14) and (15), respectively.

(14)   *It-ter   qeja t-oro   it-tafa   qeja.*
       1plinc-spear kill 1plinc[13] 1plinc-stab   kill
       'We spear and stab to death.' (Tugun) [Hinton 1991:137]

(15)   *N-ohik   n-oro   ni-tea.*
       3sg-take 3sg-with his-spear
       'He took his spear too.'(Iliun) [De Josselin de Jong 1947:107]

2.2.2 *Causative constructions*

Austronesian languages in the area indicate causation by means of a verb 'to make' or 'to do'. For clarity's sake and because of lack of time and space, this discussion focusses on *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* causative constructions with intransitive verbs. It must be stated, however, that all the languages discussed also allow similar constructions with transitive verbs.

Causative constructions in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* use 'to give' as an auxiliary and are either multiverb constructions or different subject constructions, depending on the animateness of the object of 'to give'. Inanimate objects are placed in a multiverb construction after the second verb.

(16) a.   *Di kas   turun   layar.*
          he   give descend sail
          'He lowers the sail.' (MTJ)

A multiverb construction with animate objects indicates that the object is subjected to the action and cannot exert any influence.

(16) b.   *Di kas   turun   nara.*
          he   give descend sister[14]
          'He lowers you.' (MTJ)

If an animate object can influence the action, it is encoded as the coreferentially deleted subject of the second verb. This phenomenon has been labelled different subject coordination

---

[12]   In Iliun 'to be with' has also been attested in multiverb constructions, which are beyond the scope of the present discussion.

[13]   Hinton glossed this morpheme as 'to follow', however further on he translated it as 'with' (p.153).

[14]   'Sister' is used here as a term of reference, see footnote 6.

above. As can be seen from the following example, the cores are juxtaposed. Coordination with a linker meaning 'then' (*la*) is ungrammatical.

(16) c.   *Di   kas   nara   turun.*
            he   give   sister   descend
            'He has you get down.' (MTJ)

Both Wetaric and Kisaric use a structure which can best be analysed as a transitive multiverb construction.

(17)   ... *nì   ma   n-ohi   peu   ami.*
            he   come   3sg-make   ill   we.ex
            '... it would make us ill.' (Iliun) [de Josselin de Jong 1947:101]

Luangic is the only subgroup requiring different subject coordination for causative constructions. In Leti a causative construction may signal the simultaneity or the succession of the events by means of juxtaposition coordination with *po* 'then', respectively, if the object of 'to do' is a noun. Pronominal objects require sequential coordination (18a).

(18) a.   *N-si=it=po   t-kakir=o.*
            3sg-do=we.inc=then   1plinc-cry=IND
            'He causes us to cry.' (lit. 'He does us and then we cry.') (Leti) [van Engelenhoven 1995a:252]

It is only by encoding the pronoun in the second core's subject slot that the simultaneity of the events can be signalled (18b), in which case 'to do' is obligatorily inflected with the indexer suffix (DEX).

(18) b.   *N-si=e   i   t-kakir=o.*
            3sg-do=DEX   we   1plinc-cry=IND
            'He let us cry.' (lit. 'He does it, we cry.') (Leti) van Engelenhoven 1995a:252]

3 Discussion

3.1 Interpretation

A typological analysis of *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* reveals that it features a verb where other Malay variants display a preposition, conjunction or adverb. Clause internally verb sequences in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* are dubbed 'multiverb constructions' (as in Wetaric) or nominalisations (as in Luangic) to indicate their syntactic unity. In general, however, they are analysed as combinations of clauses (as in Oirata and Luangic-Kisaric). *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* and the Central Malayo-Polynesian languages of Southwest Maluku have very similar typologies, which, according to Bakker and Mous (1994), is a salient problem in the study of language-mixing. Appel and Muysken (1987) on the other hand point out that at the same time this is a major component in second language acquisition. The exceptional character of *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* amid the other variants of Malay is therefore best explained in a scenario where Malay is learned as a second language.

On the phonological plane, Malay is fairly similar to the indigenous languages of Southwest Maluku. Discarding the phonotactic appearance of the Luangic isolects there is only one noticeable difference: whereas palatal and velar nasals are assigned phonemic

status in Malay, they are not in the indigenous inventories.[15] Phonological interference from indigenous languages on *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is therefore hard to find. I have found one case of possible articulatory transfer in the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* speech of Meher-speakers throughout Indonesia and in the Netherlands: the homorganic prefricativisation of intervocalic voiceless velar plosives, as in [s'axkit] for *sakit* 'ill'. Whereas this phenomenon has been analysed as an optional articulation in Meher (Christensen and Christensen 1992), de Josselin de Jong (1937) did not mention it in his discussion on the phonology of the other language on Kisar, Oirata. I did attest it, however, in the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* speech of Oiratans in Dili (Timor-Timur), where it was also very salient. This fact suggests that there is a sociolinguistic dimension to this articulatory peculiarity. Perhaps it functions as an identity marker for Kisarese outside their home island.

Morphological transfer is even more difficult to detect in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*, because Malay and the Southwest Malukan languages have little morphology. A very salient morphological device of *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is instrumental reduplication of verbal stems, for example *pukul-pukul* 'egg-whisk' (< *pukul* 'to beat') and *gepeng-gepeng* 'clothes-peg' (< *gepeng* 'to pinch'). Although I am not aware of this phenomenon in Malay variants in West Indonesia, it is rather abundant in most languages of Maluku, including Malay variants like Ambonese Malay and Ternatan Malay.[16] Like the so-called 'reversed genitive construction', which all languages east of Flores seem to feature (Brandes 1884), it cannot qualify as an example of indigenous interference.

Influence of the indigenous languages is easiest to detect on the syntactic level. The most obvious example of transfer on the phrase level in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is the so-called stacking of deictic markers (van Engelenhoven 1996). For a discussion of deictic stacking in an indigenous language, I refer to van Engelenhoven (1994). Lack of space forces me to confine the present discussion to the following example, where Standard Indonesian, *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* and Meher are displayed contrastively.[17]

(19)   *ikan*   *besar*   *itu*   (Standard Indonesian)
          | | |
       ikan   *besar*   *itu*   *ni*   *nya*   (Melayu Tenggara Jauh)
          | | | |
       i'an   *lalap*   *onn*[18]   *eni*   *he*   (Meher)
       fish   big   that   this DEF
       'those fish over here'

A closer look at the verb sequences shows that *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* has at least two sources of imitation beside the indigenous language(s). Instrumental constructions in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* feature *pake* 'to use', like most variants of East-Indonesian Malay. Comitative constructions in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*, however, feature *sama* '(to be the) same', as in Colloquial Indonesian.

---

[15]   In a language like Leti, however, they have been introduced as loan phonemes (van Engelenhoven 1995a).

[16]   Personal communication with respectively Don van Minde and Betty Litamahuputty.

[17]   Deictic stacking is most elaborated in Leti (nineteen combinations) and least elaborate in Meher (eight combinations). Surprisingly enough, it is more abundant in the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* speech of Meher-speakers (twenty-five combinations!) than in that of Leti speakers (van Engelenhoven 1987, 1996).

[18]   The final /e/ in *onne* is deleted, because the next morpheme also has /e/.

In other words, the Southwest Malukan learner of Malay screens his frame of reference for Malay structures that resemble the ones in his first language (L1). The verbal character of comitative constructions in L1 (see example (13)) causes the Southwest Malukan learner to opt for Colloquial Indonesian *sama* 'same' (see example 12a), which he recognises as a verb and not for the non-verbal *deng* 'with'(< Standard Malay *dengan*) of East-Indonesian Malay. For the same reason the East-Indonesian Malay *pake* 'to use' is mirrored in the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* instrumental construction (see examples (5a) and (5b)), even though it may very well no longer be verbal in the replica structure (van Minde 1996).

Directional constructions in Malay feature either an adverb (Colloquial Indonesian) or a demonstrative adjunct (East-Indonesian Malay) and as such do not resemble the indigenous structures where they require a motion verb. Therefore the latter are directly copied in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*. The notion 'away from the Speaker' is encoded in the indigenous languages by means of 'to go' (see example 10b). Because this verb is perceived as transitive in the indigenous languages, the directional construction with *pi* (< *pigi* 'to go') requires an object in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* (see example 8a), but not necessarily in East-Indonesian Malay.

Since sequential coordination is an inherent feature of Southwest Malukan languages (see example (3b)), it does not come as a surprise that it also appears in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* (see examples (1a) and (1b)). This is confirmed when *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* is compared to the neighbouring *Melayu Tenggara Dekat*, another Malay-based contact language, which is spoken in the eastern part of the Maluku Tenggara region. Whereas in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* ablative *dari* 'from' is confined to the first core, it may occur in either core in *Melayu Tenggara Dekat* (MTD).

(19)   *I   bawa   bola   dari   skola*.
         he   carry   ball   from   school
         'He brings along the ball from school.' (MTD)

In most Southwest Malukan languages the ablative notion is obligatorily encoded as a verb 'to be from' in the first core,[19] its object referring to the source. Consequently, such a construction is mirrored in the *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* speech of speakers of Southwest Malukan languages (see example (7)). Ongoing research in the Southeast Malukan migrant community of Zwolle (East Netherlands) reveals that the ablative verb is not at all restricted to the first core in Ewaw, the major language in Southeast Maluku.

(20)   *I   n-taha   bol   i   n-how   sakol*.
         he   3sg-bring   ball   he   3sg-from   school
         'He brings along the ball from school.' (Ewaw)

From the phonological and morphological perspective both Malay variants are fairly identical. Inhabitants of Maluku Tenggara usually mention the habit of preferring the Ewaw pronouns over the Malay ones in *Melayu Tenggara Dekat* as a distinctive feature (Adelaar and Prentice 1996). As can be seen in the example above, differences between both Malay regiolects are found rather on syntactic level, which can be explained as syntactic differences between the indigenous languages of the respective regions.

---

[19]   A notable exception is Tugun (Wetaric), where it is better analysed as a clause-final deverbal adjunct (see example (9)).

4 Conclusion

The main objective of the government's language policy is to introduce and popularise Standard Indonesian as it is designed by the National Centre for Language Cultivation and Development in Jakarta (Steinhauer 1994). The structures displayed in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* indicate that it is daily speech in the form of Colloquial Indonesian and East-Indonesian variants of Malay that function as models of imitation, even though everybody will acknowledge Standard Indonesian as the target language.

Except for the books at school and the Indonesian Bible, no sources are available for Standard Indonesian in Southwest Maluku. Radio is still confined to the few financially strong, whereas television broadcastings cannot yet be received on the islands. It is a known fact that speakers like to copy the speech patterns of people that are ranked high on the social ladder, for example officials and the church minister. Especially among such people in Southwest Maluku, there is a strong tendency to speak 'fancy' Indonesian. This sociolect is heavily influenced by Jakarta Malay because of the capital's impact on modern Indonesian society. The only other sources for Southwest Malukans to receive Malay influence are return migrants visiting their native villages (referred to as *pulang kampong*) and traders from other islands, who come to the region on the steamships calling in at set times. However, these return migrants and' traders use an East-Indonesian variant of Malay (mostly Ambonese Malay), seldom Standard Indonesian.

The spread of Standard Indonesian in Southwest Maluku depends on infrastructure, which is still relatively deficient. Although transport by sea has improved thanks to the establishment of a bimonthly service from Ambon and Dili, contact with the outside world is still feeble. No telephone or cable connections exist, although they could easily be introduced through the nearby satellite stations in Saumlaki (Southeast Maluku) and Dili (Timor-Timur). The installation of a landing strip near Pura-Pura and a telegraph station in Wonreli (both on Kisar) promise a complete and final connection of Southwest Maluku to the rest of Indonesia. Following Appel and Muysken (1987), *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* now qualifies for the term interlanguage, a transitional speech phase of the second language learner on his way to master the target language. When connection of Southwest Maluku becomes a fact, television will replace the visitors travelling by ship as the main source for learning Malay. The Malay dialects of East-Indonesia will then be unmasked as non-standard variants. If it has not yet fossilised by then into an identity marker as it has in Dili up to 1999, *Melayu Tenggara Jauh* will probably disappear from the linguistic scene in Southwest Maluku.

References

Adelaar, K. Alexander and D.J. Prentice (with contributions from C.D. Grijns, H. Steinhauer and A. van Engelenhoven), 1996, Malay: its history, role and spread. In S.A. Wurm, P. Mühlhäusler and D.T. Tryon, eds *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, Trends in Linguistics Documentation 13, 673–694. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Appel, René and Pieter Muysken, 1987, *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous, eds, 1994, *Mixed languages: 15 case studies in language intertwining*, Studies in language and language use 13, Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Blood, Cindy, 1992, Subject-verb agreement in Kisar. In Donald A. Burquest and Wyn D. Laidig, eds *Descriptive studies in languages of Maluku I*. NUSA 34, 1–21, Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya.

Blust, Robert, 1993, Central and Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, *Oceanic Linguistics* 32:241–293.

Brandes, Jan L.A., 1884, Bijdrage tot de vergelijkende klankleer der westersche afdeeling van de Maleisch-Polynesische taalfamilie. PhD thesis, Utrecht University.

Christensen, John, Sylvia Christensen and Cindy Blood, 1991, *Wanakunu Yotowawa akilere. Percakapan bahasa Kisar. Kisar Daily Conversation*. Ambon: Center for Moluccan Studies and Development, Pattimura University, Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Christensen, John and Sylvia Christensen, 1992, *Yotowawa nin koirwakar. Kumpulan dongeng dari pulau Kisar. Kisar Folktales*. Ambon: Center for Moluccan Studies and Development, Pattimura University, Summer Institute of Linguistics.

        1992, Kisar phonology. In Donald Burquest and Wyn D. Laidig, eds *Phonological studies in four languages of Maluku*. SIL and UTA Publications in Linguistics 108, 33–65, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.

Dirks, Zeth, Idaletha Binnendijk, Eudoxia Binnendijk, Balthasar Johansz, Lee Steven and Paula Steven, 1990, *Snyinni nora Hlyatu la Romana, Lagu-lagu dan cerita rakyat dari Roma, Songs and Folktales from Roma*. Ambon: Pattimura University, Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Dijk, Toos van, 2000, *Gouden eiland in de Bandazee, socio-kosmische ideeën op Marsela, Maluku Tenggara, Indonesië*. Leiden: Centre of Non-Western Studies, Leiden University.

Engelenhoven, Aone van, 1987, *Systematiek van de definietmarkers in het Moluks Maleis*. MS, Leiden.

        1994, On determiners in the Leti of Tutukei. In Ger P. Reesink, ed. *Topics in descriptive Austronesian linguistics*. Semaian 11, 106–129, Leiden: Department of Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia & Oceania.

        1995a, A description of the Leti language (as spoken in Tutukei). PhD thesis, Leiden University.

        1995b, Van Proto Malayo-Polynesisch naar Proto Luangisch-Kisarisch. In Conny Baak, Mary Bakker and Dick van der Meij, eds *Tales from a concave world. Liber amicorum Bert Voorhoeve*, 246–264. Leiden: Projects Division, Department of Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania.

        1996, *Definietmarkers in de Zuid-West Molukken*. Paper presented at the weekly seminar of the Department of Comparative Linguistics, Leiden University.

        1997, *Melayu Tenggara Jauh: a case of language contact in the Southwest Moluccas*. Paper presented at the Irian Jaya Studies Project (ISIR)/Netherlands Scientific Research (NWO) workshop on language contact in East-Indonesia, Leiden University, August 20, 1997.

        in press, *Lirasniara*, the sung language of Southwest Maluku. In James T. Collins, Moh. Hj. Salleh and Hein Steinhauer, eds *The study of endangered languages and literatures of Southeast Asia*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Hinton, Bryan D., 1991, Aspects of Tugun phonology and syntax. MA thesis, The University of Texas at Arlington.

Josselin de Jong, J.P.B. de., 1937, *Studies in Indonesian culture I. Oirata, a Timorese settlement on Kisar*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche uitgeversmaatschappij.

        1947, *Studies in Indonesian culture II. The community of Erai (Wetar) (texts and notes)*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche uitgevers-maatschappij.

1987, *Wetan Fieldnotes, some eastern Indonesian texts with linguistic notes and a vocabulary.* VKI 130, Dordrecht: Foris.

Meilink-Roelofsz, M.A.P., 1962, *Asian trade and European influence in the Indonesian archipelago between 1500 and about 1630.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Minde, Donald van, 1996, Verb Sequences in Ambonese Malay. Paper presented at the Fourth International Maluku Research Conference at Pattimura University, Ambon.

Neurdenberg, J.C., 1876, Hoe de zending op de zuidwester-eilanden tot zegen had kunnen worden. Nog altijd een les voor de toekomst. *Mededeelingen vanwege het Nederlandsch Zendelingengenootchap* 20:247–257.

1884, W. Luijke en de zending op de Zuidwester- en Ambonsche eilanden. *Mededeelingen vanwege het Nederlandsch Zendelingengenootchap* 28:71–96, 161–199.

Nivens, Richard, 1994, Written Ambonese Malay, 1895–1992. *Cakalele Maluku Research Journal* 5:33–75.

Pannell, Sandra N.,1991, Narrative boundaries, national horizons: The politics of identity in Amaya, Maluku Tenggara, Indonesia. PhD thesis, University of Adelaide.

Steinhauer, Hein, 1994, The Indonesian language situation and linguistics. *Bijdragen* 150:755–784.

Taber, Kathleen B. and Mark H. Taber, 1995, On being partially pregnant: transitivity in Luang. In Wyn D. Laidig, ed. *Descriptive studies in languages of Maluku II*. NUSA 38, 88–106. Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya.

Taber, Mark H., 1993, Towards a better understanding of the indigenous languages of Southwestern Maluku. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32:389–441.