Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Author: Kluge, Angela Johanna Helene
Title: A grammar of Papuan Malay
Issue Date: 2014-06-03

1.   Introduction

Papuan Malay is spoken in West Papua, which covers the western part of the island of New Guinea. This grammar describes Papuan Malay as spoken in the Sarmi area, which is located about 300 km west of Jayapura. Both towns are situated on the northeast coast of West Papua. (See Map 1 on p. xxi and Map 2 on p. xxi.)

This chapter provides an introduction to Papuan Malay. The first section (§1.1) gives general background information about the language in terms of its larger geographical and linguistic settings and its speakers. In §1.2, the history of the language is summarized. The classification of Papuan Malay and its dialects are discussed in §1.3, followed in §1.4 by a description of its typological profile and in §1.5 of its sociolinguistic profile. In §1.6, previous research on Papuan Malay is summarized, followed in §1.7 by a brief overview of available materials in Papuan Malay. In §1.8 methodological aspects of the present study are described.

1.1.   General information

This section presents the geographical and linguistic setting of Papuan Malay and its speakers, and the area where the present research on Papuan Malay was conducted. The geographical setting is described in §1.1.1, and the linguistic setting in §1.1.2. Speaker numbers are discussed in §1.1.3, occupation details in §1.1.4, education and literacy rates in §1.1.5, and religious affiliations in §1.1.6. The setting for the present research is described in §1.1.7.

1.1.1.   Geographical setting

Papuan Malay is mostly spoken in the coastal areas of West Papua. As there is a profusion of terms related to this geographical area, some terms need to be defined before providing more information on the geographical setting of Papuan Malay.

"West Papua" denotes the western part of the island of New Guinea. More precisely, the term describes the entire area west of the Papua New Guinea border up to the western coast of the Bird's Head, as show in Map 1 (p. xxi).[1] In addition to the name "West Papua", two related terms are used in subsequent sections, namely "Papua province" and "Papua Barat province". Both refer to administrative entities within West Papua. As illustrated in Map 2 (p. xxi), Papua province covers the area west of the Papua New Guinea border up to the Bird's Neck; the provincial capital is Jayapura. Papua Barat province, with its capital Manokwari, covers the Bird's Head.

The following information on the island of New Guinea and West Papua is taken from Encyclopædia Britannica Inc. (2001a-, 2001b-, and 2001c-).

Located in the western Pacific ocean, New Guinea belongs to the eastern Malay Archipelago. With its 821,400 square km and its extension of 2,400 in length from northwest to southeast and 650 km in width from north to south, New Guinea is the second largest island in the world.

---

[1]   This term is also used in the literature, as for instance in King (2004), Kingsbury and Aveling (2002), and Tebay (2005).

West Papua occupies the western part of New Guinea. With its 317,062 square km, it covers about 40% of New Guinea's landmass. Its length from the border with Papua New Guinea in the east to the western tip of the Bird's Head is about 1,200 km. Its north-south extension along the border with Papua New Guinea is about 700 km. The central part of West Papua is dominated by the Maoke Mountains, which are an extension of the mountain ranges of Papua New Guinea. The Maoke range has an east-west extension of about 640 km and rise up to 4,884 meters at snow-covered Jaya Peak. For the most part the mountain range is covered with tropical rainforest, which also covers the northern lowlands. The southern lowlands are dominated by large swampy areas drained by major river systems. In terms of its flora, West Papua, as the whole of New Guinea, is part of the *Malesian botanical subkingdom* which stretches from Myanmar in the west to the Fiji islands in the east. As for fauna, West Papua, again as all of New Guinea, is part of the Australian faunal region; typical for this area are the many different kinds of marsupials. The climate is mostly tropical with average temperatures of about 30-32 °C in the lowlands and 22 °C in the highlands.

West Papua is rich in natural resources. Gold and copper are mined southwest of Mount Jaya at Tembagapura, petroleum in the Doberai Peninsula in the western part of the Bird's Head, and gas in Bintuni Bay, south of the Bird's Head; valuable timber is found in the thick tropical rainforests covering most of West Papua.

1.1.2.   Linguistic setting

West Papua is the home of 275 languages. Of these, 218 are non-Austronesian, or Papuan, languages (79%).[2] The remaining 57 languages are Austronesian (21%) (Lewis et al. 2013).[3]

In the Sarmi regency, where most of the research for this description of Papuan Malay was conducted, both Papuan and Austronesian languages are found, as shown in Map 4 (p. xxiii). Between Bonggo in the east and the Mamberamo River in the west, 23 Papuan languages are spoken. Most of these languages belong to the Tor-Kwerba language family (21 languages). One of them is Isirawa, the language of the author's host family. The other twenty Papuan languages are Airoran, Bagusa, Beneraf, Berik, Betaf, Dabe, Dineor, Itik, Jofotek-Bromnya, Kauwera, Keijar, Kwerba, Kwerba Mamberamo, Kwesten, Kwinsu, Mander, Mawes, Samarokena, Trimuris, Wares, and Yoke. The remaining two languages are Yoke which is a Lower Mamberamo language, and the isolate Massep. In addition, eleven Austronesian languages are spoken in the Sarmi regency. All eleven languages belong to the Sarmi branch of the Sarmi-Jayapura Bay subgroup, namely Anus, Bonggo, Fedan, Kaptiau, Liki, Masimasi, Mo, Sobei, Sunum, Tarpia, and Yarsun. While all of these languages are listed in the *Ethnologue* (Lewis et al. 2013), three of them are not included in Map 4 (p. xxiii), namely Jofotek-Bromnya and Kaptiau,

---

[2]   For a discussion of the term 'Papuan languages' see Footnote 30.

[3]   The *Ethnologue* Lewis et al. (2013) lists Papuan Malay as a Malay-based creole, while here it is counted among the Austronesian languages (see also §1.3.1). A listing of West Papua's languages is available at http://www.ethnologue.com/country/id/languages and http://www.ethnologue.com/map/ID_pe_.

both of which are spoken in the area around Bonggo, and Kwinsu which is spoken in the area east of Sarmi.

Of the 23 Papuan languages, one is "developing" (Kwerba) and five are "vigorous" (see Table 1). The remaining languages are "threatened" (7 languages), "shifting" to Papuan Malay (7 languages), "moribund" (1 language), or "nearly extinct" (2 languages). One of the threatened languages is Isirawa, the language of the author's host family.[4]

Most of the 23 Papuan languages are spoken by populations of 500 or less (16 languages), and another three have between 600 and 1,000 speakers. Only three have larger populations of between 1,800 and 2,500 speakers. One of them is the "developing" language Kwerba.

Table 1: Papuan languages in the Sarmi regency: Status and populations

Name & ISO 639-3 code		Status	Population
Aironan	[air]	6a (Vigorous)	1,000
Bagusa	[bqb]	6a Vigorous	600
Beneraf	[bnv]	7 (Shifting)	200
Berik	[bkl]	7 (Shifting)	200
Betaf	[bfe]	6b (Threatened)	600
Dabe	[dbe]	7 (Shifting)	440
Dineor	[mrx]	8a (Moribund)	55
Isirawa	[srl]	6b (Threatened)	1,800
Itik	[itx]	6b (Threatened)	80
Jofotek-Bromnya	[jbr]	6b (Threatened)	200
Kauwera	[xau]	6a (Vigorous)	400
Keijar	[kdy]	7 (Shifting)	370
Kwerba	[kwe]	5 (Developing)	2,500
Kwerba Mamberamo	[xwr]	6a (Vigorous)	300
Kwesten	[kwt]	7 (Shifting)	2,000
Kwinsu	[kuc]	7 (Shifting)	500
Mander	[mqr]	8b (Nearly extinct)	20
Massep	[mvs]	8b (Nearly extinct)	25
Mawes	[mgk]	6b (Threatened)	850
Samarokena	[tmj]	6b (Threatened)	400

---

[4] The *Ethnologue* Lewis et al. (2013) give the following definitions for the status of these languages: 5 (Developing) – The language is in vigorous use, with literature in a standardized form being used by some though this is not yet widespread or sustainable; 6a (Vigorous) – The language is used for face-to-face communication by all generations and the situation is sustainable; 6b (Threatened) – The language is used for face-to-face communication within all generations, but it is losing users; 7 (Shifting) – The child-bearing generation can use the language among themselves, but it is not being transmitted to children; 8a (Moribund) – The only remaining active users of the language are members of the grandparent generation and older; 8b (Nearly Extinct) – The only remaining users of the language are members of the grandparent generation or older who have little opportunity to use the language. (For details see http://www.ethnologue.com/about/language-status).

Name & ISO 639-3 code		Status	Population
Trimuris	[tip]	6a (Vigorous)	300
Wares	[wai]	7 (Shifting)	200
Yoke	[yki]	6b (Threatened)	200

Three of the 23 Papuan languages have been researched to some extent, namely "shifting" Berik, "threatened" Isirawa, and "developing" Kwerba. The resources on these languages include word lists, descriptions of selected grammatical topics, issues related to literacy in these languages, anthropological studies, and materials written in these languages. Isirawa especially has a quite substantial corpus of resources, including the New Testament of the Bible. Moreover, the language has seen a five-year literacy program. In spite of these language development efforts, the language is loosing its users. In four languages a sociolinguistic study was carried out in 1998 (Clouse et al. 2002), namely in Aironan, Massep, Samarokena, and Yoke. Limited lexical resources are also available in Samarokena and Yoke, as well as in another eight languages (Beneraf, Dabe, Dineor, Itik, Kauwera, Kwesten, Mander, and Mawes). For the remaining eight languages no resources are available except for their listing in the *Ethnologue* (Lewis et al. 2013) and *Glottolog* (Nordhoff et al. 2013): Bagusa, Betaf, Jofotek-Bromnya, Keijar, Kwerba Mamberamo, Kwinsu, Trimuris, and Wares. (For more details see Appendix D.)[5]

Of the eleven Austronesian languages, one is threatened, four are "shifting" to Papuan Malay, five are "moribund", and one is "nearly extinct" (see Table 2). Most of these languages have less than 650 speakers. The exception is Sobei with a population of 1,850 speakers. Sobei is also the only Austronesian language that has been researched to some extent. The resources on Sobei include word lists, descriptions of some of its grammatical features, anthropological studies, and one lexical resource in Sobei. In another four languages limited lexical resources are available. For the remaining six languages no resources are available, except for their listing in the *Ethnologue* (Lewis et al. 2013) and *Glottolog* (Nordhoff et al. 2013): Fedan, Kaptiau, Liki, Masimasi, Sunum, and Yarsun. (For more details see Appendix D.)

Table 2:   Austronesian languages in the Sarmi regency: Status and populations

Name & ISO 639-3 code		Status	Population
Anus	[auq]	7 (Shifting)	320
Bonggo	[bpg]	8a (Moribund)	320
Fedan	[pdn]	8a (Moribund)	280
Kaptiau	[kbi]	7 (Shifting)	230
Liki	[lio]	8a (Moribund)	11

---

[5]   The *Ethnologue* Lewis et al. (2013) provides basic information about these languages including their linguistic classification, alternate names, dialects, their status in terms of their overall development, population totals, and location. The *Ethnologue* is available at http://www.ethnologue.com. *Glottolog* (Nordhoff et al. 2013) is an online resource provides a comprehensive catalogue of the world's languages, language families and dialects. Glottolog is available at http://glottolog.org/.

Name & ISO 639-3 code		Status	Population
Masimasi	[ism]	8b (nearly extinct)	10
Mo	[wkd]	7 (Shifting)	550
Sobei	[sob]	7 (Shifting)	1,850
Sunum	[ynm]	6b (Threatened)	560
Tarpia	[tpf]	8a (Moribund)	630
Yarsun	[yrs]	8a (Moribund)	200

1.1.3. Speaker numbers

The conservative assessment presented in this section estimates the number of
Papuan Malay speakers in West Papua to be about 1,100,000 or 1,200,000.

Previous work provides different estimates for the number of people who use
Papuan Malay as a language of wider communication. Burung and Sawaki (2007),
for instance, give an estimate of one million speakers, while Paauw (2008: 71)
approximates their number at 2.2 million speakers. As for first language speakers,
Clouse (2000: 1) estimates their number at 500,000. None of the authors provides
information on how they arrived at these numbers.

The attempt here to approximate the number of Papuan Malay speakers is based
on the 2010 census, conducted by the Non-Departmental Government Institution
Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS-Statistics Indonesia). More specifically, the speaker
estimate is based on the statistics published by the BPS-Statistics branches for Papua
province and Papua Barat province.[6]

According to the BPS-Statistics for Papua province and Papua Barat province,
the total population of West Papua is 3,593,803; this includes 2,833,381 inhabitants
of Papua province and 760,422 inhabitants of Papua Barat province[7] (Bidang Necara
Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik 2011: 92, and Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis
Statistik 2011: 11–14). The census data does not discuss the number of Papuan
Malay speakers. The (online) data does, however, give information about ethnicity
(Papuan versus non-Papuan)[8] by regency (for detailed population totals see
Appendix E).

The present attempt at approximating the number of Papuan Malay speakers is
based on the following assumptions: (1) Papuans who live in the coastal regencies of
West Papua are most likely to speak Papuan Malay, (2) Papuans living in the

---

[6] Statistics from BPS-Statistics Indonesia are available at http://www.bps.go.id/. Statistics
     for Papua province are available at http://papua.bps.go.id, and statistics for Papua Barat
     province are available at http://irjabar.bps.go.id/. In late 2010, Papua province was
     divided into two provinces: Papua province in the east and Papua Tengah province in the
     west. The 2010 census data do not yet make this distinction.

[7] Population totals for Papua province are also available at http://papua.bps.go.id/yii/9400/
     index.php/post/552/Jumlah+Penduduk+Papua, and for Papua Barat province at
     http://irjabar.bps.go.id/publikasi/2011/Statistik%20Daerah%20Provinsi%20Papua%20Bar
     at%202011/baca_publikasi.php.

[8] A "Papuan" is defined as someone who has at least one Papuan parent, is married to a
     Papuan, has been adopted into a Papuan family, or has been living in Papua for 35 years
     Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik (2011: 11).

interior regencies are less likely to speak Papuan Malay, and (3) non-Papuans living in West Papua are less likely to speak Papuan Malay. It is acknowledged, of course, that there might be older Papuans living in remote coastal areas who do not speak Papuan Malay, that there might be Papuans living in the interior who speak Papuan Malay, and that there might be non-Papuans who speak Papuan Malay.

For Papua province, the census data by regency and ethnicity give a total of 2,810,008 inhabitants, including 2,150,376 (76.53%) and 659,632 non-Papuans (23.47%), who live in its 29 regencies.[9] (This total of 2,810,008 more or less matches the total given for the entire province which lists the entire population of Papua province with 2,833,381). Of the 29 regencies, 14 are essentially coastal; the remaining 15 are located in the interior.[10] The total population for the 14 coastal regencies is 1,364,505, which includes 756,335 Papuans and 608,170 non-Papuans. Based on the above assumptions that Papuans living in coastal areas can speak Papuan Malay, and that non-Papuans are less likely to speak it, the number of Papuan Malay speakers living in Papua province is estimated at 760,000 speakers.

For Papua Barat province, the census data by regency and ethnicity gives a total of 760,422 inhabitants, including 405,074 Papuans (53.27%) and 355,348 non-Papuans (46.73%) living in its 11 regencies.[11] Ten of its regencies are essentially coastal; the exception is Maybrat, which is located in the interior. The total population for the ten regencies is 727,341, including 373,302 Papuans and 354,039 non-Papuans. Based on the above assumptions, the number of Papuan Malay speakers living in Papua Barat province is estimated with 380,000 speakers. (Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik 2011: 11–14)

These findings give a total of between 1,100,000 to 1,200,000 potential speakers of Papuan Malay (PM). This estimate is conservative, as people living in the interior are excluded. Moreover, non-Papuans are excluded from this total. However, the results of a sociolinguistic survey carried out in 2007 by the Papuan branch of SIL International in several costal regencies indicate "substantive use of PM by non-Papuan residents of the region" (Scott et al. 2008: 11).

The population estimate presented here does not make any statements about the potential number of first language Papuan Malay speakers. The results of the 2007 survey indicate, however, that large numbers of children learn Papuan Malay at home: "All of the [14] focus groups interviewed indicated that PM is spoken in their region and 70% of the groups suggested that PM is the first language children learn

---

9   The statistics for Papua province do not give population details by regency and ethnicity *per se*. They do, however, include this information in providing population details by religious affiliation under the category *Sosial Budaya* 'Social (affairs) and Culture' (http://papua.bps.go.id/yii/9400/index.php/site/page?view=sp2010). By adding up the population details according to religious affiliation it is possible to arrive at overall totals by regency and ethnicity.

10   Coastal regencies: Asmat, Biak Numfor, Jayapura, Kota Jayapura, Keerom, Yapen, Mamberamo Raya, Mappi, Merauke, Mimika, Nabire, Sarmi, Supiori, Waropen. Interior regencies: Boven Digoel, Deiyai, Dogiyai, Intan Jaya, Jayawijaya, Lanny Jaya, Mamberamo Tengah, Nduga, Paniai, Pegunungan Bintang, Puncak, Puncak Jaya, Tolikara, Yahukimo, Yalimo.

11   Papua Barat regencies: Fakfak, Kaimana, Kota Sorong, Manokwari, Maybrat, Raja Ampat, Sorong, Sorong Selatan, Tambrauw, Teluk Bintuni, and Teluk Wondama.

in the home as well as the language most commonly used in their region" (Scott et al. 2008: 11).

1.1.4. Occupation details

Most of West Papua's population works in the agricultural sector: 70% in Papua province, and 54% in Papua Barat province. As subsistence farmers, they typically grow bananas, sago, taro, and yams in the lowlands, and sweet potatoes in the highlands; pig husbandry, fishing, and forestry are also widespread. The second most important domain is the public service sector. In Papua province, 10% of the population works in this sector, and 17% in Papua Barat province. Furthermore, 9% in Papua province and 12% in Papua Barat province work in the commerce sector. Other minor sectors are transport, construction, industry, and communications. (Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik 2012: 21, and 2012: 12, and Encyclopædia Britannica Inc. 2001a- and 2001b-; see also Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik 2011: 83).

The census data does not provide information about occupation by ethnicity. However, the author made the following observations for the areas of Sarmi and Jayapura (see Map 2 on p. xxi and Map 3 on p. xxii). Papuans typically work in the agricultural sector; those living in coastal areas are also involved in small-scale fishing. Those with a secondary education degree usually (try to find) work in the public sector. The income generating commerce and transportation sectors, by contrast, are in the hands of non-Papuans. This assessment is also shared by Chauvel (2002: 124) who maintains that "Indonesian settlers dominate the economy of [West] Papua". The author does not provide details about the origins of these settlers. Given Indonesia's *transmigration* program, however, it can be assumed that most, or at least substantial numbers, of these settlers originate from the overcrowded islands of Java, Madura, Bali, and/or Lombok. Moreover, substantial numbers of active and retired military personnel have settled in West Papua.[12] (See Fearnside 1997, and Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in London 2009.)

1.1.5. Education and literacy rates

The 2010 census data provides information about school enrollment and literacy rates. Most children attend school. For older teenagers and young adults, however, the rates of those who are still enrolled in a formal education program are much lower. Literacy rates for the adult population aged 45 years or older are lower than the rates for the younger population. Overall, education and literacy rates are (much) lower for Papua province than for Papua Barat province. Details are given in Table 3 to Table 5.

Most children under the age of 15 go to school, as shown in Table 3. However, this data also indicates that this rate is much lower for Papua province than for

---

[12] *Transmigration* is a program by the Indonesian government to resettle millions of inhabitants. Coming from the overcrowded islands of Java, Madura, Bali, and Lombok, they settle in the less populated areas of the archipelago, such as West Papua. (Fearnside (1997), and Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in London (2009))

Papua Barat province. The number of teenagers aged between 16-18 who are still enrolled in school, is much lower for both provinces, again with Papua province having the lower rate. As for young adults who are still enrolled in a formal education program, the rate is even lower, at less than 15%. The data in Table 3 gives no information about the school types involved. That is, these figures also include children and teenagers who are enrolled in a school type that is not typical for their age group. (For enrollment figures by school types see Table 4.)[13]

Table 3:   Formal education participation rates by age groups

Province	7-12	13-15	16-18	19-24
Papua	76.22%	74.35%	48.28%	13.18%
Papua Barat	94.43%	90.25%	60.12%	14.66%

The 2010 census data also show that most children get a primary school education (76.22% in Papua province, and 92.29% in Papua Barat province). Enrollment figures for junior high school are considerably lower with only about half of the children and teenagers being enrolled. Figures for senior high school enrollment are even lower, at less than 50%. The data in Table 4 also shows that overall Papua Barat province has higher enrollment rates than Papua province, especially for primary schools.[14]

Table 4:   School enrollment rates by school type

Province	Primary	Junior high	Senior high
Papua	76.22%	49.62%	36.06%
Papua Barat	92.29%	50.10%	44.75%

Literacy rates in 2010 differ considerably between the populations of both provinces. In Papua province only about three quarters of the population is literate, while this rate is above 90% for Papua Barat province, as shown in Table 5. In Papua province, the literacy rates are especially low in the Mamberamo area, in the highlands, and along the south coast (Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik 2011: 27–30).[15]

Table 5:   Illiteracy rates by age groups

Province	<15	15-44	45+
Papua	31.73%	30.73%	36.14%
Papua Barat	4.88%	3.34%	9.91%

---

[13]   The school participation rates by school types in Table 3 are available at http://www.bps. go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=28&notab=3.

[14]   The enrollment rates by school types in Table 4 are available at http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=28&notab=4.

[15]   The literacy rates in Table 5 are available at http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=28&notab=2.

The census data provides no information about education and literacy rates according to rural versus urban regions. The author assumes, however, that education and literacy rates are lower in rural than in urban areas. The census data also does not include information about education and literacy rates by ethnicity. As mentioned in §1.1.4, the author has the impression that Papuans typically work in the agriculture sector while non-Papuans are more often found in the income generating commerce and transportation sectors. This, in turn, gives non-Papuans better access to formal education, as they are in a better position to pay tuition fees.

1.1.6. Religious affiliations

West Papua is predominantly Christian. For most Papuans their Christian faith is a significant part of their Papuan identity. It distinguishes them from the Muslim Indonesians who have come from Java, Madura, and Lombok and settled in West Papua, as a result of Indonesia's transmigration program (see Footnote 12 in §1.1.4).

Papua province has 2,810,008 inhabitants, including 2,150,376 Papuans and 659,632 non-Papuans. Almost all Papuans are Christians (2,139,208 = 99.48%), while only 10,759 are Muslims (0.05%); the remaining 0.02% has other religious affiliations. Of the 659,632 non-Papuans, two thirds are Muslims (439,337 = 66.60%), while one third are Christians (216,582 = 32.83%); the remaining 0.57% has other religious affiliations.[16]

Papua Barat province has 760,422 inhabitants, including 405,074 Papuans and 355,348 non Papuans. For Papua Barat province, no census data is published by ethnicity and religion. Based on the data given in Bidang Necara Wilayah dan Analisis Statistik (2011: 11–14), however, the following picture emerges: most Papuans are Christians (352,171 = 86.94%), while 52,903 are Muslims (13.06%), most of whom live in the Fak-Fak regency. Of the 355,348 non-Papuans, about two thirds are Muslims (239,099 = 67.29%) and one third are Christians (110,166 = 31.00%); the remaining 1.71% have other religious affiliations.

1.1.7. Setting of the present research

The research for the present description of Papuan Malay was conducted in Sarmi, the capital of the Sarmi regency (see Map 3 on p. xxii). In the planning stages of this research, it was suggested to the author that Sarmi would be a good site for collecting Papuan Malay language data, due to its location, which was still remote in late 2008 when the first period of this research was conducted (see also §1.8). It was anticipated that Papuan Malay as spoken in Sarmi would show less Indonesian influence than in other coastal urban areas such as Jayapura, Manokwari, or Sorong.

This coastal stretch of West Papua's north coast is dominated by sandy beaches. The flat hinterland is covered with thick forest and gardens grown by local subsidiary farmers. The town of Sarmi is situated on a peninsula, about 300 km west

---

[16] Detailed data by regency are available under the category *Sosial Budaya* 'Social (affairs) and Culture' (http://papua.bps.go.id/yii/9400/index.php/site/page?view=sp2010).

of Jayapura on West Papua's northeast coast; in 2010, the town had a population of 4,001 inhabitants; the regency's population was 32,971.[17]

During the first period of this research, in late 2008, it was still difficult to get to Sarmi, as there were no bridges yet across the Biri and Tor rivers, located between Bonggo and Sarmi. Both rivers had to be crossed with small ferries with the result that public transport between Jayapura and Sarmi was limited, time-consuming, and expensive. A cheaper alternative was travel by ship, since the Sarmi harbor allows larger ships to anchor. This was also time-consuming, as the traffic between both cities was limited to about one to two ships per week. There is also a small airport but in 2008 there were no regular flight connections and tickets were too expensive for the local population. Today, there are bridges across the Biri and Tor rivers and public transport between Sarmi and Jayapura is both regular and less time-consuming and expensive than in 2008.

In late 2008, the most western part of Sarmi regency was not yet accessible by road; the sand/gravel road ended in Martewar, 20 km west of Sarmi town. The villages between Martewar and Webro, that is, Wari, Aruswar, Niwerawar, and Arbais, were accessible by motorbike via the beach during low tide; the villages further west, that is, Waim, Karfasia, Masep, and Subu, were only accessible by boat. Today, the coastal road extends to Webro. The villages further west are still not accessible via road. Travel to the inland villages (Apawer Hulu, Burgena, Kamenawari, Kapeso, Nisro, Siantoa, and Samorkena) is also difficult as there are no proper roads to these remote areas. Some villages located along rivers are accessible by boat. Other villages are at times accessible via dirt road, constructed by logging enterprises. After heavy rains, however, these roads are impassable for most cars and trucks.

Most of the Sarmi regency's Papuan population work as subsistence farmers. Employment in the public sector is highly valued, and those who have adequate education levels try to find work as civil servants in the local government offices, in the health sector, or in the educational domain. However, secondary school education is not widely available. While the larger villages west of Sarmi have primary and junior high schools, there are no senior high schools in these villages. Hence, teenagers from families who have the financial means to pay tuition fees have to come to Sarmi. Here, they usually live with their extended families. This also applies to the author's host family, most of whom are from Webro (see §1.8.3).

Public health services are basic in the regency. There is a small hospital in Sarmi, but its medical services are rather limited. For surgery and the treatment of serious illnesses, the local population has to travel to Jayapura. Financial and postal services are available in Sarmi but not elsewhere in the regency. Communication via cell-phone is also possible in Sarmi and the surrounding villages, but it is limited in the more rural areas. Many villages are still not connected to telecommunication networks, as there are not enough cell sites to cover the entire regency.

---

[17]   Detailed 2010 census data are available at http://bps.go.id/eng/download_file/Population_ of_Indonesia_by_Village_2010.pdf (see also §1.1.3).

1.2.   History of Papuan Malay

Papuan Malay is a rather young language. It only developed over approximately the last 130 years, unlike other Malay languages in the larger region. As will be discussed in this section, though, the precise origins of Papuan Malay remain unclear. That is, it is not known exactly which Malay varieties had which amount of influence in which regions of West Papua in the formation of Papuan Malay.

Malay has a long history as a trade language across the Malay peninsula and the Indonesian archipelago. The language spread to the Moluccas through extensive trading networks. It it was already firmly established there before the arrival of the first Europeans in the sixteenth century. (See Adelaar and Prentice 1996, Collins 1998, and Paauw 2008: 42–79.) From the Moluccas, Malay spread to West Papua where it developed into today's Papuan Malay.

The southwestern part of West Papua was under the influence of the island of Seram in the central Moluccas, with trade relationships firmly established from about the fourteenth century, long before the first Europeans arrived. A special lingua franca, called Onin, was used in the context of these trade relations. Onin was "a mixture of Malay and local languages spoken along the coasts of the Bomberai Peninsula" (Goodman 2002: 1). Unfortunately, Goodman does not discuss the relationship between Onin and Malay in more detail. It is noted, though, that today Malay is spoken in Fak-Fak, the main urban center on the Bomberai Peninsula, as well as in the areas around Sorong and Kaimana. According to Donohue (to be published: 2), the Malay spoken in these areas "is essentially a variety of Ambon Malay" (see also Walker 1982).

The Bird's Head and Geelvink Bay, now Cenderawasih Bay, were under the authority of the Sultanate of Tidore. The first mention of Tidore's authority over this part of West Papua dates back to 15 January 1710 and can be found in the *Memorie van Overgave* 'Memorandum of Transfer' by the outgoing Governor of Ternate Jacob Claaszoon. In summarizing this memorandum,[18] Haga (1884: 192–195) lists the locations on New Guinea's coast which belonged to Tidore's territory. Included in this list is the west coast of Geelvink Bay, with Haga pointing out that Tidore also claimed authority over Geelvink Bay's south coast. In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, Tidore's authority over Geelvink Bay declined after the Dutch banned Tidore's raiding expeditions to New Guinea on 22 February 1861 (Bosch 1995: 28–29). Roughly 35 years later, in 1895, the outgoing Resident of Ternate, J. van Oldenborgh noted that, due to this ban, Tidore's authority on New Guinea had been reduced to zero as the sultans no longer had the means to enforce their authority in this area (van Oldenborgh 1995: 81). In 1905, the last sultan of Tidore, Johar Mulki (1894-1905), relinquished all rights to western New Guinea to the Dutch (van der Eng 2004: 664; see also Overweel 1995: 138).

Due to Tidorese influence in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Bird's Head and Geelvink Bay were firmly connected with the wider Moluccan trade network (see Seiler 1982: 72, Timmer 2002: 2–3, and van Velzen 1995: 314–315;

---

[18]   While Haga (1884: 192–195) gives no further bibliographical details for this memorandum, the following details are found in Andaya (1993: 262): VOC 1794. Memorie van overgave, Jacob Claaszoon, 14 July 1710, fols 55-56.

see also Huizinga 1998 on the relations between Tidore and New Guinea's north coast in the nineteenth century). However, scholars disagree on how firmly Malay was established in this area, especially in Geelvink Bay, during these early trading relations.

Rowley (1972: 53), for instance, suggests that the Malay presence along West Papua's western coast may date back to the fourteenth century. Malay influence began with Javanese trading settlements and then continued with trading settlements which were under the control of Seram and Tidore. At that time, the Dutch did not yet show any direct interest in this region. It was the British who, in 1793, established the first European post at Dorey, now Manokwari, which they maintained for two years. During this period Dorey was already under the influence of Tidore and its inhabitants had to pay an annual tribute to the Tidore sultan. Van Velzen (1995: 314–315) also claims that Malay was a regional language of wider communication long before the arrival of the first Europeans is. He refers to Haga's (1885) account of one of the first European visits to the Yapen Waropen area, which took place in 1705. On Yapen Island the crew was able to communicate in Malay with some of the local inhabitants. Given that these inhabitants were ethnically Biak, van Velzen concludes that it may have been the Biak who first introduced Malay to Geelvink Bay.[19]

This claim of the long-standing presence of Malay in the Geelvink Bay is not, however, supported by the reports of explorers who visited the Geelvink area in the nineteenth century. These early visits occurred after the Dutch had first shown interest in this region. This was only in 1820, after the British had established their post at Dorey in 1793; this first Dutch interest "was due in part to the fear that other attempts would be made" (Rowley 1972: 53).

For instance, when the French explorer and rear admiral Dumont d'Urville (1833: 606) stayed in Dorey (Manokwari) in September 1827, he noted that the Papuans, who formed the majority of inhabitants in Dorey, hardly knew any Malay; only the upper-class of Dorey spoke Malay more or less fluently. A similar statement about the Papuans abilities to speak Malay comes from van Hasselt (1936). He reports how the first missionaries to West Papua, the Germans Ottow and Geissler, together with his father van Hasselt and the Dutch researcher Croockewit attempted to learn and study the local language after they had arrived in Geelvink Bay in 1858. The author notes that it was very difficult for them to learn the local language, as the Papuans knew little or no Malay (1936: 116). Along similar lines, the British naturalist Wallace (1890: 380) relates that, when he came to Dorey (Manokwari) in 1858, the local Papuans could not speak any Malay.

Based on these reports, it can be concluded that in the early eighteen hundreds Malay was not yet well established in Geelvink, including the area in and around today's Manokwari. Hence, the author of the present book agrees with Seiler (1982: 73), who comes to the conclusion that in light of accounts such as the one by Dumont d'Urville

---

[19]   Along similar lines Samaun (1979: 3) states that Malay, namely Ambon or Ternate Malay, "was long ago introduced" in West Papua. The author does not, however, provide a more precise date, instead maintaining that Malay has been used in West Papua "for more than a century" (1979: 3).

> [t]here is no reason to assume that Malay was better known at other places along New Guinea's north coast; Manokwari was one of the most visited places in the area and if anything, Malay should have been known to a larger extent there than anywhere else.

The history of Malay along West Papua's north and northeast coast is also disputed among scholars.

Rowley (1972: 56–57) states that "Malay adventurers" went eastwards to the Sepik area "in expeditions for birds of paradise". Even long before the nineteenth century, Malay traders made sporadic visits to the northeastern coasts of New Guinea and the Bismarck Archipelago. Hence, Rowley concludes that Malay influence along West Papua's north and northeast coast began long before the Dutch started taking an interest this area.

The Danish anthropologist Parkinson (1900) came to a similar conclusion after having visited the north coast of today's Papua New Guinea. Based on his acquaintanceship with some Malay-speaking inhabitants, Malay artifacts, and some inherited Malay words, the explorer concludes that Malay seafarers from the East India islands have undertaken trips along the coast of New Guinea "for a long time" (1900: 20–21).

This conclusion is not supported, however, by the observations of other European explorers who visited West Papua's northeast coast in the nineteenth century after the Dutch had annexed the western part of New Guinea in 1828.[20]

Twenty years after this annexation, in 1848, the Dutch laid formal claim on West Papua's north coast, including Humboldt Bay in the east, now Yos Sudarso Bay with the provincial capital Jayapura. In 1850, the Dutch sent a first expedition fleet eastwards to mark their claim; this expedition included Sultanese boats and a number of pirate boats. The fleet did not, however, reach Humboldt Bay, although the Cyclops Mountains were in sight. Two years later, though, the Dutch were able to establish a garrison in Humboldt Bay; the troops were from Ternate. (Rowley 1972: 56). However, it seems that this garrison did not include any Europeans, because, according to Seiler (1982: 74), it was only in the course of the "Etna expedition" in 1858 that the Dutch first reached Humboldt Bay. The report of this expedition states that the Papuans living in Humboldt Bay did not know any Malay and had had no contact with the outside world (Commissie voor Nieuw Guinea et al. 1862: 182, 183).

Twenty years later it was still not possible to communicate in Malay with the Papuans of Humboldt Bay. Robidé van der Aa (1879: 127–129), for instance, reported that when the Government commissioner van der Crab visited Humboldt Bay in 1871, his interpreter could not communicate with the local population because of their very poor Malay. The commissioner also noted that outside trading in this area was very limited due to tense relations between the Papuan population and outside traders and due to the wild sea.

Around this time, however, outside trading between the Moluccas and West Papua's northeast coast, including Humboldt Bay and the areas to its east, started to

---

[20]   In 1828, the Dutch annexed today's' West Papua as far as 141 degrees of east longitude (today's border with Papua New Guinea) (Burke 1831: 509).

take off. As a result of this increase in outside contacts, knowledge of Malay, especially of the North Moluccan varieties, also started to spread rapidly in this region. Seiler (1982 and 1985) gives an overview of these developments, citing government officials, merchants, and missionaries who visited West Papua's northeast coast in the late nineteenth century.

One of them is the Protestant missionary Bink (1894). In 1893, about twenty years after van der Crab's 1871 visit to this area, Bink travelled to Humboldt Bay. In his report he noted the presence of Malay traders from Ternate who were shooting birds of paradise in the area (1894: 325). Another observer is the German geologist Wichmann (1917). In 1903, he travelled to Humboldt Bay and Jautefa Bay, where today's Abepura is located. Wichmann reported the presence of Malay traders who were living on Metu Debi Island in Jautefa Bay (1917: 150). A third observer is van Hasselt (1926). When he visited Jamna Island (located off the northeast coast between Sarmi and Jayapura) in 1911, he noted that several Papuans could already speak Malay, because they had been in regular contact with traders (1926: 134).

Based on the reports of these observers, Seiler (1985: 147) comes to the following conclusion:

> It would appear that Malays started regular trading visits to areas east of Geelvink Bay sometime after the middle of the 19th century, at the same time as the Dutch began to explore their long-forgotten colony. This was just prior to the beginning of the German activities in the area. Twenty years or so of contact between the local people and Malays could easily account for the knowledge of Malay on the part of the coastal people.

In the early twentieth century, the use of Malay throughout West Papua increased when the Dutch decided to increase their influence in this area and to enforce the use of Malay in the domains of education, administration, and proselytization. A major resource for these efforts was the Malay-language school system already established in the Moluccas. It provided the Dutch with the personnel necessary for bringing the population and the resources of West Papua under their control (Collins 1998: 64). Therefore West Papua saw a constant influx of Ambon Malay speaking teachers, clerks, police, and preachers during this period. This link between West Papua and Ambon was especially close, as until 1947 West Papua was part of the Moluccan administration, which had its capital in Ambon. (Donohue and Sawaki 2007: 254–255). So Ambon Malay played an important role in the genesis of Papuan Malay, as well as North Moluccan Malay.

After Word War II, the Dutch government recruited additional personnel for West Papua from other areas, such as North Sulawesi, Flores, Timor, and the Kei Islands. In addition, fishermen and traders from Sulawesi and, to some extent, from East Nusa Tenggara came to West Papua. (Roosman 1982: 96, Adelaar and Prentice 1996: 682, and Donohue and Sawaki 2007: 254–255). At the same time, increasing numbers of Papuans received a primary school education. Furthermore, the Dutch established schools to train Papuans for public services. As a result, more and more Papuans become government officials, teachers, and police officers. During this period, standard Malay was the official language in public domains, including trade and the religious domain. (Chauvel 2002: 120 and Donohue and Sawaki 2007: 255; see also Adelaar 2001: 234). Outside the coastal urban centers, however, Malay

played only a very limited role. This is evidenced by that fact that along West Papua's north coast Papuan Malay is still "restricted to a coastal fringe, and does not extend inland to any great extent except where agricultural projects were in force" (Donohue and Sawaki 2007: 255).

After Indonesia annexed West Papua in 1963, standard Indonesian became the official language of West Papua. It is used in all public domains, including primary school education, the mass media, and the religious domain.

West Papua's Malay, by contrast, is not recognized as a language in its own right vis-à-vis Indonesian (for details on the sociolinguistic profile of Papuan Malay, see §1.5). Only recently has Papuan Malay received attention from linguistics as an independent language (details are discussed in §1.6). Materials in Papuan Malay are equally recent (for details see §1.7).

In speaking about "Papuan Malay" and its history and genesis, however, two aspects need to be highlighted.

First, while Ambon and North Moluccan Malay, and recently Indonesian, played an important role in the formation of Papuan Malay, it is still unknown exactly how much influence each variety had in the various regions of West Papua. As Paauw (2008: 73) points out, however,

> there is linguistic evidence that both North Moluccan Malay (on the north and east coasts of the Bird's Head and in parts of Cendrawasih Bay, including the islands of Biak and Numfoor) and Ambon Malay (in the western and southern Bird's Head, the Bomberai peninsula, and in other parts of Cendrawasih Bay, including the island of Yapen) have been influential.

Two factors complicate the identification of regional varieties. One is that Papuan Malay is spoken in a linguistic environment where about 270 other languages are spoken, most of which are non-Austronesian languages. "Each of these languages has its own grammatical and phonological system which can influence the Malay spoken by individuals and communities" (Paauw 2008: 75). Also, most of the Papuan Malay speakers are second-language speakers "and this too influences the linguistic systems of individuals and communities" (2008: 76).

Second, Papuan Malay is not a cohesive entity. There exist a number of regional varieties, one of which is the variety spoken along West Papua's north coast and described in this book. (The Papuan Malay dialect situation is discussed in §1.3.2). The developments described in this section show that the history of Papuan Malay is quite distinct from that of other eastern Malay varieties. Other eastern Malay varieties were already well established before the first Europeans arrived in these areas in the sixteenth century. This applies to Ambon and North Moluccan Malay, both of which contributed to Papuan Malay. It also applies to Manado Malay, which apparently developed out of North Moluccan Malay. Likewise, it applies to Kupang Malay. (Paauw 2008: 42–79; see also Adelaar and Prentice 1996, and Collins 1998). Papuan Malay, by contrast, only developed over the last 130 years or so.

1.3.   Classification of Papuan Malay and dialect situation

This section discusses the classification of Papuan Malay and its dialect situation. Various aspects related to its linguistic classification are explored in §1.3.1. This is

followed in §1.3.2 by an overview of its dialect situation. Additional classifications
of Papuan Malay from a socio-historical perspective are presented in §1.3.3.

1.3.1.   Linguistic classification

Papuan Malay belongs to the Malayic sub-branch within the Western-Malayo-
Polynesian branch of the Austronesian language family. A review of the literature
suggests, however, that the exact classification of Papuan Malay is difficult for three
reasons.

First, the Western-Malayo-Polynesian subgroup in itself appears to be
problematic, with Blust (1999: 68) pointing out that "Western Malayo-Polynesian
does not meet the minimal criteria for an established subgroup". Hence, Blust
concludes that Western Malayo-Polynesian instead constitutes a "residue" of
languages which do not belong to the Central- and Eastern-Malayo-Polynesian sub-
branch (1999: 68). Donohue and Grimes (2008) also discuss the problematic status
of the West-Malayo-Polynesian subgroup. Based on phonological, morphological,
and semantic innovations, the authors conclude that there is no basis for the Western
Malayo-Polynesian and Central/Eastern-Malayo-Polynesian subgroups. In 2013, the
status of the Western-Malayo-Polynesian (WMP) subgroup remains problematic,
with Blust (2013: 31) maintaining that it "is possible that WMP is not a valid
subgroup, but rather consists of those MP [Malayo-Polynesian] languages that do
not belong to CEMP [Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian]" (see also Blust 2013:
741–742).

Secondly, there is disagreement among scholars with respect to the classification
of the Malayic languages within Western-Malayo-Polynesian. Based on
phonological and morphological innovations, Blust (1994: 31ff) groups them within
Malayo-Chamic which is one of five subgroups within Western-Malayo-Polynesian.
The two branches of this grouping refer to the Malayic languages of insular
Southeast Asia, and the Chamic languages of mainland Southeast Asia (see also
2013: 32). Adelaar (2005a), by contrast, suggests that Malayic is part of a larger
collection of languages, namely Malayo-Sumbawan. This group has three branches.
One includes the sub-branches Malayic, Chamic, and Balinese-Sasak-Sumbawa,
while the other two include Sundanese and Madurese. Blust (2010), however, rejects
this larger Malayo-Sumbawan grouping. Based on lexical innovations, he argues
that Malayic and Chamic form "an exclusive genetic unit" and should not be
grouped together with Balinese, Sasak, and Sumbawanese (2010: 80–81; see also
Blust 2013: 736). Hence, Blust (2013: xxxii) classifies Papuan Malay as a Malayo-
Chamic language.

Thirdly, there is an ongoing discussion in literature regarding the status of the
eastern Malay varieties, including Papuan Malay, as to whether they are Malay-
based creoles or non-creole descendants of Low Malay. Three factors contribute to
this discussion: (1) the "simple structure" of Papuan Malay and the other eastern
Malay varieties, with their lack of inflectional morphology and limited derivational
processes (see §1.4.1.2), (2) the influence from non-Austronesian languages which
these languages, including Papuan Malay, show (see §1.4.2), and (3) the history of
Malay as a trade language (see §1.2).

These pertinent characteristics of the eastern Malay varieties receive different interpretations. Scholars such as Adelaar and Prentice (1996: 675) and McWhorter (2001) conclude that these languages best be characterized as Malay-based pidgins or creoles. Other scholars, such as Bisang (2009), Collins (1980), Gil (2001a), and Paauw (2013), in contrast, challenge this view given that structural simplicity is also found in inherited Malay varieties and also that linguistic borrowing is not limited to pidgins or creoles.

This is also the view adopted in the present description of Papuan Malay. The fact that Papuan Malay has a comparatively simple surface structure and some features typically found in Papuan but not in Austronesian languages is not sufficient evidence to classify Papuan Malay as a creole.

Throughout the remainder of this section, the different positions regarding the creole versus non-creole status of the eastern Malay varieties are presented in more detail. The view that the eastern Malay varieties are creolized languages is discussed first.

Adelaar and Prentice (1996: 675) propose a list of eight structural features which illustrate the reduced morphology of the eastern Malay varieties and some of the linguistic features they borrowed from local languages. According to the authors, these features, which distinguish the eastern Malay varieties from the western Malay varieties and literary Malay, point to the pidgin origins of the eastern Malay varieties, including those of West Papua. Hence, Adelaar and Prentice propose the term *Pidgin Malay Derived* dialects for these varieties. In a later study, Adelaar (2005b: 202) refers to the same varieties as *Pidgin-Derived* Malay varieties. Another researcher who supports the view that the (eastern Malay) varieties are creolized languages is McWhorter (2001, 2005, and 2007). Considering the structural simplicity of Malay and its history as a trade language, he comes to the conclusion that Malay is an "anomalously decomplexified" language which shows "the hallmark of a grammar whose transmission has been interrupted to a considerable degree (2007: 197, 216). The *Ethnologue* (Lewis et al. 2013) also adopts the view that the eastern Malay varieties are creolized languages and classifies them as *Malay-based creoles*; these varieties include Ambon, Banda, Kupang, Larantuka, Manado, North Moluccan, and Papuan Malay; the ISO 639-3 code for Papuan Malay is [pmy]. (See also Burung and Sawaki 2007, and Roosman 1982.)

This view that the regional Malay varieties are creolized languages is further found in descriptions of individual eastern Malay varieties such as Ambon Malay, Kupang Malay, and Manado Malay.

For Ambon Malay, Grimes (1991: 115) argues that the language is a creole or nativized pidgin. This conclusion is based on linguistic, sociolinguistic, and historical data, which the author interprets in light of Thomason and Kaufman's (1988: 35) framework on "contact-induced language change". Following this framework, nativized pidgins are the long-term "result of mutual linguistic accommodation" and "simplification" in multi-lingual contact situations (1988: 174, 205, 227). Along similar lines, Jacob and Grimes (2011: 337) consider Kupang Malay to be a Malay-based creole that displays a substantial amount of influence from local substrate languages (see also Jacob and Grimes 2006). Manado Malay is also taken to be a creole that developed from a local variety of Bazaar Malay which is a Malay-lexified pidgin (Prentice 1994: 411 and Stoel 2005: 8).

Van Minde (1997), in his description of Ambon Malay, and Litamahuputty (1994), in her grammar of Ternate Malay, by contrast, make no clear statements as to whether they consider the respective eastern Malay varieties to be creolized languages.

In fact, the alleged creole status and pidgin origins of the regional (eastern) Malay varieties have been contested by a number of scholars. Bisang (2009), Collins (1980), Wolff (1988), Gil (2001a), and Paauw (2013), for instance, argue that structural simplicity *per se* is not evidence for the pidgin origins of a language. Nor is the borrowing of linguistic features. Blust (2013) seems to have a similar viewpoint, although he does not overtly state this. Less clear is Donohue's (1998, 2007a, 2007b: 72, 2011: 414, and to be published) position concerning the creole/non-creole status of the eastern Malay varieties.

Bisang (2009: 35) challenges the view that low degrees of complexity should be taken as an indication to the pidgin/creole origins of a given language. In doing so, he specifically addresses the viewpoints put forward by McWhorter (2001, 2005). Paying particular attention to the languages of East and Southeast Mainland Asia, Bisang makes a distinction between overt and hidden complexity. The author shows that languages with a long-standing history may also have "simple surface structures […] which allow a number of different inferences and thus stand for hidden complexity" (2009: 35). That is, such languages do not oblige their speakers to employ particular structures if those are understood from the linguistic or extralinguistic context.

As far as particular regional Malay varieties are concerned, Collins (1980), for example, comes to the conclusion that Ambon Malay is not a creole. Examining sociocultural and linguistic evidence, the author compares Ambon Malay to standard Malay and to the non-standard Malay variety Trengganu. Ambon Malay is spoken in a language-contact zone and held to be a creole. Trengganu Malay, by contrast, is spoken on the Malay Peninsula and considered an inherited Malay variety. This Malay variety, however, is also characterized by structural simplifications typically held to be characteristics of creole languages. In consequence, Trengganu Malay could well be classified as a creole Malay just like Ambon Malay (1980: 42-53, 57-58). As a result of his study, Collins questions the basis on which Malay varieties such as Ambon Malay are classified as creole languages, while other varieties such as Trengganu are not. Arguing that the overly simplified categorization offered by creole theory does not do justice to the Austronesian languages, he comes to the following conclusion (1980: 58–59):

> The term creole has no predictive strength. It is a convenient label for linguistic phenomena of a certain time and place but it does not encompass the linguistic processes which are taking place in eastern Indonesia.

In the context of his study on Banjarese Malay, a variety spoken in southwestern Borneo, Wolff (1988) expresses a similar viewpoint. The author examines the question of whether Banjarese Malay represents a direct continuation of old Malay or is the result of rapid language change, such as creolization. Wolff concludes that there is "absolutely no proof that any of the living dialects of Indonesian/Malay are indeed creoles" (1988: 86).

Another critique concerning the use of the term *creoles* with respect to regional Malay varieties is put forward by Steinhauer (1991) in his study on Larantuka Malay. Given that too little is known about the origins and historical developments of the eastern Malay varieties, the author argues that the label *creole* is not very useful. Moreover, it becomes "meaningless" if it is too "broadly defined" in terms of the type of borrowing it takes for a language to be labeled a creole (1991: 178).

Gil (2001a) also refutes the classification of the regional Malay varieties as creolized languages and Adelaar and Prentice's (1996) notion of *Pidgin Malay Derived* dialects. More specifically, he argues that Adelaar and Prentice do not give sufficient evidence that the original trade language was indeed a pidgin. Based on his research on Riau Indonesian, Gil maintains that structural simplicity in itself is not sufficient evidence to conclude that a language is a creole.

Paauw (2005, 2007, 2008, and 2013) also takes issue with classification of the eastern Malay varieties as creolized languages. In his 2005 paper, Paauw points out that the features found in *Pidgin Malay Derived* varieties (Adelaar and Prentice 1996) are also found in most of the inherited Malay varieties. Therefore, these features are better considered "markers of 'low' Malay, rather than contact Malay" (2005: 17). In another paper addressing the influence of local languages on the regional Malay varieties, Paauw (2007) discusses some of the features which have been taken as evidence that these Malay varieties are creolized languages. He comes to the conclusion that borrowing in itself does not prove creolization. Otherwise, "it would be hard to find any language which couldn't be considered a creole" (2007: 3). In discussing the alleged pidgin origins and creolization of the eastern Malay varieties, Paauw (2008: 26) maintains that there is not enough linguistic evidence for the claim that these are creoles. Likewise, Paauw (2013: 11) points out that there is no linguistic evidence for the pidgin origins of the eastern Malay varieties, even though they developed under sociocultural and historical conditions which are typical for creolization. Instead, these varieties show many similarities with the inherited Malay varieties with respect to their lexicon, isolating morphology, and syntax.

It seems that Blust (2013) also questions the classification of the eastern Malay varieties as creoles. First, he lists the eastern Malay varieties as Malayo-Chamic languages rather than as creoles (2013: xxvii). Second, in discussing pidginization and creolization among Austronesian languages, Blust (2013: 65–66) refers in detail to Collins's (1980) study on Ambon Malay. Blust does not overtly state that he agrees with Collins. He does, however, quote Collins's (1980: 58-5) above-mentioned conclusion that the label "creole has no predictive strength", without critiquing it. This, in turn, suggests that Blust has a similar viewpoint on this issue.

Donohue's position about the creole/non-creole status of regional Malay varieties, including Papuan Malay, is less clear. Donohue and Smith (1998: 68) argue that the different Malay varieties cannot be explained in terms of a single parameter such as "pure" versus "mixed or creolized". With regard to Papuan Malay, Donohue (to be published: 1)[21] remarks that the fact that Papuan Malay displays six of the eight features found in Adelaar and Prentices (1996) *Pidgin Malay Derived* varieties does not prove the pidgin origins of this Malay variety. Due

---

[21]   This grammar sketch was written in the early 2000s.

to areal influence these features may also have developed independently in nonpidgin or noncreole Malay varieties. In a later study on voice in Malay, Donohue (2007a) takes a slightly different position in evaluating the contact which the Malay languages of eastern Indonesia had with non-Austronesian languages. He concludes this contact caused "some level of language assimilation" and "language adaptation", but he does not assert that this contact had to result in creolization (2007a: 1496). In another 2007 publication on voice variation in Malay, Donohue (2007b: 72) notes that those Malay varieties spoken in areas far away from their traditional homeland show characteristics not found in the inherited Malay varieties. Moreover, in some areas these "transplanted" Malay varieties have undergone "extensive creolization". Finally, in his 2011 study on the Melanesian influence on Papuan Malay verb and clause structure Donohue refers to Papuan Malay as one of the "ill-defined 'eastern creoles" spoken between New Guinea and Kupang. As such, it does not represent "an Austronesian speech tradition", with the exception of its lexicon (2011: 433).

In concluding this discussion about the creole versus non-creole status of Papuan Malay, the author of the present study agrees with those scholars who challenge the view that the eastern Malay varieties are creolized languages. Moreover, the author agrees with Bisang (2009: 35, 43), who argues that complexity is not limited to the morphology or syntax of a language, but may instead be found in the pragmatic inferential system as applied to utterances in their discourse setting. Such "hidden complexity" is certainly a pertinent trait of Papuan Malay, as will be shown throughout this book. Two examples of hidden complexity are presented in (1) and (2). Due to the lack of morphosyntactic marking in Papuan Malay, a given construction can receive different readings, as shown in (1). Depending on the context, the *kalo … suda* 'when/if … already' construction can receive a temporal or a counterfactual reading. Example (2) illustrates the pervasive use of elision in Papuan Malay. Verbs allow but do not require core arguments. Therefore, core arguments are readily elided when they are understood from the context ("Ø" represents the omitted arguments).

Examples of hidden complexity

(1) **kalo** de **suda** kasi ana prempuang, suda tida ada
     if   3SG already give child woman   already NEG exist
     prang suku   lagi
     war   ethnic.group again
     [About giving children to one's enemy:]
     Temporal reading: '**once** she has given (her) daughter (to the other group), there will be no more ethnic war'
     Counterfactual reading: '**if** she **had** given (her) daughter (to the other group), there would have been no more ethnic war' [081006-027-CvEx.0012]

(2) … karna de tida bisa   bicara bahasa, maka   Ø pake
        because 3SG NEG be.capable speak language therefore use
     bahasa orang bisu,   … baru   Ø Ø foto,   foto,
     language person be.mute and.then   photograph photograph

a, **Ø** snang,   prempuang bawa babi, **Ø** kasi **Ø Ø**
ah!   feel.happy(.about) woman   bring pig   give
[First outside contacts between a Papuan group living in the jungle and a group of pastors:] '[but they can't speak Indonesian,] because she can't speak Indonesian, therefore (**she**) uses sign language … (**the pastor are taking**) pictures, pictures, ah, (**the women** are) happy, the women bring a pig, (**they**) give (**it to the pastors**)' [081006-023-CvEx.0073]

1.3.2.   Dialect situation

Papuan Malay is not a cohesive entity but consists of a number of different varieties.
Donohue (to be published: 1–2) suggests that there are at least four distinct Papuan Malay varieties (see Map 5 on p. xxiv):

1.   North Papua Malay, spoken along West Papua's north coast between Sarmi and the Papua New Guinea border, where the Malay variety described in this book is spoken.
2.   Serui Malay, spoken in Cenderawasih Bay (except for the Numfor and Biak islands); it has similarities with Ambon Malay.
3.   Bird's Head Malay, spoken on the west of the Bird's Head (in and around Sorong, Fak-Fak, Koiwai), is closely related to Ambon Malay; the varieties spoken on the east of the Birds' Head (in and around Manokwari and other towns) are similar to Serui Malay.
4.   South Coast Malay, spoken in and around Merauke.

The results of the previously mentioned 2007 sociolinguistic survey modify Donohue's (to be published: 1–2) dialectal divisions. One of the goals of this survey was to investigate how many distinct varieties of Papuan Malay (PM) exist (Scott et al. 2008) (for more details see §1.6.4). Therefore, word lists and recorded texts were collected in (and around) Fak-Fak (Bird's Head), Jayapura (northeast coast), Merauke (southwest coast), Timika (south coast), and Sorong (Bird's Head). In addition, recorded texts were collected in Manokwari and Serui (see Map 5 on p. xxiv). The analysis of the collected data "supports a possible Eastern PM and Western PM divide, with Timika sometimes following the Western regions of Fak-Fak and Sorong and sometimes following the Eastern regions of Jayapura and Merauke" (Scott et al. 2008: 43).

1.3.3.   Socio-historical classification

Beyond the linguistic debate about the creole/non-creole status of the eastern Malay varieties, classifications from a socio-historical perspective have been proposed.
Focusing on the period of European colonialism, Adelaar and Prentice (1996: 674) identify three distinct sociolects of Malay: (1) "literary Malay", (2) "lingua franca Malay", and (3) "inherited Malay". Within this framework, Papuan Malay is classified as a ("Pidgin Malay Derived") lingua franca or trade language.
A typology that takes into account the diglossic nature of Malay is offered by Paauw (2005 and 2007), who distinguishes between "national languages", "inherited varieties", and "contact varieties". Among the latter, Paauw (2007: 2) further

differentiates four subtypes, one of them being the eastern Malay "nativized" varieties. Within this framework, Papuan Malay is classified as a "nativized" eastern Malay "contact variety".

A different approach is taken by Gil and Tadmor (1997) in their "tentative typology of Malay/Indonesian dialects". As their primary parameter, the authors propose the "lectal cline", and thus distinguish between acrolectal (that is, Standard Malay/Indonesian) and basilectal (that is, nonstandard) Malay varieties (1997: 1). The basilectal varieties are further divided into varieties with and without native speakers. For the former, Gil and Tadmor (1997: 1) propose a classification according two parameters: (1) ethnically homogeneous vs. ethnically heterogeneous and (2) ethnically Malay vs. ethnically non-Malay. According to this typology, Papuan Malay is classified as an "ethnically heterogeneous / non-Malay" variety.

1.4.   Typological profile of Papuan Malay

This section presents an overview of the typological profile of the Papuan Malay variety described in this book. General typological features of the language are discussed in §1.4.1, followed in §1.4.2 by a comparison of some of its features with those found in Austronesian and in Papuan languages. In §1.4.3, some features of Papuan Malay are compared to those found in other eastern Malay varieties.

1.4.1.   General typological profile

In presenting the pertinent typological features of Papuan Malay, an overview of its phonology is given in §1.4.1.1, its morphology in §1.4.1.2, its word classes in §1.4.1.4, and its basic word order in §1.4.1.4.

1.4.1.1.   Phonology

Papuan Malay has 18 consonant and five vowel phonemes. The consonant system consists of the following phonemes: /p, b, t, d, g, k, tʃ, dʒ, s, h, m, n, ɲ, ŋ, r, l, j, w/. All consonants occur as onsets,[22] while the range of consonants occurring in the coda position is much smaller. The five vowels are /i, e, u, o, a/. All five occur in stressed and unstressed, open and closed syllables. A restricted sample of like segments can occur in sequences. Papuan Malay shows a clear preference for disyllabic roots and for CV and CVC syllables; the maximal syllable is CCVC. Stress typically falls on the penultimate syllable. Adding to its 18 native consonant system, Papuan Malay has adopted one loan segment, the voiceless labio-dental fricative /f/. (Chapter 2)

1.4.1.2.   Morphology

Papuan Malay is a language near the isolating end of the analytic-synthetic continuum. Inflectional morphology is lacking, as nouns and verbs are not marked

---

[22]   Velar /ŋ/ however, only occurs in the root-internal and not in the word-initial onset position.

for any grammatical category such as gender, number, or case. Word formation is limited to the two derivational processes of reduplication and affixation.

Reduplication is a very productive process. Three types of lexeme formation are attested, namely full reduplication, which is the most common, partial and imitative reduplication. Usually, content words undergo reduplication; reduplication of function words is rare. The overall meaning of reduplication is "a HIGHER/LOWER DEGREE OF …" (Kiyomi 2009: 1151). (Chapter 4)

Affixation has very limited productivity. Papuan Malay has two affixes which are somewhat productive. Verbal prefix **TER-** 'ACL' derives monovalent verbs from mono- or bivalent bases.[23] The derived verbs denote accidental or unintentional actions or events. Nominal suffix **-ang** 'PAT' typically derives nominals from verbal bases. The derived nouns denote the patient or result of the event or state specified by the verbal base. In addition, Papuan Malay has one nominal prefix, **PE(N)-** 'AG', which is, at best, marginally productive.[24] The derived nouns denote the agent or instrument of the event or state specified by the verbal base. (§3.1, in Chapter 3)

Compounding is a third word-formation process. Its degree of productivity remains uncertain, though, as the demarcation between compounds and phrasal expressions is unclear. (§3.2, in Chapter 3)

Papuan Malay has no morphologically marked passive voice. Instead, speakers prefer to encode actions and events in active constructions. An initial survey of the present corpus shows that speakers can use an analytical construction to signal that the undergoer is adversely affected. This construction is formed with bivalent **dapat** 'get' or **kena** 'hit', as in **dapat pukul** 'get hit' or **kena hujang** 'hit (by) rain'.[25]

1.4.1.3. <u>Word classes</u>

The open word classes in Papuan Malay are nouns, verbs, and adverbs. The major closed word classes are personal pronouns, interrogatives, demonstratives, locatives, numerals, quantifiers, prepositions, and conjunctions. The distinguishing criteria for these classes are their syntactic properties, given the lack of inflectional morphology and the limited productivity of derivational patterns. A number of categories display membership overlap, most of which involves verbs. This includes overlap between verbs and nouns as is typical of Malay and other western Austronesian languages.

One major distinction between nouns and verbs is that nouns cannot be negated with **tida**/**tra** 'NEG' (§5.2 and §5.3, in Chapter 5). According to Himmelmann (2005: 128), "in languages where negators provide a diagnostic context for distinguishing nouns and verbs, putative adjectives always behave like verbs". This also applies to Papuan Malay, in that the semantic types usually associated with adjectives are encoded by monovalent stative verbs. Verbs are divided into monovalent stative,

---

23 The small caps designate an abstract representation of the prefix as it has more than one form of realization, namely the two allomorphs **ter-** and **ta-**.

24 The small caps denote an abstract representation of the prefix given that it has more than one form of realization, namely the two allomorphs **pe(N)-** and **pa(N)-** (small-caps N represents the different realizations of the nasal).

25 In this book Papuan Malay strategies to express passive voice are not further discussed; instead, this topic is left for future research.

monovalent dynamic, bivalent, and trivalent verbs. A number of adverbs are derived from monovalent stative verbs (§5.16, in Chapter 5). Personal pronouns, demonstratives, and locatives are distinct from nouns in that all four of them can modify nouns, while nouns do not modify the former. (Chapter 5)

1.4.1.4.   Basic word order

Papuan Malay has a basic SVO word order, as is typical of western Austronesian languages (Himmelmann 2005: 141–144; see also Donohue 2007c: 355–359). This VO order is shown in (3). Very commonly, however, arguments are omitted if the identity of their referent was established earlier. This is the case with the omitted subject *tong* '1PL' in the second clause and the direct object *bua* 'fruit' in the third clause. An initial survey of the present corpus also shows that topicalized constituents are always fronted to the clause initial position, such as the direct object ***bapa desa pu motor itu*** 'that motorbike of the mayor' in (4).[26]

> Word order: Basic SVO order, elision of core arguments, and fronting of topicalized arguments

(3)   tong **liat**   bua, Ø **liat**   bua dagn tong **mulay   tendang~tendang** Ø
          1PL   see   fruit   see   fruit and   1PL   start   RDP~kick

'we **saw** a fruit, (we) **saw** a fruit and we **started kicking** (it)' [081006-014-Cv.0001]

(4)   **bapa**   **desa**   **pu**   **motor**   **itu**   Hurki de   ada
          father   village   POSS   motorbike   D.DIST   Hurki 3SG   exist

          taru   **Ø**   di   Niwerawar
          put   at   Niwerawar

'(as for) **that motorbike of the mayor**, Hurki is storing (**it**) at Niwerawar' [081014-003-Cv.0024]

A Papuan Malay verb takes maximally three arguments, that is, the subject, a direct object, and an indirect object. In double object constructions with trivalent verbs, the typical word order is 'SUBJECT – VERB – R – T'.[27] However, trivalent verbs do not require, but do allow, three syntactic arguments. Most often, speakers use alternative strategies to reduce the number of arguments. (§11.1.3, in Chapter 11)

As is typical cross-linguistically, the SVO word order correlates with a number of other word order characteristics, as discussed in Dryer (2007c).

Papuan Malay word order agrees with the predicted word order with respect to the order of verb and adposition, verb and prepositional phrase, main verb and auxiliary verb, marker and standard, parameter and standard, clause and complementizer, and head nominal and relative clause. In two aspects, the word

---

[26]   Donohue (2011: 433) suggests that the frequent topicalization of non-subject arguments "is an adaptive strategy that allows the OV order of the substrate languages in New Guinea […] to surface in what is nominally a VO language, Papuan Malay.
       In this book the issue of topicalization is not further discussed, instead, this topic is left for future research.

[27]   R encodes the recipient-like argument and T the theme.

order differs from the predicted order. In adnominal possessive constructions, the possessor precedes rather than follows the possessum, and in interrogative clauses, the question marker is clause-final rather than clause-initial. Six word order correlations do not apply to Papuan Malay. The word order of verb and manner adverb, of copula and predicate, and of article or plural word and noun are nonapplicable, as Papuan Malay does not have manner adverbs, a copula, an article, and a plural word. Nor does the order of main and subordinate clause and the position of adverbial subordinators apply, as in combining clauses Papuan Malay does not make a morphosyntactic distinction between main and subordinate clause.

Table 6: Predicted word order for VO languages (Dryer 2007c: 130) versus Papuan Malay word order

Predicted word order	Papuan Malay word order	Examples
prepositions	as predicted	(5), (6)
verb – adpositional phrase	as predicted	(5), (6)
auxiliary verb – main verb	as predicted	(5),
mark – standard[28]	as predicted	(7), (8)
parameter – standard	as predicted	(7), (8)
initial complementizer	as predicted	(9)
noun – relative clause	as predicted	(10)
noun – genitive	POSSESSOR LIG POSSESSUM	(11)
initial question particle	clause final question	(12)
verb – manner adverb	nonapplicable	
copula – predicate	nonapplicable	
article – noun	nonapplicable	
plural word – noun	nonapplicable	
main clause – subordinate clause	nonapplicable	
initial adverbial subordinator	nonapplicable	

Papuan Malay has prepositions, with the prepositional phrase following the verb, as illustrated in (5) and (6); auxiliary verbs precede the main verb as shown in (5) (§13.3, in Chapter 13[29]) (see also Donohue 2007c: 373–379). The example in (6) shows that aspect-marking adverbs also precede the verb (§5.4.1, in Chapter 5); cross-linguistically, however, the order of aspect marker and verb does not correlate with the order of verb and object (Dryer 2007c: 130).

Word order: Auxiliary verb – main verb – prepositional phrase

(5) ko   **harus**   pulang   **ke tempat**
     2SG   have.to   go.home   to   place
     'you **have to** go home **to (your own) place**' [080922-010a-CvNF.0143]

---

28 Dryer (2007c: 130) uses the term "marker" rather than "mark". The terminology for comparative constructions employed in this book, however, follows Dixon 's (2008) terminology; hence, "mark" rather than "marker" (see §11.5).

29 Auxiliary verbs are briefly mentioned in 13.3 in Chapter 13; a detailed description of these verbs is left for future research.

(6)   de   **suda**   naik   **di   kapal**
       3SG   already   ascend   at   ship
       'he **already** went **on board**' [080923-015-CvEx.0025]

In Papuan Malay comparison clauses, the parameter precedes the mark, both of
which precede the standard, as in (7) and (8). The position of the index differs
depending on the type of comparison clause. In degree-marking clauses the
parameter follows the index, as in the superlative clause in (7). In identity-marking
clauses, by contrast, the parameter precedes the index as in the similarity clause in
(8), or it is omitted. The word-order of index and parameter, however, does not
correlate with that of verb and object (Dryer 2007c: 130). (§11.5, in Chapter 11)

       Word order: PARAMETER − MARK − STANDARD

(7)   COMPAREE   INDEX   PARAMETER   MARK   STANDARD
        dia   **lebi**   **tinggi**   dari   saya
        3SG   more   be.high   from   1SG

        'he/she is **taller** than me' (Lit. 'be **more tall** from me') [Elicited
        BR111011.002]

(8)   COMPAREE   PARAMETER   INDEX   MARK   STANDARD
        de   **sombong**   **sama**   deng   ko
        3SG   be.arrogant   be.same   with   2SG

        'she'll be **as arrogant as** you (are)' (Lit. 'be **arrogant same** with you')
        [081006-005-Cv.0002]

The complementizer **bahwa** 'that' occurs in clause-initial position, with the
complement clause following the verb, as in (9). (§14.3.1, in Chapter 14)

       Word order: Initial complementizer

(9)   sa   tida   taw   **bahwa**   jam   tiga   itu   de   su   meninggal
       1SG   NEG   know   that   hour   three   D.DIST   3SG   already   die

       'I didn't know **that** by three o'clock (in the afternoon) she had already
       died' [080917-001-CvNP.0005]

Within the noun phrase, the relative clause follows its head nominal, as shown in
(10) (§8.2.8, in Chapter 8). Other modifiers, such as demonstratives, or monovalent
stative verbs, also occur to the right of the head nominal. This order of head nominal
and modifier is typical for western Austronesian languages (Himmelmann 2005:
142; see also Donohue 2007c: 359–373). Cross-linguistically, however, the order of
head nominal and demonstrative, numeral, or stative verb does not correlate with the
order of verb and object (Dryer 2007c: 130). Numerals, quantifiers, and
interrogative **brapa** 'how many' precede or follow the head nominal, depending on
the semantics of the phrasal structure (§14.3.2, in Chapter 14).

Word order: Head nominal – relative clause

(10)   … karna   liat ada makangang dalam **kantong yang** saya bawa
          because see exist food   inside bag   REL   1SG   bring
         '[she was already glad] because she saw there was food in **the bag that** I
         brought' [080919-004-NP.0032]

Likewise in noun phrases with adnominally used nouns, the modifier noun follows the head nominal, as in **tulang bahu** 'shoulder bone' (§8.2.2, in Chapter 8). By contrast, adnominal possession in Papuan Malay is typically expressed with a construction in which the POSSESSOR precedes the POSSESSUM; both are linked with the possessive marker **pu(nya)** 'POSS', as illustrated in (11) (Chapter 9). This word order does not correlate with the general VO order, but it is typical for the eastern Malay varieties in general and other Austronesian languages of the larger region, as discussed in more detail in §1.4.2.

Word order: POSSESSOR – POSSESSUM

(11)   … sa pegang **sa** pu   parang   **sa** punya jubi   …
           1SG hold   1SG POSS short.machete 1SG POSS   bow.and.arrow
         'so, in the morning I got up, I fed the dogs,] I took **my** short machete, **my**
         bow and arrows …' [080919-003-NP.0003]

In alternative interrogative clauses, alternative-marking disjunctive **ka** 'or' occurs in clause-final position, as demonstrated in (12) (§13.2.3, in Chapter 13). Again, this word order does not correlate with the general VO order.

Word order: Clause-final question marker **ka** 'or'

(12)   ko   sendiri   **ka**?
         2SG   be.alone   or
         'are you alone **(or not)**?' [080921-010-Cv.0003]

As mentioned, in a number of aspects the predicted word order does not apply to Papuan Malay. Papuan Malay has no manner adverbs. Instead monovalent stative verbs express manner; they take a post-predicate position (§5.4.8, in Chapter 5). The language has no copula either. Hence, in nonverbal predicate clauses, the nonverbal predicate is juxtaposed to the subject (Chapter 12). Neither does Papuan Malay have an article or plural word. Instead, free pronouns signal the person, number, and definiteness of their referents (Chapter 6). In combining clauses, Papuan Malay makes no morphosyntactic distinction between main and subordinate clauses; dependency relations are purely semantic (§14.2, in Chapter 14).

In negative clauses, the negators occur in pre-predicate position: **tida/tra** 'NEG' negates verbal, existential, and nonverbal prepositional clauses, while **bukang** 'NEG' negates nonverbal clauses, other than prepositional ones; besides, **bukang** 'NEG' also marks contrastive negation (§13.1, in Chapter 13). This order is typical for western Austronesian languages (Himmelmann 2005: 141). Cross-linguistically, however, it does not correlate with the order of verb and object (Dryer 2007c: 130).

1.4.2.   Papuan Malay as a language of the Papuan contact zone

In this section, some of the typological features of Papuan Malay, as spoken along West Papua's northeast coast, are compared to pertinent features found in Austronesian languages in general, as well as to features typical for Austronesian spoken in the larger region, and to some features of Papuan languages.[30]

The reason for this investigation is the observation that Papuan Malay is lacking some of the features that are typical for Austronesian languages, while it has a number of features which are found in Papuan languages. This investigation is not based on a comparative study, which would explore whether and to what extent Papuan Malay, as spoken in Sarmi, has adopted features found in the languages of the larger region, such as Isirawa, a Tor-Kwerba language and the language of the author's hosts, or the Tor-Kwerba languages Kwesten and Mo, or the Austronesian languages Mo and Sobei. Such a study is left for future research. (See also Table 1 in §1.1.2.)

Instead this investigation is based on studies on areal diffusion. For a long time, scholars have noted that in the area east of Sulawesi, Sumba, and Flores, all the way to the Bird's Head of New Guinea, a number of linguistic features have diffused from Papuan into Austronesian languages and vice versa.

Klamer et al. (2008) and Klamer and Ewing (2010) propose the term "East Nusantara" for this area. More specifically, Klamer and Ewing (2010: 1) define[31]

> East Nusantara as a geographical area that extends from Sumbawa to the west, across the islands of East Nusa Tenggara, Maluku […] including Halmahera, and to the Bird's Head of New Guinea in the east […]. In the northwest, the area is bounded by Sulawesi.

The Papuan Malay varieties spoken in the Birds' Head, such as those of Fak-Fak, Manokwari, and Sorong, belong to East Nusantara. The variety of Papuan Malay described in this book, by contrast, is not located in this geographical area. Yet, it seems useful to examine the typological profile of Papuan Malay in light of the observed diffusion of linguistic features, discussed in Klamer et al. (2008) and Klamer and Ewing (2010).

This comparison shows that Papuan Malay is lacking some of the features which are typical for Austronesian languages. At the same time, it has a number of features which are untypical for Austronesian languages, but which are found in Austronesian languages of East Nusantara. Moreover, Papuan Malay has some features not typically found in Austronesian languages of East Nusantara but found in Papuan languages. These features are summarized in Table 7 to Table 9; the listed features are taken from Klamer et al. (2008) and Klamer and Ewing (2010), unless mentioned otherwise.

---

[30]   The term "Papuan" is a collective label used for "the non-Austronesian languages spoken in New Guinea and archipelagos to the West and East"; that is, the term "does not refer to a superordinate category to which all the languages belong" (Klamer et al. 2008: 107).

[31]   As Klamer and Ewing (2010: 1) point out, though, there is an ongoing discussion about "the exact geographic delimitations of the East Nusantara region" and "whether (parts of) New Guinea are also considered to be part of it" (see also Footnote 3 in Klamer and Ewing (2010)).

Table 7 presents seven features found in Austronesian languages in general, six of which are listed in Klamer et al. (2008: 113).[32] Papuan Malay shares five of these features. It does not, however, share the typical noun-genitive order which is used to express adnominal possession. As discussed in §1.4.1, Papuan Malay noun phrases with post-head nominal modifiers are used to denote important features for subclassification of the head nominal rather than for adnominal possession. Also, Papuan Malay does not distinguish between inclusive and exclusive first person plural in its pronominal paradigm.

Table 7:   Pertinent features of Austronesian languages in general vis-à-vis Papuan Malay features

Austronesian languages	Papuan Malay	
Phonemic l/r distinction	yes	(Chap. 2)
Preference for CVCV roots	yes	(Chap. 2)
Reduplication	yes	(Chap. 4)
Head-initial	yes	(Chap. 8)
Negator precedes the predicate	yes	(Chap. 13)
Noun-genitive order	no	(Chap. 8 & 9)
Inclusive/exclusive distinction in pronouns	no	(Chap. 5 & 6)

Table 8 lists 17 linguistic features "found in many of the Austronesian languages of East Nusantara" (Klamer and Ewing 2010: 10),[33] some of these features are also listed in Table 7. Papuan Malay shares eight of them, such as left-headed compounds or prepositions. However, Papuan Malay does not share eight of these features, such as metathesis or clause-final negators.

Table 8:   Pertinent features of Austronesian languages of East Nusantara vis-à-vis Papuan Malay features

Austronesian languages of East Nusantara	Papuan Malay	
Phonology		
Preference for CVCV roots	yes	(Chap. 2)
Prenasalized consonants	no	(Chap. 2)
Metathesis	no	(Chap. 2)
Morphology		
No productive voice system on verbs	yes	(Chap. 3 & 5)
Left-headed compounds	yes	(Chap. 3)
Agent/subject indexed on verb as prefix/proclitic	no	(Chap. 3 & 5)
Inclusive/exclusive distinction in pronouns	no	(Chap. 5 & 6)
Morphological distinction between alienable and inalienable nouns	no	(Chap. 3 & 5)

---

[32]   The noun-genitive order is not explicitly mentioned in Klamer et al. (2008).
[33]   This list of features in Klamer and Ewing (2010) builds on Klamer (2002), Himmelmann (2005), Donohue (2007c), and Klamer et al. (2008).

Austronesian languages of East Nusantara	Papuan Malay	
Syntax		
Verb-object order	yes	(Chap. 11)
Prepositions	yes	(Chap. 10)
Genitive-noun order ("preposed possessor")	yes	(Chap. 8 & 9)
Noun-Numeral order	yes	(Chap. 8)
Absence of a passive construction	yes	(Chap. 11)
Clause-final negators	no	(Chap. 13)
Clause-initial indigenous complementizers	no	(Chap. 14)
Formally marked adverbial/complement clauses	no	(Chap. 14)
Other		
Parallelisms without stylistic optionality	---	not yet researched

Two of the nonshared morphological and two of the shared syntactic features require additional commenting.

Papuan Malay does not have indexing on the verb. Instead, Papuan Malay uses free pronouns (Chapter 6).

Overall, Papuan Malay does not distinguish between alienable and inalienable possessed items, with one exception: adnominal possessive constructions with omitted possessive marker signal inalienable possession of body parts or kinship relations. This is not a dedicated construction, though. Just as commonly, inalienable possession of these entities is encoded in the same way as possession of alienable items, that is, in a POSSESSOR LIGATURE POSSESSUM construction. Examples are *sa maytua* 'my wife', *dia pu maytua* 'his wife', or *sa pu motor* 'my motorbike' (literally '1SG wife', '3SG POSS wife', '1SG POSS motorbike'). (Chapter 9)

In Papuan Malay noun phrases, numerals and quantifiers follow the head nominal. As mentioned in §1.4.1, however, they can also precede the head nominal, depending on the semantics of the phrasal structure (§8.3, in Chapter 8).

Like other East Nusantara Austronesian languages, Papuan Malay does not to have a dedicated passive construction. Instead, speakers encode actions and events in active constructions (see also §1.4.1.2).[34]

East Nusantara Austronesian languages also often make use of parallelisms without stylistic optionality. Whether, and to what extent, Papuan Malay employs this feature has not been researched for the present study; instead this topic is left for future research.

Papuan Malay also has a number of features which are not usually found in the East Nusantara Austronesian languages. Instead, these features are typical characteristics of Papuan languages.

Table 9 presents 15 linguistic features typically found in Papuan languages (Klamer and Ewing 2010: 10).[35] Papuan Malay shares six of them, such as the

---

[34]   As mentioned in §1.4.1.2, passive constructions are not further discussed in this book; instead, this topic is left for future research.

[35]   This list of features in Klamer and Ewing (2010) builds on Foley (1986), Foley (2000), Pawley (2005), and Aikhenvald and Stebbins (2007).

subject-verb order, or the genitive-noun order. There is also limited overlap between Papuan Malay and Papuan languages with respect to the position of conjunctions. All Papuan Malay conjunctions are clause-initial, but two of them can also take a clause-final position (Chapter 14). Eight of the 15 features are not found in Papuan Malay, such as gender marking or postpositions.

Table 9:   Pertinent features of Papuan languages vis-à-vis Papuan Malay features

Papuan languages	Papuan Malay	
Phonology		
No phonemic l/r distinction	no	(Chap. 2)
Morphology		
No inclusive/exclusive distinction in pronouns	yes	(Chap. 5& 6)
Marking of gender	no	(Chap. 3 & 5)
Subject marked as suffix on verb	no	(Chap. 3 & 5)
Morphological distinction between alienable and inalienable nouns	no	(Chap. 3 & 5)
Syntax		
Subject-verb order	yes	(Chap. 11)
Genitive-noun order ("preposed possessor")	yes	(Chap. 8 & 9)
Serial verb constructions[36]	yes	(Chap. 11)
Clause-chaining	yes	(example (13))
Tail-head linkage	yes	(example (14))
Clause-final conjunctions	few	(Chap. 14)
Object-verb order	no	(Chap. 11)
Postpositions	no	(Chap. 10)
Clause-final negator	no	(Chap. 13)
Switch reference	no	(Chap. 14)

Among the syntactic features, three need to be commented on, namely clause-chaining, switch reference, and tail-head linkage.

Clause chaining is not discussed in the present study. An initial survey of the corpus indicates, however, that it is very common in Papuan Malay. One example is given in (13).

Clause-chaining in Papuan Malay

(13)   langsung   **sa   pegang   sa   putar   sa   cari**
        immediately   1SG   hold   1SG   turn.around   1SG   search

        'immediately **I held** (the plate), **I turned around**, **I looked around**'
        [081011-005-Cv.0034]

Tail-head linkage is not mentioned in Klamer et al. (2008). It is, however, a typical Papuan feature (see Foley 1986: 200–201, or Foley 2000: 390)).

[36] Serial verb constructions are briefly mentioned in §11.2, in Chapter 11; a detailed description of this topic is left for future research.

Following Klamer and Ewing (2010: 11), clause-chaining in Papuan languages is often characterized by "some concomitant switch reference system". This, however, does not seem to apply to Papuan Malay. That is, so far dedicated switch-references devices have not been identified, a finding which contrasts with Donohue's (2011) observations. Donohue (2011: 431–432) suggests that the sequential-marking conjunction *trus* 'next' "is a commonly used connective when there is a same-subject coreference condition between clauses", while the sequential-marking conjunction *baru* 'and then' tends "to indicate switch reference". An initial investigation of the attested *trus* 'next, and then' and *baru* 'and then' tokens in the present corpus shows, however, that both conjunction more often link clauses with a switch in reference, than those with same-subject coreference. Neither do any of the other conjunctions function as dedicated switch-references devices.

Tail-head linkage is not treated in the present study. An initial survey of the corpus shows, however, that it is a very common "structure in which the final clause of the previous sentence initiates the next sentence, often in a reduced form" (Foley 2000: 390; see also de Vries 2005). In the example in (14), for instance, the speaker repeats part of the first clause at the beginning of the second clause: *kasi senter* 'give a flashlight'.

       Tail-head linkage in Papuan Malay

(14)   skarang dong **kasi** dia **senter**,   **kasi senter**   dong mo   kasi pisow
        now   3PL   give 3SG flashlight give flashlight 3PL   want give knife
       'now they **give** him **a flashlight**, (having) **given** (him) **a flashlight**, they
       want to give (him) a knife' [081108-003-JR.0002]

1.4.3.   Papuan Malay as an eastern Malay variety

This section compares some of the features found in Papuan Malay to those found in other eastern Malay varieties, namely in Ambon Malay (AM) (van Minde 1997), Banda Malay (BM) (Paauw 2008), Kupang Malay (KM) (Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (LM) (Paauw 2008), Manado Malay (MM) (Stoel 2005), North Moluccan or Ternate Malay (NMM/TM) (Taylor 1983, Voorhoeve 1983, and Litamahuputty 2012).[37]

These comparisons are far from systematic and exhaustive. Instead, they pertain to a limited number of topics as they came up during the analysis and description of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Papuan Malay. (A detailed typological study of the eastern Malay varieties is Paauw 2008.) The comparisons discussed here touch upon the following phenomena:

    – Affixation (§3.1, in Chapter 3)
    – Reduplication (Chapter 4)

---

[37] In their contributions, Taylor (1983) and Voorhoeve (1983) label the Malay variety spoken in the northern Moluccas as North Moluccan Malay, while Litamahuputty (2012) uses the term Ternate Malay for the same variety in her in-depth grammar. Given that the three studies differ in depth, all three of them are included here, with Taylor 's (1983) and Voorhoeve 's (1983) summarily listed under North Moluccan Malay.

   – Adnominal uses of the personal pronouns (§6.2, in Chapter 6)
   – Existence of diphthongs (§2.1.2, in Chapter 2)
   – Non-canonical functions of the possessive ligature in adnominal
     possessive constructions (§9.3, in Chapter 9)
   – Argument elision in verbal clauses (§11.1, in Chapter 11)
   – Morphosyntactic status of the reciprocity marker **baku** 'RECP' (§11.3, in
     Chapter 11)
   – Contrastive uses of negator **bukang** 'NEG' (§13.1.2, in Chapter 13)

The remainder of this section gives an overview how Papuan Malay compares to the other eastern Malay varieties with respect to these phenomena. (In Table 10 to Table 13 empty cells signal that a given feature is not mentioned in the available literature. One reason could be that the respective feature is nonexistent. It is, however, just as likely that such empty cells could be a result of gaps in the available literature.)

   Affixation is one area in which Papuan Malay has a number of features which are distinct from those found in other eastern Malay varieties. Table 10 presents three prefixes and one suffix and shows that the Papuan Malay affixes are different both in terms of their form and their degree of productivity (PROD). In most of the eastern Malay varieties, the three prefixes are realized as **ta-**, **pa(N)-**, and **ba-**. By contrast, the Papuan Malay affixes **TER-** (ACL), **PE(N)-** (AG), and **BER-** (INTR) are most commonly realized as **ter-**, **pe(N)-**, and **ber-**, respectively; hence, they have more resemblance with the corresponding Standard Indonesian affixes.

   Papuan Malay prefix **TER-** has only limited productivity ('lim.'), prefix **BER-** is unproductive. In the other eastern Malay varieties, by contrast, the corresponding prefixes **ta-** and **ba-** are very productive. Papuan Malay prefix **PE(N)-** is, at best, marginally productive. In Manado Malay **paŋ-** is productive (in addition an unproductive form **pa-** exists). Likewise, in North Moluccan / Ternate Malay prefixation with **pang-** is productive (Litamahuputty 2012: 30).[38] In Ambon Malay the prefix occurs but it is unproductive. The Papuan Malay prefix **-ang** has only limited productivity. In Ambon Malay, the suffix also occurs but according to van Minde (1997: 106) it is difficult to determine whether and to what degree it is productive.

Table 10:   Affixation: Form and productivity

	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
Prefix **TER-**							
Form PROD	**TER-** lim.	**ta-** yes	**ta-** yes	**ta-** yes	**tə(r)-** yes	**ta-** yes	**ta-** yes	**ta-** yes
Prefix **PE(N)-**							
Form PROD	**PE(N)-** marg.	**pa(N)-** no				**paŋ-** yes	**pa-** no	**pang-** yes

---

[38] Voorhoeve (1983: 4), by contrast, suggests that **pa-** "is no longer morphologically distinct".

	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM	
Prefix *BER-*								
Form PROD	*BER-* no	*ba-* yes	*ba-* yes	*ba-* yes	*bə(r)-* yes	*ba-* yes	*ba-* yes	*ba-* yes
Prefix *-ang*								
PROD	lim.	*-ang*						

Reduplication is another phenomenon in which Papuan Malay displays a number of features which differ from those described for other eastern Malay varieties (Chapter 4). As shown in Table 11, Papuan Malay and the other eastern Malay varieties employ full reduplication. Partial and imitative reduplication however, is only reported for Papuan Malay, Ambon Malay, and Larantuka Malay. Besides, Papuan Malay shares especially many features with Ambon Malay regarding the morpheme types which can undergo full reduplication (§4.3.1, in Chapter 4).

In general, reduplication conveys a wide range of different meaning aspects. These meaning aspects differ with respect to the range of word classes they attract for reduplication. Among the eastern Malay varieties, the attested meaning aspects in Papuan Malay attract the largest range of different word classes, followed by a medium (med.) range of attracted word classes in Ambon Malay. In the other eastern Malay varieties, by contrast, this range of attracted word classes seems to be much smaller. (§4.3.2, in Chapter 4)

In Papuan Malay, the reduplicated items can also undergo "interpretational shift" or "type coercion". This feature is also attested in Ambon, Larantuka, Manado, and Ternate Malay. Again, Papuan Malay and Ambon Malay share pertinent features, in that in both varieties nouns and verbs can undergo interpretational shift, while in Manado Malay only nouns and in Larantuka and Ternate Malay only verbs are affected. (§4.3.3, in Chapter 4)

These findings suggest that reduplication in Papuan Malay has more in common with Ambon Malay than with the other eastern Malay varieties.

Table 11:   Reduplication

	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	NMM / TM	
Type of reduplication							
Full Partial Imitative	yes yes yes	yes yes yes	yes	yes	yes yes yes	yes	yes
Meaning aspects and range of attracted word classes							
Range	large	med.	small	small	small	small	small
Interpretational shift of reduplicated lexemes							
Shift	yes	yes			yes		yes

Papuan Malay is also distinct from other eastern Malay varieties with respect to the adnominal uses of its personal pronouns (§6.2, in Chapter 6). In Papuan Malay, the

second and third singular personal pronouns have adnominal uses. They signal definiteness and person-number values, whereby they allow the unambiguous identification of their referents. In other eastern Malay varieties, by contrast, 'N PRO-SG' expressions are analyzed as topic-comment constructions. Besides, the first, second, and third person plural pronouns in Papuan Malay also have adnominal uses; they express associative plurality. In the other eastern Malay varieties, by contrast, associative plural expressions are only formed with the third person plural pronoun.

Table 12:   Personal pronouns: Adnominal uses of singular and plural pronouns

	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
2/3SG	yes	no	no				no
1/2PL	yes	no		no		no	no
3PL[39]	yes	yes		yes		yes	no

In addition, Papuan Malay is compared to the other eastern Malay varieties in terms of one phonological and four syntactic features, summarized in Table 13.

Papuan Malay has no diphthongs; instead the vowel combinations /ai/ and /au/ are analyzed as V.V or VC sequences (§2.1.2, in Chapter 2). The same analysis applies to Larantuka and Manado Malay. For Ambon and North Moluccan Malay, by contrast, the same vowel sequences are analyzed as diphthongs. Most likely, though, the different analyses result from differences between the analysts rather than from distinctions between the respective Malay varieties.

In adnominal possessive constructions, the ligature *pu(nya)* 'POSS' not only marks possessive relations, but also has a number of non-canonical functions, such as that of an emphatic marker. Such non-canonical functions of the ligature are also reported for two other eastern Malay varieties, namely Ambon and Ternate Malay.

In Papuan Malay verbal clauses, core arguments are very often elided (see §1.4.1.4 and §11.1, in Chapter 11). The same observation applies to Ambon and Manado Malay.

In Papuan Malay verbal clauses, the reciprocity marker *baku* 'RECP' is analyzed as a separate word (§11.3, in Chapter 11). For Ambon, Banda, Kupang, Manado, and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay, by contrast, the same marker is analyzed as a prefix. Most likely, this different analysis is again due to differences between the analysts rather than due to linguistic differences between the respective Malay varieties.

In Papuan Malay negative clauses, the negator *bukang* 'NEG' not only negates nouns and nominal predicate clauses, but also signals contrast (§13.1.2, in Chapter 13). The same observation applies to Ambon, Manado, and Ternate Malay.

---

39   Adnominal uses of the third person plural pronoun are also reported for Balai Berkuak Malay (Tadmor 2002: 7), Dobo Malay (Nivens, p.c. 2013), and Sri Lanka Malay (Slomanson 2013); in Balai Berkuak Malay and Manado Malay the pronoun occurs in pre-head position.

Table 13:   Some phonological and syntactic features in Papuan Malay and other
eastern Malay varieties

Phonology: Diphthongs (DIPH)							
	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
DIPH	no	yes			no	no	yes

Adnominal possessive constructions: Non-canonical uses of the ligature (LIG)							
	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
LIG use	yes	yes					yes

Verbal clauses: Argument elision							
	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
Elision	yes	yes				yes	

Verbal clauses: Morphosyntactic status of reciprocity marker **baku** 'RECP'							
	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
RECP	word	prefix	prefix	prefix		prefix	prefix prefix

Negative clauses: Contrastive (CST) function of **bukang** 'NEG'							
	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	NMM / TM
CST	yes	yes				yes	yes

The overview presented in this section shows several differences and commonalities
between Papuan Malay and the other eastern Malay varieties.

The differences pertain to affixation (form and degree of productivity of the
affixes), and the adnominal uses of the personal pronouns. The discussed
commonalities involve reduplication, the non-canonical uses of the possessive
ligature, elision of core arguments in verbal clauses, and the contrastive uses of
negator **bukang** 'NEG'. The observed commonalities suggest that Papuan Malay has
more in common with Ambon Malay than with the other eastern Malay varieties. It
is important to note, however, that these differences and commonalities could also
result from gaps in the descriptions of the other eastern Malay varieties. The noted
differences concerning the morphosyntactic status of the reciprocity marker and the
phonological status of VV sequences most likely result from differences between the
analysts rather than from linguistic differences between the compared Malay
varieties.

Overall, the noted distinctions and similarities support the conclusion put
forward in §1.2 that the history of Papuan Malay is different from that of the other
eastern Malay varieties, and that Ambon Malay played a significant role in its
genesis.

1.5.   Sociolinguistic profile

This section discusses the sociolinguistic profile of Papuan Malay. In summary, this profile presents itself as follows:

- Strong and increasing language vitality;
- Functional distribution of Papuan Malay as the LOW variety, and Indonesian as the HIGH variety, in terms of Ferguson's (1972) notion of diglossia;
- Ambivalent language attitudes towards Papuan Malay; and
- Lack of language awareness of Papuan Malay speakers about the status of Papuan Malay as a language distinct from Indonesian.

Papuan Malay is spoken in a rich linguistic and sociolinguistic environment, which includes indigenous Papuan and Austronesian languages, as well as Indonesian and other languages spoken by migrants who have come to live and work in West Papua (see §1.1.2 and §1.1.3). As in other areas of New Guinea, many Papuan living in the coastal areas of West Papua speak two or more languages (Foley 1986: 15–47; see also Mühlhäusler 1996). The linguistic repertoire of individual speakers may include one or more local Papuan and/or Austronesian vernaculars, Papuan Malay, and – depending on the speaker's education levels – Indonesian, and also English, all of which are being used as deemed necessary and appropriate.

Many of the indigenous Papuan and Austronesian languages are threatened by extinction. By contrast, the vitality of Papuan Malay is strong and increasing. This applies especially to urban coastal communities where Papuan Malay serves as a language of wider communication between members of different ethnic groups (Scott et al. 2008: 10–18). In the Sarmi regency, for instance, many vernacular languages are shifting, or have shifted, to Papuan Malay (see §1.1.2).

There is also substantial language contact between Papuan Malay and Indonesian with both languages being in a diglossic distribution. In this diglossic distribution, according to Ferguson's (1972) notion of diglossia, Indonesian serves as H, the HIGH variety which is acquired through formal education, and Papuan Malay as L, the LOW variety, which is acquired in the home domain.

Papuan Malay speakers display the typical language behavior of LOW speakers in their language use patterns as well as with respect to their language attitudes. Language use and the diglossic distribution of Papuan Malay and Indonesian are discussed in §1.5.1 and language attitudes, together with language awareness, in §1.5.2.[40]

---

[40]   For the present discussion, the status of the indigenous vernacular languages vis-à-vis Papuan Malay and Indonesian is not further taken into consideration. More investigation is needed to determine whether the interplay between all three best be explained in terms of Fasold 's (1984: 44–50) notion of *double overlapping diglossia* or whether their functional distribution represents an instance of *linear polyglossia*.

1.5.1.   Language use

The diglossic, or functional, distribution of Indonesian as the HIGH variety and
Papuan Malay as the LOW variety implies that in certain situations Indonesian is
more appropriate while in other situations Papuan Malay is more appropriate.

In terms of Fishman's (1965: 86) "domains of language choice", three factors
influence such language choices: the topic discussed, the relationships between the
interlocutors, and the locations where the communication takes place. Another factor
to be taken into account is speaker education levels, given that Indonesian is
acquired through formal education. Below the four factors are discussed in more
detail.[41]

1.   Speaker education levels

In diglossic situations, the LOW variety is known by everyone while the HIGH variety
is acquired through formal education (Ferguson 1972). This also applies to the
diglossic distribution of Papuan Malay and Indonesian. While Papuan Malay is
known by almost everyone in West Papua's coastal areas, knowledge of Indonesian
depends on speaker's education levels.

The results of the mentioned 2007 survey (Scott et al. 2008: 14–17) show that
bilingualism/multilingualism is "a common feature of the Papuan linguistic
landscape". The report does, however, not give details about the degree to which
Papuans are bilingual in Indonesian, but notes that bilingualism levels remain
uncertain.

During her 3-month fieldwork in Sarmi (see §1.8.3), the author did not
investigate bilingualism in Indonesian. She did, however, note changes in speakers'
language behavior depending on their education levels. Papuan Malay speakers with
higher education levels displayed a general and marked tendency to "dress up" their
Papuan Malay with Indonesian features. This tendency was even more pronounced
when discussing high topics (see Factor 2 'Topical regulation'), or when interacting
with group outsiders (see Factor 3 'Relationships between interlocutors'). The
observed features include lexical choices, such as Indonesian *desa* 'village' and
mereka '3PL' instead of Papuan Malay *kampung* 'village' and *dorang*/*dong* '3PL',
respectively.

Another feature is an Indonesian pronunciation of certain lexical items. For
instance, instead of realizing *ade* 'younger sibling' as [ˈa.dɛ] or *tida* 'NEG' as [ˈti.da],
better-educated speakers tend to realize these items as [ˈa.dɪk˺] or [ˈti.dɐk˺],
respectively. Other features are syntactic ones, such as Indonesian passives formed
with prefix *di-* 'UV', causatives formed with suffix *-kang* 'CAUS', or possessives
formed with suffix *-nya* '3POSSR'.[42] Less-educated speakers, by contrast, did not
display this general tendency of mixing and switching to Indonesian given their
more limited exposure to the HIGH variety Indonesian. They only showed this

---

41   Not further taken into account here is the growing influence of the mass media, namely
     TV, even in more remote areas which exposes Papuans more and more to colloquial
     varieties of Indonesian, especially Jakartan Indonesian (see also Sneddon (2006)).

42   For detailed grammatical descriptions of Indonesian see for instance Mintz (1994) and
     Sneddon (2010).

tendency to "dress-up" their Indonesian when discussing HIGH topics (see Factor 2 'Topical regulation'), or when interacting with fellow-Papuans of higher social standing or with group outsiders (see Factor 3 'Relationships between interlocutors').

2.   Topical regulation

As Fishman (1965: 71) points out, "certain topics are somehow handled better in one language than in another". The results of the 2007 survey provide only limited information about this issue, however. The findings only state that Papuan Malay is the preferred language for humor and that politics are typically discussed in the indigenous vernaculars (Scott et al. 2008: 17). The author's own observations during her 3-month fieldwork in late 2008 modify these findings (see §1.8.3). The observed Papuan Malay speakers displayed a notable tendency to change their language behavior when discussing HIGH topics. That is, when talking about topics associated with the formal domains of government, politics, education, or religion they tended to "dress up" their Papuan Malay and make it more Indonesian-like.

3.   Relationships between interlocutors

Language behavior is not only influenced by the topics of communication and speaker education levels, but also by role relations. That is, individual speakers display certain language behaviors depending on the role relations between them (Fishman 1965: 76).

As for Papuan Malay, the 2007 survey results (Scott et al. 2008: 13, 14) indicate that family members and friends typically communicate in Papuan Malay or in the vernacular, but not in Indonesian. The same applies to informal interactions between customers and vendors, or between patients and local health workers. Teachers may also address their students in Papuan Malay in informal interactions (in informal interactions in primary school, students may even address their teachers in Papuan Malay). The report does not discuss which language(s) Papuans use when they interact with fellow-Papuans of higher social standing or with outsiders. During her 3-month fieldwork in Sarmi (see §1.8.3), however, the author did note changes in speakers' language behavior depending on the role relations between interlocutors in terms of their status and community membership.

In interactions with fellow-Papuans of equally low status, less-educated Papuans typically used the LOW variety Papuan Malay. (At times, they also switched to Isirawa, the vernacular language for most of them.) By contrast, when interacting with fellow-Papuans of higher social standing, such as teachers, mayors and other government officials, and pastors, or when conversing with group outsiders, that is non-Papuans, the observed speakers showed a marked tendency to change their language behavior. That is, in such interactions, their speech showed influences from the high variety Indonesian, similar to the general language behavior of better-educated speakers, described under Factor 1 'Speaker education levels'. As for the language behavior of better-educated speakers, their general tendency to "dress-up" their Papuan Malay with Indonesian features was even more marked when they interacted with group outsiders, such as the author. This tendency to "dress-up" one's Papuan Malay with Indonesian features reflects role relations, in that the use

of Papuan Malay indicates intimacy, informality, and equality, while the use of Indonesian features signals social inequality and distance, as well as formality (see also Fishman 1965: 70).[43]

4.   Locations

Language behaviors are also influenced by locations where communication takes place, in that speakers consider certain languages to be more appropriate in certain settings (Fishman 1965: 71, 75). Due to the diglossic distribution of Papuan Malay and Indonesian, Papuan Malay speakers consider Indonesian to be more appropriate in certain domains than Papuan Malay (Scott et al. 2008: 11–18). That is, Indonesian is the preferred language for formal interactions in the education and religious domains (such as formal instruction, leadership, or preaching) or other public domains such as government offices. Papuan Malay strongly dominates all other domains. In addition, it is also the preferred language for informal interactions in public domains such as schools, churches, and government offices.

1.5.2.   Language attitudes

Fishman's (1965: 70) considerations of intimacy and distance, informality and formality also apply to Papuan Malay.

The findings of the 2007 survey indicate that Papuans associate Papuan Malay with intimacy and informality, while they associate Indonesian with social distance and formality. Most interviewees also stated that they are interested in the development of Papuan Malay. Moreover, the majority of interviewees stated that Papuan Malay and Indonesian are of equal value and that Indonesian speakers do not deserve more respect than Papuan Malay speakers. Given these findings, the researchers came to the conclusion that among the interviewed Papuans attitudes towards Papuan Malay are "remarkably positive" (Scott et al. 2008: 18–22).

The expressed attitude that Papuan Malay and Indonesian are of equal value is remarkable, given that in diglossic communities speakers usually consider the HIGH variety to be superior. The LOW variety, by contrast, is usually held "to be inferior, even to the point that its existence is denied" (Fasold 1984: 36).

The author's own observations agree with the survey findings that Papuans find Papuan Malay suitable for intimate communication, while they feel at a distance with Indonesian. At the same time, though, it is questioned here to what extent Papuans feel at ease with Papuan Malay and how positive their attitudes really are. While most of the 2007 interviewees said that Papuan Malay and Indonesian are of equal value, the same interviewees also stated that Indonesian was more appropriate in certain domains. Besides, the author's own observations suggest that Papuans also consider Indonesian to be more appropriate for certain topics and with certain interlocutors. These language behaviors undermine the stated positive attitudes and suggest that overall language attitudes are ambivalent rather than wholly positive.

This "low level of correlation between attitudes and actual behavior" is not unusual, though, as scholars such as Agheyisi and Fishman (1970: 140) point out (see

---

[43]   All observed Papuans of higher social standing were also better educated, whereas none of the observed less-educated Papuans was of high social standing.

also Cooper and Fishman 1974: 10, and Baker 1992: 16). The mismatch can perhaps be accounted for in terms of Kelman's (1971) distinction of sentimental and instrumental attachments. Applying this distinction, one can say that Papuans are "sentimentally attached" to Papuan Malay but "instrumentally attached" to Indonesian. Papuan Malay is associated with sentimental attachments, in that it makes Papuans feel good about being Papuan. Indonesian, by contrast, is associated with instrumental attachments in that it allows them to achieve social status and their education and to get things done. (1971: 25)

In this context, the attitudes which Indonesians and Indonesian institutions express towards Papuan Malay are also important. Overall, it seems that Indonesians who live in West Papua but do not speak Papuan Malay consider the language to be poor or bad Indonesian (Scott et al. 2008: 19). In West Papua, this view is implicitly communicated by Indonesian government institutions, for instance by hanging banners across major roads which demand **mari kita berbicara bahasa Indonesia yang baik dan benar** 'let us speak good and correct Indonesian'. Such negative language attitudes are widespread and apply to the eastern Malay varieties in general. As Masinambow and Haenen (2002: 106) report, scholars in Indonesia continue to regard the regional Malay varieties as second-class, mixed languages which are opposed by the pure High Malay language. (For a discussion of Indonesian language planning see Sneddon 2003: 14–143, for a discussion of the role of Papuan Malay in the context of Indonesian language politics see Besier 2012: 13–17.)

Hence, the need for Papuans to distinguish between sentimental and instrumental attitudes is confounded by the negative attitudes which Indonesian institutions and individuals have towards Papuan Malay.

Notably, Papuan Malay is not recognized by the Papuan independence movement OPM (*Organisasi Papua Merdeka* – Free Papua Movement) either.

The First Papuan People's Congress, held on 16-19 October 1961, issued a manifesto which declared that *Papua Barat* 'West Papua' would be the name of their nation, *Papua* the name of the people, *Hai Tanahku Papua* 'My land Papua' the national anthem, the *Bintang Kejora* 'Morning Star' the national flag, the *burung Mambruk* 'Mambruk bird' the national symbol, and 'One People One Soul' the national motto. Moreover, the Congress decided that the national language should not be Malay, as it was the colonizer's language (Alua 2006: 40–43). The Second Papuan People's Congress, held from 29 May until 4 June 2000 at Cenderawasih University in Jayapura, reconfirmed the national anthem, flag, and symbol, and again rejected Papuan Malay as the national language. Instead the Congress decided that English should be the official language. In addition, Papuan Malay and Tok Pisin should serve as "common" languages (King 2004: 50).[44] Likewise, the Third Papuan People's Congress, held from 17-19 October 2011 in Abepura, rejected Papuan Malay as the national language (Besier 2012: 19).

This desire of Papuan nationals "of a clean linguistic break" is a utopian dream, as Rutherford (2005: 407) points out. Moreover, it presents a dilemma since only

---

[44] King 's (2004: 195) report is based on an *Agence France Presse* summary, dated 6 January 2000, which is titled "The constitution of the 'State of Papua' as envisaged in Jayapura".

few people in West Papua speak these other languages, while Papuan Malay is the *de facto* language of wider communication. (See also Besier 2012: 17–22.)

The fact that Papuan Malay has not been officially recognized in spite of its large numbers of speakers reflects the lack of esteem held by the main stakeholders vis-à-vis this language. (See also Besier 2012: 32.)

Another factor to be considered in the context of language attitudes is the issue of language awareness.

The findings of the 2007 sociolinguistic survey note a lack of language awareness among Papuans with respect to Papuan Malay (Scott et al. 2008: 11, 18-19). That is, many interviewees were unaware of differences between Papuan Malay and Indonesian. The names which the interviewees used to refer to Papuan Malay also reflects this lack of language awareness, names such as **bahasa santay** 'language to relax', **bahasa tanah** 'home language' (literally 'ground language), **bahasa sehari-hari** 'every-day language', or **bahasa pasar** 'market/trade language'. While these names illustrate the identification Papuans have with Papuan Malay, none of them indicates that the interviewees recognize Papuan Malay as a distinct language. Paauw (2008: 76) also reports that many Papuan Malay speakers are not aware of the fact that their speech variety is distinct from Indonesian. (See also Burung 2008a: 5–7.)

The author made similar observations during her 2008 fieldwork in Sarmi. Most Papuan Malay speakers she met thought that they were speaking Indonesian (maybe with a local Papuan flavor) when conversing with other Papuans. Only a few household members and guests were aware that their speech variety was distinct from Indonesian. They referred to their speech variety as **logat Papua** 'Papuan dialect'. None of them knew the term **Melayu Papua** 'Papuan Malay'.

In summarizing this discussion on language attitudes, it is concluded that Papuans' attitudes towards Papuan Malay are ambivalent, rather than wholly positive.

1.6.   Previous research on Papuan Malay

Until the second half of the twentieth century, the Malay varieties spoken in New Guinea had received almost no attention. Linguists only started taking more notice of the language in the second half of the twentieth century. These early studies are discussed in §1.6.1. Starting from the early years of the twenty first century, Papuan Malay has received more attention. This includes linguistic descriptions of some of the Malay varieties spoken in West Papua (§1.6.2), as well as typological studies of the eastern Malay varieties, including Papuan Malay (§1.6.3). In addition, Papuan Malay has received attention in the context of sociolinguistic studies (§1.6.4).

1.6.1.   Early linguistic studies on the Malay varieties of West Papua

Zöller (1891) mentions Malay in his description of the *Papua Sprachen* 'languages of Papua' (1891: 351–426), as well as in his 300-item word of 48 languages of Papua (1891: 443–529); the 48 languages include 29 languages of German New Guinea, and 17 languages of British New Guinea, as well as Malay and Numfor of

Netherlands New Guinea (for comparison reason, the word list also includes Maori and Samoan, besides the 48 languages of Papua).

Likewise, Teutscher (1954) mentions Malay in his article on the languages spoken in New Guinea. As a *lingua franca* it is used in formal and informal domains. Moreover, for Papuans this Malay has become a *tweede moedertaal* 'second mother tongue' (1954: 123).

Also available is a *Beknopte leergang Maleis voor Nieuw-Guinea* 'A concise language course in the Malay variety spoken in New Guinea' (Bureau Cursussen en Vertalingen 1950).

The Malay of New Guinea is also mentioned by Anceaux and Veldkamp in their Malay-Dutch-Dani word list (1960) as well as in their penciled New Guinea Malay-Dutch word list (no date).

In addition, Teeuw (1961: 49) states that after 1950 a variety of publications were produced specifically for western New Guinea; they were written in Malay with a "distinctly local colour". At the same time, however, the author notes that there were no publications which discussed the Malay of Netherlands New Guinea or the language policies regarding this Malay variety.

Around the same time, Moeliono (1963) mentions Indonesian in his study of the languages spoken in West Papua. The author refers to the language as a ***logat bahasa Indonesia*** 'dialect of the Indonesian language' without, however, discussing its features. The author does state, though, that this "dialect" is spoken in the coastal and urban areas of West Papua and used by the Dutch colonial government for letters and announcements. Moreover, it is used as a *lingua franca*, both in formal and informal domains.

Early linguistic studies on the Malay varieties spoken in West Papua date back to the second half of the twentieth century.

Samaun (1979) highlights some morphological, syntactical, and lexical features in which the *dialek Indonesia Irian* of Jayapura differs from standard Indonesian. While explaining these differences as mere simplifications, the author also notes that due to some of these modifications, this *dialek* of Indonesian sounds non-Indonesian.

Along similar lines, Suharno (1979, 1981) describes some aspects of Papuan Malay phonology, morphology, lexicon, and grammar in comparison to standard Indonesian. While referring to Papuan Malay as an Indonesian dialect, the author suggests that this variety of Indonesian is autonomous and deserves more research. The author also maintains that this dialect is a suitable language for development programs. In formal situations, however, the language variety is unacceptable.

Unlike Samaun (1979) and Suharno (1979, 1981), Roosman (1982) does not refer to Papuan Malay as a dialect of Indonesian. Instead, he considers Papuan Malay as a form of Ambon Malay which has "pidgin Malay as its basic stratum" (1982: 1). In his paper, the author presents phonetic inventories of Ambon (Irian Malay), Pidgin Malay, and Indonesian and comments on some of the differences he found.

Another scholar who mentions various features of the Malay spoken in West Papua is Walker (1982). In the context of his study on language use at Namatota, a village located on West Papua's southwest coast, the author discusses some of the

similarities which Malay shares with Indonesian and some of the distinctions between both languages.

Ajamiseba (1984) mentions the Malay variety spoken in West Papua in the context of his study on the linguistic diversity found in this part of New Guinea. Referring to this speech variety as *Irian Indonesian*, the author compares some of its features to those of other languages spoken in West Papua. This comparison, however, seems to be based on standard Indonesian rather than on Papuan Malay.

In 1995, van Velzen published his "Notes on the variety of Malay used in Serui and vicinity". Similar to previous studies, the author highlights some aspects of the Serui Malay phonology, morphology, and lexicon in comparison to standard Indonesian. Van Velzen (1995: 315) concludes that Serui Malay and the other Malay varieties of West Papua's north coast "are probably more closely related to Tidorese or Ternatan Malay" than to Ambon Malay, as suggested by Roosman (1982).[45]

1.6.2.   Linguistic descriptions of Papuan Malay

More recently, Papuan Malay has received attention from linguistics as a language in its own right vis-à-vis Indonesian and as a distinct cluster of Malay dialects vis-à-vis the other eastern Malay varieties. Three studies give an overview of the most pertinent features of Papuan Malay, two of which are Donohue (to be published) and Scott et al. (2008). The third study is Paauw (2008) which is presented in §1.6.3.

Donohue (to be published) discusses various linguistic features of Papuan Malay as spoken in the area around Geelvink Bay. The described features include, among others, phonology, noun phrases, verbal morphosyntax, and clause linkages.

Scott et al.'s (2008) study is part of a larger sociolinguistics language survey of the Malay varieties of West Papua (see §1.6.4). The authors describe different aspects of the lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax, and discourse of the Malay varieties spoken in (and around) the urban areas of Fak-Fak, Jayapura, Manokwari, Merauke, Timika, Serui, and Sorong (see also Map 5 on p. xxiv).

In addition, there are a number of studies which explore specific aspects of Papuan Malay.

One of the investigated features is the pronoun system. Donohue and Sawaki (2007) examine the innovative forms and functions of the pronoun system in Papuan Malay as spoken along West Papua's north coast. In their study on the development of Austronesian first-person pronouns, Donohue and Smith (1998) explore the loss of the inclusive-exclusive distinction in non-singular personal pronouns in Serui and Merauke Malay and other nonstandard Malay varieties. Saragih (2012) investigates the use of person reference in everyday language on the social networking service Facebook.

As well as the pronoun system, the voice system has also received attention. Donohue (2007a) investigates the variation in the voice systems of six different

---

[45]   With respect to this quote, Nivens (p.c. 2013) suggests that van Velzen (1995: 315) made this comment "because the sultan of Tidore once claimed sovereignty over parts of Papua", but it is doubtful "that he had any actual linguistic data to back up this claim".

Indonesian/Malay varieties, one of them being Papuan Malay from the area around Jayapura, and another being Serui Malay (see also Donohue 2005b, 2007b).

In a more recent study on the Melanesian influence on Papuan Malay, Donohue (2011) investigates pronominal agreement, aspect marking, serial verb constructions, and various aspects of clause linkage in Papuan Malay.

In addition to these more in-depth studies on Papuan Malay, initial research has been conducted on a variety of different topics. Burung (2004) examines comparative constructions in Papuan Malay. Burung (2005) discusses three types of textual continuity, namely topic, action, and thematic continuity. Burung and Sawaki (2007) describe different types of causative constructions. Burung (2008a) presents a brief typological profile of Papuan Malay. Burung (2008b) investigates how Papuan Malay expresses the semantic prime FEEL, applying the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) framework. Sawaki (2004) discusses serial-verb constructions and word order in different clause types, and gives an overview of the pronominal system. Sawaki (2007) investigates how Papuan Malay expresses passive voice. Warami (2005) examines the uses of a number of different lexical items, including selected interjection and conjunctions. None of these studies specifies, however, which variety of Papuan Malay is under investigation.

Other materials on Papuan Malay mentioned in the literature but not available to the author are the following (listed in alphabetical order): Donohue's (1997) study on contact and change in Merauke Malay, Hartanti's (2008) analysis of SMS texts in Papuan Malay, Mundhenk's (2002) description of final particles in Papuan Malay, Podungge's (2000) description of slang in Papuan Malay, Sawaki's (2005) paper *Melayu Papua: Tong Pu Bahasa*, Sawaki's (no date) paper on nominal agreement in Papuan Malay, and Silzer's (1978 and 1979) *Notes on Irianese Indonesian*.

1.6.3.   Typological studies on the eastern Malay varieties

Two studies deal with Papuan Malay in the context of typological comparisons of the eastern Malay varieties.

Lumi (2007) investigates similarities and differences of the plural personal pronouns in Ambon Malay, Manado Malay, and Papuan Malay (without specifying, however, which variety of Papuan Malay is under investigation).

Paauw (2008) compares seven eastern Malay varieties, namely Ambon, Banda, Kupang, Larantuka, Manado, North Moluccan, and Papuan Malay.[46] The described features include phonology, lexical categories, word order, clause structure, noun phrases, prepositional phrases, and verb phrases.

1.6.4.   Sociolinguistic studies

To date, sociolinguistic studies on Papuan Malay are scarce.

---

[46]   The basis for the description of Papuan Malay is textual data collected in Manokwari (Paauw 2008: 35), as well as data available in previous studies: Burung and Sawaki (2007), Donohue (to be published), Kim et al. (2007) (this study is an earlier version of Scott et al. 2008), Sawaki (2007), Suharno (1981), and van Velzen (1995).

The earliest one is Walker's (1982) study on language use at Namatota, mentioned in §1.6.2. Examining the different functions Malay and other languages have in this multilingual community, the author highlights the pervasive role of Malay in the community.

A more recent study is the sociolinguistic survey mentioned in §1.3.2, §1.5, and §1.6.2, which the Papuan branch of SIL International carried out in (and around) the coastal urban areas of Fak-Fak, Jayapura, Manokwari, Merauke, Timika, Serui, and Sorong (Scott et al. 2008). In the context of this study, sociolinguistic and linguistic data were collected to explore how many distinct varieties of Papuan Malay exist and which one(s) of those varieties might be best suited for language development and standardization efforts. (See also Map 5 on p. xxiv.)

Another study on Papuan Malay, mentioned in §1.5, is Besier's (2012) thesis. The author explores the role of Papuan Malay in society in terms of the language policies of the Indonesian government, as well as its role in the independence movement, in formal education, and in the church and mission organizations.

Burung (2008a) discusses the issue of language awareness and language vitality in Papuan Malay. Unlike Scott et al. (2008) (see §1.5), Burung (2008a) suggests that Papuan Malay is increasingly losing domains of use to standard Indonesian due to the increasing influence of Indonesian throughout West Papua and the lack of language awareness among Papuans. (See also Burung 2009).

1.7.   Available materials in Papuan Malay

At this point, materials in Papuan Malay are still scarce. Most of them seem to come in the form of jokes, or **mop** 'humor'. These jokes are published in newspapers or posted on dedicated websites, such as *MopPapua*. Some of them are also published in book form, such as the jokes collected by Warami (2004, 2004). Humor in Papuan Malay also comes in the form of comedy, such as the sketch series *Epen ka, cupen toh* 'Is it important? It's important enough, indeed!' from Merauke, which is accessible via YouTube.[47]

In 2006, the movie *Denias* came out, a film in Papuan Malay about a boy from the highlands who wants to go to school.[48]

Other materials in Papuan Malay are only available on the internet, such as:

1.   *Kamus Bahasa Papua* 'Dictionary of the Papuan Language'

    –   A Papuan Malay – Indonesian dictionary with currently 164 items (last updated on 24 March 2011)
    –   Online URL: http://kamusiana.com/index.php/index/20.xhtml

2.   *Kitong pu bahasa* 'Our Language'

    –   A Christian website in Papuan Malay, Indonesian, and English which includes information about the Papuan Malay language and its history, the

---

[47]   *MopPapua* is available at http://moppapua.com/.
    Epen ka, cupen toh is available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IWiQK0qKIj8.
[48]   *Denias* is available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kc683zv6H_E.

Easter story from the New Testament of the Bible in PDF format, and Christian texts and songs in audio format.
– Online URL: http://kitongpubahasa.com/en/_5699

Also, mention needs to be made of a language development program launched by Yayasan Betania Indonesia, a Papuan non-governmental organization located in Abepura, West Papua. The program's goal is to develop written and audio resources with a focus on Bible translation, seeking to promote and develop the use of the language in the religious domain. (Harms, p.c. 2013)

An online resource providing materials on issues relevant to West Papua is 'West Papua Web'.[49] This resource is hosted by The University of Papua, Cenderawasih University, and the Australian National University. To date, however, the website does not provide materials in Papuan Malay.

1.8.   Present study

Six different issues related to the present study are presented in this section. After discussing some pertinent theoretical considerations in §1.8.1, the methodological approach is briefly outlined in §1.8.2. This is followed in §1.8.3 by a description of various aspects of the fieldwork. Details on the recorded corpus and the sample of speakers contributing to this corpus are presented in §1.8.4. The procedures for the data transcription and analysis are discussed in §1.8.5. Finally, §1.8.6 describes the procedures involved in eliciting the word list.

1.8.1.   Theoretical considerations

Papuan Malay is spoken in a rich linguistic and sociolinguistic environment in the coastal areas of West Papua (see §1.1.2 and §1.5). Many Papuans speak two or more languages which they use as deemed appropriate and necessary. That is, depending on the setting of the communicative event, speakers may use one or the other code or switch between them.

The conversations, recorded in Sarmi in late 2008, reveal some of this linguistic richness. They include conversations in which the interlocutors freely switch between different codes, such as Papuan Malay, Isirawa, and Indonesian. These recordings illustrate how intertwined and close to the speakers' minds the languages that are part of their linguistic repertoire are.

With a few exceptions, however, this description of Papuan Malay does not take into account language contact issues and therefore does not reflect the rich linguistic environment which Papuan Malay is part of. Instead, the present description creates an abstraction of one Papuan Malay variety, as if it were a distinct linguistic entity that is spoken in isolation, rather than being part of a larger and complex linguistic and sociolinguistic reality.

That is, in terms of de Saussure (1959) distinction between *langue* and *parole*, the present description of Papuan Malay focuses on the language system as "a collection of necessary conventions" (1959: 9). The rationale for this abstraction is

---

[49]   'West Papua Web' is available at http://www.papuaweb.org/.

twofold. First, it is needed in order to identify, analyze, illustrate, and discuss
pertinent linguistic features which are characteristics of Papuan Malay and which
distinguish this speech variety from others, such as other eastern Malay varieties.
Second, the abstraction is necessary in order to appreciate the complexity of Papuan
Malay as *parole*; as discussed below, however, the investigation of this complexity
is beyond the scope of the present research.

It is pointed out, however, that this abstraction of Papuan Malay as *langue* is
based on natural speech or *parole*, which represents "the executive side of
speaking". Moreover, Papuan Malay as *langue* is accessible and recognized by its
speakers, although not without some difficulty. Furthermore, in being extracted from
a "heterogeneous mass of speech facts", the examples and texts presented in this
book reflect at least part of the larger linguistic reality of the recorded speakers.
(1959: 13, 14)

Given this focus on *langue*, the present isolated analysis of Papuan Malay
remains incomplete. After having extracted Papuan Malay from its complex
(socio)linguistic reality, the next step in presenting an adequate linguistic description
of this Malay variety needs to focus on Papuan Malay as *parole*, with its
"heterogeneous mass of speech facts" (de Saussure 1959: 14). More specifically,
this next step needs to consider the larger linguistic environment and the interactions
between the different codes which are at the disposal of the coastal Papuan
communities. This step, however, is beyond the scope of this book and is left for
future research.

1.8.2.   Methodological approach

This study primarily deals with the Papuan Malay language as it is spoken in the
Sarmi area, which is located about 300 km west of Jayapura. Both towns are located
on West Papua's northeast coast. The description of the language is based on
recordings of spontaneous conversations between Papuan Malay speakers. The
corpus includes only a few texts obtained via focused elicitation. The rationale for
this methodological approach is discussed below in §1.8.3.

1.8.3.   Fieldwork

The fieldwork was conducted in West Papua in four periods between September
2008 and December 2011. The first period took place in Sarmi from the beginning
of August until mid-December 2008. During this time the texts which form the basis
for the present study were recorded. The remaining three fieldwork periods took
place in Sentani, located about 40 km west of Jayapura, from early October until
mid-December 2009, from mid-October until mid-December 2010, and from early
September until the end of November 2011. During these periods, the recordings
were transcribed, about one third of the texts were translated into English, additional
examples were elicited, and grammaticality judgment tests were conducted (see
§1.8.5). During the fourth fieldwork in late 2011, the word list was recorded (see
§1.8.6).

During the first fieldwork I lived with a pastor, Kornelius[†] Merne, and his
family, his wife Sarlota, and three of their five children. Also living in the house

were one of Sarlota's sisters and eight teenagers (three males and five females). The teenagers were part of the extended family and came from the Mernes' home village Webro, located about 30km west of Sarmi, or nearby villages, which, like Webro, belong to the Pante-Barat district. At that time, the eight teenagers were junior or senior high school students. Furthermore, there was a constant coming and going of guests from villages of the Sarmi regency: relatives, pastoral workers, and/or local officials passing through or staying for several days up to several weeks. Hence, the household included between 14 and about 30 persons. The Mernes, their household members and many guests belonged to the Isirawa language group (Tor-Kwerba language family), to which Webro and the neighboring villages belong. Some guests originated from other language areas, such as the Papuan languages Samarokena, Sentani, and Tor, or the Austronesian languages Biak and Ambon Malay.

At the beginning of my stay with his family, pastor Merne had given me permission to do recordings in his house. Besides recording spontaneous conversations, I had planned to elicit different text genre such as narratives, procedurals, or expositories. This, however, soon proved to be impossible for two reasons, namely the diglossic distribution of Papuan Malay and Indonesian, and the lack of language awareness, discussed in §1.5. As a result of these two factors, it proved *de facto* impossible for the household members and guests to talk with me in Papuan Malay. They always switched to Indonesian. This made both focused elicitation and language learning difficult. Therefore, after a few unsuccessful attempts to elicit texts, I decided to refrain from further elicitation and to record spontaneous conversations instead. From then on, I always carried a small recording device with internal microphone which I turned on when two or more people were conversing. After a few days the household members were used to my constant recording. I never had the impression that they were trying to avoid being recorded (there were only two situations in which speakers distanced themselves from me in order not to be recorded). Most of the sixteen hours of text were recorded in this manner, as discussed in more detail in 1.8.4.1. There are a few exceptions, though, which are also discussed in 1.8.4.1.

Given that my hosts and their guests typically switched to Indonesian when talking with me, most of my language learning was by listening to Papuans when talking to each other in Papuan Malay, by applying what I observed during these conservations and in the recorded data, and by discussing these observations with those speakers who were interested in talking about language related issues. During the fourth period of fieldwork, from the beginning of September until the end of November 2011, I recorded a 2,458-item word list. The items were extracted from the transcribed corpus and recorded in isolation to investigate the Papuan Malay phonology at the word level. The consultants from whom the list was recorded were two Papuan Malay speakers, Ben Rumaropen and Lodowik Aweta. The procedures involved in recording this list are described in §1.8.6.

1.8.4.   Corpus and Papuan Malay speaker sample

During the first fieldwork period in late 2008, 220 texts totaling almost 16 hours were recorded. Almost all of them were recorded in Sarmi (217/220 texts); the remaining three were recorded in Webro. The texts were recorded from a sample of

about 60 different Papuan Malay speakers. The corpus is described in §1.8.4.1, and the sample of recorded speakers in §1.8.4.2.

1.8.4.1.   Recorded texts

The basis for the current study is a 16-hour corpus. In all, 220 texts were recorded (see Appendix C). The texts were recorded in the form of WAV files with a Marantz PMD620 using the recorder's internal microphone. Each WAV file was labeled with a record number which includes the date of its recording, a running number for all texts recorded during one day, and a code for the type of text recorded. This is illustrated with the record number 080919-007-CvNP: 080919 stands for "2008, September 19"; 007 stands for "recorded text #7 of that day"; and CvNP stands for "Personal Narrative (NP) which occurred during a Conversation (Cv)". The same record numbers are used in Toolbox for the transcribed texts (see §1.8.5.1) and the examples given in this book (see §1.8.5.3).

Most texts are spontaneous conversations which occurred between two or more Papuan speakers (157/220 texts – 71.4%). Details concerning the contents of these conversations are given in Table 15. The remaining 63 texts (28.6%) fall into two groups: conversations with the author (see Table 16) and elicited texts (see Table 17). (See also Appendix C for a detailed listing of the 220 recorded texts.)

Table 14:   Overview of 16-hour corpus

Text types	Count of texts		Count of hours	
Spontaneous conversations	157	71.4%	10:08:02	63.4%
Conversations with the author	40	18.2%	04:27:15	27.9%
Elicited texts	23	10.4%	01:23:17	8.7%
Total	220	100%	15:58:34	100%

Most of the texts in the present corpus are spontaneous conversations between two or more Papuans. While being present during these conversations, I usually did not participate in the talks unless being addressed by one of the interlocutors. The recorded conversations cover a wide range of text genre and topics. The majority of conversations are casual and about everyday topics related to family life, relations with others, work, education, and local politics. Five conversations were conducted over the phone. A substantial number of the recorded conversations are narratives about personal experiences such as journeys or childhood experiences. Included are also 14 expositories, five hortatories, two folk stories, and one brief procedural. In all, the corpus contains 157 such conversations (157/220 – 71.4%), accounting for about ten hours of the 16-hour corpus (63.4%).

Table 15:   Spontaneous conversations[50]

Contents	Count of texts		Count of hours	
Casual conversations	105	66.9%	05:59:55	59.2%

---

[50]   As percentages are rounded to one decimal place, they do not always add up to 100%.

Contents	Count of texts		Count of hours	
Phone conversations	5	3.2%	01:13:19	12.1%
Expositories	14	8.9%	00:59:48	9.8%
Hortatories	5	3.2%	00:03:48	0.6%
Narratives (folk stories)	2	1.3%	00:39:45	6.5%
Narratives (personal experiences)	25	15.9%	01:05:17	10.7%
Procedurals	1	0.6%	00:06:10	1.0%
Total	157	100%	10:08:02	100%

The corpus also includes 40 texts which I recorded when visiting two relatives of the Merne family. Unlike the other family members and guests of the Merne household, two of Sarlota Merne's relatives, a young female pastor and her husband who also lived in Sarmi, had no difficulties talking to me in Papuan Malay. I visited them regularly to chat, elicit personal narratives, and discuss local customs and beliefs. In all, the corpus contains 40 such texts (40/220 – 18.2%) (see Table 16). These texts account for about four and a half hours of the 16-hour corpus (27.9%).

Table 16:   Conversations with the author

Contents	Count of texts		Count of hours	
Casual conversations	13	32.5%	01:17:05	28.8%
Expositories	17	42.5%	02:10:15	48.7%
Narratives (personal experiences)	8	20.0%	00:50:36	18.9%
Procedurals	2	5.0%	00:09:19	3.5%
Total	40	100%	04:27:15	100%

The corpus also contains 23 elicited texts (23/220 – 10%) (see Table 17). These texts account for about one and a half hours of the 16-hour corpus (8.7%). During the first two weeks of my first fieldwork, I elicited a few texts, as mentioned in §1.8.3. Two were short procedurals which I recorded on a one-to-one basis. Besides, I elicited three personal narratives with the help of Sarlota Merne, who was one of the few who were aware of the language variety I wanted to study and record. She was present during these elicitations and explained that I wanted to record texts in *logat Papua* 'Papuan dialect'. She also monitored the speech of the narrators; that is, when they switched to Indonesian, she made them aware of the switch and asked them to continue in *logat Papua*. Toward the end of my stay in Sarmi, when I was already well-integrated into the family and somewhat proficient in Papuan Malay, I recorded one narrative in a group situation from one of Sarlota Merne's sisters and another three personal narratives on a one-to-one basis from one of the teenagers living with the Merne's. Also toward the end of this first fieldwork, I recorded 14 jokes which two of the teenagers also living in the house told each other. A sample of texts is presented in Appendix B.

Table 17:   Elicited texts

Contents	Count of texts		Count of hours	
Jokes	14	60.9%	00:13:12	15.8%
Narratives (personal experiences)	7	30.4%	01:06:47	80.2%
Procedurals	2	8.7%	00:03:18	4.0%
Total	23	100%	01:23:17	100%

1.8.4.2.   Sample of recorded Papuan Malay speakers

The present corpus was recorded from about 60 different speakers. This sample includes 44 speakers personally known to the author. Table 18 to Table 20 provide more information with respect to their language backgrounds, gender, age groups, and occupations.

   The sample also includes a fair number of speakers who visited the Merne household briefly and who took part in the recorded conversations. In transcribing their contributions to the ongoing conversations, their gender and approximate age were noted; additional information on their language backgrounds or occupations is unknown, however.

   Table 18 presents details with respect to the vernacular languages spoken by the 44 recorded Papuan Malay speakers. Most of them are speakers of Isirawa, a Tor-Kwerba language (38/44 – 86). The vernacular languages of the remaining six speakers are the Austronesian languages Biak and Ambon Malay, and the Papuan languages Samarokena, Sentani, and Tor.

Table 18:   The recorded Papuan Malay speakers by vernacular languages

Vernacular language	Total
Isirawa	38
Ambon Malay	1
Biak	1
Samarokena	2
Sentani	1
Takar	1
Grand Total	44

Table 19 gives an overview of the recorded 44 speakers in terms of their gender and age groups. The sample includes 20 males (45%) and 24 females (55%). Age wise, the sample is divided into three groups: 19 adults in their thirties or older (19/44 – 43%), 20 young adults in their teens or twenties (20/44 – 45%), and five children of between about five to 13 years of age.

Table 19:   The recorded Papuan Malay speakers by gender and age groups

Age groups	Males	Females	Total
Adult (thirties and older)	10	9	19

Young adult (teens and twenties)	6	14	20
Child (5-13 years)	4	1	5
Grand Total	20	24	44

Table 20 provides an overview of the speakers and their occupations. The largest subgroups are pupils (13/44 – 30%), farmers (10/44 – 23%), and government or business employees (5/44 – 11%). Eight of the 13 students were the teenagers living in the Merne household. The two BA students were the Merne's oldest children who were studying in Jayapura and only once in a while came home to Sarmi. In addition to the ten full-time farmers, three of the government employees worked as part-time farmers. Of the total of five children, three were not yet in school; the remaining two were in primary school.

Table 20:   The recorded Papuan Malay speakers by occupation

Occupation	Males	Females	Total
Student (BA studies)	1	1	2
Pupil (high school)	1	4	5
Pupil (middle school)	1	5	6
Pupil (primary school)	2	0	2
Farmer	2 (+3)	8	10 (+3)
Employee (government/business)	5	0	5
Pastor	2	1	3
(ex-)Mayor	2	0	2
Housewife	0	2	2
BA graduate	0	1	1
Church verger	1	0	1
Nurse	1	0	1
Teacher	0	1	1
Child	2	1	3
Total	24	20	44

1.8.5.   Data transcription, analysis, and examples

This section discusses the transcription and analysis of the recorded Papuan Malay texts, and conventions for examples. In §1.8.5.1, the procedures for transcribing and translating the recorded data are discussed. In §1.8.5.2, the procedures related to the data analysis are described, including grammaticality judgments and focused elicitation. In §1.8.5.3, the conventions for presenting examples are described.

1.8.5.1.   Data transcription and translation into English

Two Papuan Malay consultants transcribed the recorded texts during the second fieldwork in late 2009 and the third fieldwork in late 2010. The two consultants were Ben Rumaropen, who was one of my main consultants throughout the entire research project, and Emma Onim.

B. Rumaropen grew up in Abepura, located about 20 km west of Jayapura; his parents are from Biak. In 2004, B. Rumaropen graduated with a BA in English from Cenderawasih University in Jayapura. From 2002 until 2008, he worked with the SIL Papua survey team. During this time he was one of the researchers involved in the mentioned 2007 sociolinguistics survey of Papuan Malay (Scott et al. 2008). E. Onim grew up in Jayapura; her parents are from Wamena. In 2010, E. Onim graduated with a BA in finance from Cenderawasih University in Jayapura. Since then, she has been the finance manager of a local NGO.

The two consultants transcribed the texts in Microsoft Word, listening to the recordings with Speech Analyzer, a computer program for acoustic analysis of speech sound, developed by SIL International.[51] B. Rumaropen transcribed 121 texts, and E. Onim 99 texts; each text was transcribed in a separate Word file. Using Indonesian orthography, both consultants transcribed the data as literally as possible, including hesitation markers, false starts, truncation, speech mistakes, and nonverbal vocalizations, such as laughter or coughing. Once a recording had been transcribed, I checked the transcription by listening to the recording. Transcribed passages which did not match with the recordings were double-checked with the consultants. After having checked the transcribed texts is this manner, I imported the Word files into Toolbox, a data management and analysis tool developed by SIL International.[52] In Toolbox, I interlinearized the 220 texts into English and Indonesian and compiled a basic dictionary. Each text was imported into a separated Toolbox record, receiving the same record number as its respective WAV file (for details see §1.8.4.1).

During the second fieldwork in late 2009, B. Rumaropen and I translated 83 of the 220 texts into English, which accounts for a good five hours of the 16-hour corpus. The translated texts also contain explanations and additional comments which B. Rumaropen provided during the translation process. Appendix B presents 12 of these texts. The entire material, including the recordings and the Toolbox files will be archived with SIL International. Due to privacy considerations, however, they will not be made publically available. The examples in this book are taken from the entire corpus; that is, examples taken from the 137 texts which have not yet been translated were translated as needed.

1.8.5.2.   Data analysis, grammaticality judgments, and focused elicitation

In early 2010, after B. Rumaropen had transcribed a substantial number of texts and we had translated the mentioned 83 texts, I started with the analysis of the Papuan Malay corpus. This analysis was greatly facilitated by the Toolbox concordance tool, in which all occurrences of a word, phrase, or construction can be retrieved. The retrieved data was imported into Word for further sorting and analysis. Another helpful feature was the Toolbox export command, which allows different fields to be chosen for export into Word, such as the text, morpheme, or speech part fields.

During the analysis, I compiled a list of questions about analytical issues and comprehension problems encountered in the corpus. During the third and fourth fieldwork periods in late 2010 and late 2011, I worked through these questions with

---

[51]   Speech Analyzer is available at http://www-01.sil.org/computing/sa/.
[52]   Toolbox is available at http://www-01.sil.org/computing/toolbox/.

Papuan Malay consultants. Most of this work was done by B. Rumaropen. I also consulted informally with other Papuan Malay speakers on various occasions.

During both fieldwork periods, I also worked with B. Rumaropen on grammaticality judgments. That is, based on the analysis of the corpus data, I constructed sentences which I submitted to B. Rumaropen to comment upon. When I found gaps in the data, I discussed them with B. Rumaropen to establish whether a given expression or construction exists in Papuan Malay, and I asked him to provide some example sentences. Beyond these fieldwork periods, B. Rumaropen and I stayed in contact via email and Skype and continued working on grammaticality judgments and the elicitation of example sentences, as needed.

The elicited examples and the constructed sentences for grammaticality judgments were entered into a separate Toolbox database file. Where used in this grammar, these examples are explicitly labeled as "elicited". All other examples are taken from the Papuan Malay corpus.

1.8.5.3.   Conventions for examples

The examples in this book are taken from the recorded corpus. For each example the record number of the original WAV sound file (see §1.8.4.1) is given. This record number also includes a reference number, as each interlinear text is broken into referenced units. Hence, the example number 080919-007-CvNP.0015 refers to line or unit 15 in the record 080919-007-CvNP. Elicited examples, including constructed sentences for grammaticality judgments, are labeled as "elicited". For each of these examples the respective Toolbox record/reference number is given. All examples are numbered consecutively throughout each chapter (the same applies to tables, figures, and charts).

The conventions for presenting the Papuan Malay examples, interlinear glosses, and the translations of the examples into English are presented in Table 21.

Table 21:   Papuan Malay example and translation conventions

Convention	Meaning
Papuan Malay example	
bold	highlights parts of the example pertinent for the discussion
~	separates reduplicant and base
–	morpheme boundary
=	clitic boundary
Ø	omitted constituent
…	ellipsis
|	intonation breaks
[ ]	surrounds utterances in a language other than Papuan Malay, or instances of unclear pronunciation
(( ))	surrounds nonverbal vocalizations, such as laughter, or pauses
*	precedes ungrammatical examples
??	precedes only marginally grammatical examples
á	acute accent signals a slight increase in pitch of the stressed syllable

Convention	Meaning
VVV	vowel lengthening
Is	utterance in the Isirawa language
UP	unclear pronunciation
i, j	subscript letters keep track of what different terms refer to
Interlinear gloss	
.	separates words glossing single Papuan Malay words for which English is lacking single-word equivalents, as with ***papeda*** 'sagu.porridge'
:	separates formally segmentable morphemes without marking the morpheme boundaries in the corresponding Papuan Malay words, either to keep the text intact and/or because it is not relevant, as in ***tujuangnya*** 'purpose:3POSSR'
[ ]	surrounds truncated utterances, or speech mistakes
TRU	truncated utterance which results from a false start, or an interruption, as in ***ora*** 'TRU-person'; the untruncated lexeme is ***orang*** 'person'
SPM	speech mistake, as in ***ar*** 'SPM-fetch'; the correct form is ***ambil*** 'fetch'
Translation	
bold	highlights the part of the translation relevant for the discussion
( )	surrounds parts of the translation which do not have a parallel in the example, such as explanations or omitted arguments
[ ]	surrounds the record/reference number
[ ]	surrounds utterances in the Isirawa language, instances of unclear pronunciation, or speech mistakes
(( ))	surrounds nonverbal vocalizations, such as laughter, or pauses
Is	utterance in the Isirawa language
SPM	speech mistake
TRU	truncated utterance
UP	unclear pronunciation
i, j	subscript letters keep track of what different terms refer to

In the examples, commas mark intonation breaks, question marks signal question intonation, and exclamation marks indicate directive speech acts and exclamations. Where considered relevant for the discussion, intonation breaks are indicated with "|" rather than with a comma. Morpheme breaks are shown in Chapter 3, which discusses 'Word-formation'. In subsequent chapters, though, they are usually not shown, given the low functional load of affixation in Papuan Malay; the exception is that hyphens are still used in compounds. Names are substituted with aliases to guard anonymity.

In the translations, gender, tense, and aspect are often not deducible; they are given as in the original context.

When parts of an example are quoted in the body text, they are marked in ***bold italic***.

1.8.6.   Word list

During the fourth fieldwork period in late 2011, I recorded a 2,458-item word list with two Papuan Malay consultants, namely B. Rumaropen and Lodowik Aweta. Originally from Webro, L. Aweta was one of the young people living in the Mernes' household during my first fieldwork in 2008. In 2011, L. Aweta was a student at Cenderawasih University.

The word list was extracted from the compiled Toolbox dictionary. During the elicitation, B. Rumaropen provided the stimulus, while L. Aweta repeated the stimulus within one of two different frame sentences.

The frame sentences, which are given in (15) and (16), were used alternatively and served two purposes. First, I anticipated that by repeating the target word within a larger sentence, L. Aweta would potentially be less influenced by B. Rumaropen's pronunciation. This precaution was taken in case that the pronunciations of the two consultants differed, with one being from Sentani and the other one from Sarmi. Second, eliciting the target word as part of a larger sentence allowed me to analyze how some of the word-final segments were pronounced when they occurred in sentence final position and when they were followed by another word. This proved especially helpful in analyzing the realizations of the plosives and the rhotic when occurring in the word-final coda position (see §2.1.1.1, §2.3.1.2, and §2.3.1.3 in Chapter 2).

Frame sentences for word list elicitation

(15)   sa   blum   taw   ko   pu   kata   itu,   kata   ___
        1SG   not.yet   know   2SG   POSS   word   D.DIST   word   ___
        'I don't yet know that word of yours, the word ___'

(16)   ko   pu   kata   ___   itu,   sa   blum   taw
        2SG   POSS   word   ___   D.DIST   1SG   not.yet   know
        'that word ___ of yours, I don't yet know (it)'

B. Rumaropen recorded each elicited word in a separate WAV file, using Speech Analyzer. Subsequently, I transcribed the recorded target words as separate records in Toolbox. Each record includes the orthographic representation of the target word, its phonetic transcription, English gloss, and the word class it belongs to. The word list is found in Appendix A.

After having entered the target words in Toolbox, I analyzed the lexical data with Phonology Assistant. This analysis tool, developed by SIL International, creates consonant and vowel inventory charts and assists in the phonological analysis.[53]

The description of the Papuan Malay phonology in Chapter 2 is based on a word list of 1,116 lexical roots, extracted from the 2,458-item list. In addition 381 items, historically derived by (unproductive) affixation, are investigated. The corpus also includes a large number of loan words, originating from different donor languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, Dutch, English, Persian, Portuguese, or Sanskrit. Hence, a sizeable percentage of the attested lexical items are loan words. So far, 718 items of

---

[53]   Phonology Assistant is available at http://www-01.sil.org/computing/pa/index.htm.

the 2,458-item word list (29%) have been identified as loan words, using the
following sources: Jones (2007) and Tadmor (2009) (on borrowing in Malay in
general see also Blust 2013: 151–156). Upon further investigation, some of the
1,116 lexical roots listed as inherited Papuan Malay words may also turn out to be
loan words. In addition, the corpus includes a number of lexical items which are
typically used in Standard Indonesian but not in Papuan Malay; examples are
Indonesian *desa* 'village' and ***mereka*** '3PL' (the corresponding Papuan Malay words
are ***kampung*** 'village' and ***dorang***/***dong*** '3PL', respectively). Given that these words
are inherited Malay lexical items, they are not treated as loan words in this book.