Proceedings of
AFLA 7

The Seventh Meeting of the Austronesian Formal
Linguistics Association

Edited by
Marian Klamer

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Department of Linguistics
2000

Proceedings of AFLA 7

The Seventh Meeting of the
Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association

Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
May 11-13, 2000-07-06

Edited by
Marian Klamer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TO ORDER:

Send a cheque made out to
Vrije Universiteit, Faculteit der Letteren to:
AFLA VII Proceedings
c/o Vrije Universiteit
Secretariaat Faculteit der Letteren
Kamer 10A14
De Boelelaan 1105
1081 HV Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Price per volume: US$ 25 (postage included)
We cannot accept creditcards

Preface

This volume consists of papers presented at the seventh meeting of AFLA (Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association), held at the Vrije Universiteit on May 11-13, 2000.

For the first time in the history of AFLA, this meeting was held outside the North-American continent, and contained contributions by speakers from eleven different countries: New Zealand, Australia, Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam, Taiwan, the USA including Hawaii, Canada, the UK, France, Germany, and The Netherlands.

Apart from the languages that are traditionally well-represented at Austronesian conferences, we were happy to see that the program also contained work on relatively small or lesser described languages, such as the minority languages of Taiwan, North-West Borneo, Eastern Indonesia, Papua and Oceania.

Special themes of this conference were Iconicity and Argument marking. The papers in this volume show that the program covered a broad range of subdisciplines -- from discourse grammar, phonology, morphology, syntax, to semantics -- and that the authors are working within various theoretical frameworks. But despite the obvious differences in expertise, interest and background, the atmosphere on the conference was typically AFLA: lively and constructive, with an average rate of attendance of about 80%. The papers in this volume deserve the same rate of attention.

This meeting has again furthered the unwritten mandate of AFLA to encourage the formal study of Austronesian languages, especially work by speaker linguists and junior scholars. Six scholars presented analyses of their native language, and more than half of the 45 participants subscribed as 'student'. This suggests that the future of Austronesian linguistics looks very bright indeed.

The eight edition of Afla will be held in the spring of 2001 at the Massachussetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Boston, USA. The principal organiser will be Ileana Paul.

Marian Klamer, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Proceedings of previous AFLA meetings:

A Selection of the papers of AFLA 2, in 1995 is published as:
Paul, Ileana, Vivianne Phillips, and Lisa Travis (eds.). 2000. *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.

The proceedings of AFLA 3 and AFLA 4 in 1996/1997 are published as:
Pearson, Mathew (ed.). 1998. *Recent papers in Austronesian Linguistics*. UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics 21.

The proceedings of AFLA 6 in 1999 are published as:
Smallwood, Carolyn and Catherine Kitto (eds.). 2000. *Proceedings of AFLA VI*. Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics.

Table of Contents

AUSTRONESIAN FEATURES IN A LINGUISTIC AREA

Ger P. Reesink, Leiden University

Linguistic areas are, in general, defined by diffused traits shared by languages belonging to more than one, more or less well-defined (genetic) family (see, among many others, Campbell 1998). In the New Guinea area (including adjacent islands) a distinction is made between Austronesian (AN) and Non-Austronesian (NAN) languages. The latter are often referred to as Papuan, without any implication regarding their genetic homogeneity (Foley 1986), but sometimes lists of characteristic featues are given (e.g. Wurm et al. 1975; Foley 1998).

The NAN languages of the Bird's Head peninsula and Halmahera in the Indonesian provinces Papua (Irian Jaya) and Maluku do not show many of the typical Papuan traits (Reesink 1996, 1998). Are they perhaps Austronesian? Framing the question thus would lead us on a search for "platonic essences" which may not be available, when virtually all features are "negotiable and contestable" in an area with centuries-old contacts (Foley 1998:515-16). But, in order "to sort out more clearly the typological vs. genetic affiliations in the large Papuan-Austronesian Sprachbund" (Bradshaw 1998), it would be helpful to determine the origin of the shared features. I will try to determine the essential origin of a few features present in Biak and some other AN languages in the area, which are also found in (some of) what I call West Papuan languages. Notice that for the purpose of this paper I do not focus on the distinction between the AN families CMP and SHWNG, nor do I intend any commitment to the existence of a genetic grouping called West Papuan Phylum. For the time being, it is enough to assume a genetic relationship for what we call Austronesian, based on extensive cognate sets between the languages thus defined, while a possible overall genetic relationship between West Papuan languages remains to be proven. The term Papuan, then, I use rather loosely to refer to the NAN languages of the area.

This paper will discuss the spread of a few basically AN traits, of which two are mainly syntactic: (i) SVO word order; (ii) the N+G order for possessive constructions; (iii) one is morphosyntactic: the Inclusive-Exclusive opposition for first person plural; (iv) one is a morphophonological feature: *Ca(C)*-reduplication to form an Instrument-like noun from a verb (Blust 1998). Conversely, two semantico-syntactic features, which are arguably Non-Austronesian, will be considered: (v) morphological form and syntactic position of the negative, and (vi) the function of two verbal adjuncts, which change the meaning (and sometimes valency) of the main verb.

1. Constituent order

The West Papuan languages have for the most part an SVO order, which is quite unusual for Papuan languages. The only other group with this feature are the Torricelli languages. As Voorhoeve (1994:656) points out, this order is most likely due to the influence of neighboring AN languages. We assume that originally the West Papuan languages all had the 'canonical' Papuan order SOV, because this is still present in the Northeast Halmahera languages. An independent spontaneous switch from SVO to SOV

231

order is not likely, as also Voorhoeve reasoned. Although there are many cases of AN languages that have adopted an SOV order and a distinction between medial and final verbs, such as Takia (Ross 1993), or even a switch-reference mechanism, as is claimed for Dami (Roberts 1997:192), there are no neighboring languages from which North Halmahera languages could have borrowed this order.

On the Bird's Head, the southern Bird's Head languages (claimed to belong to the Trans New Guinea Phylum) maintain the canonical Papuan SOV order, even though these languages exhibit yet another aberrant feature, subject and object prefixes on the verb. This is shared with Marind languages to the east and North Halmahera to the west.

Neither the SOV order, nor the object prefixes are very stable features in the Halmahera languages. The languages on the small islands west of Halmahera and the west coast of the main island have had the most contact with AN speakers for many centuries. This contact has apparently been instrumental in the erosion of object prefixes in Ternate, Tidore and West-Makian, while these languages, plus Sahu on the west coast have adopted the SVO order. Similarly, in the south Bird's Head languages, the SOV order is leaking to an SVO order, as some examples of Inanwatan suggest (De Vries 1996:120-121).

Thus, we assume that West Papuan languages originally had the canonical Papuan SOV order, and that most of these languages have changed their basic order under influence from contact with AN languages. Whether the other languages of the Bird's Head ever had object prefixes is doubtful, but possible, given the attested erosion in some of the North-Hamahera languages.

2. Possessive construction

The so-called 'reversed genitive' has long been discussed as a possible diagnostic for the nature of the languages in the area (Van der Veen 1915:92; Voorhoeve 1994:658; Discussion on the AN-LANG site, May 1998). I am not advocating that G+N order can be used to make any statement about the nature of a language. I do think, though, that in the linguistic area under discussion, the spread of possessive orders says something about language contact and diffusion in one direction or the other. It seems significant that a language like Biak has only postnominal possessors, both for inalienable and alienable possession. The possessive pronouns in Biak are rather complex (see also Van Hasselt 1905), indicating number and gender (animate-inanimate; only for plural) of the possessed, as in (1). Only body-part terms and some kinship terms seem to have remnants of AN possessive suffixes, as in (2). The *b* in 2SG form is phonetic.

(1) *inokən ai-di-ne*　　　　　*fno*　*ai-ja*
　　bag　　1SG-POS-this　　　　si.ch　1SG-POS
　　'my bag'　　　　　　　　　　'my sister's child'

　　inokən ai-su-ine　　　　　*fno*　*ai-e-su(-ya)*
　　bag　　1SG-DU-this　　　　　si.ch　1SG-POS-DU-TOP
　　my two bags　　　　　　　　my two nephews/nieces

　　inokən ai-na-ne　　　　　*fno*　*ai-e-si(-ya)*
　　bag　　1SG-PL-this　　　　　si.ch　1SG-POS-PL-TOP

my bags   my nephews/nieces (my sister's children)

(2) *bru-ri*   *sna-ri*
     head.3SG-ART   mother.3SG-ART
     my/his/her head   my/his/her mother

     bru-m(b)-ri   *sna-m(b)-ri*
     head-2SG-ART   mother-2SG-ART
     your head   your mother

The suffix *ri* on singular body-part and kinship terms (body-parts which always come in pairs do not have *ri*, but *si*, as *mgasi* 'my, his, her eye(s)', *mga-m-si* 'your eye(s)'), which I gloss as article, seems to have some connection with the possessive marker in other AN languages of the area. Waropen distinguishes factual possession and expected possession (Held 1942:46-46; 119-124). The first notion employs *–(r)i*: *ra-i* '1SG-POS', *a-ri* '2SG-POS', *(i)-ri* '3SG-POS', etc., the second is expressed by *–na*: *ra-na* '1SG-POS', *a-na* '2SG-POS', *(i)-na* '3SG-POS', etc., so that a subtle difference can be expressed, as in (3).

(3)a. *Ra-wu   ra-na   bin-o*
      1SG-take   1SG-POS   woman-CLIT.
      I take a wife (the woman still has to become mine)

(3)b *Ra-wu   ra-i-bin-gha*
      1SG-take   1SG-POS-woman-ART
      I took a wife (she has already become my wife) (Held 1942:121)

Just as Waropen, other (genetic) relatives Taba (Bowden 1998:271-282) and Wandamen contrast with Biak in that they have prenominal possessors, although in Wandamen (or Windesi) "[...] sometimes we also find the normal Austronesian order, e.g. *anio Marani-pasiat* 'the house of the Maranis'; *rawa-tawai-pai* 'the snake's skin' (*rawa* = 'skin')" (Cowan 1955:47). This alternative AN order is not given in the Wandamen phrase book (Ramar et al. 1983:27):

(4) *Yohan nie   anio   wai*
     John   his   house   a
     John's house.

Compare this with postnominal clitics on inalienable nouns, and preposed clitics on alienable nouns in Bandanese (Collins & Kaartinen 1998:535) and other CMP languages.
     Now, in the majority of the West Papuan languages the regular order is: possessor prefix on inalienables and pre-nominal possessor + possessive pronoun for alienables. In a language like Maybrat (5) the inalienable pattern is maintained, but the alienable possession is modeled after the post-nominal AN construction (not necessarily implying this comes directly from Biak):

(5) *Tfo   ro-Yan   y-atia*
     machete   POS-Yan   3SG.M-father

Yan's father's knife. (Dol 1999:151)

In Hatam both pre- and post-nominal possessors are possible on alienable nouns, that is, both are attested in unelicited narrative material, (6) and (7). Inalienable possession is always expressed by means of a prefix, as in *di-cig* '1SG-father', *a-cig* '2SG-father', etc.

(6) *Munggwom   ji-de-nya*
    child   2PL-POS-PL
    Your children.

(7) *Nyen-de   andigpoi-nya*
    1PL-POS   old.man-PL
    Our parents.

There are both so-called Papuan, as Hatam, and AN languages, as Mor (Laycock 1978:300), that allow both orders. These facts suggest that G+N is basically a Papuan feature, and that its presence in a language which has an overwhelming AN nature is due to diffusion. Conversely, N+G is basically an AN feature and its presence in a language which is Papuan equally suggests the result of language contact.

3. Inclusive-Exclusive opposition

The inclusive-exclusive opposition for first person plural (and dual) pronouns is a rather stable AN feature. It yields a global cline, showing complete absence in the far west (Europe, Africa) and nearly 100% presence in the far east (Australia). I am not sure which of Nichols' three interpretations (Nichols 1992:278) will turn out to be the correct one: (i) the lack originated in the far west and spread to the east, reached New Guinea but not Australia; (ii) the diversity tree: the Australia-New Guinea discontinuity goes back to second stage: the upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic time of circum-Pacific spread and differentiation; (iii) zero frequency in the far west and 100% frequency in Australia, both result from initial frequencies of 50%. (ii) and (iii) are mutually compatible (p. 279).

The lack of this opposition can be said to be 100% in New Guinea. The only Papuan languages which do employ the distinction are those adjacent to more recently arrived AN languages (about 4.000 BP). Conversely, there are a few AN languages in New Guinea which have discarded the opposition (Ross 1988:131), presumably due to Papuan contact, I think.

It would appear then, that in the area of the Moluccas and New Guinea (specifically the Bird's Head), the I/E opposition is clearly of AN origin and it has dispersed to (West) Papuan languages through contact. All the West Papuan languages have a clear I/E opposition, except the three more centrally located languages in the Bird's Head, Maybrat, Abun and Mpur. Hatam seems to make the distinction in verbal (and inalienable nominal) prefixation: the 3SG prefix is used for exclusive, the 3PL for inclusive, but no opposition is found in the free pronouns. In contrast, adjacent languages Meyah and Sougb, as well as the western languages, such as Moi and Tehit, exhibit the opposition wherever it is feasible, including the very robust dual paradigm.

4. *Ca(C)*- reduplication

In his survey of Ca- reduplication in AN languages, Blust (1998:49) raises the question whether the CaC- template in Taba (Bowden 1998:91-94; 207) and similar facts in South Halmahera language are perhaps products of an independent history, and not related to the proposed Proto-Austronesian pattern of deriving instrumental nouns from verbs. Whatever the outcome of this question, it seems rather safe to claim that Ca(C)- reduplication is a strong diagnostic for Austronesian languages. Blust (1998:50) admits that the semantic function of Ca- reduplication is not always unequivocally instrumental. And Bowden (1998:94) recognizes a 'plurality of action' as a second function in Taba, for forms such as *K-sang-sung um* '1SG-RED-enter house' meaning 'I entered many houses'. Although a thorough analysis of similar forms in Biak is not yet possible, it seems that it behaves somewhat like its relative Taba. A number of CaC-CVC items can be found in Van Hasselt's Numfor dictionary (1947), at least one of which can be interpreted as instrumental, *kankun* 'fireplace' from *kun* 'burn, cook'. Others are not so clear: *bisər* 'to be hungry' and *bas-bisər* 'famine'. Yet others fall more easily in the categpry of 'plurality of action' or agree with the general intensifying function of any reduplication in many languages: *kenəm* 'to live' > *kan-kenəm* 'life', or *i-kan-kun* '3SG-RED-cook' from *kun* 'cook, burn', which my informant translated as 'she is cooking' (*dia sedang masak*). From Lex van der Leeden I have the information that the ubiquitous Bird's Head word for 'clothing' *sansun* (or [səsun], [sasun] etc. depending on the individual language) originate in Ma'ya, the AN language of Salawati, where the verb *sun* means 'to enter' (also present in Biak for *or i-s-i-un* 'sun 3SG-goes in' = 'the sun is going down').

From a Wandamen wordlist (Henning et al. 1991) I have extracted only one possible example, *saso* 'bellows' from *so* 'to blow', which is also found in Waropen (Held's dictionary gives *so* 'blow' and *saso-ri* 'bellows').

A similar pattern is found in other AN languages of the region, like Ambai (Silzer 1983), where not only *a*, but also other vowels, *e* and *i* are used, and Keiese (Geurtjens 1921). The latter does have Ci(C)-, rather than CaC-, for intensification: *sa* 'wrong' > *si-sa* 'very wrong'; *waruk* 'sprinkle' > *wir-waruk* 'squander, waste'. Geurtjens (p. 47) claims that if the stem vowel is *i*, the reduplicated form contains *a* and follows: *wil* 'move' > *wil-wal* 'move all the time'; but this seems rather unlikely.

Biak seems to use another template as well: $C^1C^2 V... > C^1$-a C^2a- $C^2V...$, as in: *frur* 'to make' > *f-ara-rur* 'work' (as verb and as noun); and possibly *f-aya-yer* 'dance' from *fyer* 'dancing of women, similar to the scratching of chickens' (Van Hasselt 1947:84-85; verb used in Luk15:25); *mkak* 'to fear' > *m-aka-kak* 'fear'; *pyar* 'float' > *p-aya-yar* 'anchoring place' (Hasselt 1947:173). Ambai has a variant: *fobera* 'to pull' > *fo-ba-bera* 'to keep pulling'; *mirisin* 'to be happy' > *mi-ra-risin* 'to be very happy' (Silzer 1983:58). These variants are probably due to some interaction with fossilized prefixes.

It seems likely that more focussed research would turn up more instances of Ca(C)-reduplications in the AN languages of the area, some with instrumental meaning, others with general durative intensification of the basic event.

No such reduplication template is present in any of the (West-)Papuan languages, with one possible exception. Tidore (Van Staden 2000) has a similar reduplication in which the vowel is either a copy of the stem vowel or *o* rather than the invariant *a*, noted by Blust. Possibly, Tidore has adopted this feature, as there are many other signs for heavy AN

influence, due to its and Ternate's prolonged exposure to AN speakers, far more than is the case for other North Halmahera languages.

5. Form and position of negative adverb

The canonical place of the negative adverb is pre-predicate, both in SVO AN languages, like Tetun (Van Klinken 1999:228), Leti (Van Engelenhoven 1995:213), and in SOV Papuan languages, where the consequence of negation is often a total or partial reduction of person-number and tense categories of the verbal inflection, as in Sentani (Cowan 1965:22; Hartzler 1994).

The behavior of the negative in the West Papuan languages and the AN languages in this area is quite different. In all these languages the position of the negative adverb is rather strictly clause-final, or at least post-predicate in a language such as Moi, where it may move thrugh the clause, if its scope needs to be narrowed. Even its actual phonemic form is quite wide-spread throughout the area. It is *βa* in Mor (Laycock 1978:300)[1], Wandamen, Biak and *(u)wa* in North Halmahera languages (Van der Veen 1915:98), and *wo(mo)* in one dialect of Waropen, while the Napan dialect has *te* (Held 1942: 80). As just one example, consider the Biak sentence in (8), in which the first word no doubt contains the negative element as well: *βa-pe* 'not-?' = 'but'.

(8) *βape w-ak-βuk neknek mkun oso fa*
    but 2SG-with-give goat young one for

    ya-βuk-i d-ak-marisen kuker maniβoβ ay-e-si βa
    1SG-give-3SG 3SG-with-happy with friend 1SG-POS-PL not
    But you have not given me a young goat that I (could) give it and have fun with my friends.

The West Papuan languages Mansim and related Hatam have a regular sound correspondence word-final *–ar* in Mansim and *–ig* in Hatam, attested in the negative adverbs *bar* and *big*, respectively. None of the other West Papuan languages have this form. West-Bird's Head Moi *dau* might be related through metathesis and additional *d-*, but clearly Maybrat *fe*, Abun *nde*, Mpur *jan*, Meyah *guru*, Sougb *ero* are not. Nor is AN Ambai *kaka* 'not' related; this seems more a reduplicated reflex of PAN **ta*.

It is perhaps significant that Abun has a pre-predicate negative element as well, which is *yo*. It is tempting to relate these two items to the negative adverbs, divided over the two languages of Makian: *nde = te* in the Austronesian Taba and *yo = yo* in Papuan West-Makian (with its endonym Moi). Notice, that just as *βa*, the form *te* is found in both AN and West Papuan languages, the latter presumably a reflex of PAN **ta*.

Which direction the diffusion of the basic form *ba~βa~wa* has taken is not easily determined. My hypothesis is that it is 'originally' West Papuan, and that Biak,

---

[1] Laycock p. 289 mentions that /β/ definitely contrasts with /w/, but that these sounds are often difficult to distinguish; while [b] only seems to occur following a bilabial nasal. Similarly, in Biak β, w, and b seem to contrast but in many contexts they fluctuate, as in the orthography of the Biak NT.

Wandamen, Mor have borrowed the form from Mansim, the original language along the coast around Manokwari, and/or Tidore.

In most Papuan languages the negative occurs in pre-predicate position on the last verb of a sentence. Some Papuan languages have a sentence-final negative with different semantic import from the canonical pre-predicate one. For example, Sentani has, in addition to to the verbal negator which is *ə* or homorganic vowel preceding the verb stem plus postclitic *i* on a verb stem devoid of any tense/person-number suffix, the form *ban* to negate non-verbal material. But this can operate on a clause with a fully inflected final verb, as in (9), which Hartzler (1994:59) characterizes as 'psychological negation': 'but there is just this small thing'. I would interpret this sentence as conveying 'it is not the case that I intend for you to do something for me', parallel to the non-verbal negation of (10), meaning 'It is not a true word'.

(9) *Rabuhi-re*   *mokonsele-re*   *ban*
    something-to you:will:do:for:me-purpose not
    I don't intend for you to do anything for me [but there is just this one small thing...]

(10)*A*   *hele*   *ban*
    word   true   not
    It's not true, untrue word.

Perhaps, the clause-final negatives in Dani (and related languages) may suggest that it is an alternative strategy of Papuan languages. In these languages, the negative does not need to be sentence-finally, but it is always post-predicate, as in:

(11)*At-en* *wam* *waty'*   *lek*
    3s-by pig   hit.Iterative.participle not
    He did not kill a/the pig. (Bromley, p.c.)

(12) *i...*   *nykky'*   *lek*   *lakeikhatek*
    water consuming not   they.normally.go
    They travel without drinking. (Bromley 1981:250)

The strict clause-final position is an innovation of the languages of Maluku and the Bird's Head. Strictly clause-final negative adverbs are typologically highly unusual (Horn 1989:447-462).[2] It cannot easily be traced to either AN or Papuan languages outside this area. It seems safe to say that it is linked closer to Papuan than to Austronesian languages, just as the 'reversed genitive' is due to Papuan influence on the later arrived AN languages.

6. Verbal adjuncts

A rather striking feature of eastern Bird's Head languages is the behavior of two adverbial adjuncts, which intensify the action expressed by the verb and/or increase its valence. The semantic function of these adjuncts is not easily captured. They appear to

---

[2] Payne (1985:226) notes that a few Chadic languages have solely a final negative marker in a similar configuration of S-V-O-Neg.

follow immediately the main verb but in some cases a nominal object may intervene. What is of interest here is the striking similarity, not only in function, but also in some instances in actual form, of two Biak elements. So far, I am not aware of equivalents in other AN languages, and thus, until such evidence shows up, my hypothesis is that Biak has adopted such constructions from the languages of the eastern Bird's Head. Let me first illustrate the adjunct that means something like 'press' or 'hold onto with force', which may express a durative aspect in Hatam (13) and Sougb (14). The actual forms are[3]:

Meyah	*keingg*
Sougb	*deb(-in)*
Hatam	*kep*
Biak	*epən*

(13) *Noni coi kep dimbou dini*
s/he enter keep.onto door this
S/he always enters this door.

(14) *Dan d-eigtou deb*
I 1SG-sit keep.onto
I'm sitting

The meaning of 'press, with force' is possible in conjunction with other verbs in Hatam and Sougb. It is illustrated by Meyah (15) and Biak (16). My informant gave *yaref epen* in (16) as the involuntary analog of the voluntary *y-ores epen* 'I-stand onto' which he explained as 'saya berdiri dan tindis' = 'I trample on'

(15) *Esin keingg anggur efek*
poke onto grape juice
Smash/squeeze grape.

(16) *Y-aref epən mangkoko kapu*
1SG-step onto chicken shit
I stepped in chicken shit

The other adjunct is even more difficult to translate. It is invariably translated by the Malay term *pele*, which means something like 'block, screen, shield off', and which in conjunction with a position verb like 'stand' means 'guard' or 'protect', as Meyah *Ot joug efesa* 's/he guards his/her child'. The forms of this adjunct in the four languages are:

Meyah:	*joug*
Sougb:	*dougwo*
Hatam:	*ser*
Biak:	*user*

---

[3] For further data on Hatam, see Reesink (1999); on Meyah, see Gravelle (1998). Sougb and Meyah are also presented in Reesink (to appear).

The Biak item is given in isolation is given as [usər], but in context it gets reduced to [usər] or [us], the latter form being the one given for Numfor dialect in Van Hasselt (1915:20). In the Biak New Testament it occurs as *si-ya-user kuker wa-ya* 'they followed with the boat' (Yoh.21:8), while *si-yaw* by itself means 'they follow, chase', similar to Meyah *osku mem* 's/he trails a bird' and *osku joug mem* 's/he hunts a bird'.

All of these languages have something like 'sit + adjunct' for 'to protect, guard', with extended meaning 'comforting' the bereaved, as illustrated for Hatam (17) and Biak (18).

(17) *Yoni   i-gwam   ser   ni-ngon   ti*
     they   3PL-sit   'keep.out' 3SG-heart   NOM
     They are comforting him.

(18) *S-kain   us   ena   mar-mar*
     3PL-sit 'protect'   3PL   RED-die
     They sit down with the corpse.

The same adjunct with the verb 'to see' conveys some 'scrutiny', as Biak (19), Hatam (20) and Sougb (21) show.

(19) *Ya-mam   us   ro   nannane   resari*
     1SG-see 'protect' REL   things   first
     I will study these things first.

(20) *Dani   di-ngat   ser   srad*
     I   1SG-see 'block.off'   letter
     I check the letter.

(21) *Dan d-ed-eiya   dougwo   ind-an   srat*
     I   1SG-go-see   'block.off' 1SG-POS   letter
     I go check my letters

For Abun Berry and Berry (1999:26-28) described a very similar function for the grammaticalized variant of the benefactive marker *wa*. Compare (22) with the Hatam and Biak examples for the action of joining bereaved people in their sorrow, presumably by sitting with them in order to block off evil influences. Meyah lacks this possiblitiy for *joug* (Gravelle, p.c.)

(22) *Noru   ne   ye   ke-wa   Lamber   nombrok*
     night   DET   3INDEF   sit-TRS   Lamber   morning
     That night they guarded Lamber's (body until) the morning.

My preliminary conclusion is that Biak has adopted a basically eastern Bird's Head template for two adverbs which seem to have been grammaticalized to increase the valence and/or affect of a verb. In turn, the north-western Bird's Head language Abun may have calqued this construction from Biak visitors along the north coast.

7. Conclusion

A great number of sources give evidence that there have been extensive interlinguistic contacts in the area of Maluku and Papua for many centuries, at least since the arrival of the Europeans in the 16th century, but most likely these contacts (and migrations) had existed a long time before that date.

It seems likely that some of the speakers of (West) Papuan languages had moved from the Bird's Head westward, to Halmahera (Voorhoeve 1984; Wurm et al. 1975). Some 3500 years BP Austronesians arrived in the area, some of them directly to Maluku and dispersed there (the CMP languages), others to Halmahera and in and around the Cenderawasih Bay (SHWNG group), from which a further group split off to become the ancestors of the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian languages (Ross 1995:85). It is not clear whether the AN speakers moved from Halmahera to the islands around the Bird's Head or vice versa.

Given the distribution of the AN traits in the West Papuan languages, one might entertain the hypothesis that these languages are relexified AN languages. This possibility is ruled out, I believe, because it cannot explain the clearly abundant AN vocabulary in all the AN languages of the area (pronoun sets, with reflexes of PAN Inclusive and Exclusive pronouns, number systems, basic vocabulary, reflexes of PAN derivational prefixes *pang- and *mang- for actives/causatives and intrasitives/processes) and its absence in the West Papuan languages.

In fact, the wildly divergent vocabularies of the West Papuan languages do not allow a fruitful investigation into their mutual genetic relationship, except for some local groups, like the Western Bird's Head languages Moi, Tehit, Moraid and Seget, and the two groups in the eastern Bird's Head: Mansim and Hatam are clear relatives and so are Meyah, Moskona and Sougb. But to what extent these groups are related to each other and to the 'isolates' Abun, Maybrat and Mpur remains dubious. Indeed, the pronoun sets of the West Papuan languages do suggest an ancient relation but one would like to have some further evidence. More than a few tentative cognates have not as yet been identified.

In the present paper I have tried to identify at least some features which may be related to one or the other group. The main difficulty in this discussion is that the term AN can be used to refer to a genetic group, whereas the term (West) Papuan for the moment lacks such denotation. The SVO order can be ascribed to AN influence on the West Papuan languages, whereas the word orders of the possessive constructions in the various languages point to a mutual influence.

The so-called 'reversed' Genitive-Noun, as present in AN Taba, Wandamen, and the local variants of Malay can be traced to Papuan languages, while the AN order N+G is present as an alternative in some of the NAN languages of the Bird's Head, presumably motivated by other AN languages such as Biak.

The I/E opposition has infiltrated all the West Papuan languages, with the exception of three (or four) languages located in the center of the Bird's Head, from west to east: Abun, Maybrat, Mpur, and (marginally) Hatam.

Quite a different fate befell the AN reduplication strategy of Ca(C)- deriving instrument-like nouns or indicating some durative aspect. It has not really been able to affect the West Papuan languages. Perhaps the very restricted spread of this AN trait (only Tidore, possibly Ternate?) as opposed to the wide-spread diffusion of the I/E opposition and the syntactic orders of SVO and N+G is due to (i) a sociological factor, such as degree and time of contact, and (ii) a psychological factor such as extent to which a certain trait is

part of the *Innere Form* of a language: the more deeply embedded morphological features are less easily borrowed.

The other two features discussed suggest that the AN languages have undergone Papuan influences. The final negative, most likely of Papuan origin, is attested throughout the area, while the typical function of two verbal adjuncts seems to be more local: originating in the eastern Bird's Head languages and spread to Biak (of course, the absence of evidence for this feature in other AN languages is not evidence of absence – it may well turn up in other AN languages as well; as it seems to have found its way into Abun and Maybrat, possibly via Biak).

The mixing of linguistic features can be ascribed to centuries-old intermingling of people. The longstanding supremacy of the Sultanates of Ternate and Tidore, consisting of West Papuan speakers, with their AN speaking vasals of the Raja Empat islands and Biak, was instrumental in the movements of people from around the Bird's Head to other areas. The intruders had all kinds of trading contacts along the coasts of the Bird's Head. Within the Bird's Head many people changed locations, either through intermarriage or because they were traded as slaves. These migrants brought along their own morphosyntactic configurations, which easily spread through the region. At the same time, each linguistic community held a strong sense of identity, expressed in a great diversity of vocabularies.

In this paper I have presented some global indications of some traits, meant as a start for further detailed comparison of many other features, such as the pronominal and spatial deictic systems, the expression of TAM categories, and other bound-like morphological material. Together with an inventory of the possible cognate sets, however small they may turn out for the West Papuan languages, such a comparison might lead us to answers to the remaining questions.

Whether the West Papuan languages indeed form another family of languages, apart from the proposed Trans New Guinea Family, see Campbell (1998:166) for the suggestion to avoid terms other than Family, remains a matter of further research. That is, there are two questions: To what extent form the West Papuan languages a coherent (genetic) group? And secondly, is such a group ultimately related to the TNG Family? And, notwithstanding my earlier dismissal of the hypothesis that (some) West Papuan could be relexified AN languages, it should not be completely ruled out.

References

Berry, Keith & Christine. 1999. *A Description of Abun, a West Papuan language of Irian Jaya. Pacific Linguistics* B-115.

Bowden, John. 1998. *Taba (Makian Dalam), Description of an Austronesian language from Eastern Indonesia.* Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

Bradshaw, Joel, 1998. AN-NAN typological mixing bowl. Website discussion group "AUSTRONESIAN LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS" 20-May-1998.

Blust, Robert, 1998. Ca- reduplication and proto-Austronesian grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37.1:29-64.

Bowden, John, 1998. *Taba (Makian Dalam), Description of an Austronesian language from Eastern Indonesia.* Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

Campbell, Lyle. 1998. *Historical Linguistics.* Edinburgh University Press.

Collins, James T. & Timo Kaartinen. 1998. Preliminary Notes on Bandanese, Language Maintenance and Change in Kei. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 154-4:521-570.

Cowan, H.J.K. 1955-1956. Notes on Windesi grammar. *Oceania* Vol. XXVI:42-58.
1965. *Grammar of the Sentani language.* 's Gravehage: Martinus Nijhoff. [Verhandelingen van het KITLV, Deel 47.]

Dol, Philomena. 1999. *A grammar of Maybrat.* PhD dissertation. Leiden University.

Engelenhoven, Aone van. 1995. *A description of the Leti language.* PhD dissertation. Leiden University.

Foley, William A.1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea.* Cambridge: University Press.
1998. Towards understanding Papuan languages. In: Miedema, Odé, and Dam (eds.) *Perspectives on the Bird's Head of Irian Jaya, Indonesia:*503-518. Amsterdam, Editions Rodopi.

Gravelle, Gilles. 1998. Syntactic constructions and the Meyah lexicon. In: Miedema, Odé, and Dam (eds.) *Perspectives on the Bird's Head of Irian Jaya, Indonesia:*555-573. Amsterdam, Editions Rodopi.

Hartzler, Margaret. 1994. Sentani. In: Peter Kahrel & René van den Berg (eds.) *Typological studies in Negation:* 51-64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hasselt, F.J.F. 1905. van. *Spraakkunst der Nufoorsche Taal.* Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff.

Hasselt, J.L & F.J.F. van. 1947. *Noemfoersch woordenboek.* Amsterdam: J.H. de Bussy.

Held, G. J. 1942. *Grammatica van het Waropensch.* [Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, deel LXXVII, Eerste stuk.]

Henning, Jean C. et al. 1991. *Sane pai ve pir kavavo nana kavo Wodama.* (Wandamen Vocabulary). Irian Jaya: Universitas Cenderawasih & Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Horn, Laurence R. 1987. *A Natural History of Negation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Klinken, Catharina Lumien van. 1999. *A grammar of the Fehan dialect of Tetun, an Austronesain language of West Timor. Pacific Linguistics* C-155.

Laycock, Don. 1978. A little Mor. In: Wurm & Carrington (eds.) *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings, Fascicle I:*285-316. *Pacific Linguistics* C-61.

Nichols, Johanna (1992) *Linguistic Diversity in space and time.* University of Chicago Press.

Payne, John R. 1985. Negation. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and syntactic description I, Clause structure:*197-242. Cambridge: University Press.

Ramar, Origenes et al. 1983. *Vekavavo nana kavo Wondama* (Wandamen conversations). Irian Jaya: Universitas Cenderawasih.

Reesink, Ger P.1996. Morpho-syntactic features of the Bird's Head languages. In: Reesink (ed.) *Studies in Irian languages. NUSA* Vol.40:1-20.
1998. The Bird's Head as Sprachbund. In: Miedema, Odé and Dam (eds.) *Perspectives on the Bird's Head of Irian Jaya, Indonesia:*603-642. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi.
1999. *A grammar of Hatam. Pacific Linguistics* C-146.
to appear. *Languages of the Eastern Bird's Head.*

Roberts, John. 1997. Switch-reference in Papua New Guinea: a preliminary survey. In: Franklin (ed.) *Papers in Papuan Linguistics No.* 3:101-241. *Pacific Linguistics* A-87.

Ross, Malcolm D. 1994. Describing interclausal relations in Takia. In: Reesink (ed.)
 Topics in Descriptive Austronesian Linguistics: 40-85. *Semaian* 11. Leiden: DASCUL.
 1995. Some current issues in Austronesian linguistics. In: Tryon, D.T. (ed.)
 Comparative Austronesian dictionary, Fascicle I:45-120. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Staden, Miriam van. 2000. *Tidore: A Grammatical Description of a Language of the North
 Moluccas.* PhD dissertation. Leiden University.
Veen, H. van der. (1915) *De Noord-Halmahera'se taalgroep tegenover de Austronesiese
 talen.* Leiden: Van Nifterik.
Voorhoeve, C.L.(1994) Contact-induced change in the non-Austronesian languages in the
 north Moluccas, Indonesia. In: Dutton & Tryon (eds.) *Language Contact and Change in
 the Austronesian world*:649-674. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
 1984. Comparative linguistics and the West Papuan Phylum. In: E.K.M. Masinambow
 (ed.) *Maluku & Irian Jaya.* [Buletin LEKNAS, Vol. III, No. 1, 1984; published 1994]
 Jakarta: Lembaga Ekonomi dan Kemasyarakatan Nasional, Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan
 Indonesia.
Vries, Lourens de. 1996. Notes on the morphology of the Inanwatan language. In: Reesink
 (ed.) *Studies in Irian languages, Part I*:97-127. *NUSA* Volume 40.
Wurm, S.A, Laycock, D.C., Voorhoeve, C.L., Dutton, T.E. 1975. Papuan linguistic
 prehistory, and past language migrations in the New Guinea area. In: Wurm, S.A. (ed.)
 Papuan languages and the New Guinea linguistic scene: 935-960. *Pacific Linguistics*
 C-38.