

PAPUAN MALAY – A LANGUAGE OF THE AUSTRONESIAN- PAPUAN CONTACT ZONE

Angela Kluge
SIL International
angela_kluge@sil.org

Abstract

This paper describes the contact features that Papuan Malay, an eastern Malay variety, situated in East Nusantara, the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone, displays under the influence of Papuan languages. This selection of features builds on previous studies that describe the different contact phenomena between Austronesian and non-Austronesian languages in East Nusantara. Four typical western Austronesian features that Papuan Malay is lacking or making only limited use of are examined in more detail: (1) the lack of a morphologically marked passive voice, (2) the lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns, (3) the limited use of affixation, and (4) the limited use of the numeral-noun order. Also described in more detail are six typical Papuan features that have diffused to Papuan Malay: (1) the genitive-noun order rather than the noun-genitive order to express adnominal possession, (2) serial verb constructions, (3) clause chaining, and (4) tail-head linkage, as well as (5) the limited use of clause-final conjunctions, and (6) the optional use of the alienability distinction in nouns. This paper also briefly discusses whether the investigated features are also present in other eastern Malay varieties such as Ambon Malay, Maluku Malay and Manado Malay, and whether they are inherited from Proto-Austronesian, and more specifically from Proto-Malayic. By highlighting the unique features of Papuan Malay vis-à-vis the other East Nusantara Austronesian languages and placing the regional “adaptations” of Papuan Malay in a broader diachronic perspective, this paper also informs future research on Papuan Malay.

Keywords: Papuan Malay, areal linguistics, Proto-Malayic, Proto-Austronesian

ISO 639-3 codes: abs, bhw, bpq, btj, goq, kew, kvo, lrt, lti, max, mkn, mky, pmy, slp, tbc, tet, wgo, xbr, xmn, xmt

1 Introduction¹

Papuan Malay [pmy], an eastern Malay variety, is a Malayic language of East Nusantara, the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone that comprises the islands of eastern Indonesia and East Timor. Like other Austronesian languages of this zone, Papuan Malay is lacking some of the features typical for western Austronesian languages,² while it has a number of features typically found in Papuan languages. These contact phenomena are the focus of the present contribution.

As a Malayic language, Papuan Malay belongs to the Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian family. Its classification within this branch is problematic, however. Blust (2013:32) groups Papuan Malay, together with the other Malay varieties, within Malayo-Chamic which is one of five subgroups within Western-Malayo-Polynesian (2013:32; see also Blust 1994:31). Adelaar (2005a), by contrast, suggests that

¹ The author would like to thank René van den Berg of SIL International for his helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

² Himmelmann (2005:111) employs the term “western Austronesian” as a “rather loose geographical expression”; it is “strictly equivalent to *non-Oceanic Austronesian languages*”.

Malayic is part of a larger collection of languages, namely Malayo-Sumbawan, a grouping, however, that Blust (2010:80–81) rejects.³ The language is spoken in coastal West Papua.⁴ Characterized by complex linguistic and sociolinguistic settings, this western part of the Island of New Guinea is the home of about 270 languages (Eberhard et al. 2020). Most of these languages are non-Austronesian, or Papuan (ca. 80%);⁵ the remaining languages are Austronesian (ca. 20%). Many of these languages are threatened and, in coastal West Papua, shifting to Papuan Malay. Here, Papuan Malay is the language of wider communication and the first or second language for ever-increasing numbers of people (1,100,000 to 1,200,000 speakers⁶). Major areas with substantial concentrations of Papuan Malay speakers are the coastal urban areas (Scott et al. 2008:10). (See Figure 1.)

Papuan Malay displays a number of contact features that studies on areal diffusion have also shown for other languages of the area east of Sulawesi, Sumba, and Flores, all the way to the Bird's Head of New Guinea. In this area, 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) define⁷

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.

According to this definition, only the western part of West Papua belongs to East Nusantara, namely the Bird's Head. As Klamer and Ewing (2010:1) point out, however, 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”. Therefore, it seems useful to include West Papua's north coast – with its urban, Papuan Malay speaking communities of Jayapura and Sarmi – also as part of East Nusantara (see Figure 1).

Almost all of the Austronesian languages spoken in East Nusantara – as defined by Klamer and Ewing (2010:1) – belong to the Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian (CEMP) branch. Within this branch, they belong either to the Central Malayo-Polynesian (CMP) group or, within the Eastern Malayo-Polynesian (EMP) branch, to the Greater South Halmahera-West New Guinea (SHWNG) group. The remaining non-CEMP languages spoken in East Nusantara are, together with Papuan Malay, all Malayic languages: Gorap [goq] (North Maluku province),⁸ and the following eastern Malay varieties: Ambonese Malay [abs] (Maluku province), Bacanese Malay [btj] (North Maluku province), Banda Malay [bpq] (Maluku province), Kupang Malay [mkn] (East Nusa Tenggara province), Larantuka Malay [lrt] (East Nusa Tenggara province), and North Moluccan Malay [max] (North Maluku province); another eastern Malay variety spoken in the larger region is Manado Malay [xmn] (Gorontalo and North Sulawesi provinces). Extending the geographic delimitations of the East Nusantara region to include West Papua's north coast, the Oceanic languages spoken east of the Mamberamo River also become part of the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone. (See Eberhard et al. 2020.)

³ The exact classification of Papuan Malay is difficult for two reasons. First, there is a debate in the literature concerning the internal classification of the Malayo-Polynesian subgroup, as well as concerning the classification of the Malayic languages within Western-Malayo-Polynesian. Secondly, there is disagreement among scholars regarding the status of the eastern Malay varieties, including Papuan Malay, as to whether they are non-creole descendants of Low Malay or Malay-based creoles. For a more detailed review of the literature, see Kluge (2017:2–8).

⁴ Despite its sheer geographical extent, Papuan Malay is a structurally coherent unit. Regional variations are minor and the observed differences support at most dialectal divisions, such as a possible East-West divide (Scott et al. 2008).

⁵ 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).

⁶ This conservative population estimate is based on Kluge's (2017:37) assessment.

⁷ According to Klamer et al. (2008:95), South Sulawesi also belongs to East Nusantara.

⁸ With the Malayic group, Gorap remains unclassified.

Figure 1: West Papua with its provinces Papua and Papua Barat

The following sections describe in more detail a selection of contact features that Papuan Malay displays under the influence of Papuan languages.⁹ After presenting in §2 an overview of the typological profile of Papuan Malay, §3 explores a number of features that are typical of western Austronesian languages, but that Papuan Malay is lacking or making only limited use of: the lack of a morphologically marked passive voice, the lack of the inclusive/exclusive distinction in personal pronouns, the limited use of affixation, and the limited use of the numeral-noun order; the lack of the noun-genitive order to express adnominal possession is discussed in §4.1 ‘Genitive-noun order’. In §4, a selection of features is discussed that Papuan Malay shares with Papuan languages but that are untypical of western Austronesian languages in general: the genitive-noun order, serial verb constructions, clause chaining, tail-head linkage, clause-final conjunctions, and the alienability distinction in nouns; the lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns is discussed in §3.1. For each of the investigated features the respective sections briefly discuss whether this feature is also present in other eastern Malay varieties, and whether it is inherited from Proto-Austronesian, and more specifically from Proto-Malayic.¹⁰

The selection of features discussed in this contribution builds on previous studies describing the different contact phenomena that the Austronesian languages of East Nusantara display under the influence of Papuan languages (see Klamer et al. 2008; Klamer and Ewing 2010; see also Aikhenvald and Stebbins 2007; Blust 2013; Donohue 2007:352–353; Foley 1986, 2000; Klamer 2002; Himmelmann 2005; Pawley 2005; de Vries 2005). Whether and to what extent other pertinent features of Papuan Malay (see Kluge 2017) also constitute contact phenomena is a question that is not addressed here but left for future research.

2 Typological profile

Papuan Malay has 18 consonant (/p, b, t, d, k, g, tʃ, dʒ, s, h, m, n, ɲ, r, l, j, w/) and five vowel phonemes (/i, e, u, ə, a/), plus two adopted loan segments (/f/ and /ʃ/). The language has a preference for disyllabic roots and for CV and CVC syllables, with CCVC as the maximal syllable. Stress typically falls on the penultimate

⁹ This discussion is based on a 16-hour corpus of narratives and spontaneous conversations between Papuan Malay speakers. The texts were recorded in the Sarmi area from a sample of about 60 different Papuan Malay speakers. Sarmi is located about 300 km west of Jayapura; both towns are located on the north-east coast of West Papua. The entire corpus, including the recordings and transcriptions in Toolbox, are archived with SIL International. Due to privacy considerations, however, they are not publicly available. In addition, an extended word list was recorded; the sound files and the Toolbox database file are found in Kluge et al. (2014). (For more details concerning the corpus see Kluge 2017:52–63).

¹⁰ (Initial) grammar descriptions are available for Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1991), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005), and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983; Litamahuputty 2012). No descriptions are available for Bacanese Malay and Gorap.

syllable.¹¹ (See Kluge 2017:65–118 for a detailed discussion on the Papuan Malay phoneme inventory, phonotactics, and its non-native segments.)

In terms of its morphology, Papuan Malay is near the isolating end of the analytic-synthetic continuum. Having very little productive morphology and lacking inflectional morphology, words are typically single root morphemes and nouns and verbs are not marked for any grammatical category. Word formation is limited to the two derivational processes of reduplication and affixation. The former process is very productive, while the latter has only very limited productivity. As for compounding, its degree of productivity remains unclear given the lack of a clear demarcation between compounds and phrasal expressions. (See Kluge 2016 and Kluge 2017:119–216 for a detailed examination of the productivity of morphological patterns in Papuan Malay.)

The open word classes are nouns, verbs, and adverbs, the major closed word classes are personal pronouns, demonstratives, locatives, interrogatives, numerals, quantifiers, prepositions, and conjunctions. Given the limited productivity of derivational patterns and the lack of inflectional morphology, the distinguishing criteria for the different parts of speech are their syntactic properties. A number of categories display membership overlap, however, most of which involves verbs, including the overlap between verbs and nouns.

The basic word order is SVO; arguments are quite commonly omitted, however, if the identity of their referent was established earlier. This VO word order correlates with a number of cross-linguistically predicted word order characteristics (Dryer 2007:130): Papuan Malay has prepositions; in verbal clauses, the verb precedes the prepositional phrase and the auxiliary verb precedes the main verb; in comparison clauses, the mark precedes the standard; in complementizer clauses, the complementizer precedes the complementizer clause; and in noun phrases, the head nominal precedes the relative clause.

Two other pertinent word order features are the position of the question marker in polar interrogative clauses and the position of the negators in negative clauses (Kluge 2017:519–529). The question marker occurs in clause-final position, as is typical for the languages of New Guinea (Dryer 2013c). Cross-linguistically, however, SVO languages display no correlation between the position of the question marker and the order of object and verb. Instead, “they exhibit a pattern intermediate between OV languages and verb-initial languages” in that “SVO languages with initial question particles and SVO languages with final question particles are both common” (Dryer 2013c:93). Clause-final question markers are not included in Klammer and Ewing’s (2010:9–11) list of features characterizing the East Nusantara Austronesian languages. The authors point out, however, that a number of East Nusantara languages display a preference for clause-final marking, “including ... questions” (2010:18). In negative clauses, the two 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; in addition, *bukang* ‘NEG’ marks contrastive negation. This negator-predicate order is typical for the western Austronesian languages (Himmelman 2005:141). Cross-linguistically, however, “the order of negative particle and verb exhibits no correlation with the order of object and verb” (Dryer 2013b; see also Dryer 1992b:97–98, 2007:130).

Furthermore, of Dryer’s (2007:130) predicted word order correlations six do not apply to Papuan Malay. The order of verb and manner adverb, of copula and predicate, and of article or plural word and noun are not applicable, given that Papuan Malay does not have manner adverbs, a copula, an article, and a plural word. The predicted order of main and subordinate clause and the position of adverbial subordinators do not apply either, given that Papuan Malay does not make a morphosyntactic distinction between main and subordinate clause in combining clauses (Kluge 2017:537–540).

Finally, in one aspect the Papuan Malay word order differs from the predicted order for VO languages. In adnominal possessive constructions, the possessor precedes rather than follows the possessum, both being linked with a possessive marker (Kluge 2017:422–423, 425–444). This reversed order is a typical trait of

¹¹ Kluge’s (2017:96–98) claim that Papuan Malay exhibits word stress is based on auditory impressions rather than a comprehensive acoustic analysis. The findings of Riesberg et al.’s (2018) and Riesberg et al.’s (2020) perception experiments on the prosody of Papuan Malay suggest, however, that Papuan Malay does not make use of pitch accent. By contrast, Kaland’s (2019) and Kaland’s (2020) comprehensive acoustic analyses of spontaneous Papuan Malay narratives provide “consistent evidence for the production of word stress in Papuan Malay” (Kaland 2019:55); “it is non-phonemic and regularly located on the penultimate syllable” (2019:72; see also Kaland 2018; Kaland et al. 2019; Kaland and van Heuven 2020).

Papuan languages and one of the features “found in many of the Austronesian languages of East Nusantara” (Klamer and Ewing 2010:10) (for more details see §4.1).

3 Non-western Austronesian characteristics of Papuan Malay

This section explores the non-Austronesian character of Papuan Malay. A selection of features is explored that are commonly found in the western Austronesian languages, including western Malay languages, but that – due to diffusion from Papuan languages – are “not found in many of the Austronesian languages of East Nusantara (Klamer and Ewing 2010:10) and that are also missing in Papuan Malay. The selection of 18 such features, presented in Table 1, is based on Klamer et al.’s (2008:113) and Klamer and Ewing’s (2010:9–10) lists of features characterizing the East Nusantara Austronesian languages (see also Blust 2013:78, 92, 223–228, 270, 355–360; Donohue 2007:352–353; Himmelman 2005:115–126, 141–151, 163–175; Klamer 2002).

Table 1: Pertinent features of Papuan Malay and East Nusantara Austronesian languages vis-à-vis western Austronesian languages¹²

Grammatical features	WAN	ENAN	PM
Phonology			
Phonemic l/r distinction	yes	yes	yes
Preference for CVCV roots	yes	yes	yes
Prenasalized consonants	yes	yes	no
Metathesis	sporadic	yes	no
Morphology			
Reduplication	yes	yes	yes
Alienability distinction in nouns	no	yes	no
Productive affixation	yes	lmtd.	lmtd.
Left-headed compounds	yes	yes	lmtd.
Clusivity distinction in personal pronouns	yes	yes	no
Morphologically marked passive voice	yes	no	no
Agent/subject indexed on verb	sporadic	yes	no
Syntax			
Verb-object order	yes	yes	yes
Prepositions	yes	yes	yes
Clause-initial/prepredicate complementizers	yes	yes	yes
Clause-initial/prepredicate negators	yes	no	yes
Numeral-noun order	yes	no	lmtd.
Noun-genitive order	yes	no	no
Formally marked adverbial/complement clauses	yes	no	no

Papuan Malay shares eight of the western Austronesian features listed in Table 1. The language makes a phonemic l/r distinction, has a preference for CVCV roots, makes extensive use of reduplication, and makes no morphological distinction between alienable and inalienable nouns. Papuan Malay has a basic verb-object order, is prepositional, has a clause-initial complementizer and clause-initial or prepredicate negators. Another three typical western Austronesian traits are only marginally present in Papuan Malay, namely affixation, left-headed compounding, and the numeral-noun order. The remaining seven western Austronesian features are not found in Papuan Malay. Papuan Malay does not make a distinction between inclusive and exclusive personal pronouns, and, given its lack of inflectional morphology, has no morphologically marked passive voice and does not index the subject on the verb. Furthermore, Papuan Malay does not have a noun-genitive order to signal adnominal possession and does not formally mark adverbial and complement clauses. (See §2; see also Kluge 2017:21–26.)

The following sections discuss in more detail four features which Papuan Malay does not share with western Austronesian languages: the lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns (§3.1), the lack of a morphologically marked passive voice (§3.2), the limited use affixation (§3.3), and the limited use of the

¹² Abbreviations: WAN = western Austronesian, ENAN = East Nusantara Austronesian, PM = Papuan Malay, lmtd. = limited.

numeral-noun order (§3.4).¹³ (The lack of the noun-genitive order to express adnominal possession is discussed in §4.1 ‘Genitive-noun order’.)

3.1 Lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns

Papuan Malay does not make an inclusive/exclusive distinction in its pronominal paradigm (Kluge 2017:278–279). That is, in Papuan Malay, the long and short first-person plural personal pronoun forms are used regardless of the issue of clusivity, as demonstrated in (1) to (4). Long *kitong* ‘1PL’ and short *tong* ‘1PL’ receive an inclusive reading in (1) and (3), respectively. By contrast, long *kitong* ‘1PL’ and short *tong* ‘1PL’ receive an exclusive reading in (2) and (4), respectively. The same lack of the clusivity distinction applies to the long first-person plural personal pronoun form *kitorang* ‘1PL’ and short *torang* ‘1PL’.

Lack of a clusivity distinction in personal pronouns

- (1) *kalo ko alpa, kitong tra jalang*
 if 2SG be.absent 1PL NEG walk
 [Addressing her son about an upcoming trip:] ‘if you play hooky, **we (INCL)** won’t go’
 [080917-003a-CvEx.0038]
- (2) *ya sodara ko bawa daging, kitong trima-kasi*
 yes sibling 2SG bring meat 1PL thank.you
 [Addressing a cousin:] ‘yes, brother, you brought meat, **we (EXCL)** (say) thank you’
 [080919-003-NP.0022]
- (3) *tong tra ke kampung*
 1PL NEG to village
 [Talking to her son:] ‘**we (INCL)** do not (go) to the village’ [080917-003a-CvEx.0048]
- (4) *dong bilang, yo tong taw ko pu sodara*
 3PL say yes 1PL know 2SG POSS sibling
 ‘they said (to her), ‘yes, **we (EXCL)** know (that he is) your relative’ [080918-001-CvNP.0040]

This lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns is a typical trait of the eastern Malay varieties that Papuan Malay shares with Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997:69), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009:166), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009:166; Steinhauer 1991:194), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005:30), and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983:19; Litamahuputty 2012:142). Kupang Malay is the only eastern Malay variety that makes a limited inclusive/exclusive distinction (Paauw 2009:166; Steinhauer 1983:50).¹⁴ (See also Donohue and Smith 1998.) This lack of the clusivity contrast is a feature that Papuan Malay also shares with Papuan languages (Foley 1986:12).

Within the Austronesian language family, however, the clusivity distinction is a nearly universal feature, found in almost all languages, including those of East Nusantara (Himmelman 2005:149; Klamer and Ewing 2010:10; Klamer et al. 2008:113–115; Tryon 1995:34). The clusivity distinction was also reconstructed for the Proto Austronesian and Proto Malayo-Polynesian personal pronouns (Blust 2013:314–315), as well as for the Proto Malayic pronouns (Adelaar 1992:122, 201).

¹³ Compounding in Papuan Malay is not further discussed as the demarcation between compounds and phrasal expressions is unclear. Hence, it remains uncertain to what degree compounding is a productive process. (For details see Kluge 2017:178–183.)

¹⁴ In Kupang Malay, the exclusive pronoun is “used with exclusive reference”, whereas the inclusive form is “used indiscriminately with exclusive and inclusive reference” (Steinhauer 1983:50).

3.2 Lack of a morphologically marked passive voice

Papuan Malay has no morphologically marked passive voice (Kluge 2017:22). Instead, Papuan Malay employs periphrastic constructions or topicalization to create non-agent focus sentences which provide the possibility of a passive interpretation.

Periphrastic passive constructions are formed with the regular bivalent verbs *dapat* ‘get’ and *kena* ‘hit’, as shown in (5) to (10). In these constructions, the subject is the undergoer, namely the adversely affected undergoer, of an event or state.

Constructions with *dapat* ‘get’ show the inception of events that adversely affect the subject, highlighting the unpleasant experiences that the subject undergo. Bivalent *dapat* ‘get’ occurs in serial verb constructions. It precedes verbs that either convey events that involve unpleasant experiences for the undergoer, as in (5) and (7), or verbs that denote violent acts, as in (6). The agent or source of these events or acts may be overtly mentioned in an oblique phrase headed by *dari* ‘from’, as in (5). Most commonly, however, the agent or source is not mentioned, as in (6) and (7). Most often the agent or source is animate, as in (5) and (6); less commonly it is inanimate, as in (7). (Serial verb constructions are discussed in more detail in §4.2.)

Periphrastic passive constructions with *dapat* ‘get’

- (5) ... *itu sala, sa dapat mara dari kaka dorang*
 D.DIST be.wrong 1SG get feel.angry(.about) from older.sibling 3PL
 ‘(... that was not allowed,) that was wrong, I **got scolded** by (my) older sibling and the others’ [081006-024-CvEx.0088]
- (6) *ko tida kerja, ko tida makang, ko menangis baru dapat hajar*
 2SG NEG work 2SG NEG eat 2SG cry and.then get beat.up
 (if) you don’t work, you don’t eat, (if) you cry, then (you’ll) **get beaten up**’ [081115-001b-Cv.0058]
- (7) ... *de bilang, kitong dua jalang suda, mata-hari suda masuk,*
 3SG say 1PL two walk already sun already enter
nanti kitong dua dapat gelap, jalang cepat suda
 very.soon 1PL two get be.dark walk be.fast already
 [A couple walking home to their village:] ‘(on the way I rested,) he (my husband) said, ‘let the two of us walk (on)!, the sun is already going down, in a short while, we’ll **be caught by the dark**, let’s walk fast!’ [081015-005-NP.0036]

Constructions with *kena* ‘hit’ emphasize the inception of states that adversely affect the subject, highlighting the source of the unpleasant states that the subject is confronted with. Bivalent *kena* ‘hit’ occurs in transitive clauses in which the source of these states is the object of *kena* ‘hit’. Most often, this source is inanimate, as in (8) and (9); less commonly it is nonhuman animate, as in (10).

Periphrastic passive constructions with *kena* ‘hit’

- (8) *kasiang, de kena prut sakit langsung meninggal*
 pity 3SG hit stomach be.sick immediately die
 ‘poor thing, he was **hit (by) a sick stomach** (and) died immediately’ [081006-015-Cv.0023]
- (9) *itu kena air langsung de lapuk*
 D.DIST hit water immediately 3SG decompose
 [Conversation about the wood of the casuarina tree:] ‘(when) that is **exposed to water**, it decomposes immediately’ (Lit. ‘(when) that is **hit (by) water**’) [081006-033-Cv.0108]
- (10) *e, de tra bawa kaing, de kena ro apa*
 hey! 3SG NEG bring cloth 3SG hit spirit what
 [About sleeping conditions during a youth retreat:] ‘hey, she didn’t bring a cloth, she was **hit (by) which spirit?**’ [081025-006-Cv.0051]

Another strategy to create passive-like constructions is by topicalization with the undergoer object being fronted to the clause-initial position. The structure corresponding to an agentless passive is formed by eliding the subject agent, as in (11) to (13).¹⁵ These examples also illustrate that, unlike in the periphrastic passive constructions formed with *dapat* ‘get’ and *kena* ‘hit’, the undergoer is not adversely affected by the event or state denoted by the verb. Instead, the connotation of the entire construction is rather neutral.

Passive-like constructions via topicalization

- (11) *jadi saya ada di sini dengang bapa, saya punya ana itu*
 so 1SG exist at L.PROX with father 1SG POSS child D.DIST
 Ø *suda ambil suda bayar*
 already fetch already pay
 [About the exchange of bride-price children:] ‘so, I’m here with father, **my child here has already been taken** (away), (we) already paid’ (Lit. ‘that child of mine, (they) already took (it away)’) [081006-024-CvEx.0032]
- (12) *ini de punya tempat oli itu, oli tu Ø harus perhatikang*
 D.PROX 3SG POSS place oil D.DIST oil D.DIST have.to watch
karna biar Ø baru ganti tapi Ø harus priksa
 because although recently replace but have.to check
 [Discussing motorbike problems:] ‘umh, it’s that oil tank, **that oil (EMPH) has to be watched**, because although (it) **had just been changed**, but (it) has **to be checked**’ (Lit. ‘that oil (EMPH), (we) have to check (it), because although (we) just changed (it), but (we) have to check it’) [081008-003-Cv.0012]
- (13) ... *makangang satu itu Ø harus baku bagi, makang sama~sama*
 food one D.DIST have.to RECP divide eat RDP~be.same
 ‘(our parents gave us this advice:) **any food has to be shared with each other**, (we have to) eat together’ (Lit. ‘any food, (we) have to share (it) with each other’) [080919-004-NP.0053]

This lack of a morphologically marked passive voice is a feature that Papuan Malay has in common with other East Nusantara Austronesian languages (Klamer and Ewing 2010:10). More specifically, this lack is also found in other eastern Malay varieties, such as Ambon Malay (Collins 1983:33; van Minde 1997:326), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009:441), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009:469; Steinhauer 1983:45–49), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009:306), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005:43), and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983:18; Litamahuputty 2012:107, 112-124) (cf. also Adelaar 2005b:217). Furthermore, this lack of a morphologically marked passive voice is also a typical trait of Papuan languages (Foley 1986:12; Klamer et al. 2008:98).

The western Malay varieties, by contrast, have productive voice systems on their verbs. Along similar lines, the western Austronesian languages are, overall, “well known for their rather complex voice systems” (Tryon 1995:34; see also Himmelmann 2005:112–114; Klamer and Ewing 2010:10). For Proto Austronesian a four-voice system was reconstructed (Wolff 1973 in Blust 2013:438). In Proto Malayic, this system has been reduced “to two voices, actor and undergoer, or more conventionally ‘active’ and ‘passive’” (Ross 2004:100; see also Blust 2013:452).

3.3 Limited productivity of affixation

In Papuan Malay, affixation plays only a minor role. Papuan Malay has only three affixes which have limited or marginal productivity, namely the prefixes *TER-* ‘ACL’ and *PE(N)-* ‘AG’, and the suffix *-ang* ‘PAT’.¹⁶ (See

¹⁵ See Kluge (2017:8, 467-480, 537-540) for the rather common elision of syntactic arguments in Papuan Malay; see also Margetts and Austin’s (2007) cross-linguistic typology.

¹⁶ The small caps designate the abstract representation of affixes that have more than one form of realization; prefixes *TER-* and *PE(N)-* have two allomorphs each, namely *ter-* and *ta-*, and *pe(N)-* and *pa(N)-* (small-caps *N* represents the different realizations of the nasal).

Kluge 2016 and Kluge 2017:119–178 for a detailed examination of the productivity of affixation in Papuan Malay.)

Affixation with the verbal prefix **TER-** ‘ACL’ has only limited productivity. The prefix derives monovalent verbs from mono- or bivalent bases. The derived verbs denote accidental or unintentional actions or events. Most often, the **TER-**-prefixed lexemes are derived from bivalent verbal bases through a valency-changing operation, in which the prefix removes agent arguments, as shown with **ter-pengaru** ‘be influenced’ in (14). Other examples are **ter-ganggu** ‘be disturbed’ or **ter-tukar** ‘be changed’. Instead of using a monovalent **TER-**-prefixed lexeme, however, Papuan Malay speakers prefer to use the respective base, such as **peng-aru** ‘influence’, in the sense of ‘be influenced’ in (15). With monovalent verbal bases, such as **jatu** ‘fall’ in (16), the affixation process does not further decrease the verbal valency; neither does it result in a loss of agentivity. The prefix downplays the level of control of its arguments, however: the referents of **ter-jatu** ‘be dropped, fall’ and **jatu** ‘fall’ have the same semantic functions. Another example is **ta-sala** ‘be mistaken’.

Prefix **TER-** ‘ACL’

- (14) ... *tapi de ana juga cepat ikut ter-pengaru*
 but 3SG child also be.fast follow ACL–influence
 ‘... but he/she, a kid, also quickly joins in (with others) to **be influenced**’ [080917-010-CvEx.0001]
- (15) *de su pengaru dengang orang~orang yang minum*
 3SG already influence with RDP~person REL drink
 ‘he has already **been influenced** by people who drink’ [080919-007-CvNP.0018]
- (16) *dia ter-jatu de jatu baru motor tindis dia*
 3SG ACL–fall 3SG fall and.then motorbike overlap 3SG
 ‘he **fell (off unexpectedly)**, he **fell (off)**, and then the motorbike crushed him’ [080923-010-CvNP.0012]

Affixation with the nominal suffix **-ang** ‘PAT’ also has only limited productivity. The suffix typically derives nominals from verbal bases. The derived nouns denote the patients or results of the events or states specified by the verbal bases, such as **makang-ang** ‘that which is eaten’ or ‘food’ in (17), with its base **makang** ‘eat’. Other examples are **bagi-ang** ‘that which is divided’ or ‘part’ or **jalang-ang** ‘that which is walked’ or ‘route’. Some **-ang**-suffixed lexemes have nominal or numeral bases, such as **bayang** ‘image’ and **bayang-ang** ‘shadow’, or **ratus** ‘hundred’ and **ratus-ang** ‘hundreds’, respectively. Overall, the meanings of the derivations signal a generalization of the base, such as **ana** ‘child’ and **ana-ang** ‘offspring’ in (18), or a magnification of the base, such as **laut** ‘sea’ and **laut-ang** ‘ocean’.

Suffix **-ang** ‘PAT’

- (17) *maytua bilang, makang karna makang-ang suda masak*
 wife say eat because eat–PAT already cook
 ‘(my) wife said, ‘**eat**, because the **food** has already been cooked’ [080919-004-NP.0039]
- (18) *kalo mo antar ana prempuang ke ana laki-laki ... kitorang*
 if want bring child woman to child RDP~husband 1PL
itu harus ... bawa ana-ang pinang ana-ang sago
 D.DIST have.to bring child–PAT betel.nut child–PAT sago
 [About wedding preparations:] ‘if we want to bring (our) **daughter** to (their) **son** ... we have to ... bring betel nut **seedlings** (and) sago **seedlings**’ (Lit. ‘female/male **child**; betel nut/sago **offspring**’) [081110-005-CvPr.0055]

Affixation with the nominal prefix **PE(N)-** ‘AG’ has, at best, marginal productivity. The prefix derives nouns from verbal and nominal bases. The derived nouns denote the agents or instruments of the actions, events, or states specified by the verbal bases. Most often, **PE(N)-**-prefixed lexemes are derived from verbal bases. The derivations include personal agents such as **pe-tinju** ‘boxer’ in (19), impersonal agents such as **pen-yakit** ‘disease’, or instruments such as **peng-iris** ‘ slicer’ which are derived from **tinju** ‘box’, **sakit** ‘be sick’, and

iris ‘slice’, respectively. Some of the derivations have additional verbal functions in their actual uses, such as *pan-diam* ‘taciturn person, be very quiet’, or *pa-malas* ‘listless person, be very listless’. Only few of the *PE(N)*-prefixed lexemes are derived from nominal bases. They denote abstract concepts, such as *pem-rinta* ‘government’ in (20), which is derived from *printa* ‘command’.

Prefix *PE(N)*- ‘AG’

- (19) ... *supaya Sarmi ada pe-tinju prempuang satu*
 so.that Sarmi exist AG-box woman one
 ‘... so that Sarmi has a certain **woman boxer**’ [081023-003-Cv.0005]
- (20) *kalo de bilang spulu milyar pem-rinta sanggup bayar*
 if 3SG say ten billion AG-command be.capable pay
 ‘if he demands ten billion (then) the **government** is capable of paying’ [081029-004-Cv.0073]

The limited productivity of affixation is also a characteristic of other Austronesian languages of eastern Indonesia and the Pacific (Blust 2013:359; see also Adelaar 2005b:216–217). More specifically, this limited productivity is also a characteristic of other eastern Malay varieties. Ambon Malay has four, marginally productive prefixes (van Minde 1997:59, 93-111). Banda Malay (Paauw 2009:444–445), Kupang Malay (Steinhauer 1983:46–49), and Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009:517; Steinhauer 1991:193) each have two productive affixes. Manado Malay has four productive prefixes (Stoel 2005:18–25). For North Moluccan Malay, Taylor (1983:18–19) submits that the language has two productive verbal prefixes, while Voorhoeve (1983:4) maintains that the language “has no productive affixes”; Litamahuputty (2012:5, 10) does not discuss affixation in Ternate Malay other than presenting a brief review of Taylor’s (1983) and Voorhoeve’s (1983) findings. In addition, the reciprocity marker *baku-* is analyzed as a prefix in Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997:101–102), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009:445), and Manado Malay (Stoel 2005:23). For Papuan Malay, by contrast, the reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’ is analyzed as an independent word and not as a prefix, as it can be reduplicated whereas the attested Papuan Malay affixes are not reduplicated (Kluge 2017:490).

In western Austronesian languages overall, by contrast, affixation plays a pertinent role for word formation (Blust 2013:355).¹⁷ A relative abundance of affixes” has also been reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian (Blust 2013:370), including 24 prefixes, eight suffixes and four infixes. In Proto-Malayic, affixation also played a major role, although this system was less elaborate than the Proto-Austronesian one. The reconstructed system comprises derivational and inflectional verbal affixes and derivational nominal affixes, including prefixes, suffixes, and circumfixes (Adelaar 1992:145–194). As for Papuan languages, they vary considerably in their morphological type from languages with very little bound morphology, as in the West Papuan area, to highly complex polysynthetic languages, such as those belonging to the Lower Sepik-Ramu family (Foley 2000:370).

3.4 Limited use of the numeral/quantifier-noun word order

Papuan Malay employs a numeral/quantifier-noun order, as well as a noun-numeral/quantifier order both of which have distinct functions.

Noun phrases with preposed numerals express a sense of individuality by signaling the composite nature of their referents. This is achieved in that the preposed numerals denote absolute numbers of the items expressed by their head nominals, including quantities as in (21), or periods of time as in (22). By contrast, noun phrases with postposed numerals signal exhaustivity, or mark unique positions within series or sequences. With head nominals undifferentiated in terms of their ranking, the postposed numerals indicate exhaustivity of definite referents, as in (23). With head nominals differentiated in terms of their ranking within a series, the postposed numerals signal the unique position of a referent within such a ranking as in (24), or specify unique points in time as in (25). (For details see Kluge 2017:415–418.)

¹⁷ Blust (2013:355) maintains that the western Austronesian languages are characterized by “rich systems of affixation”, whereas, according to Himmelmann (2005:125), the western Austronesian languages show, overall, “a moderate inventory of affixes”.

Noun phrases with preposed or postposed numerals

- (21) *mungking lima orang mati*
 maybe five person die
 ‘about **five people** died’ [081025-004-Cv.0033]
- (22) *ini untuk balita dang bayi yang usia dari*
 D.PROX for children.under.five and baby REL age from
lima taung ke bawa sampe **dua bulang**
 five year to bottom until two month
 ‘this is for children and babies who are **five years** down to **two months**’ [081010-001-Cv.0197]
- (23) *pace dua ini dong dua dari pedalamang*
 man two D.DIST 3PL two from interior
 ‘**both these men**, the two of them are from the interior’ [081109-010-JR.0001]
- (24) *kitong lari~lari sampe di SP tuju*
 1PL RDP~run reach at transmigration.settlement seven
 ‘we drove all the way to **transmigration settlement** (number) **seven**’ [081006-033-Cv.0007]
- (25) *jam dua, tong keluar dari sini jam satu*
 hour two 1PL go.out from L.PROX hour one
 ‘(we arrived at) **two o’clock**, we left from here at **one o’clock**’ [081025-008-Cv.0099]

Noun phrases with preposed quantifiers also express a sense of individuality by signaling the composite nature of their referents. This is achieved in that the preposed quantifiers express non-numeric amounts or quantities of their countable referents, as in (26) and (27). Postposed quantifiers, by contrast, either denote exhaustivity of indefinite referents, as in (28), or signal unknown positions within series or sequences, as in (29); they modify countable as well as uncountable referents.

Noun phrases with preposed or postposed quantifiers

- (26) *de itu kalo banyak orang de biasa begitu*
 3SG D.DIST when many person 3SG be.usual like.that
 ‘if there’re **many people**, he’s usually like that’ [081025-006-Cv.0272]
- (27) *smua buku bisa basa*
 all book be.able be.wet
 ‘**all books** could get wet’ [080917-008-NP.0188]
- (28) *minum te banyak, minum te dulu*
 drink tea many drink tea be.prior
 ‘drink **lots of tea**, drink tea for now!’ [081011-001-Cv.0240]
- (29) *kalo di situ kang, jam brapa saja bisa*
 if at L.MED you.know hour several just be.able
 ‘as for (the office) there, you know, (you) can (go there) **any time**’ (Lit. ‘**several hours**’)
 [081005-001-Cv.0001]

The limited use of the numeral/quantifier-noun word order is a characteristic that Papuan Malay has in common with other eastern Malay varieties. For Ambon Malay, van Minde (1997:152–153) notes that the language makes use of the numeral/quantifier-noun order, as well as the noun-numeral/quantifier order, with preposed numerals/quantifiers occurring more often than postposed ones. Other than mentioning that “the contrast is subtle”, however, van Minde (1997:153) does not discuss the semantics of these constructions. In Banda Malay, numerals always follow the head noun (Paauw 2009:440). Likewise, in Kupang Malay and Larantuka Malay, numerals and quantifiers typically follow the head noun; due to Indonesian influence,

however, they occasionally precede the head noun (Paauw 2009:462, 515). For Manado Malay, Stoel (2005) does not discuss the order of numerals and nouns. For North Moluccan / Ternate Malay, Litamahuputty (2012:60) submits that the cardinal numerals, as well as the mid-range quantifier *banya* ‘many’ and the universal quantifier *samua* ‘all’ may occur in preposed or in postposed position. Contrary to Kluge’s (2017:415–421) analysis, however, Litamahuputty (2012:60) maintains that preposed numerals denote “a collective meaning”, while postposed numerals “express a distributive meaning” which highlights “individuality”. Neither Taylor (1983) nor Voorhoeve (1983) discuss the order of numerals and nouns in North Moluccan Malay.

Generally speaking, however, the East Nusantara Austronesian languages employ a noun-numeral order rather than a numeral-noun order (Donohue 2007:369–373; Himmelmann 2005:142; Klamer and Ewing 2010:10). This noun-numeral order is also rather commonly found in Papuan languages (Dunn et al. 2002:58; Klamer et al. 2008:98). By contrast, in the western Austronesian languages outside East Nusantara the numerals/quantifiers typically precede rather than follow their head nouns (Donohue 2007:369; Himmelmann 2005:142).

4 Papuan characteristics of Papuan Malay

This section describes a selection of Papuan Malay features not usually found in the western Austronesian languages. Instead, these features are typical characteristics of Papuan languages. The selection of 15 such features, presented in Table 2, builds on Klamer and Ewing’s (2010:11) list of typical characteristics of Papuan languages. This list, in turn, builds on Foley (1986, 2000), Pawley (2005), and Aikhenvald and Stebbins (2007). Tail-head linkage is not mentioned in Klamer et al. (2008) and Klamer and Ewing (2010). It is, however, a typical Papuan feature (see de Vries 2005:364–365; Foley 1986:200–201, 2000:390).

Papuan Malay shares five of the Papuan features listed in Table 2: the lack of the inclusive/exclusive distinction in pronouns, the genitive-noun order, serial verb constructions, clause chaining, and tail-head linkage. In addition, the language makes limited use of clause-final conjunctions. The remaining eight Papuan characteristics are not found in Papuan Malay. Unlike Papuan languages, Papuan Malay does make a phonemic /r/ distinction. Furthermore, due to its lack of inflectional morphology, Papuan Malay does not mark gender and does not index the subject on the verb. Furthermore, Papuan Malay does not make a morphological distinction between alienable and inalienable nouns; however, the language has the option of denoting inalienable possession via elision of the possessive marker in an adnominal possessive construction (see §4.6). In terms of its syntax, Papuan Malay has a verb-object rather than an object-verb order, has prepositions rather than postpositions, and has clause-initial rather than clause-final negators. Finally, Papuan Malay does not have dedicated switch-reference devices. (See §4.3; see also Kluge 2017:21–26.)

The following sections discuss those features in more detail that Papuan Malay shares with Papuan languages: the genitive-noun or possessor-possessum order (§4.1), serial verb constructions (§4.2), clause chaining (§4.3), tail-head linkage (§4.4), and clause-final conjunctions (§4.5). In addition, the alienability distinction in nouns is discussed (§4.6). (The lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns is described in §3.1.)

Table 2: Pertinent features of Papuan Malay vis-à-vis Papuan languages¹⁸

Grammatical features	PLgs	PM
Phonology		
No phonemic /l/r distinction	yes	no
Morphology		
No clusivity distinction in personal pronouns	yes	yes
Marking of gender	yes	no
Subject marked as suffix on verb	yes	no
Alienability distinction in nouns	yes	no
Syntax		
Genitive-noun order	yes	yes
Serial verb constructions	yes	yes
Clause chaining	yes	yes
Tail-head linkage	yes	yes
Clause-final conjunctions	yes	lmtd.
Object-verb order	yes	no
Postpositions	yes	no
Clause-final negator	yes	no
Switch reference	yes	no

4.1 Genitive-noun order

In Papuan Malay, adnominal possessive constructions have a modifier-noun structure, or genitive-noun or possessor-possessum order, instead of the typical Austronesian noun-genitive order. The possessor-possessum construction is marked with the possessive ligature (LIG) *punya* ‘POSS’ which intervenes between the possessor noun phrase (POSSR-NP) and the possessum noun phrase (POSSM-NP), such that ‘POSSR-NP – LIG – POSSM-NP’.

Most often, the possessive marker is realized with the long form *punya* ‘POSS’ or reduced *pu* ‘POSS’, as in (30) and (32), respectively. The ligature can be reduced further to clitic *=p* ‘POSS’, if the possessor noun phrase ends in a vowel, as in (34).¹⁹ These reductions occur independently of the syntactic and semantic properties of the possessor and possessum, as shown in (30) to (35) and discussed below. Adnominal possessive constructions can also be stacked to form recursive constructions, as in (35).

Adnominal possessive constructions

- (30) POSSR-NP LIG POSSM-NP
ini mama Klara punya ana prempuang
 D.PROX mother Klara POSS child woman
 [Speaker-1: ‘who is in the hospital’; Speaker-2:] ‘umh, **Mother Klara’s daughter**’
 [080919-006-CvNP.0028]

¹⁸ Because of the enormous genetic and the considerable typological diversity among Papuan languages, exceptions to these generalizations can easily be found. For example, Kewa [kew] (Trans New Guinea) has both /l/ and /r/ (Franklin 1971:11); all the Torricelli languages have SVO word order (Foley 2000:383); many of the Trans New Guinea languages do not mark gender, such as the Lower Ramu languages (Foley 2000:366); and the languages of Southern New Guinea do not have clause chaining and switch reference (Evans 2018:739). The features listed here are broad typological features, characterizing a majority of the Papuan languages, but allowing for a considerable body of exceptions in each case. Abbreviations: PLgs = Papuan languages, PM = Papuan Malay, lmtd. = limited.

¹⁹ In this type of reduced possessive construction, the possessor is almost always a singular personal pronoun, such as short first person *sa* ‘1SG’ in (34), second person *ko* ‘2SG’, or short third person *de* ‘3SG’. The possessor may, however, also be expressed by a noun, although the corpus includes only one such reduced possessive construction.

- (31) *tadi pagi tu saya punya sakit pata*
 earlier morning D.DIST 3SG POSS sickle be.broken
 ‘this morning (EMPH), **my sickle** broke’ [080922-002-Cv.0006]
- (32) *ko ambil dulu ade pu itu*
 2SG fetch be.prior younger.sibling POSS D.DIST
 [Telling her son to help his younger sister:] ‘you pick (it) up for now, **that younger sister’s (fish)**’ [081006-019-Cv.0002]
- (33) *siapa pu mata yang buta?*
 who POSS eye REL be.blind
 ‘**whose eyes** (are the ones) that (are) blind?’ [080922-001a-CvPh.0142]
- (34) *sa=p prut sakit gara-gara sa makang nasi*
 1SG=POSS stomach be.sick because 1SG eat cooked.rice
 ‘**my stomach** was sick because I ate cooked rice’ [081025-009a-Cv.0046]
- (35) *ini kaka Natanael pu laki pu mobil*
 D.PROX older.sibling Natanael POSS husbandPOSS car
 ‘this is **sister Natanael’s husband’s car**’ [081006-015-Cv.0001]

Adnominal possessive constructions typically denote possession of a definite possessum, as in (30) to (35).²⁰ The noun phrases encoding the possessor and possessum can belong to different syntactic categories. Most often, the possessor slot is taken by a lexical noun as in (32), a noun phrase as in (30), or a personal pronoun as in (31). Likewise, the possessum is most often encoded by a lexical noun as in (31), or a noun phrase as in (30); possessive noun phrases with a personal pronoun possessum are unattested. Less often, the possessor and possessum slots are taken by demonstratives such as the possessum in (32), or interrogatives such as the possessor in (33). The possessor and possessum can signify human referents as in (30), nonhuman animate referents such as the possessum in (32), or inanimate referents such as the possessum in (31).

As for alienability, possessive constructions with long *punya* ‘POSS’, reduced *pu*, or clitic *=p* encode both alienable and inalienable possession. The possessive constructions in (31), (32), and (35), for instance, express alienable possession, while the examples in (30), (33), and (34) denote inalienable possession. (The encoding of inalienable possession by means of ‘POSSR-POSSM’ constructions with elided possessive marker is discussed in §4.6.)

Besides marking possession of a definite possessum, ‘POSSR-NP – LIG – POSSM-NP’ constructions also have noncanonical functions. Syntactically, the possessor or possessum slots are not only filled with nouns, personal pronouns, demonstratives, or noun phrases, as in (36) and (37), but also with verbs, as in (38). Furthermore, mid-range quantifiers, as in (39), temporal adverbs, or prepositional phrases can take the possessum slot. Semantically, noncanonical possessive constructions can (a) signal locational, temporal, or associative relations between the possessum and the possessor, as in (36), (b) express beneficiary relations, as in (37), (c) highlight speaker attitudes or evaluations, as in (38) and (39), or (d) create reflexive expressions.

In (36), the adnominal possessive construction marks an associative relation between the possessum and the possessor. More specifically, *punya* ‘POSS’ signals that the possessum *tu* ‘D.DIST’ is associated with the possessor *lima juta* ‘five million’, giving the emphatic reading ‘a minimum of five-million (*as opposed to lower prices*)’. In (37), the possessor *ko* ‘2SG’ expresses the recipient of the event expressed by the verb *bawa* ‘bring’, while the possessum *makangang* ‘food’ denotes the anticipated object of possession. In (38), monovalent dynamic *mandi* ‘bathe’ takes the possessor slot while the possessum slot is taken by monovalent stative *jaw* ‘be far’. In this example possessive *punya* ‘POSS’ has an intensifying function, highlighting the speaker’s evaluation of the situation: *mandi punya jaw* ‘bathing really very far away’. In (39), the mid-range quantifier *banyak* ‘many’ takes the possessum slot. Again, *punya* ‘POSS’ functions as an attitudinal intensifier, expressing the speaker’s feelings of annoyance. (For details see Kluge 2017:437–443.)

²⁰ Possession of an indefinite possessum is expressed with a two-argument existential clause or a nominal clause (for details see Kluge 2017:499-500, 511-513).

Non-canonical adnominal possessive constructions

- (36) *yang mahal yang di atas satu jut lima juta punya tu*
 REL be.expensive REL at top one million five million POSS D.DIST
 ‘(traditional cloths from Sorong) which are expensive, which (cost) more than one million, **a minimum of five million** (as opposed to lower prices)’ (Lit. ‘**that** (price) **of five million**’) [081006-029-CvEx.0009]²¹
- (37) *bapa-tua ada suru ko makang, ini, sa bawa ko pu makangang*
 older.uncle exist order 2SG eat D.PROX 1SG bring 2SG POSS food
 ‘older uncle told you to eat, what’s-its-name,²² I brought **food for you**’ (Lit. ‘**your food**’)
 [081025-006-Cv.0163]
- (38) *dong mandi di kali Biri, mm-mm, mandi punya jaw itu*
 3PL bathe at river Biri mhm bathe POSS be.far D.DIST
 [About a run-away boy:] ‘they were bathing in the Biri river, mhm, (they were) **bathing really very far away**’ (Lit. ‘**the being far away of the bathing**’) [081025-008-Cv.0033]
- (39) *baru, mama, setang pu banyak di situ*
 and.then mother evil.spirit POSS many at L.MED
 ‘and then, mother, (there) are **really many evil spirits** over there’ (Lit. ‘**many of**’)
 [081025-006-Cv.0062]

While Papuan Malay does not employ the typical Austronesian noun-modifier structure, or noun-genitive order, to express adnominal possession, it does employ noun phrases with a noun-modifier structure in which the head nominal N1 is modified by a post-head nominal N2 (for details see Kluge 2017:407–411). Semantically, such N1N2 noun phrases are characterized by the subordination of the adnominal N2 under the head nominal N1 position. Such noun phrases denote a wide range of associative relations between the two nominals, namely part-whole relations, property-of relations, name-of relations, subtype-of relations, composed-of relations, purpose-for relations, locational relations, temporal relations, and event relations, as illustrated in Table 3.

Encoding adnominal possession with a genitive-noun structure, or more specifically with a ‘POSSR-NP – LIG – POSSM-NP’ construction, is a feature that Papuan Malay shares with other East Nusantara Austronesian languages (Donohue 2007:352–354; Himmelmann 2005:163–165; Klamer and Ewing 2010:10). This genitive-noun structure is also typical of other eastern Malay varieties: Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997:13, 161-164), Banda Malay (Pauw 2009:438), Kupang Malay (Steinhauer 1983:53), Larantuka Malay (Pauw 2009:176; Steinhauer 1991:193),²³ Manado Malay (Stoel 2005:33, 63), and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983:20; Voorhoeve 1983:4; Litamahuputty 2012:59, 92–102). In all eastern Malay varieties, the ligature is related to the respective local variant of the full bivalent verb *punya* ‘have’, with speakers very commonly using a reduced form. (See also Adelaar 2005b:213.)

²¹ Correcting herself concerning the price of traditional cloths, the speaker said *satu jut* rather than *satu juta* ‘one million’.

²² For details concerning the placeholder uses of the Papuan Malay demonstratives see Kluge (2017:388–389).

²³ In addition, Larantuka Malay has a noun-genitive construction for the third person singular: “POSSESSED-*nya*, with the morpheme *-nya* indicating a third person singular possessor” (Pauw 2009:176; see also Steinhauer 1991:193–194).

Table 3: *N1N2 noun phrases with canonical noun-modifier structure*

Papuan Malay N1N2	Glosses	Free translation
1. Part-whole relation: N1 is a part of N2		
<i>urat kaki</i>	tendon foot	‘foot tendon’
<i>malam hari</i>	night day	‘evening (of the day)’
2. ‘Property-of’ relation: N1 is a property of N2		
<i>ruma orang</i>	house person	‘(other) people’s house’
<i>cara orang Papua</i>	way person Papua	‘Papuan traditions’
3. ‘Affiliated-with’ relation: N1 is affiliated with N2		
<i>ruma setang</i>	house evil.spirit	‘house of an evil spirit’
<i>ana~ana iblis</i>	RDP~child devil	‘children of the devil’
4. Name-of relation: N2 designates the name of N1		
<i>ikang gurango</i>	fish shark	‘shark fish’
<i>penyakit malaria</i>	disease malaria	‘malaria disease’
5. ‘Subtype-of’ relation: N2 designates a specific type of N1		
<i>ana murid</i>	child pupil	‘school kid’
<i>kaing sprej</i>	cloth bed.sheet	‘bed sheets’
6. ‘Composed-of’ relation: N1 is composed of / made from N2		
<i>ruma batu</i>	house stone	‘stone house’
<i>kantong plastik</i>	bag plastic	‘plastic bag’
7. ‘Purpose-for’ relation: N1 is intended for / at the disposal of N2		
<i>net laki~laki</i>	net RDP~husband	‘(volleyball) net for men’
<i>sikat gigi</i>	brush tooth	‘toothbrush’
8. Locational relation: (a) N1 contains N2; (b) N1 is located at/in/on N2 or originates from N2		
(a) <i>lampu gas</i>	lamp gas	‘gas lamp’
(b) <i>pisang Sorong</i>	banana Sorong	‘bananas from Sorong’
9. Temporal relation: N2 gives temporal specifications for N1		
<i>jam dua pagi</i>	hour two morning	‘two o’clock in the morning’
<i>hari sening depang</i>	day Monday front	‘next Monday’
10. Event relation: N2 is affected by event N1		
<i>pasang tugu</i>	install monument	‘statue installation’

Cross-linguistically, however, Austronesian languages, including the western Austronesian languages, typically have a noun-genitive structure, or possessum-possessor order to denote adnominal possession (Blust 2013:93; Donohue 2007:352–353; Himmelmann 2005:142). This possessum-possessor order was also reconstructed for Proto Austronesian. Referring to Blust (2005), van den Berg (2009:338) summarizes the system as follows: (1) “pronominal possession is encoded by possessive enclitics (or suffixes) on all nouns”, (2) “there is no alienable-inalienable distinction”, and (3) “the order within the noun phrase is possessed—GENITIVE MARKER—possessor” (see also Blust 1974). In Proto Malayic, pronominal possession is also encoded by possessive enclitics (or suffixes) (Adelaar 1992:122–126).

By contrast, the ‘reversed genitive’ (Klamer et al. 2008:123), or ‘preposed possessor’ order (Himmelmann 2005:114) is a typical trait of Papuan languages; hence, ‘Papuan genitive construction’ (Cowan 1953:10 in Klamer et al. 2008:123). This Papuan possessor-possessum order has diffused to the East Nusantara Austronesian languages (Klamer and Ewing 2010:12). Examples in addition to the eastern Malay varieties are the CMP language Tetun Fehan [tet] (East Nusa Tenggara province) (van Klinken 1999:142–153), or the Greater SHWNG languages Biak [bhv] (West Papua) (van den Heuvel 2006:229–253) and Magey Matbat [xmt] (Raja Ampat archipelago) (Remijsen 2010:284–286).

4.2 Serial verb constructions

Papuan Malay very commonly employs serial verb constructions (SVCs) to encode complex events by means of verb sequences.

Papuan Malay SVCs are characterized by a number of compositional and functional properties that have also been identified for SVCs in other languages (Aikhenvald 2006:1, 4-7; Comrie 2001:27; Foley 1986:178, 180, 2000:385): (a) SVCs are monoclausal constructions in which two or more verb-stems are juxtaposed without any connecting morphology to form a complex predicate; (b) such a complex predicate combines with a single set of core (and peripheral) arguments; and (c) SVCs describe single events.

The main function of SVCs is to organize discourse, to package information coherently, and to represent complex events. This is achieved in that SVCs breakdown complex events and accentuate their different components. Another function of SVCs is to express grammatical categories. (See Aikhenvald 2006:11, 46; Aikhenvald and Stebbins 2007:252; Ansaldo 2006:261–262.)

The following examples illustrate how these compositional and functional properties apply to Papuan Malay.

Papuan Malay SVCs are monoclausal constructions comprised of two or three juxtaposed verbs, such as *bawa pulang* ‘bring go.home’ in (40). This complex predicate is associated with a single set of core arguments and describes a single event. That is, the SVC *bawa pulang* ‘bring go.home’ combines with the subject *saya* ‘1SG’ and the direct object *sabit* ‘sickle’ and depicts the single event of ‘bringing home’ the gardening tool.

Most often, the Papuan Malay SVCs are comprised of two verbs, as in (40) to (42). SVCs with three verbs, however, are also quite common, as in (43). Regarding the transitivity of the SVC components, the V₁ and V₂ slots are most often taken by bivalent verbs, such as *bawa* ‘bring’ in (40). Also quite common are monovalent dynamic verbs which tend to take the V₁ slot, such as *bangung* ‘wake up’ in (41). Monovalent stative verbs occur much less frequently; they tend to take the V₂ slot, such as *sakit* ‘be sick’ in (42).

SVCs comprised of two or three verbs

- (40) *saya bawa pulang sabit*
 1SG bring go.home sickle
 ‘I brought the sickle home’ [080922-002-Cv.0006]
- (41) *Musa ini, e, de loyo~loyo ini, de bangung tidor jadi*
 Musa D.PROX uh 3SG RDP~be.weak D.PROX 3SG wake.up sleep so
 [About a small boy:] ‘Musa here, uh, right now he’s kind of weak since he woke up from sleeping’ [080922-001a-CvPh.1436,1438]
- (42) *sa jatu sakit*
 1SG fall be.sick
 ‘I fell sick’ [081006-034-CvEx.0010]
- (43) *tete lagi turung pergi bli pinang dulu*
 grandfather again descend go buy betel.nut be.prior
 ‘grandfather again descends (to) go (to the market to) buy betel nuts for now’ [081109-005-JR.0008]

In highlighting the different components of complex events, SVCs express four different semantic notions. The first function is to express directional relations, as shown in (44) and (45). The second function is to designate temporal relations, as illustrated in (46) to (51). The third function is to signal consequence relations, as demonstrated in (52) to (54). The fourth function is to convey comitative relations, as shown in (55). In addition, SVCs also encode different grammatical categories, as demonstrated in (56) to (67).

1. SVCs expressing directional relations

Among the most common semantic types are directional SVCs in which the V₁ slot is taken by a directional motion verb, such as *lari* ‘run’ in (44) or *bawa* ‘bring’ in (45).

SVCs expressing directional relations of complex events

- (44) *Fredrik de lari panggil bapa*
 Fredrik 3SG run call father
 ‘Fredrik **ran** (to father and) **called** father’ [081025-006-Cv.0167]
- (45) ... *ko bawa pulang ko pu ade ini slimut biru*
 2SG bring go.home 2SG POSS younger.sibling D.PROX blanket be.blue
 ‘... you **bring back** your younger sibling’s blue blanket’ [080917-010-CvEx.0043]

2. SVCs expressing temporal relations

Also rather commonly, SVCs designate temporal relations of complex events. In simultaneous SVCs, the action encoded by the V_1 and V_2 occur at the same time, as in (46). In sequential SVCs, the action expressed by the V_1 precedes that of the V_2 , as in (47). Durational SVCs are marked with bivalent *sampe* ‘reach’ in the V_2 slot, with the action signified by the V_1 continuing until the action specified by the V_3 is attained, as in (48).²⁴ In addition, Papuan Malay employs SVCs to express the begin or termination of an event. SVCs with bivalent *mulay* ‘start’ in the V_1 slot express the beginning of an event, as in (49). Termination of an event is marked with bivalent *selesay* ‘finish’ in the V_2 slot, as in (50); this event may be followed by another action specified in the V_3 slot, as in (51).

SVCs expressing temporal relations of complex events

- (46) *sa itu, sa pegang sago sa makang jalang~jalang*
 1SG D.DIST 1SG hold sago 1SG eat RDP~walk
 ‘as for me, I was holding (some) sago, I **ate** (it) while **strolling around**’ [081025-009a-Cv.0073]
- (47) *pasti babi suda masuk makang sa punya hasil kebun*
 definitely pig already enter eat 1SG POSS product garden
 ‘certainly the pig has already **entered** (and) **is eating** my garden crops’ [080919-004-NP.0018]
- (48) *jalang tong menyanyi sampe tiba di Webro*
 walk 1PL sing reach arrive at Webro
 ‘(while) walking we **sang until** (we) **arrived** in Webro’ [080917-008-NP.0118]
- (49) *baru nene de mulay tanya saya, de bilang, ...*
 and.then grandmother 1SG start ask 1SG 3SG say
 ‘and then the elderly lady **began asking** me, she said, ...’ [080918-001-CvNP.0057]
- (50) *makang selesay sa begitu istirahat duduk*
 eat finish 1SG like.that rest rest
 ‘(after having) **finished eating**, I sat (down) to rest like that’ [080923-012-CNP.0015]
- (51) *jadi prempuang bisa datang masak di mmm laki~laki punya ruma,*
 so woman can come cook at uh RDP~husband POSS house
masak selesay makang, prempuang pulang lagi
 cook finish eat woman go.home again
 ‘so a woman can come to cook to her fiance’s house, (after having) **finished cooking** (they) **eat**, (then) the woman goes back home again’ [081110-005-CvPr.0048]

3. SVCs expressing consequence relations

SVCs also express consequence relations between the different action components of complex events, including consequential, resultative, and purposive relations. In consequential SVCs, the V_1 and V_2 denote

²⁴ Bivalent *sampe* ‘reach’ has trial word class membership (Kluge 2017:323). In addition to its verbal uses, *sampe* functions as a temporal preposition expressing location in space and time: ‘until’. Furthermore, *sampe* functions as an anteriority-marking conjunction introducing temporal or result clauses: ‘until’.

the natural temporal and causal ordering of the different action components of a complex event, with the action of the V_1 bringing about the action or state of the V_2 , as in (52). Consequential SVCs differ from sequential SVCs in that the latter designate temporal but no causal relations between the V_1 and V_2 , as in (47). In resultative SVCs, the actions designated by the V_1 directly cause the actions or states of the V_2 , as in (53). Resultative SVCs differ from consequential SVCs, in that the former are characterized by a compelling, direct cause-effect relation as in (53), whereas in consequential SVCs the causal link between the V_1 and V_2 is more indirect and compelling. In a purposive SVC, the action expressed by the V_2 designates the goal of the V_1 , as in (54).

SVCs expressing consequence relations of complex events

- (52) *de pergi ada babi, de pana makang*
 3SG go exist pig 3SG bow.shoot eat
 ‘she went (and) there was a pig (and) she **shot** (it with her) **bow** (and) **ate** (it)’ [081006-023-CvEx.0082]
- (53) *buku~buku yang di dalam sa punya tas itu basa sampe hancur*
 RDP~book REL at inside 1SG POSS bag D.DIST be.wet reach be.shattered
 ‘those books that were in my bag (got) **wet with the result that they were ruined**’ [080917-008-NP.0159]
- (54) ... *baru kitong datang sembayang di greja*
 and.then 1PL come worship at church
 ‘... and then we **come to worship** at church’ [080927-006-CvNP.0029]

4. SVCs expressing comitative relations of complex events

In addition, SVCs can also convey a comitative meaning. In such SVCs, bivalent comitative *ikut* ‘join (in)’ takes the V_1 slot, while the V_2 designates the action that the subject joins in, as in (55).

SVCs expressing comitative relations of complex events

- (55) *majelis dong smua ikut, ikut cari Beni*
 church.elder 3PL all follow follow search Benyamin
 ‘(my husband, and also Lawrens, everyone,) all the church elders joined (my husband), **joined** (him) **looking** for Beni’ [081025-008-Cv.0042]

5. SVCs encoding different grammatical categories

Papuan Malay SVCs also encode different grammatical categories. They express aspect (habitual, progressive), mood (deontic), causativity, manner, and voice (passive), as shown in (56) to (67). In each case, it is the V_1 that encodes the respective grammatical categories.

Habitual aspect is expressed with the monovalent stative verb *biasa* ‘be usual’, which fills the V_1 slot, as in (56). Progressive aspect is encoded with the existential verb *ada* ‘exist’ in the V_1 position, as in (57).

SVCs encoding habitual and progressive aspect

- (56) *de biasa panggil sa tu prempuang gunung*
 3SG be.usual call 1SG D.DIST woman mountain
 ‘he **usually calls** me (EMPH) (a) mountain woman’ [081014-017-CvPr.0028]
- (57) *sa menuju tempat di mana dia ada makang hasil kebun ini*
 1SG aim.at place at where 3SG exist eat product garden D.PROX
 [About hunting wild pigs:] ‘I approach the place where it **is eating** the crops of this garden’ [080919-004-NP.0020]

In SVCs expressing deontic mood a modal auxiliary takes the V_1 position: *bisa* ‘can’ signals ability as in (58), *bole* ‘may’ denotes permission as in (59), *harus* ‘have to’ expresses obligation as in (60), and *mo* ‘want’ conveys volition as in (61).

SVCs encoding deontic mood

- (58) *kalo di Arbais prempuang bisa biking kebung*
 if at Arbais woman can make garden
 ‘as for (the villagers from) Arbais, the women **can / are able to work** (in the) gardens’
 [081014-007-CvEx.0035]
- (59) *setiap kegiatang apa saja dorang bole kerja*
 every activity what just 3PL may work
 ‘whatever activity, they **may / are allowed to** carry (it) out’ [080923-007-Cv.0013]
- (60) *ko harus sayang ko pu laki~laki tu*
 2SG have.to love 2SG POSS RDP~husband D.DIST
 ‘you **have to love** your husband (EMPH)’ [081110-008-CvNP.0019]
- (61) *tong mo pake untuk kamar mandi*
 1PL want use for room bathe
 ‘we **want to use** (the corrugated iron sheets) for the bathroom (roof)’ [080925-003-Cv.0005]

The notion of causativity is expressed with SVCs in which a causative verb, namely trivalent *kasi* ‘give’, with its short form *kas*, or bivalent *biking* ‘make’, takes the V₁ position. Causatives with *kasi* ‘give’ accentuate the outcome of the manipulation, as in (62) and (63); the effect expression in the V₂ slot is a monovalent or a bivalent verb. Causatives with *biking* ‘make’, by contrast, highlight the manipulation of the circumstances itself, which results in the effect, as in (64) and (65); the effect expression in the V₂ slot is always a monovalent verb. (For more details see Kluge 2017:480–489.)

SVCs encoding causativity

- (62) *dong kas masuk korek di sini*
 3PL give enter matches at L.PROX
 ‘they **inserted** the matches here’ (Lit. ‘**give to enter**’) [081025-006-Cv.0180]
- (63) *sa takut skali jadi sa kas bangung mama*
 1SG feel.afraid(.of) very so 1SG give wake.up mother
 ‘I felt very afraid, so I **woke up** you (‘mother’)’ (Lit. ‘**give to wake up**’) [080917-008-NP.0030]
- (64) *ana~ana biking pusing mama*
 RDP~child make be.dizzy mother
 ‘the kids **worry** (their mother)’ (Lit. ‘**make to be dizzy/confused**’) [081014-007-CvEx.0047]
- (65) *... tapi dong biking bangkit dia lagi, biking hidup dia*
 but 3PL make be.resurrected 3SG again make live 3SG
 [About sorcerers who can resurrect the dead:] ‘[he’s already (dead),] but they **resurrect** him again, **make** him **live**’ [Elicited BR131103.005]

Furthermore, Papuan Malay SVCs express manner. In such a construction, the V₂ specifies the manner of the action or state designated by the V₁, as in (66) and (67), respectively.

SVCs encoding manner

- (66) *sa bilang, ado mas ojek kitong dua lari plang~plang*
 1SG say oh.no brother motorbike.taxi 1PL two run RDP~be.slow
 ‘I said, oh no, Mister Motorbike-Taxidriver, (let) the two of us **drive slowly**’ [081015-004-Cv.0012]

- (67) *sa lagi sakit berat*
 1SG again be.sick be.heavy
 ‘I was **heavily sick** again’ [081006-001-Cv.0002]

Finally, Papuan Malay employs SVCs to encode passive voice, as discussed in §3.2. Designating the inception of events that adversely affect the subject, bivalent *dapat* ‘get’ or *kena* ‘hit’ takes the V₁ slot. The verb expressing the actual event takes the V₂ slot.

The common use of SVCs is a characteristic that Papuan Malay shares with other eastern Malay varieties, such as Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997:318–339), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009:233–234), Kupang Malay (2009:234–235), and Larantuka Malay (2009:235–236). Manado Malay and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay also make use of SVCs although less frequently than the above mentioned Malay varieties (Paauw 2009:233; see also Litamahuputty 2012:112, 216).

In western Austronesian languages in general, however, SVCs are rather uncommon (Blust 2013:158; Himmelmann 2005:160). They are, instead, pervasive in Papuan languages (Aikhenvald and Stebbins 2007:252–253; Foley 2000:385). Moreover, they are also rather common in the Austronesian languages of the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone, with Senft (2008:4) concluding that their occurrence “can be contributed to prolonged contact with the Papuan languages” (see also Blust 2013:158). Examples in addition to the eastern Malay varieties are the CMP languages Kambera [xbr] (East Nusa Tenggara province) (Klamer 1998:275–283) and Tetun Fehan [tet] (van Klinken 1999:304–305), or the Greater SHWNG language Taba [mky] (North Maluku province) (Bowden 2001:295–319).

4.3 Clause chaining

Papuan Malay also very commonly employs clause chaining to encode distinct but related events. Papuan Malay clause chaining constructions share a number of compositional and functional features that have also been established for clause chaining in other languages. Cross-linguistically, clause chaining constructions refer to sequences of clauses that follow one after another. Corresponding to its own clause, each verb in such a construction takes its own set of core (and peripheral) arguments. (See Dixon 2010:410; Foley 1986:178, 2007:386–387.)

Cross-linguistically, clause chaining is a typical feature of right-headed OV languages, which make a distinction between independent and dependent clauses, such as the majority of Papuan languages (Foley 2000). Independent clauses “are characterized by fully inflected verbs, in particular for subject agreement and tense-aspect-mood”, while dependent clauses “contain morphologically simpler, stripped down verbs” (2000:383). In a clausal chain, the dependent clauses typically precede the independent clause from which they receive their specifications, such as person, number, tense, aspect and/or mood. (See Foley 1986:177–198, 2007:386–387.) In Papuan languages, clause chaining is often characterized by some concurrent same-subject/different-subject switch reference system (see Aikhenvald and Stebbins 2007:245, 255; Foley 2000:383–384; Klamer and Ewing 2010:11; Pawley 2006:168).

The main function of clause chaining is to describe a sequence of distinct but related events by encoding “differences of temporal relations between the clauses” (Foley 1986:180). Within this function, chaining constructions very commonly encode temporal sequentiality; that is, the events in a chaining construction are understood to be consecutive, with the order of the verbs mirroring the order in which the events occurred. Chaining construction may also, however, encode temporal simultaneity; that is, the events in a chaining construction are understood to be overlapping in time. (See Farr 1999:19; Foley 1986:180.)

Pending a more in-depth analysis, the following examples briefly illustrate how these cross-linguistic characteristics of clause chaining apply to Papuan Malay.

Papuan Malay clause chaining constructions are sequences of clauses that follow one after another, such as the three clauses in (68) and (69), or the four clauses in (73). In such constructions, each verb is associated with its own set of arguments, such as the subject *sa* ‘1SG’ in each of the three clauses in (68), the four different subjects in (73), or the two different direct objects in the second and third clause in (68). Given its lack of inflectional morphology, however, Papuan Malay does not make the typical distinction between independent and dependent clauses. Instead, the juxtaposed clauses remain of the same rank. (See Stassen’s 1985:76–77 discussion of balancing and deranking languages.)

Neither does Papuan Malay clause chaining employ the typical Papuan trait of a concomitant switch reference system.²⁵ Instead, chaining constructions in Papuan Malay allow same subjects or different subjects. The subjects remain the same across the respective chains of clauses in (68) to (71): while the subjects are overtly mentioned in (68) and (69), they are elided in (70) and (71) (for details regarding the common elision of syntactic arguments in Papuan Malay see Kluge 2017:467–480).²⁶ By contrast, the subjects are different across the respective clause chains in (72) and (73). (For easier recognition the subject in each of the linked clauses is bolded.)

Clause chaining constructions

- (68) *jadi pagi saya bangun, sa kasi makang anjing, sa pegang*
 so morning 1SG wake.up 1SG give eat dog 1SG hold
sa pu parang
 1SG POSS short.machete
 ‘so in the morning, **I** got up, **I** fed the dogs, **I** took my short machete’ [080919-003-NP.0003]
- (69) *Fiki nanti ko kejar saya, ko liat, ko tunggu*
 Fiktor very.soon 2SG chase 1SG 2SG see 2SG wait
 ‘Fiki, in a moment **you** chase (me), **you** observe (me), **you** wait’ [080917-004-CvHt.0001]
- (70) *pagi bangun Ø sembayang Ø pergi olahraga*
 morning wake.up worship go do.sports
 [About a youth retreat:] ‘in the morning (**we**) got up, (**we**) worshiped, (and **we**) went to do sports’ [081022-002-CvNP.0004]
- (71) *tong langsung ambil itu, Ø pikol itu babi,*
 1PL immediately fetch D.DIST shoulder D.DIST pig
Ø *bawa ke ruma kebun*
 bring to house garden
 [Hunting wild pigs:] ‘right after that, ah, **we** took it immediately, (**we**) shouldered it, the pig, (and **we**) carried (it) to the garden shelter’ [080919-003-NP.0013]
- (72) *mungking de suru dia, ko ambil sa air, sa minum*
 maybe 3SG order 3SG 2SG fetch 1SG water 1SG drink
 ‘maybe s/he orders him/r, **you** fetch me water (and then) **I** drink’ [081006-024-CvEx.0092]
- (73) *Oktofernus tra makang, Mateus tra makang, Wili tra makang,*
 Oktofernus NEG eat Mateus NEG eat Wili NEG eat
 e, **paytua** tra makang
 uh husband NEG eat
 ‘**Oktofernus** didn’t eat, **Mateus** didn’t eat, **Wili** didn’t eat, uh, (my) **husband** didn’t eat’
 [080921-003-CvNP.0005]

²⁵ So far, dedicated switch-reference devices have not been identified for Papuan Malay. This finding contrasts with Donohue’s (2011) observations. Donohue (2011:431–432) submits that the sequential-marking conjunction *trus* ‘next’ tends to mark “same-subject coreference condition between clauses”, while the sequential-marking conjunction *baru* ‘and then’ tends “to indicate switch reference”. The findings of an initial investigation of the conjunctions *trus* ‘next, and then’ and *baru* ‘and then’, reported in Kluge (2017:544–546), suggest, however, that neither conjunction functions as a dedicated switch-reference device. The findings indicate furthermore that both conjunctions more often link clauses with a switch in reference, than clauses with same-subject coreference.

²⁶ Alternatively, one might argue that the example in (70) represents a sequential SVC (see §4.2) rather than a clausal chain with elided subject argument.

- (74) *ado, sa pu bahu sakit, sa pu pinggang sakit,*
 ouch! 1SG POSS shoulder be.sick 1SG POSS loins be.sick
sa pu blakang sakit
 1SG POSS backside be.sick
 [After a motorbike accident:] ‘ow, **my** shoulder hurts, **my** loins hurt, **my** back hurts’
 [081015-005-NP.0032]

The main function of Papuan Malay clause chaining is to encode the temporal sequentiality of distinct but related events, as in (68) to (72). The chained clauses in (68), for instance, describe three consecutive events related to getting ready for hunting. In (71), the chaining construction describes three consecutive actions related to a successful hunt. Less commonly, chaining constructions encode temporal simultaneity, as in (73) and (74). In both examples, the events overlap in time. The example in (73) is part of a narrative about a group of friends who got sick while visiting another village; due to their sickness none of them was able to eat during that visit. In (74), the speaker relates how different parts of her body were hurting after a motorbike accident.

While Papuan Malay makes extensive use of clause chaining, it remains unclear whether and to what extent the other eastern Malay varieties also employ this strategy of combining clauses. The consulted descriptions of Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005), and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983; Litamahuputty 2012) do not discuss this phenomenon.

Clause chaining is, as mentioned, a typical feature of right-headed languages with SOV constituent order. This is the case for the majority of Papuan languages among which clause chaining is pervasive. Austronesian languages, including the western Austronesian languages, by contrast, are typically left-headed with SVO constituent order. Hence, clause chaining seems to be, overall, rare in these languages. (It is, however, possible that structures similar or identical to those identified for Papuan Malay as clause chaining have been described under different names for these languages.) (See Aikhenvald and Stebbins 2007:255; Blust 2001-; Foley 2010:807, 2000:383–384; Klamer and Ewing 2010:11; Raible 2001:597.) Through long-term contact with Papuan languages, however, some Austronesian languages in the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone have “shifted from an earlier left-headed typology to a right-headed one” and have “innovated a clause chaining pattern typical of right-headed languages” (Foley 2010:807). An example is the Oceanic language Takia [tbc] (Madang province, Papua New Guinea) (Ross 2008:150–153).

4.4 Tail-head linkage

Also very common in Papuan Malay is tail-head linkage. It is a feature that ensures discourse cohesion in that “the final clause of the previous sentence initiates the next sentence, often in a reduced form” (Foley 2000:390). The main functions of tail-head linkage are to ensure “referential coherence, processing ease, thematic continuity [...] and thematic discontinuity” (de Vries 2005:363; see also Foley 1986:200–201, 2000:390).

Pending a more in-depth analysis, the examples in (75) to (77) briefly illustrate tail-head linkage in Papuan Malay. In (75), for instance, the speaker repeats only the verb of the preceding clause: *tidor* ‘sleep’. In (76), the speaker also repeats the prepositional phrase together with the verb: *bawa ke depan* ‘bring to the front’. In (77), the speaker repeats the subject together with the verb: *kitong dua turung* ‘the two of us went down’.

Tail-head linkage

- (75) *trus sa tidor, tidor dorang dua pulang ke Waim*
 then 1SG sleep sleep 3PL two go.home to Waim
 [After an accident:] ‘then I **slept**, (while I was) **sleeping** the two of them went home to Waim’
 [081015-005-NP.0025]
- (76) *de bawa ke depan, bawa ke depan ibu tanya dia, ...*
 3SG bring to front bring to front woman ask 3SG
 [At school drawing a banana:] ‘he **brought** (his picture) to the front, (having) **brought** (it) to the front Mrs. (Teacher) asked him, ...’ [081109-003-JR.0003]

- (77) *kitong dua turung di jalang itu, kitong dua turung sampe di pohong*
 1PL two descend at street D.DIST 1PL two descend reach at tree
 ‘the two of us **went down** that road, the two of us **went** all the way **down** to the tree’
 [081109-003-JR.0003]

In Papuan languages, tail-head linkage is quite often associated with some switch reference system, namely “when switch reference constructions are the basic type of clause linkage” (de Vries 2005:363). For Papuan Malay, however, dedicated switch-reference devices have not been identified so far, as discussed in §4.3.

Whereas tail-head linkage is very common in Papuan Malay, it remains unclear whether and to what extent the other eastern Malay varieties also make use of this discourse strategy. None of the consulted descriptions discuss this phenomenon: Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997), Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005), and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983; Litamahuputty 2012).

Tail-head linkage is a typical trait of Papuan languages (Foley 1986:201). Furthermore, in the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone of the New Guinea area, tail-head linkage “is a truly areal phenomenon in the sense that it occurs all over New Guinea irrespective of typological or genetic boundaries” (de Vries 2005:364). That is, tail-head linkage has “spread to just about all Austronesian languages spoken nearby” (Dunn et al. 2002:36). For the most part, this statement refers to the CEMP languages, such as the CMP languages Leti [l̥ti] (Maluku) (van Engelenhoven 2004:160, 186) and Tetun Fehan [tet] (van Klinken 1999:304–305), or the Greater SHWNG language Ambel [wgo] (West Papua) (Arnold 2018:367–368). Dunn et al. (2002:36), however, also mention tail-head linkage for Malayic languages, such as “Moluccan Malay” and “Irianese Malay”, that is Papuan Malay. “Further away from the Papuan sphere of influence”, however, tail-head linkage “does not seem to occur” (Dunn et al. 2002:36–37; see also de Vries 2005:365; Reesink and Dunn 2018:955).²⁷

4.5 Clause-final conjunctions

The Papuan Malay conjunctions are all clause-initial. In addition, however, two of them also occur in clause-final position, namely sequential *baru* ‘and then’ and resultative *jadi* ‘so, since’ (Kluge 2017:537–562).

The typical clause-initial position of the Papuan Malay conjunctions is illustrated with disjunctive *ato* ‘or’ in (78), sequential *baru* ‘and then’ in (79), resultative *jadi* ‘so, since’ in (80), and causal *karna* ‘because’ in (81).

Conjunctions in clause-initial position

- (78) *dong bilang, a, tunggu minum dulu, ato makang dulu*
 3PL say ah! wait drink be.prior or eat be.prior
 ‘they said, ‘ah, wait, please drink **or** eat’’ (Lit. ‘drink first **or** eat first’) [080925-003-Cv.0111]
- (79) *tong ... jaga dia sampe jam satu, baru tong tidor*
 1PL guard 3SG until hour one and.then 1PL sleep
 [About a sick relative:] ‘we ... watched her until one o’clock, **only then** did we sleep’
 [080916-001-CvNP.0005]
- (80) *tong tra snang dengang dia, jadi kitong malas datang dia pu ruma*
 1PL NEG feel.happy(.about) with 3SG so 1PL be.listless come 3SG POSS house
 ‘we don’t feel happy about her, **so** we don’t want (to) come to her house’ [080927-006-CvNP.0032]
- (81) *saya bisa pulang, karna sa su dapat babi*
 1SG be.able go.home because 1SG already get pig
 [Hunting a wild pig:] ‘I can return home **because** I already got the pig’ [080919-004-NP.0024]

²⁷ Dunn et al. (2002:37) note, for example, that “Austronesian languages to the west of Timor do not utilize this strategy of information flow”.

Occasionally, sequential *baru* ‘and then’ and resultative *jadi* ‘so, since’ occur at the right periphery of a clause, as in (82) and (83), respectively. In this clause-final position, *baru* ‘and then’ summarizes what has been said before, marking the propositional content of its clause as true despite the contents of the preceding unmarked clause. In this case, the conjunction receives the counter-expectational reading ‘after all’, as in (82). In the clause-final position, *jadi* ‘so, since’ marks a causal relation with the preceding unmarked clause, as in (41), repeated as (83). In this position, the conjunction conveys that something depicted in its clause is the cause for the event or state of the preceding clause, and that the result depicted in this clause is anticipated. Therefore, *jadi* translates with ‘since’.

Conjunctions in clause-final position

- (82) *sa tra akang kasi kaing, sa juga dinging stenga mati, ada anging baru*
 1SG NEG will give cloth 1SG also be.cold half be.dead exist wind and.then
 [About sleeping conditions during a youth retreat:] ‘I wasn’t going to give (her my) cloth,
 I was also half dead (from being) cold, it was windy **after all**’ [081025-006-Cv.0048]
- (83) *Musa ini, e, de loyo~loyo ini, de bangun tidur jadi*
 Musa D.PROX uh 3SG RDP~be.weak D.PROX 3SG wake.up sleep so
 [About a little boy:] ‘Musa here, uh, right now he’s kind of weak **since** he woke up from
 sleeping’ [080922-001a-CvPh.1436,1438]

The additional use of clause-final conjunctions is a feature that Papuan Malay shares with one other eastern Malay variety. Ternate Malay employs two of its conjunctions at the end of utterances, both of which also occur in clause-initial position (Litamahuputty 2012): *kong* ‘and then’ and *la* ‘and next’. In clause-final position, *kong* ‘and then’ signals emphasis and implies rejection of the opposite, while *la* ‘and next’ puts a statement into perspective and serves to weaken or soften it (2012:153–156). Whether or not the other eastern Malay varieties also employ clause-final conjunctions remains unclear. For Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997:290–318) and Manado Malay (Stoel 2005:52–55), the respective descriptions only mention clause-initial conjunctions, while the studies on Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009), and North Moluccan Malay (Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983) do not discuss conjunctions at all.

Cross-linguistically, however, “VO languages overwhelmingly tend to employ clause-initial subordinators” (Dryer 1992a:54) rather than clause-final conjunctions, a tendency that also applies to the western Austronesian languages. By contrast, “OV languages more often employ clause-final subordinators [..., although] initial subordinators are not uncommon in OV languages” (1992a:54; see also Dryer 2007:99–100; Schachter and Shopen 2007:46, 48). This tendency of employing clause-final conjunctions also applies to Papuan languages which “are overwhelmingly head-final, with OV constituent order, [... and] final conjunctions” (Klamer and Ewing 2010:11; see also Foley 2018:920).²⁸ In the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone, however, the feature of clause-final conjunctions has also diffused to Austronesian languages. Examples in addition to the mentioned eastern Malay varieties are the CMP language Lamaholot [slp] (East Nusa Tenggara province) (Nagaya 2015), and the Greater SHWNG language Ambel [wgo] (Arnold 2018:598–614): both languages have clause-final conjunctions in addition to their clause-initial conjunctions.

4.6 Alienability distinction in nouns

Papuan Malay has no morphologically marked distinction between alienable and inalienable nouns. The language has the option, however, of denoting inalienable possession with an adnominal possessive construction by omitting the possessive ligature in a ‘POSSR-NP – LIG – POSSM-NP’ construction, such that ‘POSSR-POSSM’.

This elision is limited to two semantic kinds of possession, namely inalienable possession of body parts, as in (84) to (86), and kinship relations, as in (87) and (88), where “∅” indicates the missing ligature. In POSSR-POSSM constructions, the possessor is usually encoded by a short personal pronoun form, as in (86) to (88). Much less often, the possessor is expressed with a lexical noun, such as *bapa* ‘father’ in (84). Likewise

²⁸ Concerning the order of adverbial subordinator and clause, Dryer (2013a) notes that in New Guinea clause-final subordinators are common, while clause-initial subordinators are uncommon.

infrequently, the possessor is expressed by a noun phrase such as *pace de* ‘the man’ in (85), where adnominally used *de* ‘3SG’ modifies *pace* ‘man’.²⁹ Most often, the possessor is human as in (84), (85), (87), and (88), but it may also be animate nonhuman as in (86). Overall, however, POSSR-POSSM constructions are a relatively marginal feature of encoding adnominal possessive relations (see also Kluge 2017:432–433).

Adnominal possessive constructions denoting inalienable possession

- (84) *adu, bapa Ø mulut jahat skali*
 oh.no! father mouth be.bad very
 ‘oh no, **father’s language** is very bad’ (Lit. ‘**father’s mouth**’) [080923-008-Cv.0019]
- (85) *pace de Ø tangang keluar ke samping*
 man 3SG arm go.out to side
 [About an accident:] ‘**the man’s hand** stuck out sideways’ [081108-001-JR.0003]
- (86) *langsung potong dia buang tali-prutnya de Ø tali-prut*
 immediately cut 3SG throw(.away) intestines:3POSSR³⁰ 3SG intestines
buang, tinggal isi saja
 throw(.away) stay contents just
 [About killing dogs:] ‘cut him up at once (and) throw away the intestines, (after having) thrown away **its intestines** just the meat remains’ [081106-001-CvPr.0005]
- (87) *de Ø mama ini ke atas*
 3SG see 3SG POSS wife
 ‘**his mother here** (went) up (there)’ [080923-001-CvNP.0019]
- (88) *de Ø bapa tra bicara, diam saja*
 3SG father NEG speak be.quiet just
 ‘**his father** didn’t speak, (he was) just silent’ [081006-032-Cv.0079]

The option of signaling inalienable possession of body parts or kinship relations by eliding the possessive ligature in a ‘POSSR-NP – LIG – POSSM-NP’ construction is a feature that Papuan Malay shares with Ambon Malay (Collins 1983:33–35).³¹ Ternate Malay also has the possibility of eliding the possessive ligature in ‘POSSR-NP – LIG – POSSM-NP’ constructions. The resulting ‘POSSR-POSSM’ constructions, however, also denote alienable possession in addition to inalienable possession of body parts or kinship relations (Litamahuputty 2012:43, 102-104). The studies on Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005), and North Moluccan Malay (Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983) do not discuss alienability at all.

Cross-linguistically, the alienability distinction is not found in the western Austronesian languages (Blust 2013:482; Himmelmann 2005:175; Klamer et al. 2008:95, 116). Neither has this distinction been reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian. The attributive possessive construction in Proto-Austronesian – *possessum=possessive.clitic (possessor) – was used to denote both alienable and inalienable possession (Lichtenberk 2013:201–203).

The alienability distinction is, by contrast, another typical trait of Papuan languages that has diffused to the East Nusantara Austronesian languages, such as the eastern Malay varieties (Donohue and Schapper 2009; Klamer et al. 2008:116, 120; Klamer and Ewing 2010:11, 13; Reesink 2005:204; Ross 2001:138; van den Berg 2009). Additional examples are the CMP languages Dobel [kvo] (Maluku province) (Hughes 1995:643) and Tetun Fehan [tet] (van Klinken 1999:145–149), or the Greater SHWNG language Biak [bhw] (van den Heuvel 2006:229–253).

²⁹ For details concerning the adnominal uses of the Papuan Malay personal pronouns see Kluge (2017:344–365).

³⁰ In Papuan Malay, affixation with *-nya* ‘3POSSR’ is not used as a productive derivation device; instead, the suffixed lexemes are best explained as code-switches with Indonesian (Kluge 2017:165–171).

³¹ In his description of Ambon Malay, van Minde (1997) does not discuss alienability.

5 Summary

The focus of this chapter was to describe the contact features that Papuan Malay, an Eastern Indonesia Trade Malay, displays under the influence of Papuan languages. Spoken in the coastal areas of West Papua, Papuan Malay is situated in East Nusantara, the Austronesian-Papuan contact zone. Here a number of linguistic features have diffused from Papuan into Austronesian languages and vice versa. Like other Austronesian languages of this contact zone, Papuan Malay displays a number of the observed contact phenomena. That is, the language is lacking some of the typical western Austronesian features, most of which have also been reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Malayic. At the same time, it shows a number of features typically found in Papuan languages but not usually found in the western Austronesian languages.

More specifically, four typical western Austronesian features that Papuan Malay is lacking or making only limited use of were examined in more detail: (1) the lack of the clusivity distinction in personal pronouns, (2) the lack of a morphologically marked passive voice, (3) the limited use of affixation, and (4) the limited use of the numeral-noun order. Also explored in more detail were six typical Papuan features that have diffused to Papuan Malay: (1) the genitive-noun order instead of the noun-genitive order to express adnominal possession, (2) serial verb constructions, (3) clause chaining, (4) tail-head linkage, (5) the limited use of clause-final conjunctions, and (6) the optional use of the alienability distinction in nouns.

Table 4 summarizes the ten features and shows which ones Papuan Malay shares with other East Nusantara Austronesian languages and with Papuan languages and which ones it shares with western Austronesian languages outside of East Nusantara and with Proto-Austronesian.³²

As discussed throughout this contribution and summarized in Table 4, Papuan Malay shares most of its ten non-Western Austronesian features with other East Nusantara Austronesian languages and with Papuan languages. By contrast, these ten features are neither typical of western Austronesian languages outside of East Nusantara, nor are they inherited from Proto-Austronesian (to the extent that the relevant information is available). In addition, Table 4 highlights two pertinent features of Papuan Malay vis-à-vis other East Nusantara Austronesian languages. First, unlike other East Nusantara Austronesian languages, but like Papuan languages, Papuan Malay makes no clusivity distinction in personal pronouns. Second, unlike other East Nusantara Austronesian languages and also unlike Papuan languages, Papuan Malay employs both a numeral/quantifier-noun order and a noun-numeral/quantifier order.

Table 4: *Pertinent western Austronesian and Papuan features shared with Eastern Nusantara Austronesian languages and Papuan languages*³³

	PM	PLgs	ENAN	WAN	PAN
Pertinent western Austronesian features					
Clusivity distinct.	no	no	yes	yes	yes
Morph. mark. pass.	no	no	no	yes	yes
Productive affixation	lmtd.	yes	lmtd.	yes	yes
Numeral-noun order	lmtd.	no	no	yes	---
Pertinent Papuan features					
Genitive-noun order	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Serial verb construct.	yes	yes	yes	no	---
Clause chaining	yes	yes	yes	no	---
Tail-head linkage	yes	yes	yes	no	---
Final conjunctions	lmtd.	yes	lmtd.	no	---
Alienability distinct.	yes	yes	yes	no	no
# Non-WAN features	+++++	+++++	+++++	---	---

³² The bottom row in Table 4 and Table 5 ('# Non-WAN features') presents the total tally of non-Western Austronesian features, combining Western Austronesian features that are absent and Papuan features that are present. Given, however, the blanks in a substantial number of cells in both tables, a symbolic tally of "+" rather than a numeric tally is given to indicate the proportion of non-WAN-ness.

³³ Abbreviations: PM = Papuan Malay, PLgs = Papuan languages, WAN = western Austronesian, PAN = Proto-Austronesian; distinct. = distinction; morph. mark. pass. = morphologically marked passive voice, construct. = construction; lmtd. = limited; "---" = no information available.

These findings raise the question why Papuan Malay behaves differently from other East Nusantara Austronesian languages. Pending a more in-depth investigation of this question, the following observation presents itself. As mentioned earlier in §1, Papuan Malay belongs to the Malayo-Chamic branch of the Austronesian language family,³⁴ whereas most of the East Nusantara Austronesian languages belong to the Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian (CEMP) branch; the exception are the other eastern Malayic languages, namely the eastern Malay varieties and unclassified Gorap. As shown in Table 5, all but one of the other eastern Malay varieties also lack a clusivity distinction in their personal pronouns. In addition, two other eastern Malay varieties also employ preposed as well as postposed adnominal numerals/quantifiers. Hence, the different behavior of Papuan Malay might be related to the different genetic affiliations within Malayo-Polynesian of the eastern Malayic languages versus the other East Nusantara Austronesian languages.

In exploring the features listed in Table 4, this contribution also examined whether these features are also present in other eastern Malay varieties. Table 5 lists the same ten features and shows which ones Papuan Malay shares with other eastern Malay varieties.³²

Papuan Malay shares many of its ten non-Western Austronesian features with other eastern Malay varieties. More specifically, Papuan Malay shares most of them with Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997) and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983; Litamahuputty 2012). By contrast, the number of shared features is considerably lower for Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009), and Manado Malay (Stoel 2005) (again to the extent that the relevant information is available for these varieties).

One probable explanation for these differences and commonalities is that they result from gaps in the respective descriptions. Especially the studies of Banda Malay (Paauw 2009), Kupang Malay (Paauw 2009; Steinhauer 1983), and Larantuka Malay (Paauw 2009) mention only the most salient grammatical features. Along similar lines, the description of Manado Malay summarizes its grammatical features in a concise way (Stoel 2005). Hence, the rather large number of gaps for these varieties in Table 5.

Table 5: *Pertinent western Austronesian and Papuan features shared with other eastern Malay varieties*³⁵

	PM	AM	BM	KM	LM	MM	TM
Pertinent western Austronesian features							
Clusivity distinct.	no	no	no	lmtd.	no	no	no
Morph. mark. pass.	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Productive affixation	lmtd.	lmtd.	lmtd.	lmtd.	lmtd.	lmtd.	lmtd.
Numeral-noun order	lmtd.	lmtd.	no	no	no	---	lmtd.
Pertinent Papuan features							
Genitive-noun order	yes	yes	yes	yes	lmtd.	yes	yes
Serial verb construct.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Clause chaining	yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
Tail-head linkage	yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
Final conjunctions	lmtd.	no	---	---	---	no	lmtd.
Alienability distinct.	yes	yes	---	---	---	---	---
# Non-WAN features	+++++	+++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	+++++

Concurrently, it can be argued, however, that the commonalities between Papuan Malay on the one side, and Ambon Malay and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay on the other side, together with the lesser overlap with the four other eastern Malay varieties, reflect the distinct history of Papuan Malay (Kluge 2017:42–47). Other eastern Malay varieties were already well established before the first Europeans arrived in these areas

³⁴ As mentioned, Blust (2013:32) groups Papuan Malay within the Malayo-Chamic branch, whereas Adelaar (2005a) maintains that the Malayic languages belong to a larger collection of languages, namely Malayo-Sumbawan.

³⁵ Abbreviations: AM = Ambon Malay, BM = Banda Malay, KM = Kupang Malay, LM = Larantuka Malay, MM = Manado Malay, PM = Papuan Malay, TM = North Moluccan / Ternate Malay; distinct. = distinction; morph. mark. pass. = morphologically marked passive voice, construct. = construction; lmtd. = limited; “---” = no information available.

in the sixteenth century. This applies to Ambon and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay. It also applies to Manado Malay, which apparently developed out of North Moluccan Malay. Likewise, it applies to Kupang Malay. (Paauw 2009:42–79; see also Adelaar and Prentice 1996; Collins 1998.) Papuan Malay, by contrast, only developed over the last 140 years or so. Its precise origins, however, still 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. Donohue (2003:1–2) and Paauw (2009:73) submit, however, that there is linguistic evidence, that both Ambon Malay and North Moluccan / Ternate Malay played an important role in the genesis of Papuan Malay. In her description of Papuan Malay, Kluge (2017) also explores how Papuan Malay compares to the other eastern Malay varieties with respect to a number of different grammatical features. While this comparison is far from systematic and exhaustive, “the noted distinctions and similarities” support Kluge’s (2017:37) conclusion “that the history of Papuan Malay is different from that of the other eastern Malay varieties, and that Ambon Malay was influential in its genesis”.

As mentioned in §1, the focus of this contribution were those grammatical features that previous studies of the East Nusantara Austronesian languages had identified as contact phenomena due to the influence of Papuan languages. Hence, other pertinent features of Papuan Malay were not investigated as to whether they also constitute such contact phenomena. Given, however, the above-mentioned different behavior that Papuan Malay displays vis-à-vis the other East Nusantara Austronesian languages, that is the lack of clusivity and the use of pre- and postposed adnominal numerals/quantifiers, other Papuan Malay features may also turn out to be contact phenomena due to Papuan influence. A number of features present themselves that might be of interest for future studies. They include features pertaining to the phonology of Papuan Malay such as the loss of schwa, the loss of final /h/, or cluster formation (Kluge 2017:70-71, 87-89), features pertaining to its syntax such as the personal pronouns and their adnominal uses (2017:325–366), or the clause-final position of the question marker in polar interrogative clauses (2017:524–528), or features pertaining to its lexicon such as borrowing, calques, or colexification. Furthermore, extending such research to the other eastern Malay varieties and also to the unclassified Malayic language Gorap might provide further insights into the particularities of the non-CEMP languages, that is, the eastern Malayic varieties spoken in East Nusantara.

6 Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	1st, 2nd, 3rd person	NP	noun phrase
ACL	accidental	O	object
AG	agent	PAT	patient
CAUS	causative	PL	plural
D.DIST	demonstrative, distal	POSS	possessive
D.PROX	demonstrative, proximal	POSSM	possessum
EMPH	emphasis, emphatic	POSSR	possessor
EXCL	exclusive	RDP	reduplication
INCL	inclusive	RECP	reciprocal
L.DIST	locative, distal	REL	relativizer
L.MED	locative, medial	S	subject
L.PROX	locative, proximal	SG	singular
LIG	ligature	TRU	truncated
N	noun	V	verb
NEG	negation, negative		

References

- Adelaar, K. A. 1992. *Proto Malayic: The reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its lexicon and morphology* (Pacific Linguistics C-119). Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.
- Adelaar, K. A. 2005a. Malayo-Sumbawan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44(2):357–388. Online URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3623345> (Accessed 8 Jan 2016).
- Adelaar, K. A. 2005b. Structural diversity in the Malayic subgroup. In Adelaar, K. A. & Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar* (Routledge Language Family Series). London: Routledge, 202–226.

- Adelaar, K. A. & Prentice, David J. 1996. Malay: Its history, role and spread. In Wurm, Stephen A. & Mühlhäusler, Peter & Tryon, Darrell T. (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas* (Trends in Linguistics: Documentation 13). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 673–693.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.), *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology* (Explorations in Linguistic Typology 2). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–68.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Stebbins, Tonya. 2007. Languages of New Guinea. In Miyaoka, Osahito & Sakiyama, Osamu & Krauss, Michael E. (eds.), *The vanishing languages of the Pacific rim* (Oxford Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 239–266.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2006. Serial verb constructions. In Brown, Keith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 2nd edn.. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Ltd. 260–264.
- Arnold, Laura. 2018. A grammar of Ambel: An Austronesian language of Raja Ampat, west New Guinea. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh. (PhD dissertation.)
- Blust, Robert A. 1974. Proto-Austronesian syntax: The first step. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13(1/2):f1–15. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3622737>.
- Blust, Robert A. 1994. The Austronesian settlement of mainland Southeast Asia. In Adams, Karen L. & Hudak, Thomas J. & Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (eds.), *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society, 1992*. Tempe: Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University, 25–83. Online URL: <http://sealang.net/sala/archives/pdf8/blust1994austronesian.pdf> (Accessed 8 Jan 2016).
- Blust, Robert A. 2001-. Austronesian languages. In Encyclopædia Britannica Inc. (ed.), *Encyclopædia Britannica online*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica. Online URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Austronesian-languages> (Accessed 13 Mar 2020).
- Blust, Robert A. 2005. Squib: A note on the history of genitive marking in Austronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44(1):215–222. Online URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3623235>.
- Blust, Robert A. 2010. The Greater North Borneo hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 49(1): 44–118. Online URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40783586> (Accessed 4 Apr 2018).
- Blust, Robert A. 2013. *The Austronesian languages* (Asia-Pacific Linguistics: Open Access Monographs A-PL 008), 2nd edn. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University. Online URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1885/10191>.
- Bowden, John. 2001. *Taba: Description of a South Halmahera Austronesian language* (Pacific Linguistics PL-521). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15144/PL-521>.
- Collins, James T. 1983. Syntactic change in Ambonese Malay: The possessive construction. In Collins, James T. (ed.), *Studies in Malay dialects: Part II* (NUSA – Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia 17). Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, 28–41.
- Collins, James T. 1998. *Malay, world language: A short history*, 2nd edn. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2001. Different views of language typology. In Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard & Oesterreicher, Wulf & Raible, Wolfgang (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook. Volume 1* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science (HSK) 20.1). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 25–39.
- Cowan, Hendrik Karel Jan. 1953. *Voorlopige resultaten van een ambtelijk taalonderzoek in Nieuw-Guinea*. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
- De Vries, Lourens. 2005. Towards a typology of tail–head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2): 363–384. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sl.29.2.04vri>.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2010. *Basic linguistic theory. Volume 2: Grammatical topics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Donohue, Mark. 2003. Papuan Malay. Singapore: National University of Singapore. Online URL: http://papuan.linguistics.anu.edu.au/Donohue/downloads/Donohue_2003_PapuanMalay.pdf (Accessed 8 Jan 2016).
- Donohue, Mark. 2007. Word order in Austronesian from north to south and west to east. *Linguistic Typology* 11(2): 349–391. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/LINGTY.2007.026>.
- Donohue, Mark. 2011. Papuan Malay of New Guinea: Melanesian influence on verb and clause structure. In Lefebvre, Claire (ed.), *Creoles, their substrates, and language typology* (Typological Studies in Language 95). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 413–435.
- Donohue, Mark & Schapper, Antoinette. 2009. Whence the Austronesian indirect possession construction. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47(2): 316–327. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/ol.0.0017>.
- Donohue, Mark & Smith, John C. 1998. What’s happened to us? Some developments in the Malay pronoun system. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37(1): 65–84. Online URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3623280>.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1992a. Adverbial subordinators and word order asymmetries. In Hawkins, John A. & Siewierska, Anna (eds.), *Performance principles of word order* (EUROTYP Working Papers). Berlin: European Science Foundation, EUROTYP Programme, 50–67.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1992b. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68(1): 81–138. Online URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/416370> (Accessed 29 Dec 2013).
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Word order. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume 1: Clause structure*, 2nd edn.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 61–131.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013a. Order of adverbial subordinator and clause. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*. München: Max Planck Digital Library, Chapter 94. Online URL: <https://wals.info/chapter/94> (Accessed 23 Sep 2020).
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013b. Position of negative morpheme with respect to subject, object, and verb. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*. München: Max Planck Digital Library, Chapter 144. Online URL: <https://wals.info/chapter/144> (Accessed 14 Sep 2020).
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013c. Position of polar question particles. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*. München: Max Planck Digital Library, Chapter 92.
- Dunn, Michael & Reesink, Gerard P. & Terrill, Angela. 2002. The East Papuan Languages: A preliminary typological appraisal. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41(1): 28–62. Online URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3623327>.
- Eberhard, David M. & Simons, Gary F. & Fennig, Charles D. (eds.) 2020. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, Twenty-third edition*. Dallas: SIL International. Online URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com/> (Accessed 5 Oct 2020).
- Evans, Nicholas. 2018. The languages of Southern New Guinea. In Palmer, Bill (ed.), *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea Area* (The World of Linguistics 4). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 641–774.
- Farr, Cynthia J. M. 1999. *The interface between syntax and discourse in Korafe, a Papuan language of Papua New Guinea* (Pacific Linguistics C-148). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15144/PL-C148>.
- Foley, William A. 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea* (Cambridge Language Surveys). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, William A. 2000. The languages of New Guinea. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:357–404. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.357>.
- Foley, William A. 2007. A typology of information packaging in the clause. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume 1: Clause structure*, 2nd edn.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 362–446.
- Foley, William A. 2010. Language contact in the New Guinea region. In Hickey, Raymond (ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 795–813.

- Foley, William A. 2018. The morphosyntactic typology of Papuan languages. In Palmer, Bill (ed.), *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea Area* (The World of Linguistics 4). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 895–937.
- Franklin, Karl J. 1971. *A grammar of Kewa, New Guinea* (Pacific Linguistics PL-C16). Canberra: The Australian National University. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25911/5d763a6a1d746> (Accessed 12 Oct 2020).
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Adelaar, K. A. & Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar* (Routledge Language Family Series). London: Routledge, 110–181.
- Hughes, Jock. 1995. Dobel (Aru Islands). In Tryon, Darrell T. (ed.), *Comparative Austronesian dictionary: An introduction to Austronesian studies, Part 1: Fascicle 1* (Trends in Linguistics: Documentation 10). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 637–650.
- Kaland, Constantijn. 2018. Spectral tilt as a correlate of Papuan Malay word stress. In Demenko, Grażyna & Bachan, Jolanta & Śledziński, Daniel (eds.), *Proceedings 9th International Conference on Speech Prosody, Poznań, 13-16 June 2018*. Urbana: Speech Prosody Special Interest Group, 339-334. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21437/SpeechProsody.2018-69>.
- Kaland, Constantijn. 2019. Acoustic correlates of word stress in Papuan Malay. *Journal of Phonetics* 74:55–74. Online URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2019.02.003> (Accessed 26 Sep 2020).
- Kaland, Constantijn. 2020. Offline and online processing of acoustic cues to word stress in Papuan Malay. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 147:731–747 (Accessed 27 Sep 2020).
- Kaland, Constantijn & Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Kluge, Angela. 2019. Stress predictors in a Papuan Malay random forest. In Calhoun, Sasha & Escudero, Paola & Tabain, Marija & Warren, Paul (eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Melbourne, Australia 2019*. Canberra: Australasian Speech Science and Technology Association Inc. 2871–2875. Online URL: http://intro2psycholing.net/ICPhS/papers/ICPhS_2920.pdf (Accessed 15 Nov 2019).
- Kaland, Constantijn & van Heuven, Vincent J. 2020. Papuan Malay word stress reduces lexical alternatives. Paper presented at the 10th International Conference on Speech Prosody 2020. Tokyo, 25-28 May 2020. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21437/SpeechProsody.2020-93> (Accessed 27 Sep 2020).
- Klamer, Marian. 1998. *A grammar of Kambera* (Mouton Grammar Library 18). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Klamer, Marian. 2002. Typical features of Austronesian languages in Central/Eastern Indonesia. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41(2): 363–383. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/ol.2002.0007>.
- Klamer, Marian & Ewing, Michael C. 2010. The languages of East Nusantara: An introduction. In Ewing, Michael C. & Klamer, Marian (eds.), *East Nusantara: Typological and areal analysis* (Pacific Linguistics PL-618). Canberra: College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University, 1–25.
- Klamer, Marian & Reesink, Gerard P. & van Staden, Miriam. 2008. East Nusantara as a linguistic area. In Muysken, Pieter (ed.), *From linguistic areas to areal linguistics* (Studies in Language Companion Series 90). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 95–151.
- Kluge, Angela. 2016. Productivity of morphological patterns and social domain analysis in Papuan Malay. *JSEALS – Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 9:200–238. Online URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1885/109356> (Accessed 8 Nov 2016).
- Kluge, Angela. 2017. *A grammar of Papuan Malay* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 11). Berlin: Language Science Press. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/langsci.b78.35>.
- Kluge, Angela & Rumaropen, Ben E. W. & Aweta, Lodowik. 2014. *Papuan Malay data – Word list*. Dallas: SIL International. Online URL: <http://www.sil.org/resources/archives/59649> (Accessed 19 May 2016).
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2013. The rise and demise of possessive classifiers in Austronesian. In Kikusawa, Ritsuko & Reid, Lawrence A. (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2011: Selected papers from the 20th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Osaka, 25-30 July 2011* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 326). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 199–225.

- Litamahuputty, Betty. 2012. *Ternate Malay: Grammar and texts* (LOT Dissertation Series 307). Utrecht: LOT. Online URL: <http://www.lotpublications.nl/ternate-malay-ternate-malay-grammar-and-texts> (Accessed 18 Oct 2016).
- Margetts, Anna & Austin, Peter K. 2007. Three-participant events in the languages of the world: Towards a crosslinguistic typology. *Linguistics* 45(3):393–451. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/LING.2007.014>.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2015. Searching for insubordination: An analysis of ləbo in Lamaholot. In Yanti & Shiohara, Asako (eds.), *Clause combining in the languages of Indonesia* (NUSA – Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia 59). Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, 33–45. Online URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/10108/86506> (Accessed 19 Feb 2020).
- Paauw, Scott H. 2009. *The Malay contact varieties of eastern Indonesia: A typological comparison*. Buffalo: State University of New York. (PhD dissertation.)
- Pawley, Andrew. 2005. The chequered career of the Trans New Guinea hypothesis. In Pawley, Andrew & Attenborough, Robert & Golson, Jack & Hide, Robin (eds.), *Papuan pasts: Cultural, linguistic and biological histories of Papuan-speaking peoples* (Pacific Linguistics PL-572). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, 67–107.
- Pawley, Andrew. 2006. Papuan languages. In Brown, Keith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 2nd edn.. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Ltd. 162–170.
- Raible, Wolfgang. 2001. Linking clauses. In Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard & Oesterreicher, Wulf & Raible, Wolfgang (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook. Volume 1* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science (HSK) 20.1). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 590–617.
- Reesink, Gerard P. 2005. West Papuan languages: Roots and development. In Pawley, Andrew & Attenborough, Robert & Golson, Jack & Hide, Robin (eds.), *Papuan pasts: Cultural, linguistic and biological histories of Papuan-speaking peoples* (Pacific Linguistics PL-572). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, 185–218.
- Reesink, Gerard P. & Dunn, Michael. 2018. Contact phenomena in Austronesian and Papuan languages. In Palmer, Bill (ed.), *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea Area* (The World of Linguistics 4). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 939–985.
- Remijsen, Bert. 2010. Nouns and verbs in Magey Matbat. In Ewing, Michael C. & Klamer, Marian (eds.), *East Nusantara: Typological and areal analysis* (Pacific Linguistics PL-618). Canberra: College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University, 281–311.
- Riesberg, Sonja & Kalbertodt, Janina & Baumann, Stefan & Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2018. On the perception of prosodic prominences and boundaries in Papuan Malay. In Riesberg, Sonja & Shiohara, Asako & Utsumi, Atsuko (eds.), *Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 31). Berlin: Language Science Press, 389–414.
- Riesberg, Sonja & Kalbertodt, Janina & Baumann, Stefan & Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2020. Using Rapid Prosody Transcription to probe little-known prosodic systems: The case of Papuan Malay. *Laboratory Phonology: Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology* 11(1):1–35. Online URL: <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.192> (Accessed 28 Sep 2020).
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2001. Contact-induced change in Oceanic languages in North-West Melanesia. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 134–166.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2004. Notes on the prehistory and internal subgrouping of Malayic. In Bowden, John & Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (eds.), *Papers in Austronesian subgrouping and dialectology* (Pacific Linguistics PL-563). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, 97–109.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2008. A history of metatypy in the Bel languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 2: 149–164. Online URL: <https://doi.org/10.1163/000000008792525255>.

- Schachter, Paul & Shopen, Timothy. 2007. Parts-of-speech systems. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume 1: Clause structure*, 2nd edn.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–60.
- Scott, Graham R. & Kim, Hyun & Rumaropen, Ben E. W. & Scott, Eleonora L. & Nussy, Christian G. & Yumbi, Anita C. M. & Cochran, Robert C. 2008. *Tong pu bahasa: A preliminary report on some linguistic and sociolinguistic features of Papuan Malay*. Sentani: SIL International.
- Senft, Gunter. 2008. Introduction. In Senft, Gunter (ed.), *Serial verb constructions in Austronesian and Papuan languages* (Pacific Linguistics PL-594). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, 1–15.
- Stassen, Leon. 1985. *Comparison and universal grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Steinhauer, Hein. 1983. Notes on the Malay of Kupang. In Collins, James T. (ed.), *Studies in Malay dialects: Part II* (NUSA – Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia 17). Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, 42–64.
- Steinhauer, Hein. 1991. Malay in east Indonesia: The case of Larantuka (Flores). In Steinhauer, Hein (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics No 1* (Pacific Linguistics A-81). Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University, 177–195.
- Stoel, Ruben. 2005. *Focus in Manado Malay: Grammar, particles, and intonation* (CNWS Publications 134). Leiden: Research School CNWS, School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies.
- Taylor, Paul M. 1983. North Moluccan Malay: Notes on a “substandard” dialect of Indonesian. In Collins, James T. (ed.), *Studies in Malay dialects: Part II* (NUSA – Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia 17). Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, 14–27.
- Tryon, Darrell T. (ed.) 1995. *Comparative Austronesian dictionary: An introduction to Austronesian studies, Part I: Fascicle 1* (Trends in Linguistics: Documentation 10). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van den Berg, René. 2009. Possession in South-Halmahera – West New Guinea: Typology reconstruction. In Adelaar, K. A. & Pawley, Andrew (eds.), *Austronesian historical linguistics and culture history: A festschrift for Robert Blust* (Pacific Linguistics PL-601). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, 327–357.
- Van den Heuvel, Wilco. 2006. *Biak: Description of an Austronesian language of Papua* (LOT Dissertation Series 138). Utrecht: LOT. Online URL: <http://www.lotpublications.nl/publish/articles/001950/bookpart.pdf> (Accessed 28 Dec 2013).
- Van Engelenhoven, Aone T. 2004. *Leti : A language of Southwest Maluku*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Van Klinken, Catharina. 1999. *A grammar of the Fehan dialect of Tetun: An Austronesian language of West Timor* (Pacific Linguistics C-155). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University.
- Van Minde, Don. 1997. *Malayu Ambong: Phonology, morphology, syntax* (CNWS Publications 61). Leiden: Research School CNWS, School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies.
- Voorhoeve, Clemens L. 1983. Some observations on North-Moluccan Malay. In Collins, James T. (ed.), *Studies in Malay dialects: Part II* (NUSA – Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia 17). Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, 1–13.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. In Gonzalez, Andrew B. (ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday* (LSP Special Monograph Issue 4). Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 71–91.