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.
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1 Introduction

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, 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”.
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Malayic is part of a larger collection of languages, namely Malayo-Sumbawan, a grouping, however, that Blust (2010:80–81) rejects. The language is spoken in coastal West Papua. 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%); 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 speakers). 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) define

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), 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.
The following sections describe in more detail a selection of contact features that Papuan Malay displays under the influence of Papuan languages. 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 abidental 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.

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, ŋ, r, l, j, w/) and five vowel phonemes (/i, ɛ, u, ɔ, 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
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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.\textsuperscript{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 language 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 Klamer 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: \textit{tida/tru} \textquotesingle NEG\textquotesingle negates verbal, existential, and nonverbal prepositional clauses, while \textit{bukang} \textquotesingle NEG\textquotesingle negates nonverbal clauses, other than prepositional ones; in addition, \textit{bukang} \textquotesingle NEG\textquotesingle marks contrastive negation. This negator-predicate order is typical for the western Austronesian languages (Himmelmann 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

\textsuperscript{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; Himmelmann 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 languages

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

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 predicate 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, limtd. = limited.
numeral-noun order (§3.4).  

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 jalong
   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 (Himmelmann 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 

\texttt{dapat} ‘get’ and \texttt{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 \texttt{dapat} ‘get’ show the inception of events that adversely affect the subject, highlighting the unpleasant experiences that the subject undergo. Bivalent \texttt{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 \texttt{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 \texttt{dapat} ‘get’

(5) \texttt{itu sala, sa } \texttt{dapat mara dari kaka dorang}
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
   & D.DIST  & be.wrong  & 1SG  & get & feel.angry(.about) from older.sibling 3PL \\
\end{tabular}
‘(… that was not allowed,) that was wrong, I got scolded by (my) older sibling and the others’  [081006-024-CvEx.0088]

(6) \texttt{ko tida kerja, ko tida makang, ko menangis baru } \texttt{dapat hajar}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
   & 2SG  & NEG & work & 2SG  & NEG & eat & 2SG & cry & and.then & get & beat.up \\
\end{tabular}
(if) you don’t work, you don’t eat, (if) you cry, then (you’ll) get beaten up  [081115-001b-Cv.0058]

(7) \texttt{de bilang, kitong dua jalang suda, mata-hari suda masuk,}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
   & 3SG & say & 1PL & two & walk & already & sun & already & enter \\
\end{tabular}
[nA 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 \texttt{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 \texttt{kena} ‘hit’ occurs in transitive clauses in which the source of these states is the object of \texttt{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 \texttt{kena} ‘hit’

(8) \texttt{kasiang, de } \texttt{kena prut sakit langsung meninggal}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
   & pity & 3SG & hit & stomach & be.sick & immediately & die \\
\end{tabular}
‘poor thing, he was hit (by) a sick stomach (and) died immediately’  [081006-015-Cv.0023]

(9) \texttt{itu } \texttt{kena air langsung de lapuk}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
   & D.DIST  & hit & water & immediately & 3SG & decompose \\
\end{tabular}[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.00108]

(10) \texttt{e, de tra bawa kaing, de } \texttt{kena ro apa}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
   & hey! & 3SG  & NEG & bring & cloth & 3SG & hit & spirit & what \\
\end{tabular}[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 anak itu*  
so I.SG exist at L.PROX with father I.SG 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 (Pauw 2009:441), Kupang Malay (Pauw 2009:469; Steinhauer 1983:45–49), Larantuka Malay (Pauw 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).
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 **pengaru** ‘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** sugu
   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 (Pauw 2009:444–445), Kupang Malay (Steinhauer 1983:46–49), and Larantuka Malay (Pauw 2009:517; Steinhauer 1991:193) each have two productive prefixes. 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 (Pauw 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). 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”.
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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 lima taung ke bawa sampe dua bulang*
d.P.PROX for children,under,five and baby REL age from 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 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 kluar 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 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 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 l/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 languages

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

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 ‘pu’ ‘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.
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 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 'POSS' reduce 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 (Paauw 2009:438), Kupang Malay (Steinhauer 1983:53), Larantuka Malay (Paauw 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” (Paauw 2009:176; see also Steinhauer 1991:193–194).
### Table 3: N1N2 noun phrases with canonical noun-modifier structure

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

Cross-linguistically, however, Austronesian languages, including the western Austronesian languages, typically have a noun-genitive structure, or possessum-possessor order to denote abnominal 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 [bhw] (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 monoclusal 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 monoclusal 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’ [081025-005-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 V1 and V2 occur at the same time, as in (46). In sequential SVCs, the action expressed by the V1 precedes that of the V2, as in (47). Durational SVCs are marked with bivalent sampe ‘reach’ in the V2 slot, with the action signified by the V1 continuing until the action specified by the V3 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 V1 slot express the beginning of an event, as in (49). Termination of an event is marked with bivalent selesay ‘finish’ in the V2 slot, as in (50); this event may be followed by another action specified in the V3 slot, as in (51).

SVCs expressing temporal relations of complex events

(46) sa itu, sa pegang sagu 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 kebung
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 V1 and V2 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 V1 bringing about the action or state of the V2, as in (52). Consequential SVCs differ from sequential SVCs in that the latter designate temporal but no causal relations between the V1 and V2, as in (47). In resultative SVCs, the actions designated by the V1 directly cause the actions or states of the V2, 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 V1 and V2 is more indirect and compelling. In a purposive SVC, the action expressed by the V2 designates the goal of the V1, as in (54).

SVCs expressing consequence relations of complex events

(52) *de pergi ada babi, de pana makang*
3SG go 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 V1 slot, while the V2 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 V1 that encodes the respective grammatical categories.

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 kebung 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 V1 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)  
\[
\text{kalo di Arbais prempuang bisa biking kebung}
\]

`as for (the villagers from) Arbais, the women can / are able to work (in the) gardens’  
[081014-007-CvEx.0035]

(59)  
\[
\text{setiap kegiatan apa saja dorang bole kerja}
\]

`whatever activity, they may / are allowed to carry (it) out’  
[080923-007-Cv.0013]

(60)  
\[
\text{ko harus sayang ko pu laki–laki tu}
\]

2SG have.to love 2SG POSS RDP–husband D.DIST  
`you have to love your husband (EMPH)’  
[081110-008-CvNP.0019]

(61)  
\[
\text{tong mo pake untuk kamar mandi}
\]

1PL want use for room bath  
`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 \textit{kasi} ‘give’, with its short form \textit{kas}, or bivalent \textit{biking} ‘make’, takes the V1 position. Causatives with \textit{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 \textit{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)  
\[
\text{dong kas masuk korek di sini}
\]

3PL give enter matches at L.PROX  
`they inserted the matches here’ (Lit. ‘give to enter’)  
[081025-006-Cv.0180]

(63)  
\[
\text{sa takut skali jadi sa kas bangung mama}
\]

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)  
\[
\text{ana–ana biking pusing mama}
\]

RDP–child make be.dizzy mother  
`the kids worry (their mother)’ (Lit. ‘make to be dizzy/confused’)  
[081014-007-CvEx.0047]

(65)  
\[
\text{… tapi dong biking bangkit dia lagi, biking hidup dia}
\]

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)  
\[
\text{sa bilang, ado mas ojek kitong dua lari plang–plang}
\]

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]
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 $V_1$ slot. The verb expressing the actual event takes the $V_2$ 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. 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). 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) 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{jadi pagi saya bangung, sa kasi makang anjing, sa pegang} \\
\text{so morning 1SG wake.up 1SG give eat dog 1SG hold} \\
\text{sa pu parang} \\
\text{1SG POSS short.machete}
\end{array}
\]

’so in the morning, I got up, I fed the dogs, I took my short machete’ [080919-003-NP.0003]

(69) 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Fiki nanti ko kejar saya, ko liat, ko tunggu} \\
\text{Fiktor very.soon 2SG chase 1SG 2SG see 2SG wait}
\end{array}
\]

‘Fiki, in a moment you chase (me), you observe (me), you wait’ [080917-004-CvHt.0001]

(70) 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{pagi bangung Ø sembayang Ø pergi olaraga} \\
\text{morning wake.up worship go do.sports}
\end{array}
\]

[About a youth retreat:] ‘in the morning (we) got up, (we) worshiped, (and we) went to do sports’ [081022-002-CvNP.0004]

(71) 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{tong langsung ambil itu, Ø pikol itu babi,} \\
\text{1PL immediately fetch D.DIST 1SG pig}
\end{array}
\]

[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) 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{mungking de suru dia, ko ambil sa air, sa minum} \\
\text{maybe 3SG order 3SG 2SG fetch 1SG water 1SG drink}
\end{array}
\]

‘maybe s/he orders him/r, you fetch me water (and then) I drink’ [081006-024-CvEx.0092]

(73) 

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Oktofernus tra makang, Mateus tra makang, Wili tra makang,} \\
\text{Oktofernus NEG eat Mateus NEG eat Wili NEG eat} \\
\text{e, paytua tra makang} \\
\text{uh husband NEG eat}
\end{array}
\]

‘Oktofernus didn’t eat, Mateus didn’t eat, Wili didn’t eat, uh, (my) husband didn’t eat’ [080921-003-CvNP.0005]
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 depang* ‘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 depang, bawa ke depang 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]
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 [lti] (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 runa**

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 bangung tidor 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 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’. 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 ∅ 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 ∅ tangang kluar 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 ∅ tali-prut
   immediately cut 3SG throw(.away) intestines:3POSSR 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 ∅ mama ini ke atas
   3SG see 3SG POSS wife
   ‘his mother here (went) up (there)’ [080923-001-CvNP.0019]

(88) de ∅ 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). 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 (Litamahputty 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pertinent western Austronesian features</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PLgs</th>
<th>ENAN</th>
<th>WAN</th>
<th>PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusivity distinct.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morph. mark. pass.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive affixation</td>
<td>ltd.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ltd.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeral-noun order</td>
<td>ltd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pertinent Papuan features</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive-noun order</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial verb construct.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail-head linkage</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final conjunctions</td>
<td>ltd.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ltd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienability distinct.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| # 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; ltd. = 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, 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. Papuan Malay shares many of its ten non-Western Austronesian features with other eastern Malayic languages. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pertinent western Austronesian features</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>KM</th>
<th>LM</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>TM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusivity distinct.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morph. mark. pass.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive affixation</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical-noun order</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pertinent Papuan features</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>KM</th>
<th>LM</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>TM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive-noun order</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial verb construct.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause chaining</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail-head linkage</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final conjunctions</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>lmtd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienability distinct.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# 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 |
| ACL | accidental |
| AG | agent |
| CAUS | causative |
| D.DIST | demonstrative, distal |
| D.PROX | demonstrative, proximal |
| EMPH | emphasis, emphatic |
| EXCL | exclusive |
| INCL | inclusive |
| L.DIST | locative, distal |
| L.MED | locative, medial |
| L.PROX | locative, proximal |
| LIG | ligature |
| NEG | negation, negative |
| N | noun |
| NEG | negation, negative |
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