K. Adelaar

Where does Malay come from? Twenty years of discussions about homeland, migrations and classifications

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 160 (2004), no: 1, Leiden, 1-30

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

K. ALEXANDER ADELAAR

Where does Malay come from?

Twenty years of discussions about homeland, migrations and classifications

Introduction

The Malay language consists of many dialects. Furthermore, various other languages are closely related to Malay, including Minangkabau, Kerinci, Iban and Kendayan. Together, these dialects and languages form the 'Malayic' linguistic subgroup within the (West) Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian language family (Adelaar 1992:1).

This article* discusses several issues involving the homeland¹ and classifications of the Malayic language subgroup and of Malay in particular. Following an overview of proposed theories about the Malay(ic) homeland (section 1), I discuss the Borneo hypothesis and the applicability of Sapir's (1968) model for the location of linguistic homelands (section 2). I treat the difficulties in assessing language divergence and genetic depth in the Malayic subgroup (section 3), and evaluate the claim of a Malay back-migration from Sumatra to Borneo (section 4). I also compare the locations that have been proposed for a Malayic homeland within Borneo (section 5) and give an overview of classifications of Malayic languages with other Austronesian

* I am grateful to Adrian Clynes (Universiti Brunei Darussalam), Anthony Jukes (University of Melbourne), and two anonymous readers for their careful reading and comments on an earlier draft of this article. They are in no way responsible for any errors in this version.

¹ That is the region where speakers of the hypothetical proto-language ancestral to a linguistic subgroup must have lived before they dispersed to other regions. In the case of speakers of Malayic isolects, this is the region where speakers of Proto Malayic originally lived.

K. Alexander Adelaar is Associate Professor and Reader at the Melbourne Institute of Asian Languages and Societies (MIALS) and holds a PhD from Leiden University. His main field of academic interest is Austronesian historical and descriptive linguistics, especially regarding the languages of Madagascar, Taiwan and Borneo. He is the author of *Proto-Malayic*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 1992, and 'Retrieving Siraya phonology: a new spelling for a dead language', in: E. Zeitoun and P. Jen-kuei Li (eds), *Selected papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, pp. 313-54, Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, 1999. Professor Adelaar may be reached at MIALS, University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia. <s.adelaar@unimelb.edu.au>

Map of the most important toponyms and languages referred to in this article

Note: Numbers following language names correspond to numbers on the map indicating the approximate location of the languages in question. Numbers on the map run more or less from west to east but are grouped by area.

Acehnese	1	Iban	24	Palembang Malay	6
Bacan Malay (eastern Indonesia)	38	Jakarta Malay/Jakartanese	15	Rejang	4
Balinese	35	Javanese	17	Salako	20
Bangka Malay	13	Kelantan Malay	10	Sambas Malay	21
Banjarese Malay	29	Kendayan	23	Sarawak Malay	25
Belitung Malay	14	Kerinci	3	Sasak	36
Bengkulu Malay	5	Kutai Malay	33	Seraway Malay	7
Berau Malay	34	Lampung	8	Sumbawa	37
Brunei Malay	26	Land Dayak	22	Sundanese	16
Cham(ic) (Indo-China)	19	Maanyan (> East Barito)	31	Tioman Malay	12
Duano	11	Madurese	18	Urak Lawoi'	9
Dusun Deyah	32	Minangkabau	2	(South-West Thailand)	
East Barito	31	Mualang	27	West Barito	30
Embaloh	28	Ngaju (> West Barito)	30		

languages (section 6). A large section assesses attempts at internal classifications of the Malayic subgroup made in the last twenty years (section 7), followed by some concluding remarks (section 8).

1. Overview of theories about the homeland of Malay and of the Malayic subgroup

Theories about the homeland of the Malay language are not new. In the late nineteenth century, the philologist and linguist H. Kern wrote an important article in which he used the 'Wörter und Sachen'² method to reconstruct the Austronesian natural environment (on the basis of predominantly animal and plant names) and to determine where they came from. In his view, the early Austronesians originally lived in coastal Indo-China and from there moved south overland prior to sailing into the areas where they presently live. Operating on this assumption, he believed that the Chams and peninsular Malays were the stay-behinds in a migration process towards the east, rather than recent arrivals of a westward migration, as is generally believed nowadays.

Kern, who did not distinguish between Malay and Malayic, argued that the Malay homeland was in the Malay peninsula. Malay has a term for 'south' which basically means 'strait' (*səlat/lan*). Kern took this as an indication that the earliest Malays had a sea strait to their south, which makes sense from the geographical perspective of the Malay peninsula. He did not believe that the homeland was in Borneo because that would leave unexplained why the early Malays had left this fertile³ and sparsely populated island to establish themselves on the coasts of more populated lands elsewhere. Their migrations must have been triggered by external pressure. Kern believed that such pressure was present in mainland Southeast Asia, where Vietnamese and Khmers are known to have gained large territories at the expense of the Austronesian-speaking Chams. Although it is sometimes unclear whether Kern is referring to the Austronesian or the Malay homeland, it is implicit in his argument that the Malays and Chams are the last vestiges of an earlier Austronesian homeland.

Kern's hypothesis of a homeland in the Malay peninsula was met with some scepticism by historians and philologists who realized that the establishment of Malay communities in the Malay peninsula was generally of a more recent date than that of Malay communities in Sumatra. These scholars also came to appreciate the authenticity of the ancient empire of Srivijaya in southern Sumatra (Çoedès 1948). Although this empire was mentioned in Malay

² A method combining the comparison of tangible objects and their various labels for prehistorical reconstruction (Malkiel 1993:x).

³ According to Kern (1889:287). Kern's description of Borneo as 'geenzins onvruchtbaar' ('not at all infertile') does not appear to reflect reality.

folklore and literature (for example in the *Sejarah Melayu* or 'Malay Annals'), it was not until the discovery of seventh-century inscriptions in an archaic form of Malay⁴ that scholars began to consider it to rest on historical fact.

Archaeological and linguistic research on Formosan languages (the Austronesian languages of Taiwan) in the last three decades has made it increasingly clear that the Austronesian homeland was either in Taiwan or in neighbouring coastal southern China (Bellwood 1997:106). The Austronesian migrations into western Indonesia must therefore have been from Taiwan south into the Philippines and then westwards, and the Southeast Asian mainland has come to be viewed as a rather late Austronesian settlement far to the west.

Blust (1984-85) was the first to propose Borneo⁵ as the Malay(ic) homeland. Inspired by his hypothesis, Adelaar (1985) argued that the Malays were more likely to have travelled by sea than by land (as believed by Kern): the demographic pattern of the Malay peninsula is a clear indication that this area had been populated by Malays more recently than had Borneo, where speakers of many Malayic isolects⁶ live rather far inland. Adelaar (1988) challenges Kern's rather weak evidence based on the term *salat/an* 'south', showing that *salat/an* and *utara* 'north' were at odds with the internal terminological consistency of the Malay cardinal direction system and must have supplanted earlier terms **daya?* 'towards the inland; south' and **laut* 'towards the sea; north'. Some other terms in this system still testify to their former presence, namely *barat-daya* 'southwest'; *barat-laut* 'northwest'; *timur-laut* 'northeast'. This state of affairs would fit with a position of the ancient Malay kingdom Srivijaya at the mouth of the Musi River in southeast Sumatra (due to siltation the ancient site is nowadays further inland).

Adelaar (1985) and Blust (1988) also believe that the presence of Malays along the Borneo coasts was the result of back-migrations. The Bornean homeland hypothesis combined with back-migrations is compatible with both linguistic and extra-linguistic findings including the traditionally held belief among Malays that the cradle of the Malay nation was in the region of Palembang in southern Sumatra (Andaya and Andaya 1994:31-4). At some

⁴ Teeuw (1959) remains cautious about qualifying Old Malay as a form of Malayic but Adelaar (forthcoming b) gives phonological and morphosyntactic evidence for it. Compare also Mahdi (forthcoming) who considers it a form of Malay.

⁵ More particularly, southwest Borneo; see section 6.

⁶ Our present state of knowledge about Malayic dialects and languages often makes it impossible to determine whether the speech of a certain community represents a language in its own right or a dialect vis-à-vis other varieties of Malayic that are identified as separate languages. In these cases, the cover term 'isolect' is often used, which is 'connotationally neutral in regard to language-dialect identification' (Hudson 1967:12). The term is also used when referring simultaneously to dialects as well as to languages, hence 'Malayic isolects' instead of the more cumbersome 'Malayic dialects and languages'.

prehistorical stage, Malayic speakers must have left Borneo and settled in southern Sumatra, where they founded a maritime empire and developed a separate Malay identity (probably under Indian influence, which also brought the idea of statehood to Southeast Asia). Blust (1988, 1994) places the Malayic homeland in southwest Borneo. He believes that Borneo is also the homeland of the Chamic languages of Vietnam and Kampuchea (see section 6).

Various other linguists have since adopted the Bornean homeland hypothesis. Collins and Nothofer have taken the hypothesis as a starting point for more far-reaching internal classifications of the Malayic language group. They place the homeland in western Borneo or northwest Borneo (see section 5). The archaeologist and prehistorian Peter Bellwood also seems to accept Borneo as a homeland in some of his earlier publications, but in a recent revision of his book *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian archipelago* he takes a more cautious position (Bellwood 1997:287).

Other linguists, however, do not consider the Bornean homeland hypothesis in their historical linguistic studies of Malay, for instance Asmah Haji Omar (1985) and Ismail Hussein (1992:2-5). The latter believes that the Malayo-Polynesian homeland was in Yunnan (southern China). He does not specifically address the question of the Malay(ic) homeland.

2. Borneo as the Malay homeland: theoretical justification

One of the assumptions behind the Borneo hypothesis is Sapir's model (1968) claiming that in the quest for a linguistic homeland, the area with the largest genetic diversity in relation to its size is most likely to be the homeland. This model is useful, all things being equal; but in practice other factors often interfere with it. If one compares Europe to the situation in the Americas, where the spread of Spanish, English, Portuguese and French is relatively recent, the model seems to make sense: the dialect diversity within each of these four languages is as a rule much less (and of less genetic depth) than it is in Europe. In Europe itself, however, it is doubtful whether the model would be helpful for tracing the homeland of, say, French. It would probably single out southern Belgium, an area with a relatively great dialect diversity compared to France itself. Nevertheless, the southern Belgian diversity does not necessarily reflect a greater time depth for the settlement of French speakers in this area. Rather, it is largely a consequence of the fact that this area has never been subjected to the same intensive political centralization and concomitant dialect levelling as have French-speaking areas within the borders of France. Neither is Sapir's model likely to be very helpful in areas affected by extensive incoming migrations, lasting foreign occupations, and epidemics, to name only a few factors that bring about language-induced change and

language shift. Finally, the reliability of the outcomes of the model should also be tested against independently acquired extra-linguistic evidence.

3. *Borneo as the Malay homeland: practical considerations*

If we adopt Borneo as the Malayic homeland on the basis of Sapir's model, it needs to be demonstrated that the diversity of Malayic isolects in western Borneo is in fact significantly greater than it is elsewhere. There is indeed considerable linguistic diversity in Borneo, particularly the western part, but to what extent is it genetically relevant? And how should we measure this diversity? There are at least three configurations distinct enough to represent separate languages: Iban-like or 'Ibanic' isolects, Kendayan⁷ isolects, and other isolects (including various local Malay dialects but possibly also other distinct languages). A separate language status for Ibanic and Kendayan is warranted on the basis of the differences they show at several linguistic levels between each other and with Malay: the evidence consists of phonological, morphosyntactic and lexical data. Considering our limited knowledge of the linguistic diversity of western Borneo, it would be speculative at this stage to distinguish other separate Malayic languages.

Much of the evidence for Malayic subgroups in western Borneo adduced by Collins and Nothofer is based on very limited phonological and lexical data and does not make use of morphosyntactic features. Moreover, some of the phonological changes and lexical replacements proposed by Collins and Nothofer may seem critical for a proposed subgroup of languages in a particular area but turn out not to be critical when other (not directly related) languages from outside that area are brought into the comparison. The Malayic isolects of western Borneo have apparently influenced each other considerably, and various phonological and lexical innovations are recurrent throughout the area. If one's research is limited to a small part of that area, it is easy to lose perspective and to develop tunnel vision, obtaining conflicting results for subgroups depending on where fieldwork was conducted and how the territory was divided up. Some other phonological changes considered critical by Collins and Nothofer are too general to be considered diagnostic for a classification (for example, raising or rounding of schwa, change of *s to h, loss of *h, loss of *-ʔ (final glottal stop), monophthongization of

⁷ The term 'Kendayan' is in itself a cover term for several mutually understandable dialects including Ahe, Banana' (Pontianak, Bengkayang, and Landak Regencies, West Kalimantan Province), and Salako (Sambas Regency and Bengkayang Regencies West Kalimantan Province and Lundu District, Sarawak; Collins 1997). However, as a linguistic term 'Kendayan' is awkward in that it does not always match 'Kendayan' as an ethnic label. The latter is often meant to include speakers of some of the neighbouring Land Dayak languages.

final vowel-glide sequences). This also applies to preploded final nasals (*-pm*, *-tn*, *-kŋ*). Although they constitute a phonetically salient development, they are a relatively recent phenomenon attested right through several linguistic subgroups (including Malayic, Land Dayak/Ulu, and even West Barito and East Barito, compare Dusun Deyah in southern Kalimantan, Djantera Kawi et al. 1983), dividing their respective member languages into those that have preplosive nasals and those that do not. They seem to be the result of an areal feature that has also spread to the western shores of the South China Sea and beyond.⁸ The phenomenon has also been observed among many non-Austronesian languages on the Southeast Asian mainland (Blust 1997).

Malayic diversity in other parts of Borneo is also considerable, with Banjarese Malay, Kutai Malay and Brunei Malay in southern, eastern and northern Borneo, respectively, to list only the more prominent ones. In principle, the case for a Malay homeland in the genetically most diverse area would be stronger if the entire island were considered as a homeland, because it would represent an even greater Malayic speech diversity with the inclusion of the habitat of Banjarese Malay, Kutai Malay and Brunei Malay. However, a greater diversity of Malayic speech forms does not necessarily represent a greater genetic diversity, and the genetic diversity in northern, eastern and southern Borneo does seem to be less than in western Borneo (see section 7.1).

What about Malayic diversity in areas to the west of Borneo? We have come to assume that this diversity is less than in western Borneo, or at least that the diversity is of a more recent nature and therefore genetically less relevant. Kelantan Malay, Urak Lawoi' Malay, Minangkabau, Kerinci, Jakartanese and Duano represent a bewildering diversity and can be considered languages in their own right, but their linguistic diversity does not necessarily represent a commensurate genetic depth. The phonological changes that make Minangkabau and Kerinci so different from Standard Malay are rather superficial: if traced back, they lead to an earlier phonology that is almost identical to that of Standard Malay. The complex morphosyntactic changes of Kerinci can also be explained as a function of these phonological changes (Prentice and Usman 1978; Steinhauer and Usman 1978; Adelaar 1992a; Steinhauer 2002). Similar explanations can be argued for Kelantan Malay, Urak Lawoi' Malay, Duano and other Malayic isolects to the west and south of the South China Sea. Nevertheless, that the phonological changes in these languages are relatively recent and superficial is something which remains to be demonstrated (as it remains to be demonstrated that the changes in some recently identified West Bornean Malayic isolects in fact reflect a greater historical depth, see section 7.2 and section 7.4).

⁸ One example is Urak Lawoi', a Malayic isolect in southwest Thailand (Hogan and Pattemore 1988).

Minangkabau, Kerinci, Bengkulu and other Malayic areas in western Sumatra also present a demographic complication. If speakers of Malayic migrated from Borneo and are relatively new to Sumatra, how did it happen that they penetrated the island from east to west and came to occupy almost two thirds of it instead of remaining in coastal areas? What ethnic acculturation processes took place here, and can they account for the present-day spread of Malayic speakers in Sumatra? This also needs to be addressed in the discussion about a homeland.

4. A back-migration from Sumatra?

Adelaar (1985, 1992a, 1995) and Blust (1988, 1994) believe that the presence of Malays in (predominantly coastal) Borneo is the result of back-migrations of Sumatran (and later, peninsular) Malays. This hypothesis brings the occurrence of Malay communities in coastal Borneo in line with the existence of Malay-speaking communities elsewhere in Southeast Asia (Moluccas, northern Java, the coasts of Sumatra and the Malay peninsula). It also brings it in line with the trading and seafaring traditions of the Malays, who often established trading posts in the places they visited. The hypothesis is supported by the fact that the oldest unequivocal manifestations of Malay civilization are found in southern Sumatra (stone inscriptions in Old Malay, archaeological sites). The existence of an early Malay empire in southern Sumatra (Srivijaya, Malayu) is corroborated by Malay historiography and by evidence from Chinese historical records (Andaya and Andaya 1994 Chapter 1). One of the names for this empire, 'Malayu', is conceivably the origin of the ethnonym 'Melayu', which is also used in Borneo.

The hypothesis does not exclude the notion of a huge acculturation and assimilation process that must have taken place in the last two millennia. It does not mean that the speakers of Malay dialects that resulted from this back-migration can trace all their ancestors to Sumatra or the Malay peninsula. Banjarese Malays primarily descend from Ngajus, Maanyans or other non-Malay ethnic groups living inland from Banjarmasin. Likewise, most Brunei Malays probably descend from members of local non-Malay communities who were assimilated into Brunei Malay society.⁹ Some coastal Malays therefore may not even have any Sumatran ancestors. Much of what Bornean Malays know about their early history may be based on knowledge after the fact and may be part of a somewhat selective collective memory. The claim, however, is that, after Malayic speakers had left Borneo and had crossed over

⁹ Brown 1970; Clynes forthcoming. This was also argued by Prentice (1988), although for editorial reasons beyond his control the published version of his paper does not make this clear.

to the opposite shores of the South China Sea where they developed a distinct Malay (as opposed to a Malayic) identity, some nuclear groups of Sumatran Malays back-migrated to Borneo. They must have brought with them their (Malay) variety of Malayic as well as some (Sumatran) Malay cultural notions. Their ethnic awareness and cultural impact account for the presence of communities with a Malay identity in Borneo today.

Nor does the hypothesis exclude the possibility that these back-migrated Malays or their descendants might occasionally have penetrated rather far inland (Collins 1998a, note 5), and might have continued the acculturation process in these interior areas.

Finally, it does not require that the Bornean Malay dialects today are in every way distinct from the inland forms of Malayic in Borneo, which are often genetically more remote from Standard Malay. Dialect convergence and linguistic osmosis are to be expected in areas where different speech forms are in contact.

Collins and Nothofer reject the notion of a back-migration. However, it is difficult to see what their advocacy of a local genesis of Bornean Malay languages could be based on. What compelling evidence do they have for the local development of a Malay identity and civilization in Borneo? And what exactly do they mean by their rejection of a back-migration?

It is fair to question the notion of a back-migration of large numbers of Malays from Sumatra who would subsequently make up the entire present-day Malay stock in Borneo. But then again, this simplistic interpretation does not do justice to the original concept of a back-migration, which is primarily a linguistic one (Adelaar 1985, 1992a; Blust 1988) with important cultural historical implications. It is not based on demographic or 'racial' considerations, even if it requires people to bring about such a movement (see above).

One could argue that the choice of the city-state of Srivijaya as a historical starting point of Malay civilization is a random one. The Kutai area has inscriptions that are at least two centuries older, and Indian artefacts found in western Borneo date back to about the fourth century AD (Collins 1998b: 5 referring to McKinnon 1994). But the evidence of Kutai inscriptions should not be overestimated. Sanskrit inscriptions of similar antiquity are also found elsewhere in Indonesia (western Java) and are moreover not unequivocal evidence for a distinct Malay settlement since they are in Sanskrit. The occurrence of Indian artefacts in western Borneo is open to several interpretations, ranging from occasional and indirect trade relations with India to the one-time establishment of a Hindu-Malay settlement that has left no traces apart from the artefacts in question. Such artefacts may become subsidiary evidence if they are part of a larger set of evidence drawn from several disciplines, but this is not the case for any part of Borneo. It is, however, the case in southern Sumatra, where we find a convergence of epigraphic, linguistic,

archaeological, historiographic and literary evidence for the existence of an ancient Malay kingdom. This kingdom may not have been the first one of its kind. Some scholars believe that Funan, an earlier settlement (in the Gulf of Siam in present-day Kampuchea), might have been a Malayo-Chamic city. However, this remains uncertain,¹⁰ and even if Funan turns out to be an earlier Malay kingdom, this would have little impact on the view that Malayhood developed on the western shores of the South China Sea, and not in Borneo.

Although the origins of Malay civilization are not entirely clear, Malays by and large do share some cultural historical notions. These include a common ethnic awareness (nowadays based largely on a common language and religion), a common literary tradition (no matter how diverse some of its products have become), and the claim to a common origin on the western shores of the South China Sea.

Finally, returning to the main question of back-migrations, what is the linguistic evidence against it? Collins (1994 and elsewhere) has argued that all Bornean Malay dialects form a distinct subgroup. However, his evidence can be refuted, and, if anything, the idea of a single Bornean Malay subgroup somehow weakens the argument that Borneo is the homeland of Malay(ic) (see section 7.1).

5. A more precise location of the homeland within Borneo

If we take Borneo as the Malayic homeland, we need to address the exact location of this homeland within Borneo. Adelaar (1985, 1992a) simply mentions Borneo as a possible homeland. Blust (1988; 1994:32, 46), however, places the homeland in southwest Borneo, whereas Adelaar (1995) and Collins (1994, 1997, 1998a, 1998b) mention western Borneo, and Nothofer (1997a) mentions northwest Borneo. Consequently, it seems that there is a 'default' consensus among these writers that the homeland was in western Borneo.¹¹

The matter may seem merely cosmetic, but it has wider implications. Southwest Borneo is relatively close to the Barito area, which is the home-

¹⁰ Coedès (1947) believed that it was a Khmer settlement and interpreted its name as a sinicized form of the Khmer word for 'hill', which is *bnam* in Old Khmer and *phnom* in modern Khmer.

¹¹ This may be less of a compromised decision than it seems. Blust (1994:46) locates the Malayic and Chamic homeland in 'southwest Borneo probably in or near the basin of the Kapuas River'. Purely geographically, however, the Kapuas basin lies in the centre of the western part of the Borneo island, and slightly more to the north of the (absolute) centre than to its south. Blust seems to take the political border between East Malaysia ('Malaysian North Borneo') and West Kalimantan (a province in Indonesian Borneo) as critical for a north/south divide. If that is the case, there is considerably more convergence in the locations proposed by Adelaar, Blust, Collins and Nothofer.

land of Malagasy (Dahl 1951). In an earlier publication, Blust (1984-85) suggests a close relationship between Javanese and some of the Barito languages. This would open the door to some wider speculations of southern Borneo as the area of dispersal of many more West-Malayo-Polynesian languages. However, our present state of knowledge about the subgrouping and spread of Malayic isolects does not justify such speculations, however attractive they may seem. They are not corroborated by evidence from other disciplines such as prehistory and archaeology (Bellwood 1997).

6. External classifications of the Malayic subgroup

In Dyen's lexicostatistical classification (1965) of Austronesian, Malay is classified with Javanese, Madurese and Sundanese and some other languages in the Malayo-Javanic subgroup, which in turn is part of larger classificatory configurations such as the Javo-Sumatran Hesion, the Western Indonesian Cluster, and the Hesperonesian Linkage within the Austronesian language family. On the basis of this subgroup, Nothofer (1975) makes a phonological reconstruction of Proto-Malayo-Javanic, which he proposes had split into a Javanese, a Sundanese, and a Malay-Madurese branch. In his evaluation of Nothofer (1975), Blust (1981) argues that Javanese is genetically rather different from the other members of this proposed subgroup, and that several other languages not included in the comparison (Salako, Iban, Rejang, Embaloh Land Dayak, Acehnese, Chamic) are closer to Malay than is Javanese. Nothofer (1985) offers a readjustment of the Malayo-Javanic subgroup, placing Malay together with Madurese, Iban, Lampung and (possibly) Sundanese in a different branch from Javanese.

Hudson (1970) offers an alternative and lower-order classification of Malay: Malay forms the Malayic subgroup together with dialects and languages that are very closely related to Malay such as Minangkabau, Banjarese and Iban. Adelaar (1985 and elsewhere) uses this classification as a starting point for the reconstruction of Proto Malayic. Nothofer (1988) questions this use of the term 'Malayic' because it does not conform to the way it is used in Blust (1981). He proposes a wider 'Malayic' subgroup including Salako, Embaloh and Rejang as well as a narrow Iban 'Malayan' branch, splitting into an Iban branch on the one hand and the various Malay dialects on the other. Adelaar (1992a, 1993, 1994) rejects this classification. He demonstrates that Embaloh and other Tamanic languages are not directly related to Malay and that there is no diagnostic device for assigning a separate branch status to Iban. An earlier study by Blust demonstrates that Rejang does not belong to Malayic either (Blust 1984). Adelaar (1992a:2), who is reluctant to use lexicostatistics for the definition of his Malayic subgroup, proposes the following

configuration of phonological innovations instead:

1. Devoicing of PAN final stops
2. PAN **j* > PM **d*, **-t*
3. PAN **z* > PM **j*
4. PAN **R* > PM **r*
5. Reduction of PAN consonant clusters to their last component
6. The nasal in PAN heterorganic nasal + stop clusters became homorganic
7. PAN initial **w* was lost
8. PAN **i*, **ey*, **-uy*, **-iw* > PM **i*
9. PAN **u*, **-ew* > PM **u*
10. PAN **q* > PM **h*
11. PAN **h*, **ʔ* > PM **ʔ* or *∅*

Later subgrouping assumptions (Blust 1994; Collins 1997, 1998a; Nothofer 1995, 1997a, 1997b) seem to conform at least implicitly to the delineation of Malayic as proposed in Adelaar (1992a).

The similarity between Malay, Chamic languages, and Acehnese has long been recognized.¹² Blust (1994) gives lexical evidence for a close genetic link between these languages. As noted in section 1, he believes that the language ancestral to Malay(ic), Chamic and Acehnese was spoken in southwest Borneo, and that some of its speakers must have migrated from there to mainland Southeast Asia and Sumatra. He speculates that at one point there must have been a Chamic-Malayic dialect continuum in mainland Southeast Asia and Sumatra: it must have run along the east coasts of Sumatra and the Malay peninsula and further north along the Gulf of Siam and the Mekong delta to the Champa kingdom in southern Vietnam. The continuum was subsequently disrupted by incoming Khmers (sixth century AD) and Thais (probably from the thirteenth century AD onwards; Blust 1994:46-7). Decisive further evidence for a Malayo-Chamic subgroup is Thurgood's (1999) reconstruction of Proto Chamic. Structural similarities between Proto Chamic and Proto Malayic are particularly clear in their phonologies.

Adelaar (forthcoming a) proposes a 'Malayo-Sumbawan' subgroup, which excludes Javanese and has a Madurese branch, a Sundanese branch, and one branch comprising the Malayic, Chamic, and Bali-Sasak-Sumbawa languages (see Figure 1). He finds that Balinese, Sasak and Sumbawa share a significant part of their phonological history with Malayic and Chamic. He reaches this

¹² Compare Marrison 1975, Adelaar 1985, Blust 1988. A close relationship between Chamic languages and Acehnese was noticed by Niemann (1891) and several other scholars. It is demonstrated in detail by Thurgood (1999).

conclusion by using low-register lexicon in the comparison of the languages involved (excluding high-register vocabulary because it is significantly more susceptible to borrowing). Although some of the phonological developments are not forceful in themselves, or even unique to Balinese-Sasak-Sumbawa and Malayic, their configuration is striking. It includes PAN $*w > \emptyset$; PAN $*q > *h$; PAN $*R, *r > *r$; PAN $*z > *j$; PAN $*j, *d > *d$. In contrast, Madurese, Sundanese and particularly Javanese are phonologically more divergent from Malayic as well as from Chamic or Bali-Sasak-Sumbawa. Balinese, Sasak and Sumbawa also have some basic vocabulary in common with Malayic as well as formal similarities in vocabulary such as the metathesis in **qudip* 'to live' which is reflected in Malay *hidup* and in Balinese and Sasak *idup* (but not in Chamic **hudip*). These common features should be seen against the history of Lombok and especially of Bali, where linguistic and cultural influence from Java has been overwhelming since the twelfth century, whereas Malay influence has been relatively weak.

Figure 1. The Malayo Sumbawan subgroup

7. Internal classifications of the Malayic subgroup

Adelaar (1985) classified the six Malayic isolects that formed the basis of his Malayic subgroup into an Iban branch and a branch including all other Malayic isolects. In Nothofer's definition of Malayic (1988), Iban is also in a separate branch (and so is Salako/Kendayan).

However, Adelaar (1992a, 1993) has subsequently refrained from an internal classification of the Malayic subgroup. In contrast, Collins and Nothofer have recently proposed some detailed genetic subdivisions within Malayic, which I now turn to.

7.1 *The proposition of one single Bornean Malay subgroup*

Collins (1994) believes that the Malay dialects of Borneo form a single subgroup. 'Proto Malay' ('Bahasa Melayu Purba') began as one language or several closely related Austronesian languages some 2,000 years ago. It split into a Sumatra/Malay peninsula branch and a Borneo branch; the Borneo branch developed into a northern branch (including Sambas Malay and various Brunei Malay dialects) and a southeastern branch. The latter consists of South Bornean Malay (with the various Banjarese Malay dialects) and East Bornean Malay (with Kutai and Berau Malay). This classification is also followed in Jaludin Chuchu (2003), a study on the classification of Brunei Malay dialects.

Collins's evidence for a single Bornean Malay subgroup is very limited and does not stand scrutiny. His argument for it is the change of penultimate schwa to *a* with concomitant gemination of the following consonant, which he claims took place in all its members. Collins (1994) does not distinguish between Malay and Malayic, and he does not include Iban and Kendayan/Salako in his classification. One might conclude from this that the descendants of his Proto Malay only represent the Malay branch of the Malayic subgroup. However, Collins (1994) does not make this explicit, nor does he make reference to previous studies on the classification of Malay. That it is in fact the Malay branch that he has in mind only becomes clear in some of his later publications (Collins 1997, 1998a).

The change of penultimate schwa to *a* as a criterion for a Bornean Malay subgroup is refuted by the existence of dialects such as Sarawak Malay which retained this schwa as a schwa (Clynes forthcoming, note 9; Collins 1987:33). It is also refuted by the existence of several Bornean Malay isolects where penultimate schwa became *o* in contradistinction to final-syllable schwa which became *a* (as documented, among others, by Collins himself (1997) and by Nothofer (1997b)). Furthermore, in Banjar Malay, there is no evidence for Collins's alleged consonant gemination after a historical schwa.

Another observation in relation to Collins's Bornean Malay subgrouping hypothesis (1994) (be it an observation of a somewhat theoretical nature)

is that it reduces the possibility of a homeland of Malay in Borneo. If all Malay dialects in Borneo were members of one exclusively Bornean Malay subgroup, the island would be more homogeneous than if they belonged to various subgroups (whether exclusively Bornean or not). As a Malay homeland, however, one would in principle expect it to be genetically more diverse than other areas.

So it appears that the evidence for an exclusive Bornean Malay subgroup is wanting on several counts. Nevertheless, in his attempt to establish this subgroup, Collins seems to have found evidence for a more limited genetic configuration, although the evidence for it is not without problems. Collins (1996:83-4) observes that Brunei Malay and Banjarese Malay share the possibility for verbs to combine the locative *-i* suffix with a following recipient-oriented suffix *-akan*. This combination points to a possible close historical relationship. Collins (1996) furthermore believes that Bacan Malay (spoken on Bacan Island in the North Moluccas) is an offshoot of Brunei Malay (Collins 1996). Bacan Malay also allows a concatenation of a (location-oriented) suffix *-i* following (recipient-oriented) *-akan*. A link is not unlikely, considering the nature of the argument and the fact that both Bacan and Brunei were on the northern spice route between the western and eastern parts of the Indonesian archipelago. Further evidence adduced by Collins (1996) for a Bacan Malay – Brunei Malay link is the maintenance of a nasal ligature (*ŋ*) in the first-person singular possessive pronoun (*-ŋku*) and a number of lexical innovations. However, this evidence is not critical because the ligature in *-ŋku* is a retention. It is also found in Old Malay (*çatru-ŋku* ‘my enemies’, De Casparis 1956: 33, 36) and should be attributed to Proto Malayic. Moreover, six out of nine of Collins’s lexical innovations are not exclusively shared (Adelaar 1999).

7.2 *The proposition of subgroups in western Borneo*

Collins (1997) distinguishes three linguistically distinct areas in western Borneo: a Northwest Sector, a Central Sector and a Southwest Sector. These sectors are based on evidence from a comparison of basic vocabulary. The evidence is insufficient to support the distinctiveness of the Central and Southwest Sectors.

The distinction of a Northwest Sector is based on lexical and phonological evidence. It includes Ahe, Banana’ and Salako. These are dialects of a language which Collins labels ‘Kendayan’. The dialect group is no revelation considering that it was already discussed in Hudson (1970) and in Adelaar (1992b, 1995).¹³ A serious problem with Collins’s evidence is that it is too limited in quantity and in scope. It does not make use of grammatical data although

¹³ Adelaar (1995) calls the subgroup ‘West Malayic Dayak’ but ‘Kendayan’ is more appropriate (see footnote 7).

these are available in the form of several (published and unpublished) grammatical sketches and many texts (Dunselman 1949, 1950; Ina Anak Kalom and Hudson 1970; Hudson 1970; Syahroen Alan et al. 1980; Thomas et al. 1984, 1985; Adelaar 1991, 1992b, 2002). Collins also overlooks an important phonological change, the reduction of voiced stops in original homorganic nasal + voiced stop clusters, as in **m/andi?* 'to bathe' > Kendayan, Salako *mani?*.¹⁴ If not evidence for a subgrouping, this change at least illustrates some of the phonological history that Kendayan isolects (or Northwest Sector) share with Land Dayak isolects. It also reinforces the position of Kendayan isolects as a subgroup that is phonologically distinct from Sambas Malay, in spite of the fact that Sambas Malay and Kendayan share the merger of **a* and **ə* and the occurrence of a final glottal stop. Collins's suggestion that Sambas Malay may belong in a subgroup with Kendayan is unconvincing. An occasional phonological resemblance between Sambas Malay and Kendayan is to be expected considering that they are neighbouring isolects. Moreover, Collins's treatment of *-ʔ* as an innovation is aprioristic (section 7.3), and even if it turns out to be an innovation, it is shared by too many forms of Malayic to have any direct significance for subgrouping. Sambas Malay and Kendayan must have been in contact for quite a long time, and some linguistic osmosis is expected. Unless we can distinguish between phonological innovations due to common inheritance and phonological innovations due to convergence, we have very little reason indeed to use widespread features such as a final glottal stop or merger of schwa to *a* as evidence for an exclusive common origin. One would also like to see morphosyntactic evidence (from Sambas Malay) for such a claim, especially since Kendayan isolects have an aspectual system that clearly sets them apart from all other forms of Malayic (Adelaar 1992b, 2002).

The Central Sector includes the speech isolects of four villages along the Kapuas River and its tributaries: Bagan Asam, Kalampok, Sungai Ringin and Ilir Kota. If these speech forms are meant to form a subgroup, the evidence is too weak. It consists of four phonological developments and a few lexical innovations. The phonological developments are the change from penultimate schwa to *o*, the presence of a glottal stop after final vowels in certain words, the change of **-ŋ* to *-n* after **i*, and preposition of final nasals. According to Collins, only one lexical innovation is unambiguous (PM **kamah/*kumuh* 'dirty' was replaced by *combe?*, *come?*). In another case PM has two etyma whereas the Central Sector has reflexes of only one of them:

¹⁴ According to Sipol Strassman anak Ambun (1992:xxxvii), in Salako as spoken in Lundu district (Sarawak) this voiced stop is still present although barely audible. He does not write it in his orthography. From my observations of Kendayan dialects in western Kalimantan, the voiced stop in question has disappeared.

PM **kA-iri*, **kiba?* 'lefthand' > Central Sector *kiba?*. Some other lexical innovations are not shared among all members of the subgroup and are therefore not diagnostic: *jayi*, *jawi* 'hand' (compare PM **taŋan*); *nawa* 'mouth' (compare PM **mulut*); *yoŋoŋ* 'neck' (compare PM **lihər*). The problem with these distinctive features is that most of them also apply to Ibanic languages. Apart from rounding of penultimate schwa and the lexical replacement of **kamah*/**kumuh* 'dirty' by *combe?*, *come?*, all these features also apply to Mualang¹⁵ and, except for prelosion of final nasals, to Iban itself (compare Iban *nawa* 'mouth', *rəkuŋ* 'neck', *kiba?* 'lefthand', *jari* 'hand'; **piriŋ* > *pirin* 'plate, saucer', **dagiŋ* > *dagin* 'meat, flesh'). Prelosion of final nasals is a widespread areal feature in western, central and southern Borneo. It is usually not diagnostic for subgrouping, which in the present case is demonstrated by the fact that it is not exhibited in Ilir Kota. Basically, this leaves rounding of penultimate schwa as the only evidence for this subgroup, which is insufficient. Such a subgroup would moreover not be a major division in West Bornean Malayic: as far as the limited evidence shows, it would rather be a subdivision of Ibanic (Hudson 1970). At any rate, its position has to be reassessed against the evidence of Ibanic.

The Southwest Sector includes the isolects spoken in Batu Mas, Batu Tajam and Pantai Mas.¹⁶ These isolects agree in that they exhibit *o* for **ə*. The rest of the evidence supports a close link between Batu Mas and Batu Tajam alone. There are four phonological changes and three lexical replacements as well as a fourth lexical replacement which Collins attributes to Land Dayak influence. The phonological changes in Batu Mas and Batu Tajam are 1. penultimate **ə* > *o*; 2. **r* (a velar fricative) > a trill (in Pantai Mas it became a uvular fricative); 3. **-ahu-* > *owu*, *ohu* (as in **tahu* 'know' > *towu*, *tohu?*); and 4. the occurrence of a final glottal stop. In Pantai Mas and possibly Batu Mas this glottal stop is phonemic. In Batu Tajam, however, it is not, as it is heard after any final vowel. The lexical replacements are *məŋomak* 'chew' (compare PM **kuŋah*/**mamah*, but compare also Salako *ŋampə?*¹⁷ 'to chew betel'); *powi*, *poha?* 'leg' (compare PM **kaki*); *akaran porut* 'intestines' (compare PM **pərut*); furthermore, *silu?*, *silo?* 'fingernail' must be a Land Dayak loan that replaced an earlier PM **kuku* (Adelaar 1992a:131). Collins (1997:15) sees a pattern of two separate but closely related languages, with on the one hand Pantai Mas, and on the other hand Batu Tajam and Batu Mas as dialects of a single language. Clearly, there are some differences that set Pantai Mas off from Batu Mas and Batu Tajam. However, from the scanty and ambiguous evidence it is impossi-

¹⁵ Compare Dunselman (1955). Mualang is an Ibanic dialect spoken east of Sanggau town in West Kalimantan.

¹⁶ Precise locations are not specified.

¹⁷ The final *-k* in the Southwest reflexes remains unexplained and is most likely due to a mistranscription.

ble to see how much these isolects differ from Collins's Central Sector isolects, and how they fit in with the general picture of West Bornean Malayic.

Nothofer (1997b) challenges Collins's three West Bornean Malayic subgroups. He makes a bipartite distinction into West Bornean Malayic (combining Collins's Northwest and Central Sectors) and Southwest Bornean Malayic. His evidence is a set of phonological, lexical and semantic innovations. Phonologically, Southwest Bornean Malayic shows metathesis of *h* and liquid, nasal accretion in **hasap* 'smoke' and **basəh* 'wet', and substitution of *y* for **r* in **dəŋər* 'to hear'.¹⁸ There are furthermore eight lexical innovations and two semantic innovations. This evidence is insufficient in itself, and part of it can be refuted as to its exclusivity. Salako, a West Bornean Malayic isolect according to Nothofer's classification, shows metathesis of **h* and liquid in all forms where **h* historically preceded a liquid, as in PM **baharu* > *barahu*; PM **ba(h)ira?* 'diarrhoea' > *barihà?*; PM **di *hulu(?)* 'ahead, in front' > (**daloho?* >) *daoho?*. Furthermore, as a rule, it exhibits nasal accretion before intervocalic **s* in inherited vocabulary, compare PM **hi(n)sap* 'to suck' > *ŋ-ŋnsap*; PM **isi?* 'meat, contents' > *ĩnsi?*; compare also Standard Malay *musang* 'civet-cat' with Salako *muŋsəkŋ*. Of the eight lexical innovations, *sompak*, *sampak* 'to chew' (a formal innovation rather than a lexical one in view of PM **sapah* 'to chew') is matched by Salako *sampà?*; it is therefore not exclusive.

In summary, it seems that we still have a very long way to go in arriving at a solid classification of Malayic isolects in western Borneo. The evidence collected by Collins and Nothofer is far too limited and in some cases ambivalent and even contradictory.

7.3 The classification of Jakarta Malay with Bangka Malay and other 'southwest corner' dialects

Nothofer (1995) considers the areas where Jakarta Malay, Bangka Malay and Palembang Malay are spoken – the 'southwest corner' – as a relic area in which several Proto Malayic suffixes only appear in morphologically reduced form, and where final syllable schwa never underwent the merger with **a* that is reflected in all other Malayic isolects.¹⁹ The dialects in this southwest corner are claimed to form a subgroup: 'the evidence appears to show that J[akarta] M[alay] most closely links to the dialect of Palembang and to those of the islands east of this area on the southeastern coast of Sumatra. J[akarta]

¹⁸ The changes in these three lexical items are actually a sporadic 'formal' innovation within a (certain) lexeme rather than a regular phonological innovation.

¹⁹ Nothofer's claim (1995:89) that Palembang Malay retains final-syllable schwa is demonstrated with one example only: Proto Austronesian **lalaj* 'fly' > Palembang Malay *lalət* (p. 89). As I do not have his source for Palembang Malay at my disposal, I am not able to verify whether the retention of this schwa is systematic. His evidence for the retention of final-syllable schwa in Bangka Malay is also insufficient but is backed up convincingly with additional evidence in Nothofer (1997a).

M[alay] springs from B[angka] M[alay] with which it shares more innovations than with any other Malayic dialect' (Nothofer 1995:95). Nothofer bases his claim on a combination of phonological, semantic and lexical innovations. The claim is not substantiated by the evidence, which is moreover too limited to Jakarta Malay and Bangka Malay data to make a case for the inclusion of Palembang Malay and other southwest corner dialects. I reject it for the following reasons.

Nothofer's phonological evidence consists of 1. loss of final **h*, 2. fronting and raising of **a* (in final position or before final **h*), 3. metathesis in some forms, 4. excrement *-ʔ* (glottal stop), and 5. initial **s* became Bangka Malay *h-* and Jakarta Malay *ø* (still *h-* in Dewall 1909).

1. Loss of final **h* is typologically not a very significant sound change. It is moreover very common in Malayic isolects as well as in other Austronesian languages. In Bangka Island it did not affect the dialects of the centre and of Perlang (Nothofer 1997a:67, 70 (maps 9, 11)).

2. Raising (usually with subsequent fronting or backing) of final **a* is also frequently observed in languages around the Java Sea and South China Sea. It is seen in Balinese, Javanese, southern Borneo languages (including Ngaju, Maanyan and Malagasy), Sambas Malay, various Peninsular Malay dialects and various Sumatran Malay dialects (including Minangkabau Malay ones). This suggests that raising of **a* may have been an areal feature with subsequent minor vowel changes in individual languages.²⁰ Furthermore, this raising happened in Jakarta Malay to all **a*'s that were final or were followed by a final glottal stop. On the other hand, it was a more highly conditioned change in Bangka Malay dialects. The latter moreover exhibit very different conditioning patterns among themselves.

3. Nothofer gives only two examples of metathesis, and these do not lend themselves to a phonological generalization. PMP **lipət* 'fold' > Jakarta and Bangka Malay *ngələpət* idem, and Jakarta Malay *kələkopan*, Bangka Malay *kəlukup* 'eyelid' which correspond to Standard Malay *kəlupak*, *kəlopak*, *pəlopak*, *pəlupok*, and Sundanese *kalopak* (all with the same meaning).

4. Adelaar (1985, 1992a) gives an extensive treatment of final *-ʔ*. The evidence for *-ʔ* in various Malayic isolects is ambivalent and does not allow an easy historical interpretation. Although there are cases where Iban *-ʔ* is clearly innovative,²¹ Adelaar interprets it as a Proto Malayic retention because

²⁰ See Clynes (1989), who argues that as a result of the prestige of the East Javanese kingdom of Majapahit, raising and backing of **-a* spread through eastern Java to central Java, and from Malacca to Johore and further into the Malay peninsula; it also spread eastward to Bali. On the same topic, compare also Tadmor (forthcoming).

²¹ For instance, in some loanwords (*kicu?* 'cheese' < Malay *kecu* 'idem' < Portuguese *queijo* 'idem'), or in words historically ending in a diphthong (*kayu?* 'wood' < Proto Austronesian **kaSiw* 'idem').

Zorc's (1982) arguments that it is a retention from Proto Austronesian cannot be entirely refuted. It remains uncertain to what extent $-ʔ$ is a Proto Malayic retention or an innovation, although Nothofer (1995) simply treats it as an innovation without much further elaboration. He thereby overlooks an important element in Adelaar's discussion of the Malayic evidence: unlike Iban $-ʔ$ which to some extent corresponds to reflexes of $*H$, $*h$ and $*S$ in Philippine and Formosan languages, Jakarta Malay $-ʔ$ does not do so at all and seems to be an independent development. Neither does Jakarta Malay $-ʔ$ correspond to Bangka Malay $-ʔ$. This may not appear from the nine examples adduced in Nothofer (1995), but a larger sample demonstrates that Jakarta Malay $-ʔ$ and Bangka Malay $-ʔ$ have a different distribution. Elsewhere, Nothofer (1997a:87-9) presents 26 Bangka Malay words in order to show that their final $-ʔ$ corresponds regularly to that of Malayic isolects from western Borneo and Tioman Island. When tested, it turns out that only three of these words have a corresponding $-ʔ$ in Jakarta Malay (namely *nasiʔ* 'cooked rice', *dəpəʔ* 'fathom' and *tuməʔ* 'louse') whereas 12 have $-ə$ (namely Jakarta Malay *lagi/lagé* 'again', *aku* 'to confess', *daki* 'dirt', *bəri* 'give', *isi* 'content', *mandi* 'bathe', *mudə* 'young',²² *naŋkə* 'jackfruit', *paku* 'fern', *pənu* 'turtle', *taŋə* 'ask', *tərimə* 'receive'). For another eleven words, neither Abdul Chaer (1976) nor Kaehler (1966) gives a Jakarta Malay cognate (namely Bangka Malay *asowʔ* 'dog', *gəsiʔ* 'gums', *kəraʔ* 'monkey', *palu* 'hammer, blow', *payaʔ* 'swamp', *pariʔ* 'ray fish', *pəriaʔ* (?), *pukiʔ*, 'vagina', *sabaʔ* 'python', *tunŋkuʔ* 'hearth' and *ruʔ* 'casuarina').

Nothofer's a-priori assessment of $-ʔ$ as an innovation is furthermore contradicted by the fact that $-ʔ$ is particularly well represented in the supposed Malayic homeland itself, western Borneo. The evidence that he has accumulated from Bangka Malay and elsewhere shows that $-ʔ$ is more general than previously assumed: on the face of it, his evidence actually gives more momentum to the hypothesis that $-ʔ$ is a retention rather than an innovation. This is not to say that we can rule out $-ʔ$ as an innovation (at this point I do not know how to interpret it). It only demonstrates that there is no quick solution to the historical interpretation of $-ʔ$ in the Malayic subgroup, and that Nothofer's new evidence calls for a reassessment of the whole issue.

5. Like the loss of $*h$, the change from $*s$ - to h - is not very significant typologically. Adelaar (1992a:93) observes that the change in Jakarta Malay only occurred in certain function words, but Nothofer also found six pairs of Jakarta Malay lexical words with and without s - which show that the change was more widespread. He speculates that loss of $*s$ - at some point in the past may have affected Jakarta Malay lexicon more generally but was later 'reestablished due to the tendency of "leveling out" the differences between J[akarta] M[alay] and Indonesian, Javanese, Sundanese, and Balinese' (Nothofer 1995: 94). This is a plausible scenario. Note, however, that it does not necessarily

²² Found in Kaehler (1966:164).

support a close relationship with Bangka Malay. Most importantly, in Bangka Malay, loss of **s* is not a general feature but only affected the southern dialects of Arungdalem, Pakuk and Garung (Nothofer 1997a:74 (map15)). It is therefore not part of the common history of Bangka Malay dialects.

Nothofer proposes three semantic innovations in Jakarta Malay and Bangka Malay, which are generally not diagnostic: 1. the form *bəri* means 'hit' as well as 'give', 2. *pulan* 'tough, sticky' is the 'antonym' of Standard Malay *pulan* 'nonadhesive, crisp', and 3. *putri mandi* 'rainbow' contrasts with Standard Malay *putri mandi* 'sugared dumpling'. From Abdul Chaer's example of Jakarta Malay *bəri* 'to hit' it appears that this is merely an idiomatic extension of the meaning 'to give' in the sense of 'give a blow'. The compound *putri mandi* is relatively recent (it cannot be older than the introduction of Sanskrit loanwords in Malayic as *putri* is a Sanskrit loanword). It acquired its meanings through metaphoric change and probably originated in literary Malay rather than in a vernacular form.

Nothofer proposes only one lexical innovation: Bangka Malay *əŋga?* 'not want to' corresponding to Jakarta Malay *əŋga?* 'no' and Sarawak Malay *ŋga?* 'only'.

Summarizing Nothofer's arguments, his phonological evidence is not compelling. Raising of **-a* can be attributed to an areal feature of wider geographical scope. The status of Bangka Malay *-?* as an innovation cannot be ascertained, but more importantly, this *-?* does not correspond to Jakarta Malay *-?*. There is no case for structural metathesis. Loss of **h-* and change of **s-* to *h* are of a rather general nature. Most importantly, both these changes have only partially affected the Bangka Malay area: for instance, whereas the northern dialect area lost both **s-* and **h-*, the central dialect area has undergone neither change, and the southern dialect area lost only **s-*. (This distribution in itself would narrow down Nothofer's subgrouping case to a classification of Jakarta Malay with Northern Bangka Malay only). The lexical and semantic evidence is very limited. Finally, there seems to be no corroborating extralinguistic evidence for Nothofer's hypothesis.

It so happens that the four major sound changes proposed by Nothofer for his subgrouping (raising of **-a*, excrescence of *-?*, loss of **h-* and loss of **s-*) also apply to Maanyan, a non-Malayic Austronesian language from southern Borneo. The circumstance is anecdotal, but it goes to show that some of these changes are not unique in the history of western Indonesian languages and may easily develop independently.

7.4 The classification of 'southwest corner' isolects with Malayic isolects from northwest Borneo

Nothofer (1995:95) states that 'B[angka] M[alay] itself was probably settled from northwest Borneo and appears most closely related to Iban and

Kendayan [...]. In Nothofer (1997a:85-92) he classifies Bangka Malay, Belitung Malay, Palembang Malay and Serawak Malay with the Malayic isolects from northwest Borneo (including Iban, Sarawak Malay and Kendayan) and with Tioman Malay (spoken on Tioman Island off the Malay peninsula's east coast). His phonological evidence consists of the following innovations:

1. Final **r* was replaced with a glottal stop in **air* 'water', **ikur* 'tail', **kapur* 'chalk', **gugur* 'fall', **sabutir* 'a grain (used as a noun classifier)' and (in Bangka Malay and Sarawak Malay only) **tidur* 'sleep'.
2. Final **l* became Iban, Sarawak Malay and Bangka Malay glottal stop in certain words: the only example given is **ambil* 'take' > *ambi?*.
3. Accretion of a glottal stop after original final vowels.
4. In some cases, *-h* was replaced by a glottal in Bangka Malay, Iban and Sarawak Malay: the examples given are reflexes of PM **basuh* 'wash' (> Bangka Malay, Sarawak Malay, Iban *basu?* idem), **m-əntah/m-antah* 'raw, unripe' (> Bangka Malay, Sarawak Malay *manta?*, Iban *mata?* id.), **ayah* 'father' (> Bangka Malay *aya?* 'older sibling', Iban *aya?* 'uncle, step-father'), **kudah* 'to chew' (> Iban, Sarawak Malay *kuna?* idem).
5. Reduction of homorganic nasal + voiced-stop clusters to their nasal before the penultimate syllable in trisyllabic words in Iban, Palembang Malay and Sarawak Malay.
6. Irregular loss of **b* in **bukan*²³ 'no(t)' > Bangka Malay, Belitung Malay *ukan*, Iban *ukay*.
7. Irregular loss of **n-* in **nini* 'grandmother'²⁴ > Bangka Malay *eney?*, Iban *ini?*, Kendayan *ene?*.
8. **h* between like vowels was lost in Iban, Sarawak Malay and Bangka Malay.
9. Palatalization of final velars after **i* in Iban, Sarawak Malay and Bangka Malay.
10. Preplosion of final nasals in Bangka Malay and Kendayan.

Nothofer gives the following morphological innovations:

1. Loss of suffixes in Bangka Malay and in Iban.
2. PM **pəN-* (which derived attributively and predicatively used nouns from verbs) became a general deriver of nouns in Iban and (apparently also) in Bangka Malay.²⁵

²³ **bukan* 'no, not; other' in Adelaar (1992a:76ff).

²⁴ **nini?* 'grandparent, ancestor' in Adelaar (1992a:46).

²⁵ This is my qualification based on the meaning of *pəN-* in Iban. Nothofer's description of the meaning of Iban and Bangka Malay *pəN-* is somewhat implicit: 'BAN [Bangka Malay] dan IBN [Iban] menggunakan awalan *pə-* yang fungsinya sama dengan SM [Standard Malay] *-an*, misalnya SM *makanan*, BAN *pəmakān*, IBN *pəmakai*' (Nothofer 1997a:91). Elsewhere he specifies that 'Semua dialek Bangka [...] dan IBN memakai prefix *pə-* yang maknanya objek, instrumen' (Nothofer 1997b:54).

3. The genitive suffix **-na* is also used as a nominative pronoun in Dul (a subdialect of Bangka Malay) and in Sarawak.

Finally, Nothofer gives eight lexical innovations and three semantic innovations.

Nothofer's evidence is largely limited to data from Bangka Malay, Iban and Sarawak Malay, and there are consequently no grounds for assuming that Palembang, Tioman, Seraway or Jakarta Malay belong to his putative subgroup.

Evidence from Palembang Malay is virtually absent (it consists of only six words). Evidence from Tioman is also very limited, although it seems to confirm the first and third phonological innovations (which are probably the most important ones). In the case of Seraway, there is no evidence that this dialect shares any of the morphological, lexical and semantic innovations given above, nor does it share any of the above phonological innovations except for the substitution of a glottal for final **-r* (the distribution of which is moreover not entirely parallel in Seraway).

At this point it is important to note that none of Nothofer's phonological, morphological and lexical evidence for a subgroup including his southwest corner languages and northwest Bornean isolects applies to Jakarta Malay, which, as discussed earlier, he claims to be an offshoot of Bangka Malay (section 7.3). (As demonstrated above, the final glottal stop in Jakarta Malay is historically an idiosyncratic development.) Of the three semantic innovations, only one is documented with a possible Jakarta Malay cognate (*engga?* 'no(t)' versus Bangka Malay and Iban *engga?* 'not want to').

Consequently, the evidence only has implications for the position of Iban, Sarawak and Bangka Malay. Furthermore, preposition of final nasals is no evidence for subgrouping (section 3), and the loss of suffixes affected Iban and Bangka Malay²⁶ in rather different ways so that it is not clear how this can be interpreted as a common innovation. The loss of **-l* in **ambil* also occurs in several other Malayic isolects (including Minangkabau) and this change is of a more general nature (Adelaar 1992a:90). Nevertheless, the remaining evidence is significant enough in that it indicates a common history – and possibly a direct common origin – of Bangka Malay, Sarawak Malay and Iban.

²⁶ Resulting in the loss of all inherited suffixes in Iban while bringing about some flexional derivation in Bangka Malay.

8. Conclusion

Malay historical linguists agree on the likelihood of the Malay homeland being in western Borneo. Viewed from the wider perspective of Taiwan as the Austronesian homeland, Borneo as the Malay homeland certainly makes more sense than the Malay peninsula, or even Sumatra.

The hypothesis of a back-migration of Malays from the western shores of the South China Sea (primarily Sumatra) to Borneo brings into perspective some important cultural, historical and linguistic factors that would otherwise remain unexplained. Although it has not yet met with full acceptance, critics of this hypothesis have not so far produced substantive evidence against it.

Although it still needs further elaboration, the idea of a Malayo-Chamic dialect continuum along the mainland Southeast Asian east coast offers some interesting perspectives for Malay and mainland Southeast Asian prehistory.

Consensus among historical linguists with regard to the 'Borneo hypothesis' notwithstanding, the idea has at times been presented in an *a priori* way. It has also generated diverse and often incompatible theories on the early migrations of Malayic speakers and on the internal classification of their languages. Most of the theories proposed in Collins (1994, 1997) and Nothofer (1995, 1997a, 1997b) must be rejected for lack of solid evidence. In a few cases these publications contain interesting observations, such as the phonological agreements between Bangka Malay and some Northwest Bornean Malay isolects (Nothofer 1997a), or the similarities in verbal morphology between Brunei Malay, Banjarese Malay and Bacan Malay (Collins 1996). In general, however, the past twenty years have not brought us any closer to a solid internal classification of the Malayic language subgroup.

The score is better for the external classification of Malayic. Thurgood's reconstruction (1999) of Proto Chamic and Adelaar's comparison (forthcoming) of the Bali-Sasak-Sumbawa group with Chamic, Javanese, Madurese and Sundanese, demonstrate that Chamic and Bali-Sasak-Sumbawa are more closely related to Malayic than any of these language groups is to Sundanese, Madurese or especially to Javanese.

References

- Abdul Chaer
1976 *Kamus dialek Melayu Jakarta – bahasa Indonesia*. Ende: Nusa Indah.
- Adelaar, K. Alexander
1985 *Proto-Malayic; The reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its morphology and lexicon*. [PhD thesis, Leiden University.]

- 1988 'More on Proto-Malayic', in: Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds), *Rekonstruksi dan cabang-cabang Melayu Induk*, pp. 59-77. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. [Siri Monograf Sejarah Bahasa Melayu.]
- 1991 'A phonological sketch of Salako (West Kalimantan)', in: Ray Harlow (ed.), *Papers of the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. Part II. West Austronesian*, pp. 21-40. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand, University of Auckland. [Vical 2.]
- 1992a *Proto-Malayic; The reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its lexicon and morphology*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Department of Linguistics, Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics, Series C, 119.] [Revised edition of Adelaar 1985.]
- 1992b 'The relevance of Salako for Proto-Malayic and for Old Malay epigraphy', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 148:382-408.
- 1993 'The internal classification of the Malayic subgroup', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 56:566-81.
- 1994 'The classification of the Tamanic languages (West Kalimantan)', in: Tom Dutton and Darrell T. Tryon, *Contact-induced language change in the Austronesian-speaking area*, pp. 1-41. Berlin: Mouton-de Gruyter.
- 1995 'Borneo as a cross-roads for comparative Austronesian linguistics', in: Peter Bellwood, James J. Fox and Darrell Tryon (eds), *The Austronesians; Historical and comparative perspectives*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Department of Anthropology, Australian National University.
- 1999 'Review of Martin, Peter W., G. Poedjosoedarmo and C. Ozog (eds), *Language use and language change in Brunei Darussalam*. *Journal of South-East Asian Studies* 30:359-63.
- 2002 'Salako morphology and the interrelation between voice, mood and aspect', in: K. Alexander Adelaar, and Robert Blust (eds), *Between worlds; Linguistic papers in memory of David John Prentice*, pp. 1-27. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics 529.]
- forthcoming a 'Malayo-Sumbawan', in: P. Austin (ed.), *Working papers in Bali, Lombok and Sumbawa*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- forthcoming b 'On the internal classifiability of Malayic', in: David Gil (ed.), *Malay/Indonesian linguistics*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Andaya, Barbara Watson and Leonard Y. Andaya
1994 *A history of Malaysia*. London: Macmillan. [Asian History Series.] [First edition 1982.]
- Asmah Haji Omar
1985 *Susur galur bahasa Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Bellwood, Peter
1997 *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian archipelago*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [Revised edition.]
- Blust, R.A.
1981 'The reconstruction of Proto-Malayo-Javanic; An appreciation', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 134:456-69.

- 1984 'On the history of Rejang vowels and diphthongs', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 140:422-50.
- 1984-85 'The Austronesian homeland; A linguistic perspective', *Asian Perspectives* 26:45-67.
- 1988 'Malay historical linguistics; A progress report', in: Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds), *Rekonstruksi dan cabang-cabang bahasa Melayu Induk*, pp. 1-33. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. [Siri Monograf Sejarah Bahasa Melayu.]
- 1994 'The Austronesian settlement of mainland Southeast Asia', in: Karen L. Adams and Thomas John Hudak (eds), *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, pp. 25-83. Tempe Ar.: Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University.
- 1997 'Nasals and nasalization in Borneo', *Oceanic Linguistics* 36:149-79.
- Brown, D.E.
1970 *Brunei; The structure and history of a Bornean Malay sultanate*. N.p.: Brunei Museum. [Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal 2.]
- Casparis, J.G. de
1956 *Selected inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th century A.D.* Bandung: Masa Baru. [Dinas Purbakala Republik Indonesia, Prasasti Indonesia 2.]
- Clynes, Adrian
forthcoming 'Brunei Malay; An overview', in: David Gil (ed.), *Malay/Indonesian Linguistics*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- 1989 Speech styles in Balinese and Javanese. [MA thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.]
- Çoedès, G.
1948 *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*. Paris: De Boccard. [Histoire du Monde 8, 2.]
- Collins, J.T.
1987 *Dialek Melayu Sarawak*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 1994 'Sumbangan dialek Brunei dalam pengkajian sejarah Bahasa Melayu', in: *Tinggal Landas ke Abad 21*, pp. 62-75, Bandar Seri Begawan: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 1996 'Borneo and Maluku; The evidence from the language of Bacan', in: Martin, Ozog, and G. Poedjosoedarmo (eds), pp. 73-88.
- 1997 'The Malays and non-Malays of Kalimantan Barat: evidence from the study of language'. Paper, International Conference on Tribal Communities in the Malay World, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (Singapore) 24-27 March 1997.
- 1998a *Klasifikasi Varian Melayik di Ketapang; Kepelbagaian Bahasa di Kalimantan Barat*, *Dewan Bahasa* 42:233-60.
- 1998b *Malay, world language of the ages; A sketch of its history*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Dahl, Otto Christian
1951 *Malgache et Maanyan; Une comparaison linguistique*. Oslo: Egede Institutet. [Avhandlingar utgitt av Egede Instituttet 3.]

- Dewall, H.A. von
1909 'Bataviaasch-Maleische taalstudiën', *Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap* 51:191-221.
- Djantera Kawi, Durdje Durasid and Aris Djinal
1983 *Struktur bahasa Dusun Deyah*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Dunselman, P. Donatus
1949 'Bijdragen tot de kennis van de taal en adat der Kendajan-Dajaks van West-Borneo', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 105:59-105, 147-218.
1950 'Bijdragen tot de kennis van de taal en adat der Kendajan-Dajaks van West Borneo', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde* 106:321-73.
1955 *Kana Sera; Zang der zwangerschap*. The Hague: Nijhoff. [Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap 17.]
- Dyen, Isidore
1965 *A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages*. Baltimore MD: Waverly Press. [International Journal of American Linguistics, Memoir 19.]
- Fokker, A.A.
1895 *Malay phonetics*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hogan, David W. and Stephen W. Pattemore
1988 *Urak Lawoi'; Basic structures and a dictionary*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Department of Linguistics, Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics, Series C, 109.]
- Hudson, Alfred B.
1967 *The Barito isolects of Borneo; A classification based on comparative reconstruction and lexicostatistics*. Ithaca NY: Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University. [Data Paper 68.]
1970 A note on Salako; Malayic Dayak and Land Dayak languages in West Borneo, *Sarawak Museum Journal* 18/36-37:301-18. [New Series.]
- Ina Anak Kalom and Alfred B. Hudson
1970 Salako traditional history; A story on the origins of Kampong Pueh, *Sarawak Museum Journal* 18/36-37:281-300. [New Series.]
- Ismail Hussein
1992 *Sejarah pertumbuhan bahasa kebangsaan kita*. Fourth revised edition. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pelajaran. [First edition 1966.]
- Jaludin Chuchu
2003 *Dialek Melayu Brunei dalam salasilah bahasa Melayu Purba*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Kaehler, Hans
1966 *Wörterverzeichnis des Omong Djakarta*. Berlin: Reimer. [Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Indonesische und Südseesprachen der Universität Hamburg 5.]

- Kern, H.
1889 'Taalkundige gegevens ter bepaling van het stamland der Maleisch Polynesische volkeren', *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde* (Third Series) 6: 270-87 (also in *H. Kern Verspreide Geschriften VI*. The Hague: Nijhoff; 105-20).
- Malkiel, Yakov
1993 *Etymology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marrison, G.E.
1975 The early Cham language and its relation to Malay, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 48(2):52-60.
- Martin, Peter W., G. Poedjosoedarmo and C. Ozog (eds)
1996 *Language use and language change in Brunei Darussalam*. Athens OH: Ohio University Center for International Studies. [Monographs in International Studies 100.]
- McKinnon, E. Edward
1994 'The Sambas hoard; Bronze drums and gold ornaments found in Kalimantan in 1991', *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 67-1:9-28.
- Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds)
1988 *Rekonstruksi dan cabang-cabang bahasa Melayu Induk*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. [Siri Monograf Sejarah Bahasa Melayu.]
- Niemann, G.K.
1891 'Bijdrage tot de kennis der verhouding van het Tjam tot de talen van Indonesië', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 40:27-44.
- Nothofer, Bernd
1975 *The reconstruction of Proto-Malayo-Javanic*. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff. [KITLV, Verhandelingen 73.]
- 1985 'The subgrouping of the languages of the Javo-Sumatran hesion; A reconsideration', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 141:228-302.
- 1988 'A discussion of two Austronesian subgroups; Proto-Malay and Proto Malayic', in: Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds), *Rekonstruksi dan cabang-cabang bahasa Melayu Induk*, pp. 34-58. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. [Siri Monograf Sejarah Bahasa Melayu.]
- 1995 'The history of Jakarta Malay', *Oceanic Linguistics* 34-1:86-97.
- 1996 'Migrasi orang Melayu Purba; Kajian awal', *Sari* 14:33-52.
- 1997a *Dialek Melayu Bangka*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- 1997b 'Klasifikasi varian Melayik di antara Sungai Semandung dan Sungai Pawan/Sungai Keriau (Gerai, Tanjung Beringin, Randau Jeka?)'. Paper, Seminar Internasional Bahasa dan Budaya di Dunia Melayu (Asia Tenggara), Mataram, 21-23 Juli.

- Prentice, D.J.
1988 'Some lexical evidence for a non-Malay substratum in Brunei Malay', in: Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds), *Rekonstruksi dan cabang-cabang bahasa Melayu Induk*, pp. 99-107. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. [Siri Monograf Sejarah Bahasa Melayu.]
- Prentice, D.J. and Hakim Usman
1978 'Kerinci sound-changes and phonotactics', in: S.A. Wurm and Lois Carrington (eds), *Second international conference of Austronesian Linguistics; Proceedings. Fascicle I: Western Austronesian*, pp. 121-63. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Department of Linguistics; Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics, Series C, 61.]
- Sapir, Edward
1968 'Time perspective in aboriginal American culture; A study in method', in: David G. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*, pp. 389-467. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sipol Strassman anak Ambun
1992 *Daftar kata bahasa Malaysia – Dialek Selakau*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Steinhauer, H.
2002 'More (on) Kerinci sound-changes', in: K. Alexander Adelaar and Robert Blust (eds), *Between worlds; Linguistic papers in memory of David John Prentice*, pp. 159-76. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics 529.]
- Steinhauer, H. and A. Hakim Usman
1978 'Notes on the morphemics of Kerinci (Sumatra)', in: S.A. Wurm and Lois Carrington (eds), *Second International Conference of Austronesian Linguistics; Proceedings. Fascicle I: Western Austronesian*, pp. 483-502. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics, Series C, 61.]
- Syahroen Alan, Tasmin Dahlan and Donatus Lansau
1980 *Struktur bahasa Kedayan*. N.p.: Fakultas Keguruan, Universitas Tanjungpura. [Proyek Penelitian dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.]
- Tadmor, Uri
forthcoming 'Final /a/ mutation: A borrowed areal feature in western Austronesian languages', in: J. Lynch (ed.), *Issues in Austronesian phonology*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Thomas, Yoseph et al.
1984 *Morfologi dan sintaksis bahasa Kedayan*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- 1985 *Morfologi kata kerja bahasa Kedayan*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Thurgood, Graham

1999 *From ancient Cham to modern dialects; Two thousand years of language contact and change*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. [Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 28.]

Zorc, R. David

1982 'Where, O where, have the laryngeals gone? Austronesian laryngeals re-examined', in: Amran Halim, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm (eds), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. Vol.2: Tracking the travellers*, pp. 111-44. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. [Pacific Linguistics, Series C, 75.]

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Adelaar, KA

Title:

Where does Malay come from? Twenty years of discussions about homeland, migrations and classifications

Date:

2004-01-01

Citation:

Adelaar, K. A. (2004). Where does Malay come from? Twenty years of discussions about homeland, migrations and classifications. *BIJDRAGEN TOT DE TAAL- LAND- EN VOLKENKUNDE*, 160 (1), pp.1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-90003733>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/122869>