



PROJECT MUSE®

Salako or BadameŃ , sketch grammar, texts and lexicon of a Kanayatn dialect in West Borneo (review)

Kaufman, Daniel.

Oceanic Linguistics, Volume 46, Number 2, December 2007, pp. 624-633
(Article)

Oceanic
Linguistics
VOLUME 46 NUMBER 2 DECEMBER 2007

Published by University of Hawai'i Press
DOI: 10.1353/ol.2008.0010

➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ol/summary/v046/46.2kaufman.html>

K. Alexander Adelaar. 2005. *Salako or Badameà, sketch grammar, texts and lexicon of a Kanayatn dialect in West Borneo*. Frankfurter Forschungen zu Südostasien 2. Berlin: Harrasowitz Verlag. vii + 328 pp. ISBN 3-447-051012-7. €78, hardcover.

The Salako language, spoken in parts of West Kalimantan and Sarawak, is accepted as belonging to the Malayic family (Adelaar 1992a), but despite this linguistic affiliation, Salako speakers are culturally far removed from present-day Malay groups in Western Indonesia due to the preservation to their traditional lifestyle and religion until relatively recently. The Salako are, of course, not the only “Dayak” people of Kalimantan to be counted in the Malayic family; other such groups include the Iban and the Kendayan. But in contrast to the better-documented Iban language, Salako had not received sufficient attention from linguists prior to Adelaar’s earlier publications, especially in regard to grammar and morphology. The present grammar thus represents the first attempt at offering a more holistic picture of the Salako language, and fills an important gap in our knowledge of the Malayic family and the linguistic landscape of West Kalimantan. The grammar, however, as stated in the title, is only a sketch. It covers the fundamental points of the phonology and morphology of the language along with a basic picture of the syntax. The bulk of the book comprises a collection of texts in Salako with English translations and a lexicon. It is the product of Adelaar’s fieldwork in Nyarumkop, a Roman Catholic parochial center located in the Singkawang Timur district, Benkayang regency, where he collected data intermittently between the late 1980s and 2004.

In what follows, I review the content and presentation of this publication while at the same time highlighting some points of Salako grammar that are of importance for current issues in linguistics. The relevance of Salako to the reconstruction and subgrouping of Malayic has already been dealt with by Adelaar in several articles (Adelaar 1992a, 1992b, 2004, 2005b).

The book is organized into four parts. Part I is an introduction containing basic information about the speaker community, the history of Salako scholarship, and the recent sociolinguistic situation. Part II is a sketch grammar with subsections covering phonology, morphophonology, and morphosyntax. Part III consists of 20 texts that are mostly narrated stories, procedural texts, and stories explaining Salako customs with a few samples of dialogue included. Part IV, the final part, is a Salako–English lexicon.

The introduction is well written and informative, enriched by Adelaar’s longstanding interest in the language area in particular, and in the Malayic family more generally. We are told here about the various linguistic pressures affecting Salako speakers today, the greatest of which is from Indonesian, as is evident from the code-mixing within the texts. This pressure is not new; in earlier times, Adelaar informs us, the Catholic church was responsible for the marginalization of Salako by their promotion of Malay as the official liturgical language. In regard to classification, Adelaar locates Malayic in the framework of his Malayo-Sumbawan hypothesis (Adelaar 2005a) which groups Madurese, Sundanese, Sasak, Sumbawa, Balinese, Chamic, and Malayic into a single subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian.

The grammar proper, which takes up 63 pages, offers a short but relatively thorough description of the language. The phonology covers basic alternations and distributional patterns, including some brief historical notes on the development of the sound system. The most notable features of Salako phonology are the following:

- (i) NT without ND
- (ii) vowel nasalization
- (iii) nasal prelosion

Feature (i) is phonotactic in nature and exemplifies a counterexample to a claimed universal, namely, that nasal + voiceless obstruent clusters are more marked than nasal + voiced obstruent clusters, and that the former should thus not occur in a language without the latter.¹ This uncommon state of affairs is the result of a historical simplification that only affected clusters containing voiced stops, schematized as: *NT>NT, *ND>N. In another apparent flouting of these markedness conditions, Salako attests many cases of nasal accretion (unexplained instances of historical nasal insertion) in exactly the places where it is most marked, that is, before a voiceless alveolar fricative (cf. Padgett 1995). This can be seen in the words *insi?* ‘content’ < *isi and *munsuh* ‘enemy’ < *musuh, among many others.

Feature (ii), the nasalization of vowels from preceding nasal consonants, feeds into a large literature on the contrastive role of vowel nasality in closely related languages and adds to the list of languages attesting progressive nasalization.² In particular, the Dayak dialect recorded by Scott (1957, 1964), shown below, has fueled discussion on the architecture of the phonological component (Walker 1998; McCarthy 2003; Mielke, Armstrong, and Hume 2003). The reason is that nasalization is a regular, productive process in Sea Dayak but, at the same time, when a blocking consonant is optionally omitted, nasalization does not spread to the final vowel, as shown in the second variants of (1b) and (1c). This is a typical case of what is termed opacity in phonological theory, and appears to be most amenable to an analysis involving rule ordering (nasality spreading *before* consonant deletion).³

- (1) a. *nāŋā?* ‘straighten’
 b. *nāŋga?* ~ *nāŋa?* ‘set up a ladder’
 c. *rambo?* ~ *ramo?* ‘a kind of flowering plant’ (Sea Dayak)

Adelaar presents related data from Salako. But unlike in Sea Dayak, the variation is absent in Salako, and thus a synchronic analysis can guiltlessly stipulate that nasality is phonemic.⁴ As in Sea Dayak, a regular process of nasalization is blocked by an intervening etymological stop. Unlike Sea Dayak, however, the stop never surfaces, as ND sequences have been historically eliminated from the native vocabulary. In the minimal pair shown in

1. Other counterexamples are discussed by Blust (2004) in the context of Austronesian Nasal Substitution, and Riehl (2007), who discusses a variety of languages possessing NT but lacking ND. Hyman (2001) offers a perceptual account of similar facts in non-Austronesian languages and argues that individual constraints against both types of clusters must be recognized.

2. Although progressive nasalization is rarer than regressive nasalization cross-linguistically, it is the most common type described for Austronesian languages (Cohn 1993, Blust 1997).

3. Alternatively, it is possible that the oral portion of the stop has never been fully lost in this language, but only heavily reduced (Robert Blust pers. comm.). If this were the case, rule ordering would not be necessary.

4. Although perhaps not entirely guiltlessly, as Adelaar counts only four such cases of phonemic nasality.

(2), nasality spreads as expected in the first member (2a), but appears to be blocked by the presence of a purely etymological stop in the second one (2b).⁵

- (2) a. aŋō ‘fly’ < PMAL *laŋaw ‘fly’
 b. aŋo ‘arrogant’ < PMAL *baŋga ‘proud’⁶

Historical stops do not always block nasality spread. One of the examples Adelaar provides, shown in (3), displays spread despite the historical presence of an intervening oral stop.

- (3) tumūh < PMAL *tumbuh ‘grow’

Nasality is not consistently included in the phonetic transcriptions, and Adelaar does not state if it is equally present on all types of vowels. Furthermore, out of the six transcriptions given to exemplify nasal spread, there are two examples (indicated by bold font) that appear to lack it where expected (*binī-ŋū* ‘your wife’, *nahūī?* ‘to know O’), but these are possibly just typos. In any case, a detailed phonetic study would be rewarding, as the status of nasalization in Salako is still far from clear.⁷

Feature (iii) is closely intertwined with (ii) in that vowel nasality appears to condition the presence of nasal prelosion. Nasal prelosion, first discussed in detail for a Bornean language by Court (1967), refers to (ostensibly) single segments containing a primary nasal component preceded by a homorganic oral closure. In the case of Salako, the oral stop component is described as voiceless, and the segments are thus represented as [pm], [tn], [kj].⁸ The phenomenon of nasal prelosion in Borneo and other areas has been discussed in detail by Blust (1997), and a phonetic study of nasal prelosion in Australian aboriginal languages is offered by Butcher (1999). The typological variation in the expression of historically final nasals just within West Borneo is worthy of more attention from phonologists and phoneticians. Adelaar (25, fn. 11) states that in “various neighboring speech forms” the final preploded nasals of Salako correspond to voiced consonant nasal clusters, preglottalized nasals, and plain voiceless stops. The allomorphy involving these segments is no less interesting. Prelosion affects word-final nasals semiregularly, but only in cases where there is no immediately preceding nasal.⁹ This is shown in (4) (page 31, for which I have posited the underlying forms), where a final nasal in the root surfaces as preploded only when it is word final, as in (4a). If followed by the *-an* suffix, as in (4b), neither the root nasal nor the affixal nasal surface as preploded.¹⁰

- (4) a. /uraŋ/ → [urakŋ] b. /uraŋ-an/ → [uraŋan]
 person person-AN
 ‘person’ ‘to have many visitors’

5. Protolanguage abbreviations are PMAL, Proto-Malayic, and PMP, Proto-Malayo-Polynesian. Glosses in examples follow the Leipzig Glossing rules with the addition of AV, Actor Voice; EMPH, emphatic; NC, noncontrolled; POT, potential; PREP, preposition; PV, Patient Voice; UO, Undergoer orientation.

6. This account is, of course, dependent on the correctness of this etymology. The changes *ŋg > ŋ and *a > o are regular in Salako but *b > ø is not. Another, totally regular form *baŋo* with the same meaning also exists.

7. Concerning nasalized vowels that are not in word initial position, Adelaar states (23): “In other cases, nasalisation varies from clearly noticeable to hardly noticeable at all, and there seems to be no conditioning factor for this variation.”

8. In other transcription conventions, these segments are represented with the oral stop component superscripted to indicate its secondary status.

If the affixal nasal is separated from a preceding nasal by an opaque (non-glottal) obstruent, then it surfaces as preploded, as shown in (5b).¹¹ Opaque consonants also block the spread of nasality across vowels and thus an analysis could profitably refer to vocalic nasality as the proper conditioning factor (cf. Blust 1997:173).

- (5) a. /samut/ → [samut] b. /samut-an/ → [samutatn]
 ant ant-AN
 ‘ant’ ‘covered in ants’

Interestingly, we again find that null etymological obstruents play a role in the phonology. Adelaar reports that “the preceding consonant can be a nasal provided that it historically derives from a homorganic nasal + voiced stop cluster, or that it was historically separated from -AN by an intermediate *l ...” (31). This is shown in (6).

- (6) /N-tiŋi-an/ → [niŋiàtn] (Salako *tiŋi* < PMAL *tiŋi ‘high’)
 AV-high-APPL
 ‘to raise O’

An interesting difference between Salako and other Austronesian languages for which prepllosion has been described is the appearance of preploded nasals word-medially in onset position. In other Austronesian languages, nasal prepllosion is strictly a word-final phenomenon. According to Blust (1997), the only other clear example of word-medial preploded nasals in Austronesian comes from Mentawai, shown in (7).

- (7) mere^pm-aké
 sleep-APPL
 ‘to put to sleep (as a child)’ (Mentawa, Blust 1997:159)

In Salako, however, preploded nasals may occur word-medially, but only before the *-i?* suffix (marking plural action, reciprocal, locative applicative), as shown in (8).

- (8) a. /garam/ → [garapm] b. /N-garam-i?/ → [ŋarapmi?]
 salt AV-salt-APPL
 ‘salt’ ‘to add salt to’

9. There appear to be many exceptions to the putative rule of final prepllosion, but many of these are loans. Furthermore, there exist some minimal pairs containing nominal and verbal stems derived from the same root in which the noun undergoes nasal prepllosion but the verb does not. Whether or not an analysis in which preploded nasals are derived from underlying plain nasals is viable synchronically, it certainly represents a diachronic reality. It should also be noted that the prepllosion of final nasals would appear to pose a serious challenge to the notion that alternations of this nature are motivated by universal markedness constraints, as there could be no phonetic basis for considering preploded nasals less marked than plain nasals. Positing preploded nasals as underlying and their plain allophones as derived would constitute a case of “rule reversal,” and only pushes the problem further back to the stage at which preploded nasals first entered the phonology, as we know that, historically, these all originated from plain nasals.
10. Blust (1997) shows that this conditioning factor on preploded nasals, whereby a preceding nasal blocks prepllosion, is strikingly common and found in several genetically unrelated languages.
11. Analytically, it may be possible to subsume this alternation under the general rubric of OCP effects, which militate against adjacent marked segments. Blust (2004:110–11) discusses related patterns occurring with nasal substitution in Ngaju Dayak and Mori Bawah. In these languages, certain stop-nasal clusters are limited to one per stem by deleting either a nasal or stop after affixation of a reflex of PMP *maN-. Note, however, that in this case what is being banned is not only two occurrences of the marked (preploded) segment, but a cooccurrence of the marked segment with its unmarked (plain nasal) counterpart, as, for example, in the unattested **uray-atn* (cf. 4b).

The word-final generalization may still be maintained if *-i?* is treated as being outside the minimal phonological word, that is, as an “outer suffix.” The fact that *-i?* must be positioned outside of *-an* when they cooccur on the same word lends morphological support to such an analysis.

The morphosyntax portion of part II is organized primarily on the basis of the morphemic inventory and word class. The basic constructions are exemplified and discussed briefly in turn. Complex constructions such as subordination, topicalization, clefting, etc., are not discussed at any length. The discussion of the various morphemes is generally well exemplified but not always sufficiently detailed. For instance, the difference between the verbal prefixes *ba-* and *N-* (the Indonesian cognates of which, *ber-* and *meN-*, have been discussed rather extensively in the literature) remains somewhat unclear. We are told that *ba-* “can sometimes be translated as possess ROOT, use ROOT, wear ROOT” (42), but only five out of the ten examples given can be subsumed under one of these definitions. Overall, though, the descriptions are clear and concise.

Most morphemes have clear cognates in Indonesian and the more familiar Malayic languages. In areas where Salako does differ, however, the differences are often noteworthy. Some of the divergent morphosyntactic features, enumerated in (i)–(iv), are discussed below.

- (i) *-an* APPL
- (ii) *ma-* transitive counterpart to *ba-*
- (iii) *N-* PRF
- (iv) *di-* AGENT MARKER

Feature (i) contrasts with most other Malayic isolects in that they generally show the form *-kan* for the same morpheme. The origin of the applicative *-kan* affix in Malayic and beyond has been an issue of some contention. While many have taken *-kan* to be cognate with the independent Malay preposition *akan* (cf. Banjarese *-akan*, Ambonese *akang*), there is also evidence that militates against this connection. Tadmor (2006) suggests that *-kan* is a historically composite morpheme that contained **-an* or **-n* as its final element. If this is correct, Salako, together with several Minangkabau and Batak isolects that also show plain *-an* for Indonesian *-kan*, could represent a retention of a simplex version of the suffix (Sirk 1996). Alternatively, these languages could have reduced an inherited *-kan* suffix irregularly for phonotactic reasons.

Feature (ii) diverges from Indonesian and other familiar Malayic languages in minimally changing the intransitive prefix *ba-* to *ma-* to create a transitive verb, as shown in (9).

- | | |
|---|---|
| (9) <i>ba-</i> diri
INTR-stand
‘to stand’ | <i>ma-</i> diri
TR-stand
‘to erect O’ |
|---|---|
- (46)

Indonesian typically employs *mN-STEM-kan* for the same function but the combination of the two prefixes *mN-* plus *br-* is also attested (e.g., *mem-ber-diri-kan*). The expected outcome of the cognate morphological construction in Salako is the attested *ma-*, as the Salako cognate of *mN-* is simply *N-*, and, unlike Indonesian, it triggers nasal substitution with voiced stops. It is likely that the Salako construction, historically formed on PMP **maN-paR-*, is more representative of the early Malayic causative, which was later replaced by *maN-STEM-kan* in other Malayic isolects.

Feature (iii) represents Salako's greatest and most significant morphological divergence from the rest of Malayic. Whereas in the rest of Malayic, and indeed, the rest of Austronesian, reflexes of PMP *maN- almost always contain an actor voice function (being derived from PMP *p<um>aN- <AV>DIST, cf. Ross 2002), in Salako it seems that the *N-* prefix serves double duty, as it also indicates perfective. The Salako reflex *N-* can thus cooccur with the patient voice (referred to as "undergoer-orientation" by Adelaar). From the divergent, indeed irreconcilable, semantics it is clear that two homophonous morphemes must be recognized: *N*₁- 'Actor Voice' and *N*₂- 'perfective'. It is likely that the perfective *N-* was inherited from PMP *ni-, <in> 'perfective', which then merged with earlier Salako *N-* to trigger nasal substitution. Adelaar's discussion of the voice-aspect paradigm is slightly hampered by an implicit treatment of the two *N-* affixes as a single polysemous morpheme, as in "the interrelation between voice and mood appears from the fact that completion is only distinguished in undergoer-oriented phrases" (61). The impossibility of cooccurrence, however, should probably be viewed as phonology rather than morphology.

The relevant paradigm is shown in table 1, adapted from Adelaar (54), but to which I have added indexes to the morphemes to separate their functions. The nasal substitution affix marking actor-orientation is given as *N*₁, while that indicating completedness is *N*₂. The affix in the completed aspect of the actor-oriented verb is ambiguous between these two functions.

TABLE 1. SALAKO VOICE-ASPECT PARADIGM

	COMPLETED	NONCOMPLETED
ACTOR-ORIENTED (AV)	<i>N</i> _{1/2} -√	<i>N</i> ₁ -√
UNDERGOER-ORIENTED (PV)	<i>di</i> - <i>N</i> ₂ -√	<i>di</i> -√

The second divergent aspect of this paradigm—feature (iv) above—is the fact that the agent of patient voice verbs appears to be positioned in between the *di-* affix and the stem, as shown in (10). This is again a remarkable feature for a Malayic language and has been at the center of a lively debate concerning the origin of Malay *di-* (van den Berg 2004; Adelaar 1992b, 2005b; Ross 2004).

- (10) ... parahu an=di aku n-aredek
 dugout REL=*di* 1SG N-tick.against
 '...which dugout I am tapping on.' (56)

Adelaar notes that, unlike Indonesian, the actor marked by *di-* in this construction can be first, second, or third person. In other publications, Adelaar uses the Salako construction to argue for a prepositional etymology of Malay *di-*. Because the shift from preposition to voice marker is so rarely attested (van den Berg 2004), this case deserves much further attention, as it is of high value to those interested in grammaticalization phenomena.¹² As regards the description of the construction in Salako, there are still some questions left unanswered. For instance, we are told on page 53 that, in this construction, "the actor—if explicitly mentioned—occurs immediately before the verb," but we also find examples of postposed *di-* marked agents in the text, such as in (11). It

is not clear if noncontrolled verbs (marked with *ta-*) differ from undergoer voice verbs on this point.¹³

- (11) Padi masak dah ana? nang ta-tono-i? disc.
 rice ripe PRF NEG EMPH NC-COVER-APPL PREP3
 'They didn't cover the rice plants that were ripe.' (78)

It would also have been nice to see confirmation that the *di* agent must immediately precede the verb in the form of ungrammatical (?) sentences of the form (12), with an aspectual adverb intervening between the agent and the verb (adapted from 55).

- (12) Rajà aṅ=ṅian di Pa? Alai (?dah) mare? makàtn.
 king REL=PROX PREP Pa' Alai PRF N-give food
 'Pa' Alai gave food to the king.'

Because of the sketch nature of the grammar, it is understandable that constituent order could not be worked out in full. Some differences with Malay and other closely related languages deserve more attention, however. For instance, there are several examples in the grammar of clause-final negation, as shown in (13) and (14), but the extent of this phenomenon is not discussed. This is interesting, as it is unexpected in a head-initial language (although it is also common to several otherwise head-initial languages in Eastern Indonesia).

- (13) Ba-eṅekng ià an=na'an anà?
 INTR-pig 3 REL=DIST NEG
 'They did not have pigs.' (41)
- (14) Ta-dangar buṅi dameà pun anà?
 POT-hear sound what even NEG
 'No sound whatsoever was (=could be) heard.' (48)

Part III of the book comprises twenty texts on various topics, the primary source of the texts being the assisting coauthor Pak Vitus Kaslem. Eight of the texts explain Salako customs, while the other twelve may be described as folktales. Only the first text is provided with interlinear glossing. The other texts are presented in Salako with the English translation immediately following. This layout is somewhat unfortunate for the linguist who wishes to read the Salako line by line and requires frequent reference to the English

12. Adelaar (2005b) claims that the change is not unique in Austronesian and points to Manuk Mangkaw Sinama (Akamine 2005) as another language that apparently shows exactly the same construction. In fact, the changes involved are so uncommon that the cognate construction in Manuk Mangkaw and other Sama-Bajau languages (discussed briefly in Akamine 1996) most probably arose through contact. That contact could have occurred between the two groups should not be particularly surprising: an intriguing ethnographic hint is found in text 16, a folktale about a head-hunting expedition to the Sulu archipelago, and Blust (2005, 2007) argues for a southeast Bornean origin of the Sama-Bajau languages. But a major difficulty in this line of research is our lack of knowledge regarding the precise distribution of a *di-* PATIENT VOICE/PASSIVE throughout Indonesian languages. Adelaar and van den Berg compare *di-* in some South Sulawesi languages but the distribution even extends to Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian languages such as Bima. Whether these forms are inherited, independent innovations, or borrowings in such scattered areas is a question that will require much work.

13. The question of why and how the *di*-marked agent ends up canonically preceding the undergoer-oriented verb is an important question in its own right and is not given an explanation in Adelaar's other work on the construction. This preverbal position clearly sets it apart from contemporary and Classical Malay *oleh*-marked agents and more closely related Mualang *ulih*-marked agents (Tjia 2007).

translation, which necessitates much page-flipping. Rarely, this is made more difficult by misalignment in the paragraph breaks between the Salako and the translation (e.g., 111, end of paragraph 4). Having said that, the content of the texts is engaging and informative enough to warrant the extra effort. Especially important for ethnographic purposes is the documentation of obsolete customs such as those relating to headhunting.

A recurring difficulty in dealing with the texts is the amount of code-switching with Indonesian. The difficulty in the case of Salako stems from its inherited similarity to Indonesian, making borrowing that much more difficult to detect. Fortunately, there are salient phonological changes that mark Salako and allow us to identify many Indonesian loans. Nonetheless, there are still a great number of ambiguous lexemes, and it is unclear to what extent Indonesian has influenced the morphology and grammar. Some entire sentences, as illustrated by the fragment in (15), seem to be the result of code-switching with Indonesian (only *kayo-e* 'his enemy' is clearly Salako). This is most often left unmarked, although there are several footnotes throughout the texts indicating corrections made by the speaker.

- (15) ... dngan sagale sanang ati karna meskipun patut ia
 with all.kind happy liver because even fitting 3SG
 di-bunuh oleh kayo-e ...
 UO-kill by enemy-3SG.GEN
 '... with pleasure in their hearts, because, although it was right
 (for their kinsman) to be killed by his enemy...' (109–10)

The lexicon, which makes up part IV, contains roughly 2,300 entries. Entries consist of basic descriptions, and many words are provided with sample sentences. The lexicon is culled strictly from the texts contained in part III. Overall, the definitions are minimal, but satisfactory. A very small number of definitions encountered were difficult to interpret, for example, "ARIKNG – smell rising from graveyards, e.g. when there is rain with sunshine," repeated under the entry for BANGUS. Again, borrowings and code-switching pose serious difficulties, but Adelaar does a commendable, although admittedly non-exhaustive, job of trying to sort out the mess by distinguishing assimilated loans from unassimilated ones, including the Indonesian words used in code-switching.

The work is a highly welcome addition to the body of Austronesian descriptive grammars. For those interested in the typology and historical development of Malayic and other Indonesian languages, the importance is clear, even more so to those interested in Bornean languages and cultures. Together with Tjia's (2007) recently published grammar of Mualang, it offers us an increasingly refined linguistic understanding of the West Bornean language area. In this review, I have further outlined some issues of more general linguistic, and current theoretical, interest. Hopefully, Adelaar's grammar will also be able to serve as an additional source for data in theoretical discussions on such diverse issues as the nature of opacity, the phonology of nasalization, and the process of grammaticalization.

DANIEL KAUFMAN
 Cornell University

REFERENCES

- Adelaar, Alexander. 1992a. *Proto-Malayan: A reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its morphology and lexicon*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 1992b. The relevance of Salako for Proto-Malayan and for Old Malay epigraphy. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 148:382–408.
- . 2004. Where does Malay come from? Twenty years of discussions about homeland, migrations, and classifications. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 160:1–29.
- . 2005a. Malayo-Sumbawan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44:357–88.
- . 2005b. Much ado about di-. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 161:127–42.
- Akaminc, Jun. 1996. A grammatical analysis of Manuk Mangkaw Sinama. PhD diss., University of the Philippines, Diliman.
- . 2005. Sama (Bajau). In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus Himmelmann, 377–92. London: Routledge.
- Blust, Robert. 1997. Nasals and nasalization in Borneo. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36:149–79.
- . 2004. Austronesian nasal substitution: A survey. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43:73–148.
- . 2005. The linguistic macrohistory of the Philippines: Some speculations. In *Current issues in Philippine linguistics and anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*, ed. by Hsiu-chuan Liao and Carl R. Galvez Rubino, 31–68. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines.
- . 2007. The linguistic position of Sama-Bajaw. *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures* 15:73–114.
- Butcher, Andrew. 1999. What speakers of Australian aboriginal languages do with their velums and why: The phonetics of the nasal/oral contrast. In *Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, ed. by John J. Ohala, Yoko Hasegawa, Manjari Ohala, Daniel Granville, and Ashlee C. Bailey, 479–82. Berkeley: International Congress of Phonetic Sciences.
- Cohn, Abigail. 1993. A survey of the phonology of the feature [nasal]. *Working Papers of the Cornell Phonetics Laboratory* 8:141–203.
- Court, Christopher. 1967. Some areal features of Mentu Land Dayak. *Oceanic Linguistics* 6:46–50.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2001. The limits of phonetic determinism in phonology: *NC revisited. In *The role of speech perception in phonology*, ed. by Elizabeth Hume and Keith Johnson, 141–85. San Diego: Academic Press.
- McCarthy, John. 2003. Comparative markedness. *Theoretical Linguistics* 29:1–51.
- Mielke, Jeff, Mike Armstrong, and Elizabeth Hume. 2003. Looking through opacity. *Theoretical Linguistics* 29:123–39.
- Padgett, Jaye. 1995. *Stricture in feature geometry*. Dissertations in Linguistics Series. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Riehl, Anastasia. 2007. The phonology and phonetics of nasal-obstruent sequences. PhD diss., Cornell University.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. In *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 17–62. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2004. Notes on the prehistory and internal subgrouping of Malayic. In *Papers in Austronesian subgrouping and dialectology*, ed. by John Bowden and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 97–109. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Scott, N. C. 1957. Notes on the pronunciation of Sea Dayak. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20:509–12.
- . 1964. Nasal consonants in Land Dayak (Bukar-Sadong). In *In honour of*

- Daniel Jones: Papers contributed on his eightieth birthday, 12 September 1961*, ed. by David Abercrombie, D. B. Fry, P. A. D. MacCarthy, N. C. Scott, and J. L. M. Trim, 432–36. London: Longmans.
- Sirk, Ülo. 1996. On the history of transitive verb suffixes in the languages of western Indonesia. In *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics No. 3*, ed. by H. Stenhauer, 191–205. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Tadmor, Uri. 2006. Notes on the etymology of the Malay-Indonesian suffix ‘-kan’. Talk presented at International Symposia on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics 10, University of Delaware.
- Tjia, Johnny. 2007. *A grammar of Mualang: An Ibanic language of western Kalimantan, Indonesia*. LOT Dissertation Series 154. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
- van den Berg, René. 2004. Some notes on the origin of Malay di-. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 160:532–54.
- Walker, Rachel. 1998. Nasalization, neutral segments, and opacity effects. PhD diss., University of California at Santa Cruz.