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Differentiating language varieties

- What should be differentiated is an open question
  - Kamusella 2012
  - Nordhoff & Hammarström (ms)

- Assume we have some agreement about this
- Then there are questions about WHO and HOW
- WHO:
  - linguists
    - what sort of linguists?
  - speakers
  - others
- HOW:
  - using what sort of data?
  - what data is available?
Outline

- Situation in NE Ambon
- Various views:
  - Historical
  - Descriptive
  - Sociolinguistic
    - etic
    - emic
- Implications
Maluku in Indonesia
Ambon Island
Sou Amana Teru and related languages

- Related varieties are spoken in villages to the north and west along the north coast: Waai (now only a few elderly rememberers), Liang, Morela, Mamala, Hitu, Hila, Kaitetu and Seit

- Collins 1982:90
  "the language spoken along the north coast [of Ambon Island – SM] from Seit to Tial and in Laha on Ambon Bay is called Hitu after its most prestigious village. There are three main dialects: Hitu-Tulehu, Seit-Kaitetu, and Laha”.

- But Collins 1983 treats Seit, Kaitetu, Hitu, Laha and Tulehu as separate, but closely-related languages.
Subgrouping from Collins 1983
Collins’ methodology

- Classic comparative linguistics
- Comparison of synchronic phonological and morphological systems
  - these varieties have rather limited morphology, verb conjugation was the most important evidence of this type
- Reconstruction of the system(s) of a presumed protolanguage
- Data sources:
  - Collins own research in the area, which was primarily lexical data
  - some previous work by (mainly) Dutch scholars
- Four entities or two?
Descriptivist view

- My own work
- Based on description of current language use
- Two sorts of data:
  - word list data: c230 items, based on Swadesh 200 supplemented with locally specific items
  - standard elicitation text of 70+ clauses
- Plus general observation
- Data collected at Tulehu, Tengah-tengah, Tial, Liang, Hitu and Mamala
Descriptivist results - morphosyntax

- Identified some sound changes:
  - [l] → [r] before high vowels in Liang and 3T villages
  - palatalisation of [s] before [a] at Mamala and Hitu
  - palatalisation of [s] before [i] at Liang

- Also some morphosyntactic variation:
  - verb conjugation seen in Mamala and Hitu, but only remnant random variation
  - small difference in range of inalienably possessed kin terms in Mamala and Hitu
  - variation in -(C)V suffix on nouns (more later)
    - 3T villages same
    - Liang and Hitu have different vowels
    - Mamala has a different form of suffix
Verbs

- Central Maluku languages historically had a system of verb conjugation involving changes to the initial consonant of verb forms. In Hitu and Mamala, traces of this system can still be seen:

  Hitu, Garden Story
  *Ite kolo wa'ale kula ite tolo ahasame*
  1Pl.E sit LOC-PROX with 1Pl.E sit rest
  ‘We sat here and we rested.’

  Mamala, Garden Story
  *Au kakak mahina’ a kolo wa’ a luma’a*
  1Sg o.sibling female sit LOC house-CV
  ‘My big sister stayed at home.’

  *Am tolo istirihat wa’ ale.*
  1Pl.I sit rest LOC-PROX
  ‘We sat here and rested.’

  (Malay loan words are **bolded** in examples)
Descriptivist results - wordlists

- Cognate percentages calculated over the word lists give the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tulehu</th>
<th>Tengah</th>
<th>Tial</th>
<th>Liang</th>
<th>Mamala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tengah</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tial</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamala</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitu</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- More on these data later
Some tentative conclusions (Musgrave 2006)

- Tulehu, Tial and Tengah-tengah form a homogeneous speech community.
- The variety at Liang is a dialect of Sou Amana Teru, distinguished by a phonological change and lexical differences.
- The varieties at Hitu and Mamala are distinct from Sou Amana Teru but cluster together:
  - They retain /l/ in all environments
  - They share lexical differences
  - They share remnants of verb conjugation

- The account in Collins 1983 (Hitu and Tulehu as distinct languages) seems preferable to Collins 1982 (dialects).
A sociolinguistic view

- Various perspectives possible here:
  - etic view
    - variation
    - identity
  - emic view
    - intelligibility
    - ethnonyms
Etic view - variation

- Lexicostatistics shows variation by village
- Greatest source of variation in word lists is age of speaker
- Data collected from three speakers from Liang
  - one M 60+ (used for main lexicostatistical calculation)
  - two F 20-30
- Lowest cognate % in main table was 69%
- Same as highest cognate percentage for these three speakers
- Lowest cognate percentage is between two younger speakers
Variation by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20+¹</th>
<th>20+²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Morphosyntactic variation by age is even more striking
- Various systems of grammar are almost unused by young speakers
  - split between types of possession is vanishing
  - use of subject markers is vanishing
  - split in intransitive verbs has vanished
**Etic perspective - identity**

- These communities have three main language resources:
  - Bahasa Indonesia: national language, used in education, administration, media, contact outside Maluku
  - Melayu Ambon: creolised Malay variety, used for almost all everyday personal interactions
    BI: *Saya tidak pergi ke rumah saya*
    MA: *Beta seng pi ke beta pung rumah*
    ‘I didn’t go home’
  - indigenous variety: used by older speakers (>30yo) in some private contexts, (formal ritual situations)

- No formal study, impressionistic view
Identities

- BI is used to project an identity as
  - a member of the national society
  - also indexes modernity (although English is even better for this for the few who can manage it)

- Melayu Ambon projects an identity
  - as Moluccan NOT Indonesian
  - people from these villages will use a higher number of Arabic loans/religious terms to establish Moluccan Muslim identity as opposed to Moluccan Christian, neutral as to modernity

- Indigenous varieties project an identity
  - as member of a local community
  - but not necessarily as a member of one specific community
  - indexes that value is attached to tradition
Emic views – naming varieties

- Standard term for any local variety in Maluku is *bahasa tanah* ‘language of the land’

- If greater specificity is needed, name of a village will be used:
  - *bahasa Tulehu* = *bahasa tanah* spoken at Tulehu

- Speakers have some awareness that varieties extend more widely
  - Tulehu, Tengah-tengah and Tial people use the term *bahasa tiga* ‘language of the three Ts’
  - judgments of intelligibility are mixed
    - everyone agrees that three Ts are homogeneous
    - when asked about people from Hitu, some say they understand, some say they don’t
Finding a name

- A dictionary has been published by a native of Tengah-tengah
- He used the name *Bahasa Uli Solemata*
  - *uli* was jurisdictional division when the raja of Hitu controlled most of the Island before Dutch control
  - but Uli Solemata did not correspond to current geographical range
  - my geographical suggestion was rejected

- Following consultation, I am currently using as ethnonym *Sou Amana Teru* ‘language of the three villages’
  - acknowledges emic view of 3Ts as core
  - definitely makes northern villages separate
  - but what about Liang? (not to mention Waai....)
Emic views - shibboleths

- Variation in -(C)V suffix on nouns
  - 3T villages same
  - Liang and Hitu have different vowels
  - Mamala has a different form of suffix

- Recognised by speakers as differentiating communities/varieties

- Used by young people who have limited knowledge of indigenous variety to claim local identity

- Example from Tulehu – all lexical items are Malay, but suffix is added to noun:
  
  Beta naik gunung-e
  
  1sg climb mountain-V
  
  “I climbed the mountain”
Some implications

- Who can/should be involved in making distinctions?
  - Speakers – yes, but they may not have strong views (as in this case)
    - what value should political and economic interests of speakers have? e.g. Siraya in Taiwan, minorities in EU
  - Linguists – what sort of linguists?
    - and what sort of data is available?
  - anyone else?
    - governments?
    - economic interests?
Some implications

- Time is important
  - Important morphological evidence used by Collins would not be found today
  - Lexical variation will look very different in the future
  - Relation between language and identity changes over time:
    • 2/3 generation Moluccans in the Netherlands have different relation to ancestral language compared to Ambonese people of same age