Possession in Souw Amana Teru: internally and externally motivated change

SIMON MUSGRAVE
MONASH UNIVERSITY

This paper discusses the range of structures used to code possession in the Central Moluccan language Souw Amana Teru. In particular, data is presented to show that this area of the grammar is undergoing change in at least three ways. First, the explicit pronominal coding of alienable possession has almost vanished. Second, the coding of inalienable possession is weakening rapidly. And thirdly, a new strategy now exists for interpreting sequences of two nouns; whereas historically the first noun was the possessor in such structures, it has now become possible for the second noun to be the possessor. The first of these changes can be seen as the result of internally motivated change, but I argue that contact with varieties of Malay has had some influence in the other two cases.

In this paper, I examine the changes which are taking place in possessive structures in Souw Amana Teru. I assume that, in the recent past, the language had a similar possessive system to other Central Moluccan languages, with a distinction between alienable and inalienable possession coded respectively by proclitics and enclitics. I argue that the coding for alienable possession has almost vanished from current language use even for conservative speakers, and that one of the proclitics, combined with a linking morpheme, is being relexified as a possessive pronoun. This development can be attributed to an internal pressure, reducing redundancy in the system. The use of specific coding for inalienable possession is weakening in current usage, and has almost disappeared in the language of young speakers. This change can be attributed at least partly to a contact phenomenon, the use of Malay kin terms by speakers of Souw Amana Teru. I hypothesise a three stage process, in which Malay kin terms were first borrowed but could not appear in any possessive structure, then the borrowed items could be possessed but were never marked as inalienably possessed, and finally the lack of marking of inalienable possession extended to native kin terms. Finally, there is some evidence that it is becoming possible for sequences of two nouns in Souw Amana Teru to be interpreted as though the first noun is the possessed item and the second is the possessor. Sequences of two nouns of which the first is the head of the construction do exist historically in Souw Amana Teru, but the relationship between the two items is one of loose association, not possession. The possibility of interpreting such structures as possessive structures can be interpreted as another manifestation of Malay influence.

1. Background

1.1 The speech communities

Souw Amana Teru ('language of the three villages') is spoken in the three Muslim communities of Tulehu, Tengah-tengah and Tial at the eastern end of Ambon Island (see Map 4 in Florey, this Volume).[1] The language was formerly spoken in the Christian village of Waai, further north. This village was destroyed and the population fled during the intercommunal violence which afflicted Maluku in recent years (1999-2002). The people returned to the village in 2003 and commenced rebuilding, and only limited linguistic research has not possible there as yet. On a recent field trip (July 2005), I interviewed one inhabitant over the age of fifty who had limited knowledge of the language, and the possibility remains that other elderly rememberers are still present in the Waai community. No detailed research has yet been

undertaken in Liang, in which a dialect of the language is spoken. Subgrouping of Souw Amana Teru is summarised in Florey (this volume). Although Collins (1983) recognizes four languages on the north and east coasts of Ambon (Seit, Kaitetu, Hitu and Tulehu), Collins (1982:90) makes the claim that "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."

Anecdotal evidence from speakers in Tulehu and Tengah-tengah is contradictory on this point, with some reporting that they share mutual intelligibility with speakers from Hitu, and others disagreeing. Further research in the current project will assist in delineating language and dialect boundaries in north-east Ambon. In addition to the speech community in Indonesia, there is a small number of elderly speakers of the language in the Netherlands.

The sociolinguistic context of Souw Amana Teru is rather different from that of the other Central Moluccan languages which are the subject of current research. There is still a substantial speech community in the Indonesian homeland, which is mainly situated in a harbour town with extensive through traffic and several government offices. In the first respect, Souw Amana Teru contrasts with Allang (Ewing, this volume) and Amahai/Soahuku (Florey 2005), which have only small numbers of speakers remaining. In the second respect, Souw Amana Teru contrasts with Alune (Florey 2001, 2005), which still has a viable homeland speech community, but most of whose members live in isolated mountain villages.

Various factors have contributed to the retention of indigenous languages in Muslim communities compared to the earlier shift to Ambonese Malay in Christian communities (Musgrave and Ewing, to appear). But language shift has now commenced in Tulehu and Souw Amana Teru is currently in everyday use in a multilingual community. Ambonese Malay and Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia), which is a Malay variety, are also used, and therefore borrowing and code-switching are very common in current language use.[2] I argue below that some of the changes which are emerging in possessive structures in Souw Amana Teru can be interpreted as contact phenomena.

The data presented here derive mainly from three speakers. One speaker is an elderly (over 70 years of age) member of the Dutch Moluccan community who has had little contact with the Indonesian speech community for over 40 years (ART). His speech can be considered conservative, with minimal borrowing from Malay, although he is a fluent speaker of Melayu Sini, the variety used in the Netherlands diaspora. The other two speakers are 10-15 years younger than the first speaker, but both live in Tulehu village and both can be considered more innovative speakers (ABN, HU).[3] The examples from the first of the homeland speakers given below are all from an elicited narrative (the Garden Story, see Florey, this volume) and show limited Malay influence, mainly restricted to borrowings of single items. Example (1) from another text given by this speaker shows that he also code-switches freely in more spontaneous production.[4]

(1) | *Jadi* | *aman* | *yang* | *paling* | *nela* | *wa'a* | *nusa* | *kotae* | *yang* | *paling* |
     | then | village | REL | most | big | LOC | island | city-NP | REL | most |

     | *nela* | *wa'a* | *pulau* | *kotarena* | | *pulau* | *Ambonrena* | *ha'angma* |
     | big | LOC | island | city-PROX-EMPH | | island | Ambon-PROX-EMPH | that |

     | *aman* | *Tuirehui* |
     | village | Tulehu |

     'Then the biggest village on the city island, the biggest village on this city island, this Ambon Island, that is Tulehu village.' (ABN)

There are several examples below from a spontaneous narrative given by the second speaker which show code-switching (e.g. examples 55, 59, 60 and 62). I argue below that the lexical borrowing from Malay which ABN uses in the Garden Story is of great significance, as it reduces the probability of inalienable possession being coded. I suggest that this reduction was the first step in an overall reduction of the coding of inalienable possession, that is, what seems a lexical phenomenon has had significant structural consequences for Souw Amana Teru.

1.2 Typological information

Souw Amana Teru has many typical properties of Central Moluccan languages. Basic word order in main clauses is subject followed by verb in intransitive clauses, and subject, verb then object in transitive clauses. A reduced pronoun (see Table 2 below) normally occurs immediately to the left of the verb (see remarks below in Section 1.3 on the phonological position of this clitic). This can either be the only representation of the subject in the clause, or it may co-occur with a free pronoun or a noun phrase. A reduced pronoun can also appear to the right of a transitive verb, representing the object. The language has no morphological passive, and the division of verbs into transitive and intransitive is strictly maintained. Transitive verbs which occur without any other object have the enclitic *-r(e)* added, which is a third person non-human pronoun (homophonous with and perhaps deriving from the proximal deictic clitic *-re*). Some intransitive verbs denoting states affecting the subject also have a reduced pronoun to their right, agreeing with the subject (see discussion in Section 3.2 below).

Other constituent order properties include the presence of prepositions, and a tendency for dependent elements in noun phrases to follow the head. The exception to this tendency is possessors, discussed in detail in the remainder of this paper, but adjectives, deictics and number phrases (which include numeral classifiers) all follow head nouns. The following two tables display paradigms of the pronoun forms:

Table 1: Free pronouns in Souw Amana Teru

		Singular	Plural	
1		*yau/au*	INCL	*ike/ke/ka*
			EXCL	*yami/ami*
2		*yare/are/ar/areng*	*imi*	
3		*ire/ei/eing*	*isi/si*	

Table 2: Reduced pronouns in Souw Amana Teru

		Singular	Plural	
1		*-u*	INCL	*-ke/-ka*
			EXCL	*-mi*
2		*-m(u)*	*-mu*	
3		*-i*	*-si*	

1.3 Unresolved issues in syntax

There are two points where my analysis is not yet resolved which affect the presentation of data here. Firstly, the two front vowels i and e are perceptually very close in Souw Amana Teru (see Musgrave, in preparation, for acoustic details). Even for native speakers, confusion is possible as seen by the listing of doublets in a dictionary prepared by native speakers (Leurima 2002):

(2)	*mai*	'mari, lagi'	'let's, again'
	mae	'mari'	'let's'

These examples demonstrate the most acute form of the problem: where the front vowel is word final and follows a low vowel, the endpoint of the diphthong is often not clear. This poses a serious problem for the analysis of possessive constructions, as the reduced pronoun for third person singular is *-i*, and this is expected to appear where the noun is inalienably possessed by a suitable possessor. However, there is also a suffix which commonly attaches to nouns, especially in phrase-final position, which has the form *-e* or occasionally *-Ce*. An example of this suffix can be seen in example (1)

in the word *kotae* 'city-NP'. The function and meaning of this suffix are not yet clear. In view of the preceding remarks about the vowels *i* and *e* in Souw Amana Teru, the possibility of confusing the suffix *-e* and the enclitic *-i* must be acknowledged. The suffix is much more common than the enclitic, and I have therefore analysed final front vowels as being instances of the suffix when there is any doubt.

A second problem to be borne in mind while viewing this data is that although on the basis of cross-linguistic comparison I would expect reduced pronouns occurring before verbs (as subjects) and before nouns (as possessors) to be phonologically attached to the following word, this is not always the case. At least in the case of subject pronouns, some elements to the left tend to attract the pronoun to them. For example, this is normal where the negator *taha* occurs before the verb:

(3)   *Au*   *tahu*   *bahai'e*
         1sg   NEG-1sg   play
         'I didn't play.'

Similar cases occur with possessive pronouns, for example with the conjunctions *tula* and *laha*:

(4)   *Au*   *tulau*   *nina*   *lahau*   *baba*
         1sg   with-1sg   mother   and-1sg   father
         'I (went) with my mother and my father.'

This causes some difficulty in the analysis of possessive constructions, as a proclitic pronoun before a noun has a different value to an independent pronoun in that position.[5] This point is discussed further below.

2. Alienable possession structures

Florey (this volume) gives paradigms showing the different coding for alienable and inalienable possession common to Central Moluccan languages historically. The use of a proclitic to mark alienable possession is seen in the following example from Alune (Seram Island):

(5)   *Ami*   *alena-'e*   *atu-e*   *[ami*   *'i-ebe-ru]*
         1pl.EXCL   narrate-APPL   BEN-APPL   1pl.EXCL   1pl.EXCL.POSS.AL-friend-PL
         'We told (the story) to our friends.'

In Souw Amana Teru today, the explicit coding of alienable possession has almost vanished, that is, examples of proclitic pronouns marking alienable possession on head nouns are very rare. The most common structure used to code possession has no clitic pronoun at all, although the possibility of using an enclitic to mark inalienable possession still exists, as discussed in Section 3.

2.1 Use of the alienable possession structure

Occasional examples suggest that the historic structure for alienable possession is still possible in Souw Amana Teru. One example in my database has a full noun phrase possessor followed by what may be a proclitic:

(6)   *[[Ami*   *a'am*   *mahinai]$_{1.P}$*   *e*   *ana'i]*   *nala*   *ami*   *wa'a*   *rumae*
         1pl.E   older.sibling-1pl.E   female-NP   3sg   child-?   until   1pl.E   LOC   house-NP
         'Our older sister's child was waiting for us at the house.' (ART) (GS58 - T)

The interpretation of this example is problematic, especially the final vowel in the word *ana'i*. As noted in Section 1.3, it is often hard to determine the quality of such vowels and this is the case here. If the final vowel is interpreted as a 3rd person singular enclitic, then this would be an inalienable possession structure, and the pronoun preceding the head noun is unlikely to be a proclitic, as the marking of both alienable and inalienable possession on a single item would be surprising. However, Florey (2005) notes that this double marking is attested in other Central Moluccan languages. In

general, this speaker does not mark children as inalienably possessed. He does so in example (18) below, but that example also is not straightforward. On the balance of probabilities, then, I would interpret the final vowel of *ana'i* as the morpheme I gloss as 'noun phrase marker', and therefore example (6) is indeed an example of the old alienable possession construction. Other examples which may well be alienable possession structures occur:

(7) Au   a'a'u   malonai   tula   [imahinai]   isi   wa'ene   marinue
     1sg   older.sibling-1sg male-NP   with   3sg-female-NP   3pl   LOC-DIST garden-NP
     'My big brother and his wife were there at the garden.' (ART) (GS18 - T)

(8) [Esana'   ko'ine]   ina'e
     3pl-child   small-NP   3sg-sleep
     'Their baby was sleeping.' (ART) (GS19 - T)

While there is inconsistency as to the alienability of the relationship between parents and children (for further discussion, see below), the relationship between spouses is never treated as inalienable, and example (7) can be taken as another example of the historic alienable possession construction. It should be noted that all of these examples come from the most conservative speaker from the group discussed here, and all have possessed nouns from the domain of kinship terms.

The examples discussed so far all have 3rd person possessors, and I argue below that this is predicted by the process of change which I suggest. Example (4) above is the only example in my corpus which might possibly be analysed as containing alienable possession structures with a non-3rd person possessor. Such an analysis would imply that the reduced pronouns for the 1st person possessors were actually proclitic to the head nouns, although they are phonologically attached to the preceding word. It is at least as plausible that the vowel sequence in the strings *tula au* and *laha au* have been simplified in pronunciation. Note that analysing these examples as displaying alienable possession would include the claim that the Malay kin terms *nina* and *baba* can be marked explicitly as alienably possessed. In Section 3, I show that kin terms referring to parents are within the semantic domain of inalienable possession in Souw Amana Teru, but borrowed Malay kin terms are never explicitly coded as inalienably possessed. Therefore it would be surprising to find them with explicit coding for alienable possession: the semantics would be wrong, and the presence of a possessive clitic would be highly surprising.

2.2 The loss of the alienable possession structure

The historic possessive system of Central Moluccan languages includes redundancy. In both alienable and inalienable possession, the person and number features of the possessor are potentially given twice, once as a free form and once as a clitic. It is not surprising if such redundancy becomes a target for simplification, and I suggest that this is what has happened to the alienable possession structure in Souw Amana Teru. The change in available structures does not necessarily imply a change in the semantic basis of the distinction between alienable and inalienable categories. While the possibility of marking some relations as inalienable still exists at all (as it does in Souw Amana Teru in a limited manner), then the two categories must still exist.

The basic change, almost complete in Souw Amana Teru, is that the proclitic marking alienable possession is no longer used. The majority of possessive structures in current language use consist of a possessor pronoun before the possessed noun, a structure which I will refer to as the analytic possessive structure. Examples follow for all person and number possibilities:

(9) Sei   po   ei   supu   [au   lapune]   imi   pahoka'are
     who   ?   3sg   catch   1sg   shirt-NP   2pl   CAUS-go-out-PROX
     'Whoever it is who took my clothes, you make him come out.' (HU)

(10) [*Yare*   *burung*   *merah*]   *inai*   *teru*
      2sg   bird   red   CLF   three
      'You've got three red birds.' (HU)

(11) *Ha'angma*   *mengenai*   [*eng*   *wasi*]   *laha*   [*eng*   *batas*]
      that   about   3sg-LNK forest and   3sg-LNK border
      'That is about its lands and its borders.' (ABN)

(12) *Lau*   *muri*   *lau*   *haha*   [*ami*   *rahmatma*]   *repu*
      sea   back   sea   chest   1pl.E   blessing-DIST   many
      'Inland, towards the sea, our blessings are many.' (ABN)

(13) *Kikamane*   *haitihika*   *hoka*   *palo'oka*   *tula*   [*ike*   *lopu'e*]
      tomorrow-DIST-EMPH   all-1pl.I   go.out   all-1pl.I   with   1pl.I   parang-NP
      'Tomorrow, we will all go out with our parangs.' (HU)

(14) *Ore*   *imi*   *tana*   [*imi*   *durenre*]'*ea*
      yes   2pl   take   2pl   durian-PROX-PST
      'Yes, you have taken your durian.' (HU)

(15) *Isi*   *sa'aisi*   *si*   *tana*   [*isi*   *pakaiane*]
      3pl   climb-3pl   3pl   take   3pl   clothing-NP
      'They got up and took their clothes.' (HU)

Where the 3rd person possessor is represented by a full noun phrase, then a pronoun is used also. Example (16) shows this for a 3rd person singular noun phrase possessor, and example (17) exemplifies this structure for a 3rd person plural possessor, although not in a straightforward manner. The full noun phrase in this example refers to only one person, but the pronoun is the 3rd person plural form *isi*, which results in the pragmatically determined reading 'ibu raja and those associated with her', i.e. her family:

(16) [[*Au*   *ama'u*]₁.ₚ   *eng*   *asu*]   *upa*   *wa'a*   [*meja*   *rehui*]₁.ₚ
      1sg   father-1sg   3sg-LNK dog   sit   LOC   table   below-3sg
      'My father's dog sat under the table.' (ART) (GS70 - T)

(17) *Wa'a*   [*ibu*   *raja*   *isi*   *rumae*]
      LOC   mrs   king   3pl   house-NP
      'At the house of the family of the raja's wife.' (HU)
      [Lit: At Mrs Raja their house.]

Although this structure with a free noun phrase possessor followed by a pronoun is reminiscent of the alienable possession structure, I suggest that it is distinct. The crucial evidence is that the pronoun *eng* can be used in an inalienable possession structure, where the possessed noun, *ana*, has an enclitic, *-si*:

(18) *Nina*   *tahi*   *nau'e*   [[*au*   *a'a'u*]₁.ₚ   *eng*   *anasi*]₁.ₚ   *sala*
      mother   NEG-3sg see   1sg   older.sibling-1sg   3sg   child-3pl   yet
      'Mother had not yet seen my brother's baby.' (ART) (GS22 - T)

Here the noun phrase possessor is singular ('my brother'), but the inalienable enclitic *-si* is plural, suggesting that a more accurate translation would be 'my brother and his wife's baby'. The crucial point is not the exact meaning, however, but that *eng* is compatible with a marker of inalienable possession and therefore cannot itself be a marker of alienable possession.

The pronoun form used for a 3rd person singular possessor, *eng* or *eing*, is a specialised possessive form which suggests that the path of change for this feature combination was slightly different to that for all the other combinations. There are two possible hypotheses about the origin of the form *eng*. One is that this form is a specific genitive form of the 3rd person

singular pronoun. Collins (1980) reconstructs a form *-ɲi* as a genitive marker for 3rd person singular in Proto-Hitu, an ancestor language for Souw Amana Teru. This marker has the reflex -ŋ in Laha and has been generalised in that language as a genitive marker across all persons and numbers (cf. Allang as discussed by Ewing, this volume). Therefore one could argue that the Souw Amana Teru form is derived in similar fashion, with the velar nasal as a reflex of an old genitive marker attached to a 3rd person singular pronoun. On this account, no generalisation of the marker has occurred in Souw Amana Teru. In the case of Laha, the parallel morpheme is also used as the enclitic which marks inalienable possession. If the Souw Amana Teru morpheme was equivalent, I would expect that it would be used also to mark inalienable possession, at least in the case of 3rd person singular possessors, but this is not the case.

The alternative hypothesis is that the velar nasal is a phonetic linker used in Souw Amana Teru to add weight to final open syllables. This possibility is supported by a variety of facts. The velar nasal appears in other places, not only after 3rd person singular pronouns possessors, for example after the 2nd person singular pronoun *are*:

(19) Sore   Mam Bea   ahanau   pe'e   [areng   tangkapan] ahanau   pe'e
      evening Mama Bea like   where   2sg-LNK   catch   like   where
      'In the evening Mama Bea (asked): "How is your catch, how is it?"' (HU)

After a verb *lai*:

(20) Usia   laing   ekaimi
      all-PST   come-LNK   single-EMPH
      'All come at once.' (RL)

And after a noun, *kawe*:

(21) Yau   terima   yare   untuk   [yau   kaweng]   dunia   aherate
      1sg   receive   2sg   for   1sg   spouse-LNK   world   eternity
      'I will take you as my wife for ever after.' (HU) (Lambi Hulan 24)

Such examples (and see also examples (47) and (64) below) argue against the possibility that the velar nasal is a morpheme which codes possession only.

The data suggest that the path of change was different for 3rd person singular as opposed to the other person number combinations. For 1st and 2nd person, the pronoun now used in analytic possessive structures is not a reduced form; that is, in simplifying the redundant alienable possession structure, the proclitic was lost and the free pronoun was retained (see examples (9) to (14) above). On the other hand, the third person form, *eng*, is based on a reduced pronoun. The citation form given for 3rd person singular, *ire* is extremely rare in spontaneous language use and I have no example of it being used as a possessor. I suggest that the alienable possession structure for 3rd person did not provide any source for a possessor pronoun except the proclitic, because where the possessor was a full noun phrase, no other pronoun would be available (see Ewing, this Volume, Number 1, for arguments that a third person singular proclitic was also important in historical changes to the possessive structures of Allang). Some pronoun was needed to maintain parallel structures throughout the paradigm, so the reduced form was used. Schematically, the two paths of change were the following:

(22) a. $Pro_{1/2}$ Proclitic-N   → $Pro_{1/2}$ N
      b.   NP   e-N   →   (NP) *eng* N

Although I have argued above that the velar nasal typically attached to this pronoun is a separate morpheme, this may only be true from a diachronic perspective today. The form *eng/eing* seems to have been relexicalised as a 3rd person singular possessive pronoun. But the fact that it originates from a reduced form means that a historic alienable structure is still marginally possible for a 3rd person singular possessor, while such structures are no longer possible for 1st and 2nd persons.

3. Inalienable possession

Inalienable possession is normally coded in a structure which consists of the possessor followed by the possessed nominal marked with an enclitic pronoun which agrees with the person and number features of the possessor. Occasionally, the pre-head possessor is omitted and inalienable possession is coded with the enclitic only. This possibility is discussed in Section 5 as a case of variation. The domain of inalienable possession includes some kin terms, body parts and the noun *nala* 'name'. Below, I present evidence that part-whole relations are also treated as inalienable relationships. Inalienable possession is marked consistently (with few exceptions) in the language use of the most conservative speakers in my corpus, those living in The Netherlands. Older speakers in Indonesia are less consistent in distinguishing inalienable from alienable possession, and younger speakers rarely code inalienable possession.

3.1 Conservative usage

3.1.1 Kin relationships

Of kin, parents are reliably treated as inalienably possessed when the native Souw Amana Teru words *ina* 'mother' and *ama* 'father' are used. Where Malay loan words replace these native kin terms, usage is different and this is discussed in detail in Section 3.2.[6]

(23) Au   oi   laha   [au   ama'u]$_{I-P}$ laha   [au   ina'u]$_{I-P}$
      1sg   go   with   1sg   father-1sg   with   1sg   mother-1sg
      'I went with my father and my mother' (ART) (GS1- T)

(24) [[Yau   ama'u]$_{I-P}$ eng   asu'e]   upa   wa'a   [meja   rehui]$_{I-P}$
      1sg   father-1sg   3sg-LNK   dog-NP   sit   LOC   table   below-3sg
      'My father's dog sat under the table.' (ABN)

While parents are treated quite consistently as being inalienably linked to children, the reverse is not true. As examples (6), (8) and (18) show, the status of children in relation to their parents may vary even for a single speaker.

Sibling relations are inalienable for the most conservative speakers:

(25) [Au   wari'u]$_{I-P}$ mahinai   laha   [au   wari'u]$_{I-P}$ malonai
      1sg   younger.sibling-1sg   female-NP   and   1sg   younger.sibling-1sg   male-NP

      amusimu   oi   ramerame
      1pl.E-all-1pl.E   go   together
      'My younger sister and my younger brother came too.' (ART)

Less conservative speakers are inconsistent in their treatment of this relationship:

(26) Lai   wa'a   marinu   [au   wari'u]$_{I-P}$ isima   isi   turu
      come   LOC   garden   1sg   younger.sibling-1sg   3pl-DIST   3pl   descend

      wa'a   waire
      LOC   water-NP
      'When we reached the garden, my little siblings they went down to the river.' (ABN)

(27) [Au   wari]   mahina   laha   [au   wari]   malona   isi   usiane
      1sg   younger.sibling   female   and   1sg   younger.sibling   male   3pl   follow
      'My younger sister and my younger brother came with us.' (ABN)

Both groups of speakers consistently treat the in-law relationship as inalienable:

(28)　　[Au　　sau'u]*ₗₚ*　　ose　　ne　　　wa'anake
　　　　　1sg　　in.law-1sg　　say　　PRED-3sg　LOC-there
　　　　　'My sister-in-law said: "He's over there."' (ABN)

(29)　　[Au　　sau'u]*ₗₚ*　　ehose　　anai　　　wa'ana
　　　　　1sg　　in.law-1sg　　3sg-say　child-NP　LOC-there
　　　　　'My sister-in-law said: "He's over there."' (ART)

In contrast, the spouse relation is never treated as inalienable by any speakers. Divorce is possible in these Muslim communities, but the relationship between in-laws persists even if a marriage ends. This cultural fact reflects older belief systems, in which there were taboo relations between families linked by marriage.

3.1.2 Body parts and part whole relations

Body parts are generally treated as being inalienably possessed:

(30)　　[au　　hala'u]*ₗₚ*
　　　　　1sg　　shoulder-1sg
　　　　　'my shoulder' (ART)

(31)　　[Yare　　matam]*ₗₚ*　　ma'e'u
　　　　　2sg　　eye-2sg　　　itch
　　　　　'Your eyes are itchy.' (HU)

It is worth noting that in the word list collected by Wallace at Liang in the mid-nineteenth century many body part terms include what looks like a 1st person plural inclusive enclitic in the citation form:

(32)　　hiruka　　　　nose　　('our noses')
　　　　　rimaka hatu　finger　('our fingers')
　　　　　aika　　　　　foot　　('our feet')
　　　　　uruka　　　　head　　('our heads')　(Liang, data from Wallace 1869)

Also a person is regarded as having a special relationship with their name:

(33)　　[Ar　　nalam]*ₗₚ*　　seia?
　　　　　2sg　　name-2sg　　who
　　　　　'What is your name?' (ART)

Part-whole relations can also be coded as inalienably possessed as can be seen in the case of words used to denote spatial relations. These words are members of the word class noun, and are consistently used with a final enclitic. Examples of such words are *haha* 'upper part, above' and *rehu* 'under part, below' (and see also example (24)):

(34)　　Ike　　　upa　wa'a　[ume　　hahai]*ₗₚ*
　　　　　1pl.INCL　sit　LOC　ground　above-3sg
　　　　　'We are sitting on the ground.' (ABN)

(35)　　Kaka　　　ehose:　Ami　　pameri　wa'a　[pulawan　rehui]*ₗₚ*
　　　　　older.sibling　3sg-say　1pl.EXCL　weed　LOC　clove　below-3sg
　　　　　'My big brother said: "We have weeded under the clove trees."' (ABN)

Further evidence comes from the word *hatu*, whose basic meaning is '(small) stone', but which is also used in a number of compounds and as a numeral classifier. Particularly, *hatu* is used with the words for 'arm' and 'leg' in collocations which mean 'finger' and 'toe'. In such structures, embedded inalienable possession can occur, with the body part marked as inalienably possessed, and *hatu* also marked as having an inalienable part/whole relation with the body part:

(36) [[yau rima'u]_{I.P} hatui]_{I.P}
      1sg arm-1sg stone-3sg
      'my finger(s)' (HU)

(37) [[yau ai'u]_{I.P} hatui]_{I.P}
      1sg leg-1sg stone-3sg
      'my toe(s)' (HU)

In these cases, it is unproblematic to analyse the enclitic attached to *hatu* as a 3rd person singular inalienable possession marker. Similar structures occur when *hatu* is used as a numeral classifier:

(38) Yau ane ian hatui teru
      1sg eat fish CLF-? three
      'I ate three fishes.' (HU)

In such cases, the status of the enclitic is more ambiguous, but the data on Allang numeral classifiers discussed by Ewing (this volume) suggest that this could also be an example of inalienable possession.

3.2 Innovation in inalienable possession

3.2.1 Kin Terms

Even for conservative speakers, both native kin terms and borrowed Malay terms are available and both categories occur. Common borrowed items are *bapa/baba* 'father', *nina* 'mother', *kakak* 'older sibling' and *adik* 'younger sibling'. All of these words denote relationships which are within the domain of inalienable possession, but I have no examples where a Malay kin term is marked as inalienably possessed. Rather, conservative speakers use these Malay terms as if they were proper names and they never appear in possessive structures. More innovative speakers use Malay kin terms in possessive structures, but only with a preceding possessor, that is, in analytic possessive structures. The enclitic marking inalienable possession never occurs:

(39) Baba e'apa imi puna ha'ere
      father 3sg-ask 2pl do what
      'Father asked them: "What are you doing?"' (ART) (GS20 - T)

(40) Kaka ehose ami pameri wa'a pulawan rehu'i
      older.sibling 3sg-say 1pl.E weed LOC clove below-NP
      'My brother said "We were weeding under the clove tree."' (ART) (GS21 - T)

(41) [Au baba] apa isi ipei hasama
      1sg father ask 3pl 2pl-do? what
      'Father asked them: "What are you doing?"' (ABN) (GS20 - AB)

(42) Au tana lopu'e he'e [au kakak] uma ami rua amoi
      1sg take knife-NP from 1sg older.sibling then 1pl.I two 1pl.E-go
      'I took my big brother's parang and we two went.' (ABN)

The following examples are exactly parallel, with one speaker using the Malay kin term in an analytic possessive structure, while the other speaker uses the Souw Amana Teru kin term and marks inalienable possession:

(43) [au baba] etete tehu'e ubu bagai anai
      1sg father 3sg-cut sugar.cane-3sg give? for child-NP
      'My father cut sugar cane and gave it to the children.' (ABN) (GS11- AB)

(44) [au ama'u] etete tehu'e elope'e wa'a ana' koine
      1sg father-1sg 3sg-cut sugar.cane-NP 3sg-give to child small-NP
      'My father cut sugar cane and gave it to the children.' (ART) (GS11 - T)

Kin terminology is one of the most commonly occurring contexts in which inalienable possession is a possibility. The data from the two versions of the "Garden Story" text suggest that the use of loan words for kin relationships is a significant factor in the overall reduction in the marking of inalienable possession. The less conservative speaker also does not always mark inalienable possession when he uses a Souw Amana Teru kin term:

(45) [Au   ina]   tahai   nau'e   [[au   a'a]   mahina]   sala
      1sg   mother NEG-3sg see   1sg   older.sibling female yet
      'My mother had not yet seen my brother's wife.' (ABN)

I suggest that the structure in such examples has been influenced by the structure seen in examples (41), (42) and (43). The proposed sequence of stages in the change then would be:

    i. not allowing any possessive structure with Malay kin terms;

    ii. allowing Malay kin terms in analytic possession structures;

    iii. using an analytic possession structure with Souw Amana Teru kin terms by analogy with ii).

3.2.2 Other domains

Just as the marking of inalienable possession of kinship relations is declining in current language use, also inalienable possession is rarely used by young speakers for body parts:

(46) [Au   ai'u]$_{I-P}$ masere
      1sg   leg-1sg   sick (HU)

(47) Au   ai ...   [au   aing]   maser
      1sg   leg 1sg   leg-LNK,   'sick
      'My leg hurts.' (Tulehu, Speaker 3, 14)

In example (47), the speaker seems to be aware that something might be expected after the body part noun *ai*. He paused and then repeated the noun phrase with the addition of a semantically empty element rather than the enclitic to mark inalienable possession. My data does not show a tendency for speakers to use Malay loan words for body parts, therefore the weakening of inalienable possession in this area is parallel to the weakening for kin terms, but cannot be a result of the same process. Rather, I would suggest that the reduction in marking of inalienable possession for kin terms has weakened the category throughout the language.

The marking of spatial nouns as being in an inalienable part/whole relation is still common, but there is evidence to suggest that such forms (spatial nouns with enclitics) are being reanalysed as root morphemes, but the following data have to be interpreted in light of the remarks in Section 1.3 about the ambiguity of final vowels. Example (48) has an ambiguous final vowel on the word *usu'i*, but the doubling of the final vowel on the same word in example (49) suggests that a form with two morphemes has been reanalysed as monomorphemic by that speaker:

(48) [Au   ama'u]$_{I-P}$ e'upa   wa'a   meja   usu'i
      1sg   father-1sg   3sg-sit LOC   table   edge-?
      'My father sat at the head of the table.' (ART) (GS65 - T)

(49) Baba   e'upa   wa'a   meja   usu'i
      father 3sg-sit LOC   table   edge-?-NP
      'Father sat at the head of the table.' (ABN) (GS65 - AB)

Possessive enclitics and noun phrase markers never occur together on the same word in my data, therefore the first *i* here is being treated as part of the root noun. It is more plausible that the possessive enclitic would be lexicalised in this fashion than that the noun phrase marker would be, and this in turn suggests that the final vowel of *usu'i* in example (48) was originally an inalienable possession marker, which is being treated as a part of the root morpheme by this speaker.

Parallel weakening can also be seen in another area of the grammar of Souw Amana Teru. Some intransitive, stative predicates with undergoer subjects take enclitic marking in the language of older speakers:

(50)   *Yau*   *kere'u*   *ena*   *si'ae*
         1sg   afraid-1sg   for   cat-NP   (HU)

(51)   *Ami*   *maruhu'amu*
         1pl.E   hungry-1pl.E
         'We were hungry.' (ART)

This construction is a close parallel of the inalienable possession construction at the level of the clause; indeed Florey (2005, this volume) analyses this type of structure as inalienable possession. Just as marking of inalienable possession at the level of the noun phrase is weakening in current usage, so this clause level marking is rare in the language of younger speakers:

(52)   *Au*   *kere*   *ni' err*   *si'ae*
         1sg   afraid   (hesitation)   cat-NP
         'I'm scared of cats.' (Tulehu, Speaker 3, 14)

As in example (47), there was a hesitation in the production of this utterance. But the hesitation did not occur immediately after the production of the predicate and it seems to be associated with a problem recalling the word *si'a* 'cat', rather than any feeling that the predicate *kere* was incomplete.

This change may be internally or externally motivated, or both factors may be contributing to this change. This structure, like the historic possessive structures, is redundant in that the person and number features of the undergoer are repeated, and the loss of the enclitic could be seen as the elimination of that redundancy. However, in view of the close parallel between this structure and the inalienable possession structure, it is also possible that the overall weakening of the marking of inalienability discussed above may be having an influence here also. On this view, the loss of enclitics in the stative verb structure could be occurring by analogy with the loss of enclitics marking inalienable possession. These two explanations are not incompatible; the two types of motivation could well both be valid in this case.

4. Noun–noun sequences and possession

Van Hoëvell (1877) pointed out that the possessor-possessed word order of Moluccan languages also applies to sequences of two nouns, contrary to the pattern he expected in what he terms 'Polynesian languages' (van Hoëvell 1877:13).

(53)   *Ei*   *ikut*   *ena*   *[au*   *hoeiti]*   *rete*   *kayangan*
         3sg   follow   for   fire   smoke   inland   heaven
         'She followed the smoke of the fire up to heaven.' (Tulehu, HU) (Lambi Hulan 59)

The normal word order of Malay possessive constructions is possessed-possessor. This is the pattern used in Indonesian, and it is also possible in Ambonese Malay, although pre-head possessors with the possessive marker *punya/pung* are more common in that variety (see Florey, this Volume for examples).

Despite van Hoëvell's observation, sequences of two nouns do occur in Souw Amana Teru which can be interpreted as coding a relationship of possession, but with the Malay word order. The name of the language is an immediately obvious example, although it is possible that this is a calque on the Malay pattern *bahasa X*:

(54)   *[souw*   *aman*   *teru]*
         language   village   three
         'language of the three villages' (Tengah-tengah, 50+)

The following example has the relation between a person and a body part, at least potentially an inalienable relation, with the Malay word order. Note that this phrase occurs in an embedded clause which is essentially a Malay structure. The complementiser and the predicate are both loan words, and this type of clause combining is almost non-existent in spontaneous discourse in Souw Amana Teru. Therefore it can be assumed that there is some pressure towards Malay patterns in this context:

(55) *Uma*   *malonare*   *Lambi*   *Ulanma*   *pada*   *akhirnya* *ei*   *ambil*
      then   male-PROX   Lambi   Ulan-DIST   for   end-3   3sg   take

      kesimpulane   *bahwa*   *keure*   *adalah*   *[keur*   *mahinae]*
      conclusion-NP   that   hair-PROX   be   hair   female-NP
      'Then that man Lambi Ulan at last decided that this hair was the hair of a woman.' (HU)

One example mixes languages in a noun-noun structure, with a Malay head noun and a Souw Amana Teru attribute noun following:

(56) *Ei*   *oi*   *terus*   *ikut*   *ena*   *[aliran*   *waire]*
      3sg   go   direct   follow   for   current   water-NP
      'He went straight towards the source of the river.' (HU) (Lambi Hulan 5)

The meaning of this example taken in isolation is a little obscure. One normally thinks of the direction of the current of a river as being downstream, but in its narrative context, there is no doubt that this example refers to travel upstream. In any case, it is hard to find a plausible reading in which the river is possessed by the current.

Other noun-noun structures exist in the language for which a possessive interpretation is not necessarily the most natural reading:

Souw Amana Teru

(57) a.   *ata*   *aue*
            tongs   fire-NP
            'tongs for handling coals'

      b.   *ata*   *lapiae*
            tongs   papeda-NP
            'utensil for serving sago porridge'

In these examples, a possessive relation in either direction seems implausible. Rather, a more general associative reading works well ('tongs associated with fire/*papeda*'), with the first noun apparently the semantic head. Such looser relations can also be coded by noun-noun sequences in English (e.g. *coffee cup* or *grammar book*, with the semantic head second), and qualifying nouns in Malay follow their heads in a structure which is indistinguishable from true possession, as shown by example (58) from Indonesian:

Indonesian

(58) (a)   *rumah*   *saya*
             house   1sg
             'my house'

      (b)   *rumah*   *api*
             house   fire
             'lighthouse'

Note that all the Souw Amana Teru examples discussed here have as second noun a non-human entity, or in one case a non-specific human (example 55). Direct possession by an individual, as in example (58a), seems not to be possible.

The examples discussed in this section suggest that there is some tendency for speakers of Souw Amana Teru to use sequences of two nouns to code possession, with a word order which is not that expected on historical grounds. However, it is not clear to what extent this is influenced by Malay and to what extent it is an extended use of an existing structure, one which might in turn show earlier Malay influence.

5. Other variation

The previous sections have already introduced some data showing that the resources available to code possession in Souw Amana Teru are deployed in different ways by different speakers. Some speakers can be characterised as more conservative and others can be characterised as more innovative. This section presents some additional data displaying the range of variation which occurs in current language use.

5.1 Mixing of languages in possessive structures

I have argued above that the occurrence of Malay loan words for kin relations is a factor in the reduction of the marking of inalienable possession in Souw Amana Teru today. Malay loan words occur freely as the head noun in possessive constructions, but less commonly as possessor. Examples of the first possibility can be seen in preceding examples (4, 10, 11, 12, 15 and 19). Additional examples are:

(59) Ada satu laki-laki bujang, malona bujange yang [eing
    be one man unmarried male unmarried-NP REL 3sg-LNK

    pekerjaan] ei oi hiku'e wa'a meitetue
    work 3sg go fish.with.net LOC sea-edge-NP
    'There was one bachelor, an unmarried man, whose job it was to go fishing with his net on the beach.' (HU)(Lambi Hulan 2)

(60) Sementara [eng malona] [Lambi Hulan eng tugas] pekerjaan
    while 3sg-LNK male L.H. 3sg-LNK duty work

    keseharianya itu ei oi lohi ianeisi
    daily-3 that 3sg go look.for fish-NP-3pl
    'While her husband Lambi Hulan's daily duty was to look for fish for them' (HU) (Lambi Hulan 34)

The structure of example (60) is ambiguous. The words *Lambi Hulan eng tugas pekerjaan kesehariannya itu* 'Lambi Hulan's daily duty' might be a single noun phrase, or they may be two noun phrases in apposition, which is the analysis indicated above. If the first possibility were correct, this example would have possession marked using both a Souw Amana Teru structure (*eng pekerjaan*) and a Malay structure (the enclitic *-nya* near the end of the putative noun phrase). Prosodic evidence might resolve this question, but unfortunately I do not have access to a recording of this material at the moment. As I have no other examples of such double marking, I prefer the conservative analysis.

There are no examples in my data of Malay head nouns marked as inalienably possessed. Examples (12) and (15) (repeated below) show that speakers are willing to attach Souw Amana Teru morphemes to the end of Malay words in other constructions and with other functions:

(12) Lau muri lau haha [ami rahmatma] repu
    sea back sea chest 1pl.E blessing-DIST many
    'Inland, towards the sea, our blessings are many.' (AU)

(15)   Isi   sa'aisi   si   tana   [isi   pakaiane]
        3pl   climb-3pl   3pl   take   3pl   clothing-NP
        'They got up and took their clothes.' (AU)

These examples suggest that it is not morphological incompatibility which prevents the appearance of Malay nouns in inalienable possession constructions.

Example (17) (repeated below) shows that it is possible for a Malay noun phrase to act as possessor in a Souw Amana Teru analytic possessive construction:

(17)   Wa'a   [ibu   raja   isi   rumae]
        LOC   mrs   king   3pl   house-NP
        'At the house of the family of the raja's wife.' (HU)

This possibility is much less common than having a Malay noun as the possessed, discussed above.

5.2 Simplification of the inalienable possession structure

Occasionally, the pre-head pronoun is omitted in inalienable possession structures:

(61)   [warisima]$_{I-P}$ tahai   supu   [eing   pakaian]   sala
        younger.sibling-3pl-DIST   NEG-3sg   catch   3sg-LNK   clothing   yet
        'their little sister had not yet found her clothes' (HU) (Lambi Hulan 19)

(62)   Dan   hanya   mengucapkan   selamat tinggal   wa'a   [warisi] I-P
        and   only   say   goodbye ·   LOC   younger.sibling-3pl

        pa'amurimane
        ?-behind-DIST-EMPH
        'and [they] could only say "Goodbye" to their youngest sister' (HU) (Lambi Hulan 21)

As noted previously, the historic possession structures of Central Moluccan languages are redundant, and this type of structure is one way in which that redundancy can be reduced. Similar examples from other languages are given by Florey (this volume).

5.3 Lexical coding of possession

There is a lexical item used to denote possession, but it is a noun and never occurs between a possessor and a possessed item. It is used only to denote some possessed item:

(63)   au   ue'e
        1sg   possession
        'mine' (ART)

(64)   Ei   cari   tahu   sebenarnya   keure   seing   ue'e
        3sg   search   know   really   hair-NP   who-LNK   possession
        'He tried to find out truly whose was the hair.' (HU) (Lambi Hulan 4)

This lexical item is not commonly used, and represents a rather marginal strategy for expressing possession. The form appears to be cognate with the predicate which can code possession in Alune (Florey, this Volume).

6. Conclusion

Although the possessive structures typical of Central Moluccan languages still occur in Souw Amana Teru, current language use exploits a range of possessive structures, and innovative possibilities are used with increasing frequency.

Alienable possession is almost never explicitly coded now, and inalienable possession is explicitly coded less and less frequently. Another innovative structure arises with the possibility of interpreting sequences of two nouns as possessed item followed by possessor, and not vice versa as is general in Central Moluccan languages.

Speakers of Souw Amana Teru are all multilingual. Two varieties of Malay, Ambonese Malay and Indonesian, are the most important contact languages. However, not all of the changes in possessive structures which are occurring should be interpreted as contact phenomena. I have argued here that the almost complete disappearance of explicit coding of alienable possession is the result of internal pressures, specifically the reduction of redundancy in the older structure. The weakening of the coding of inalienable possession, on the other hand, I attribute partly to the influence of Malay. The use of Malay kin terms has had the effect of reducing the opportunities for the use of the inalienable possession structure, and I suggest that this restriction has been an important factor in a general weakening of the use of inalienable possession structures. Finally, the interpretation of sequences of two nouns as possessed followed by possessor shows the influence of Malay structures, at least in providing a new interpretative possibility for a pre-existing structure.

Notes

1. I am deeply grateful to the speakers of Souw Amana Teru who made this work possible by sharing their knowledge with me, especially Haji Abdul Rahman Tehupelasury, Pak Hasan Umarella and Pak Abu Bakar Nahumurury. I am also grateful to my colleagues, Michael Ewing and Margaret Florey, for much helpful discussion, and two anonymous reviewers whose comments led to numerous improvements. A version of this material was presented to the symposium *Language contact, hybrids and new varieties: emergent possessive constructions*, Monash University, September 2004, and I thank the symposium participants for their comments. Research in Indonesia and the Netherlands was supported by Australia Research Council Discovery Grant DP0343379, Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project Major Documentation Project MDP0009.

2. These comments apply to Tulehu village, the source of the data discussed here. Both Tengah-tengah and Tial are more isolated communities, and language use there is different in at least two respects: (i) borrowing and code-switching are less prominent; and (ii) language proficiency extends to younger age groups.

3. A single example (example 20) comes from the speech of a woman over the age of 50 (RL), whose groups with ABN and HU.

4. In examples, Malay loans are shown in **bold**, and noun phrases with possessors are enclosed in square brackets [....] which also have a subscript I-P when the possession is coded as inalienable [....]$_{I-P}$. Other abbreviations are as follows: sg - singular, pl - plural, INCL - inclusive, EXCL - exclusive, PROX - proximal, DIST - distal, CAUS - causative, CLF - classifier, EMPH - emphasis, LNK - linker, LOC - locative, NEG - negation, NP - noun phrase marker, PRED - predicate marker, PST - past, REL - relativizer. Glottal stops are represented orthographically as apostrophes.

5. A reviewer suggests the possibility that the variability in clitic placement might be a phonological phenomenon; i.e. that clitics are placed in order to create optimal phonological words. This possibility remains to be explored in detail, but my impression is that this is not the case. The examples given in the text (examples 3 and 4) show a clitic which consists of a single vowel segment, but similar behaviour occurs with clitics which consist of full syllables.

6. Example (24) also includes an example of a part-whole relation coded with inalienable possession. See further discussion in Section 3.1.2.

References

Collins, James T. 1980. Laha, a language of the Central Moluccas. *Indonesia Circle* 23:3-19.
Collins, James T. 1982. Linguistic research in Maluku: a report of recent fieldwork. *Oceanic Linguistics* 21:73-146.

Collins, James T. 1983. *The historical relationships of the languages of Central Maluku, Indonesia.* (D-47) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Florey, Margaret 2001. Verb and valence in Alune. In P. Austin, B.Blake and M. Florey (eds), Explorations in valency in Austronesian languages *La Trobe Papers in Linguistics* 11:73-120.

Florey, Margaret 2005. A cross-linguistic perspective on emergent possessive constructions in Central Moluccan languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25:59-84.

van Hoëvell, G.W.W.C. 1877. Iets over de vijf voornaamste dialecten der Ambonsche landtaal (bahasa tanah). *Bijdragen tot het Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 4:1-136.

Leurima, H. Abdullah A. 2003. *Kamus Bahasa Uli Solemata: Negeri 3 T, Tulehu, Tengah-Tengah, Tial, Kecamatan Salahutu,Pulau Ambon, Maluku.* Privately printed.

Musgrave, Simon. In preparation. Vowel sequences in Souw Amana Teru. MS, Monash University.

Musgrave, Simon and Michael Ewing. To appear. Language and religion: a case study of two communities in Ambon. To appear in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.*

Wallace, Alfred Russel. 1869. *The Malay Archipelago.* London: Macmillan (reprinted by Periplus (HK) Ltd., paperback edition 2000).

Simon Musgrave was awarded his PhD from the University of Melbourne. He was a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Leiden in The Netherlands for two years before taking up his present position at Monash University where he is conducting research on endangered languages in Central Maluku.