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CULTURAL VOCABULARY AS AN INDICATOR OF INTERETHNIC RELATIONS: EASTERN INDONESIAN EVIDENCE

Following a long interruption, Eastern Indonesian languages are once again attracting the attention of scholars, especially ethnohistorians and experts in comparative linguistics. This new wave of interest centres not only on the specific linguistic but also on the ethnographic and cultural position of Eastern Indonesia as a separate border area between Asia and Oceania. Among its many causes three principal factors should be singled out.

First of all, in terms of linguistics, Eastern Indonesia is still the least studied among the major geographical zones into which the territory where Austronesian languages are found may be divided. Secondly, this area is particularly interesting because there is reason to believe that in the majority of languages on the Moluccan and Lesser Sunda Islands there is a large non-Austronesian substratum. It is known, for instance, that two non-Austronesian enclaves have survived to this day: the so-called North Halmahera languages and the languages of the Timor-Alor family. Recently, some convincing attempts have been made to place these two language groups within the framework of Papuan languages (Wurm 1977; Cowan 1965; Capell 1943-1945 and 1975). Thus it is possible to speak of a Papuan substratum in the languages of Eastern Indonesia. This view is corroborated by the existence of a large and insufficiently studied substratum of non-Austronesian languages in this region which can in some cases be related to Papuan languages (Capell 1975: 698-711; Chlenov 1978). A number of specific features of the culture, the economy and even the social organization
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of the area, in particular the fact that the Moluccan Islands belong
to the zone of the sago economy that is so widespread in New Guinea,
point to the existence, at one time, of an ethnocultural complex here
which was closely related to that of the New Guinea region. Finally,
the third factor that makes Eastern Indonesia important to comparative
Austronesian linguistics has to do with the place of Eastern Indonesian
languages within this language family. This place is still not clear, and
in different systems of classification the languages of Eastern Indonesia
are assigned either to the one or to the other group. Most researchers
have tended to identify them with the languages of Western Indonesia,
rather than with those of Oceania. At one time the prevailing view
was that they formed a single whole which was opposed to the Western
Indonesian languages (Brandes 1884). This viewpoint may prove to be
the acceptable one today, providing the languages of Eastern Indonesia
are regarded as an areal, and not a genetic unit. General typological
features relate the Moluccan languages not only to Papuan but also to
the Melanesian languages (Sirk 1967: 92; Kanski and Kasprusch 1931).
According to Dyen's lexico-statistical classification, all Eastern Indo-
nesian languages are united in one group called the Moluccan linkage
and included with the Malayo-Polynesian languages (Dyen 1963).
Evidently, in this classification Eastern Indonesian languages show
approximately the same percentage of shared cognate pairs as do a
number of Western Indonesian languages (Batak, Bare-e, and some
Philippine languages) and certain New Guinean and Melanesian lan-
guages which, in Dyen's view, are direct offsprings of the Austronesian
family.

The place of the Moluccan languages in a genetic classification is
even less definite. Stresemann has reconstructed a parental "Ur-Ambon"
language for the languages of Ceram, the Ambon Islands, and Buru,
and has traced it to Dempwolff's parental "Ur-Austronesisch", which
is identical with parental Indonesian (Stresemann 1927). Blust, on the
other hand, having discovered some lexical innovations that appear to
be shared exclusively by Oceanic languages with languages in Eastern
Indonesia (particularly with the South Halmahera - West New Guinea
group), put forward the concept of an Eastern Austronesian parental
language common to all the languages of Oceania and Eastern Indo-
nesia (Blust 1974). While this standpoint was only proposed recently,
it has been disputed by Dyen, who favours the hypothesis that the
Eastern Indonesian languages (or to be more exact, the three languages
with which he is concerned: Buli, Kamarian and Yamdena) do not
The languages of Eastern Indonesia have, in fact, been subject to the influence of Papuan or Papuan substrata and adstrata to such an extent that Capell even reached the conclusion on the one hand that there exist Austronesian and Papuan mixed languages, and on the other that their place in the Austronesian family makes it possible to propose a hypothesis that the origin of Oceanic languages was in some way connected with Eastern Indonesia (Capell 1976).

The divisions within the Eastern Indonesian languages have apparently been studied even less than the problem of their place in the Austronesian family. According to a scheme that I have recently proposed, which is based on lexico-statistics, several independent groups may be singled out among the Austronesian languages of the Moluccas (Chlenov 1976: 243-245; and 1977).

A. The South Moluccan sub-family includes all the languages of the southern and central part of the Moluccas (east of Timor) excepting the Aru Islands. It is quite possible that the languages found between Sumbawa and Wetar, in the Lesser Sunda Islands, may be included with this sub-family, but this question has not yet been investigated. The following groups of the first degree are found within this sub-family belonging to the Moluccan languages proper.

1. the southwestern languages (Kisar, Roma, Leti, Babar, Wetar, Nila, Damar, Dawloor, and Selaru);
2. the language of Yamdena;
3. the Kei-Kur languages (Kei, Larat or Fordate, and the Kur languages);
4. the central Moluccan languages (Watubela, Geser, Bonfia, Liambata, Batuasa, Fufa, Seti, Manusela, Saleman, Sepa, Atamanu, Wemale, Taluti, Taniwel, Ambon, Alune, West Buru, Buru, and old Banda);
5. the Sula languages (the Bara and Sula-Sanana languages); and
6. the Seboyo language.

B. The Aru sub-family is divided into:
1. the north Aru languages (the central Aru language and the Ujir language); and
2. the language of Tarangan.
C. The South Halmahera sub-family, which also includes, outside the Moluccas, a number of Austronesian languages in Western New Guinea (Blust 1977), is subdivided into:

(1) the language of Makian-dalam;
(2) the language of Gane; and
(3) the Halmahera languages (the East Halmahera or Buli, the Sawai, and the Weda languages).

In addition, there is a local dialect of the Malay language in the Moluccas, known as Melayu-Ambon, and at the present time an overwhelming majority of the population is familiar, to some degree, with the Indonesian literary variety of the Malay language — Indonesia's national language. As was already mentioned above, two groups of Papuan languages also exist in this area.

The analysis of the so-called cultural vocabulary, i.e. words designating specific elements of human culture, in such a linguistically complex area as Eastern Indonesia is necessarily extremely interesting for the ethnolinguist. Isoglosses of certain roots for particular notions indicate not so much the boundaries between language groups, as the spread of the elements of culture themselves. On the other hand, their possible relation to particular linguistic groups may also have certain implications as regards particulars of the cultural and economic development of the area. In the present report, I have attempted to make a preliminary analysis of the designations for a few cultivated plants, domestic animals, and other elements of culture in the languages of Eastern Indonesia, mostly those in the Moluccas. The cultural vocabulary I have selected includes: (1) words designating the most ancient elements of pre-Austronesian culture, which are also known in the non-Austronesian part of New Guinea, such as the banana, sago, and possibly the dog; (2) those referring to phenomena which were probably connected with the Austronesian settlement of the Moluccan archipelago, such as the words for rice, iron, and possibly coconut and fowl; (3) words that were introduced later, beginning with the middle of the first millennium A.D., in the process of intercontinental trade between the eastern part of the Malay archipelago and Western Indonesia, such as the words for clove, nutmeg, gold, silver, and pepper; and (4) names of plants which appeared in the islands after they were conquered by Europeans in the 16th century, such as manioc, pineapple, and maize. As will be seen below, the nature of the occurrence of these words varies considerably.
Banana is designated by eleven different roots, only two of which may be regarded as belonging to proto-Austronesian (PA) — *punti and *buaq, “fruit”. The reflexes of *punti are found in the west and east of Ceram, on the islands of Gorom and Watubela, and in parts of the Kei Islands, as well as in the languages of Yamdena, Leti, Babar, Damar, and Dawloor. The root *buaq occurs in the Buru and Sula languages, Roma and Nila. Reflexes of the root *muku are found in Kisar, Wetar, the Kei-Kur languages and the North Aru languages. The same root is widely represented in the languages of the eastern part of the Lesser Sunda Islands, and even in some of the islands of Timor and Alor (cf. the Buna’ mok and the Tanglapui maka). It is possible that this root is related to the Alor *mohul, which is also represented by moulang in the Austronesian Sikka language in Flores. The North Halmahera root boleh on Galela may be compared with the Abui balay. Another North Halmahera root, *kui, occurs on Tidore and Ternate. Less widespread are the roots *kula (found in the Saparua and Hatuhaha dialects of the Ambon language and Tarangan), *tema (Ambon and Alune), and *telewa (Manusela, Taluti, the Nusalaut dialect of the Ambon language, and Buli). The root *loka, represented in Makian-dalam and Gane, is also found in languages in the southeast of Sulawesi. Finally, we encounter the unique roots (not found in other places) umpulue and gwege in West Buru and Selaru, respectively.

Sago. The PA *rumbia occurs in almost all of the Central Moluccan languages. The reflexes of *rotan (the connection of which with the Malay rotan, “rattan”, is doubtful) are found in Leti, Babar, and Dawloor. Those of *sekeda are found in Selaru, Yamdena, Larat, and the Serua dialect of the Nila language. The eastern dialects of Ambon have the root *pa(l)u, which in the other languages means “something made of sago”. Unique roots are: in Nila - uyeta; in Damar - priho (cf. PA *beRas); in Kei - manga; in Geser - suata; in Sula-Sanana - sa; and in Makian-dalam - bakoé. The North Halmahera root *peda has also been recorded in Buli, and apparently it is also represented in the Ambon-Malay papeda, “sago porridge”. Thus, there are also eleven roots for sago, of which only one is PA.

Dog in the overwhelming majority of languages in the region is designated by the PA reflex *asu. The few other roots found here are of interest. *kapuna is found in a number of languages in North Sulawesi (Holontalo, Sangir, and Bentenan), Geser, Watubela and Buli,
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and also in a number of Austronesian and Papuan languages in West New Guinea (Ansus, Kowiai, and Waigeu). The North Halmahera (Waioli and Ibu) kauna obviously also belongs here. It is possible that further research will show the genetic relation of this root to those in the Alor languages: Lamma - yabbal, Tewa - yebar, and Kafuna - jabar. In the Toraja languages of Bada, Kulawi, Lindu, and Tawaili the reflexes of this root mean crocodile. Seti, Fufa, and Liambata also have the root *iawan, which A. Capell says is genetically related to *kapuna, all of which cases are derived from a common West New Guinean archetype (Capell 1975: 703). This latter identification seems dubious, as it is not phonetically plausible. Rather, the root may be related to the reconstructed Proto-Oceanic roots *gaun and/or *kaun. It is possibly also connected with the Alor wangku (Woisika). Finally, the possibly onomatopoetic *yahaw occurs in Kei, Larat, Babar, Kur, Bonfia, the Moa dialect of the Leti language, and perhaps in Makian-dalam, Gane, and Sawai. The North Halmahera *kaso (Ternate and Galela) has probably been borrowed from the PA *asu. Thus, the concept "dog" is expressed here by four roots, of which one is Proto-Austronesian, a second may be Proto-Oceanic, and a third may be related to Papuan vocabulary, as well as being widespread in the most varying groups of Austronesian languages.

Coconut, like the previous concept, is designated by one reflex, the PA *niuR, in an overwhelming majority of the region's languages. The second, obviously non-Austronesian root, *mu, is encountered in Batuasa, Liambata, the Kilmuri dialect of the Geser language and the Saparua dialect of the Ambon language. In the North Halmahera languages reflexes of *igo are found. The Buli waga may be related to the PA *bu(ŋ)(CtT)a(nN), which was reconstructed by Blust, reflexes of which are also found in North Sulawesi. Finally, two unique roots are the Dawloor pess and the Watubela da. The total number of roots is six, of which two seem to be Proto-Austronesian.

Fowl has three comparatively widespread roots: (1) the PA *manuk, "bird, fowl", which occurs in most of the languages; (2) *sibe, which may be related to the Proto-Philippine *siwsiw, "nestling, chick", occurring in the southwestern languages (except for Kisar and Roma) and Yamdena, as well as in a number of Alor languages (cf. the Kabola hiw, the Woisika sibí, the Blagar hib, the Kelon hi, and the Tewa saha); and (3) *tepu in West Buru, Buru, Batuasa and Liambata, which may
also be related to the Aru *to. Unique roots are the Buli *tatale, the Manusela *mailahu, the Ternate *namo (<PA *manuk?), and the Galela and Tidor *toko (cf. the Proto-Oceanic *toqa). This makes up a total of six roots, of which one is PA and two others are possibly related to Proto-Oceanic and Proto-Philippine.

**Iron.** In the northern part of the archipelago, including North Halmahera as well as northwestern Ceram, words borrowed from the Malay *besi occur virtually everywhere. The southwestern languages and Yamdena have reflexes of *bunut; the Kei-Larat languages - *etmaan; some dialects of Ambon, Makian-dalam, Manusela and Saleman - *heta (cf. the Proto-Philippine *putaw); and the West Buru language - *kawil. The North Halmahera vocabulary has the Galela *dodido. Finally, reflexes of *mumul are widespread, extending to all the central Moluccan languages (except the ones mentioned above) and the Aru languages. All in all, the concept iron is expressed by reflexes of seven roots, of which one is PA and one is related to Proto-Philippine. Characteristically, however, in the case of iron we discover for the first time a borrowing from Malay, while the direct reflexes of the widespread PA *besi have not yet been discovered here at all.

**Rice.** This word is directly adopted from the Malay *padi in Nila, Damar, and Dawloor. At the same time, in all the central Moluccan languages, and in Aru, Selaru, and Yamdena, we find reflexes of the PA *pajay, from which *padi is also derived. Loanwords from the Malay *beras, "hulled rice, rice cereal", occur in the Northern Moluccas in Ternate, Tidore, and Sula-Sanana. Reflexes of the same PA root *beras exist in Kisar and Leti. The following forms can probably also be reduced to the one parental form, which seems to have no analogy among PA roots: the Babar *yana, the Larat *wanat, and the Roma *yantaha. Reflexes of the root *samasi are used in South Halmahera (Makian-dalam and Gane); *kokat in Kei, *tamo in Galela, and *pine in Tobelo. It is from the latter that the Buli word for rice, *pinge, is derived. Thus, there are seven roots, of which two are PA, including the usual reflexes and loanwords from Malay. It is permissible to compare *samasi with the PA *Sem(e)y.

**Glove** is represented by only three roots. It is possible that the original name of this wild-growing tree is the Buli *gumode. More probably than not, a careful study of the North Halmahera languages
will reveal the same root there; but according to the materials available to me concerning the modern Galela, Ternate, and Tidore languages, the concept clove is designated there by the Malay *cengkih. In the languages of the Ambon Islands, the central and western parts of Ceram and Buru, and Ternate — i.e., those areas where cloves have been grown commercially for hundreds of years — the name of this tree goes back to the PA *bulav-an, "gold". In the rest of the area, use is made of loanwords derived from the Malay *cengkih, which in turn came to Malay from Chinese.

**Nutmeg.** Most of the languages concerned have loanwords for this from the Malay *pala*, which in turn came to Malay from one of the Indian languages. The local name *gosora*, also borrowed by Buli, has been preserved in the North Halmahera languages. In the mountain languages in the west of Ceram, Alune and Wemale, we find *kabelan*, while in the other languages of West Ceram, the Ambon Islands and Buru the reflexes of the root *kalaka* still existed in the mid-19th century, but now have been superseded by the Malay *pala* (Ludeking 1868).

**Gold.** Reflexes of the PA *emas* are found in the southern part of the archipelago, i.e. in all the southwestern languages, Yamdena, Kei-Kur, the Aru languages (in part), Watubela, Geser, Bonfia, Liambata, Batuasa, Fufa, Seti, and Manusela, and in most cases seem to be loanwords taken directly from the Malay *emas*, though it is often difficult to distinguish a loanword from a derivative in the case of this root. This root is also found in South Halmahera (Makian-dalam and Gane). The more western of the central Moluccan languages and the Aru Tarangan language have reflexes of the PA *bulav-an*, from which in the same area the words for clove have been formed. However, the latter have been derived from the prenasalized parallel form *mbulav*, and the words for gold from *bulav*. The North Halmahera languages and Buli have the root *guraci*; Sula-Sanana has the unique root *famaka*.

**Silver.** In all of the northern and central parts of the archipelago we find the root *salaka*, and in the whole of the southern part loanwords from the Malay *perak*, derived from the PA *pirak*. Characteristically, this concept is also expressed by constructions with determinatives which are common for designating new elements of culture, as will be seen below. Thus, in Tarangan one finds *fulowan*.
elayiryir, “white gold”, and in Larta kubang ngangiar, “white metal”. The unique root leli is found in Leti.

Red pepper is usually designated by loanwords and determinative constructions. In most cases the loanwords are taken from the Malay merica; they are found throughout Halmahera, in the Sula languages, in the mountainous part of Ceram, Geser, Larat, and in the Aru languages. We encounter reflexes of *kaimlaka (<Malay kayu Melaka, “Melaka tree”?) in all the southwestern languages. Loanwords from the Malay cabé exist in Yamdena and the Ngaibor dialect of the Tarangan language. In dialects of the Ambon language and Larat, there are loanwords from the Melayu-Ambon cili, derived from the name of the South American republic. In Buru we find designations formed with the word kastélá, “Castillian, Spanish”, the determinative found in many words signifying plants that appeared in the archipelago after the European conquest of Indonesia. In central Ceram (Manusela and Taluti) and in the Saparua and Amahei dialects of the Ambon language there are reflexes of the root *karatupa (cf. the Proto-Philippine *katuNbar, “pepper”). In the western dialects of the Ambon language *kasat is found. Unique roots are the Kei us’us and the Selaru testes.

Maize, like pepper, is designated by many words, most of which turn out to be loanwords. Thus, in the Ambon Islands and in Taniwel there is the Malay jagung. In the other central Moluccan languages there are various determinative constructions incorporating the word for rice; for example, in Alune bala kastela, “Spanish rice”; in Fufa fassa inen, “yellow rice”, etc. Derivatives of the word kastela, with or without the determinative, are also found in Tarangan, Kisar, the Moa dialect of the Leti language, Roma, Taluti, and Ternate. It is interesting, however, that in the southern part of the archipelago, where maize is now the main crop, the words used include no determinatives and are not loanwords. In the southwestern languages (Leti, Babar, Nila, Dawloor, and Selaru) they are derived from the root *betar (cf. the PA *butir, “grain”), from which root it may be possible to trace the name of Wetar Island. In Yamdena and the Kei-Kur languages, the root *slaru likewise coincides with the name of an island in the Tanimbar archipelago. The root *beskutu is found in Buru. The following are unique roots: the Damar matmatrayo, the Geser hasira, the Galela goko, the Makian gocila, and the Sula-Sanana gar.
Manioc. The Kei-Kur languages, the central Moluccan languages of the Ambon Islands and Ceram, Sula-Sanana, Kisar and Roma have loanwords from the Melayu-Ambon *kasbi*, which is derived from the Portuguese, and ultimately from *cacabi* in the Taino Indian language. The same root is found in Halmahera, in both Austronesian and non-Austronesian languages. Only in Buli is manioc denoted with the term *kastela rakrak*, “ground Spanish maize”, as opposed to *kastela osal*, “standing Spanish maize”. In Nila, Babar, Damar, and the Aru languages, the word is formed according to the model “edible root + tree”, in the same way as the Malay *ubi kayu*. In Buru we encounter *mangkau* (<manioca?), and in the Gorom Islands and Manusela - *panggala*, “Bengali”. There are also many unique designations: the Yamdena *syabwalowe*, the Moa *namlaye*, the Dawloor *wuwuka*, the Selaru *imbawagwe*, and the Leti *amame*.

Pineapple, in the overwhelming majority of languages, is designated by loanwords taken from the Malay *nanas*, which in turn came from the Portuguese and Spanish *ananas*, from the Guarani *naná*. In the Alune and Ambon dialects of the southwest coast of Ceram we find *banggala* or *manggala*, “Bengali”, or *kampala* (from the city of Cambay in India?). It is possible that reflexes of these roots were formerly more widespread and were also found in other coastal central Moluccan languages, where they have now been superseded by *nanas*, which is common in all of Indonesia. In the southwestern languages (Kisar, Roma, Leti, Babar, and Damar) and Yamdena there is the root *pedan*, which is also encountered in the eastern parts of the Lesser Sunda Islands (the Solor language). Determinative constructions from different roots (e.g., *lo, *pedan, *nanas + Javanese, Spanish or Bengali for tree, and others) are used in Aru and many southwestern languages, and in Geser. Unique designations are: the Larat *ngewu*, the Selaru *ektranatka*, the Tarangan *lor*, and the Manusela *sulaka*.

As can be seen from the above material, the occurrence of the roots of different words varies considerably not only on the point of geographical distribution, but also as regards their very nature. It is possible to isolate several diagnostic signs, on the basis of which an attempt can be made to construct a preliminary typology. First of all, meanings are expressed either by a single root or by a determinative construction. Secondly, certain meanings are expressed by means of roots from the given language, others by loanwords from Malay. Thirdly, in
a number of cases they are expressed by words taken via Malay from languages outside the Malay Archipelago and New Guinea. These three categories may be compared as follows:

|                  | Determinative construction | Malay loanword | Other loanwords |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Banana           | —                         | —              | —              |
| Sago             | —                         | —              | —              |
| Dog              | —                         | —              | —              |
| Coconut          | —                         | —              | —              |
| Fowl             | —                         | —              | —              |
| Iron             | —                         | +              | —              |
| Gold             | —                         | +              | —              |
| Rice             | —                         | +              | —              |
| Clove            | —                         | +              | +              |
| Nutmeg           | —                         | +              | +              |
| Silver           | +                         | +              | + (?)          |
| Pepper           | +                         | +              | +              |
| Maize            | +                         | +              | +              |
| Manioc           | +                         | +              | +              |
| Pineapple        | +                         | +              | +              |

Four types stand out clearly:
1. Those without determinatives and loanwords (banana, sago, dog, coconut, and fowl).
2. Those without determinatives but with Malay loanwords (iron, gold, and rice).
3. Those without determinatives but with loanwords from Malay and other languages (clove and nutmeg).
4. Those with determinatives and both kinds of loanwords (silver, pepper, maize, manioc, and pineapple).

Characteristically, these categories may be correlated by means of non-linguistic features of the cultural phenomena themselves. In addition, the table above constitutes a systematic scale where the appearance of one feature is conditioned by the presence or absence of another. This warrants the supposition that the types singled out will correspond to a stratigraphic sequence in the introduction of certain cultural goods to the area considered. The earliest elements, which are organic to the local culture, belong to type 1, and those that were introduced latest
belong to type 4. The fact that rice and iron appeared later, to say nothing of gold, in comparison with banana and sago, is confirmed by ethnographic and historical investigations (Chlenov 1976: 82-87, 108-109). Finally, cloves and nutmeg become elements of culture rather than mere botanical names only after they begin to be cultivated and their spices are produced for export, i.e. at the beginning of the Christian era. This is why their designations are taken from foreign languages, i.e. are borrowed from the consumers of the product and coincide with the words for gold and wealth.

The words belonging to the first category may also be divided according to the number of roots and the proportion of them that are widespread in Austronesian languages (i.e., those that reach beyond the territory considered).

| Number of roots | Proportion of them which are Austronesian |
|----------------|------------------------------------------|
| Sago           | 11                                       |
| Banana         | 11                                       |
| Coconut        | 6                                        |
| Chicken        | 6                                        |
| Dog            | 4                                        |

The number of roots decreases as the percentage of them that are Austronesian increase. If we consider the other words we will find that this increase of Austronesian roots continues, while the overall number of roots will increase again due to determinative constructions and loanwords. The existence of a large number of roots for a given meaning (in type 1) points to the fact that the given cultural phenomenon is very ancient, as well as to the importance of studying the pre-Austronesian substratum in Eastern Indonesia.

NOTES

1 For critical reviews of works devoted to East Indonesian languages see: Sirk 1967 and 1969; Chlenov 1969 and 1976.
2 Proto-Austronesian roots have been reconstructed by many different researchers (R. Brandstetter and O. Dempwolff were the first of these scholars) and brought together in a reference work by Wurm and Wilson (1975). I have made use of various notations of PA roots.
3 The reconstructions of non-Austronesian roots cited here are tentative and intended for the readers' convenience. They are purely preliminary in nature and should not be projected on to any actual level of language.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. In Russian

Chlenov, M. A.
1969 Ocherki po etnicheskoi istorii narodov Tsentralnykh Molukkan (Indonesia) [Essays on the Ethnic History of the Central Moluccan Peoples (Indonesia)], thesis for C. Sc. (History) degree, manuscript, archives, Institute of Ethnography, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.
1976 Naseleniye Molukskikh ostrovov [Population of the Moluccan Islands], Moscow: Nauka.
1978 Review of W. A. L. Stokhof, Preliminary Notes on the Alor and Pantar Languages (East Indonesia) (Canberra, 1976) in Sovetskaya etnografiya No. 5: 184-187.

Sirk, Y. K.
1967 'O klassifikatsii avstroneziiskikh yazykov' [Concerning the Classification of Austronesian Languages], in Yu. A. Gorgoniiev, L. N. Morev and N. V. Solntseva (eds.), Yazyki Yugo-Vostochnoi Azii [Languages of Southeast Asia], pp. 81-107, Moscow: Nauka.
1969 'Nekotoriye tipologicheskiye izoglossy v Vostochnoi Indonezii' [Certain Typological Isoglosses in East Indonesia], in: I. F. Vardul' (ed.), Yazykoviye universalli i lingvisticheskaya tipologiya [Language Universals and Linguistic Typology], pp. 288-296, Moscow: Nauka.

Wurm, S. A.
1977 'Lingvisticheskaya situatsia v novogvineiskom regione' [The Linguistic Situation in the New Guinea Region], Sovetskaya etnografiya No. 1: 49-65.

II. In other languages

Blust, R. A.
1974 'Eastern Austronesian: A Note', Working Papers in Linguistics, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 101-107, Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii.
1977 'Eastern Austronesian: A Redefinition', in: Abstracts of Papers to be Presented at the Conference, Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (SICAL), mimeographed, Canberra.

Brandes, J. L. A.
1884 Bijdrage tot de vergelijkende klinkkleer der Westersche afdeeling van de Maleisch-Polynesehe taalfamille, dissertation Utrecht.

Capell, A.
1943-1945 'Peoples and Languages of Timor', Oceania 14: 191-337, and 15: 19-48.
1975 'The "West Papuan Phylum": General, and Timor and Areas Further West', in: S. A. Wurm (ed.), New Guinea Area Languages and Language Study, vol. 1, Pacific Linguistics Series C no. 38, pp. 667-716, Canberra: Australian National University.
1976 'Austronesian and Papuan "Mixed" Languages: General Remarks', in: S. A. Wurm (ed.), New Guinea Area Languages an Language Study, vol. 2, Pacific Linguistics Series C no. 39, pp. 527-580, Canberra: Australian National University.

Chlenov, M. A.
1977 'Preliminary Classification of the Austronesian Languages of the Moluccas', in: Abstracts of Papers to be Presented at the Conference, SICAL, mimeographed, Canberra.
Cultural Vocabulary as an Indicator of Interethnic Relations 439

Cowan, H. K. J.
1963 'Le Buna' de Timor; une langue ouest-papoue', BKI 119: 387-400.
1965 'The Oirata Language', Lingua 14: 360-370.

Dyen, I.
1963 The Lexicostatistical Classification of the Austronesian Languages, New Haven.
1978 'The Position of Languages of Eastern Indonesia', papers presented to SICAL, mimeographed, Canberra.

Kanski, P. and P. Kasprusch
1931 'Die indonesisch-melanesischen Übergangssprachen auf den Kleinen Molukken', Anthropos 26-5/6: 883-890.

Ludeking, E. W. A.
1868 'Schets van de Residentie Amboina', BKI 15: 1-273.

Stresemann, E.
1927 Die Lauterscheinungen in den Ambonischen Sprachen, Berlin: D. Reimer.

Wurm, S. A. and B. Wilson
1975 English Finder List of Reconstructions in Austronesian Languages (Post-Brandstetter), Pacific Linguistics Series C no. 33, Canberra: Australian National University.