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I. Introduction

1. As is generally known, the term ‘Malay’ is used for a wide range of linguistic varieties (Steinhauer 1980, 1987, forthcoming; de Vries 1980): it covers structurally distinct standardized varieties (Indonesian, Malaysian), dialects and dialect chains (along the east coast of Sumatra, the coastal areas of Borneo and in the Malay peninsula), and, finally, a number of pidginized varieties (such as Bazaar Malay) and ‘creoles’. The latter arose in urbanized centres where people from different linguistic backgrounds met and settled. These people presumably used a reduced form of Malay as their common means of communication, which subsequently became the mother tongue of the next generations, again developing into a fully fledged language. One such creole arose in Ambon town some 400 years ago (cf. Steinhauer forthcoming).

This Ambonese Malay (henceforth AM) is only distantly related to the many Austronesian local vernaculars which are still spoken in most of the villages throughout the Moluccas (cf. Blust 1978; Collins 1983, 1985; Ekris 1864-65; Hoëvell 1876, 1877; Stresemann 1927). In many villages of the Ambon-Lease archipelago (which comprises the islands of Ambon, Saparua, Nusa Laut and Haruku) the use of these so-called...
‘bahasa tanah’ is today restricted to ceremonies and (traditional) songs. As a daily means of communication, AM has replaced the bahasa tanah, especially under the influence of Christian religion and education (cf. Cooley 1967:88; Steinhauer forthcoming). In other communities throughout the Moluccas as well this influence has come to be increasingly felt in the course of the 19th century.

2. For historical reasons – which cannot be dwelt upon in the framework of this article – Moluccans, especially Ambonese and several sizable groups from other islands, came to be recruited as soldiers into the Dutch colonial army (KNIL, short for Koninklijk Nederlands Indisch Leger [Royal Netherlands Indies Army]). These soldiers spoke different mother tongues and, presumably, different forms of Malay when they entered the army. During their stay in the military training camps all over the Indonesian archipelago, where they were joined by their families, they were exposed to other languages, notably Javanese and Dutch, and to a reduced variety of Malay current in the colonial army. This variety is known as Tangsi Malay (Barracks Malay), but its linguistic character is uncertain: no descriptions of it exist, and it is even unknown to what extent it was a stabilized jargon or pidgin. In the chaotic aftermath of the Dutch decolonization of the former Netherlands Indies, about 4,000 Moluccan soldiers of the colonial army (together with their families, coming to about 12,000 people in all) were shipped to the Netherlands. There they were settled in camps, some of which had been used as concentration camps in World War II. In the course of the next 35 years the majority of these Moluccan communities moved or were moved to newly built special Moluccan quarters.

Linguistically the situation among the Moluccan communities in the Netherlands can be characterized as follows. The oldest generation, originating from various regions in the Moluccas, brought with them the knowledge or recollection of several regional Moluccan languages (bahasa tanah). Many were speakers of Ambonese Malay. All had been exposed to Tangsi Malay (whatever that may have been) and were acquainted with a particular form of Standard Malay, which was and still is used on formal occasions such as rapat-rapat (official meetings) and religious gatherings (sermons, hymn-singing sessions). In the remainder of this paper this latter variety of Malay (which does not differ basically from Standard Indonesian) will be referred to as SM.

For the ‘second’ and youngest generations the situation is different.

3 Collins (1985: 88) remarks that: ‘In Ambon and Uliase (Haruku, Nusalaut and Saparua) . . . Islamic villages maintain their respective indigenous languages, but in only a few Christian villages does the indigenous language persist, usually only among the oldest generation. Increased mobility, recent population movements, and rapidly improving mass media threaten most local languages.’
They did not grow up in a speech community where any of the mother tongues of their parents constituted the language of daily communication. As was implied above, the typical barracks society, which in fact survived in the Netherlands, gave rise to a special variety/varieties of Malay as common language. While the oldest members of the ‘second’ generation (the so-called bung, ‘older brother’, generation), who were born in Indonesia, had had at least some exposure to languages of non-Moluccan Indonesians, most Moluccans who were born in the Netherlands were, with rare exceptions, only exposed to varieties of Malay and Dutch. Especially through education and the influence of the mass media the exposure to Dutch has been strong. Not all Moluccans remained in the Moluccan camps or quarters. Among those who moved to Dutch surroundings, there are quite a number who are monolingual speakers of Dutch. On the whole, however, the Moluccan community has remained physically and culturally sufficiently segregated from Dutch society to maintain its own character and to develop unitary cultural traits.

Linguistically this unity is manifest from the variety of Malay which is commonly used among younger Moluccans. I have termed this common language ‘Malaju Sini’ (‘Malay Here’), which will henceforth be referred to as MS. As nearly all younger Moluccans are bilingual, interference from Dutch in their spoken MS is a regular phenomenon. Grammatical influence from Dutch seems to be limited, however. MS is interesting linguistically and sociolinguistically not only by the fact of its existence, but also because of its lexicon and structure, in which it differs from known varieties of Malay.

3. In the present article (which is intended as the first of a series of articles on MS) I shall give a phonological description of MS on the basis of data elicited from two groups of informants, as well as of my own knowledge of the language as a ‘native’ speaker (with an Ambonese

4 In many places in Holland (see map) Moluccans are still living separated from the Dutch. There are also mixed residential areas where Moluccans and Dutch are living side by side. There is still one camp left, Lunetten, in Vught, where the Moluccans resist settlement in newly built houses on political grounds.

5 The spelling system used by the Dutch Moluccan community is an intermediate variety between the Van Ophuysen and the Suwandi systems. I myself use the latter wherever I do not reproduce words phonemically or phonetically. The most salient differences between the current Indonesian/Malaysian orthography and the Van Ophuysen and Suwandi spelling systems are:

| Current System | Van Ophuysen | Suwandi |
|----------------|-------------|---------|
| c              | tj          | u       |
| j              | dj          | oe      |
| y              | j           |         |
| kh             | ch          |         |
| u              | oe          | u       |
The subjects to be discussed in the first part of this paper are stress, vowels, and consonants, in that order. In the second part a comparison will be made with Ambonese Malay as spoken in Ambon today, as well as with Standard Malay/Indonesian.

II. Phonology

1. STRESS

Word stress is on the penultimate syllable of the root, unless that syllable contains an /a/, in which case the ultimate syllable is stressed, even if it also contains an /a/. Examples: /gaNpan/ [g’ampan] ‘easy’, /bodo/ [b’odo] ‘stupid’, /taman/ [t’am’an] ‘friend’, /kənal/ [kən’al] to know’, /gəməs/ [gəm’əs] ‘irritated’, and /gəNdən/ [gənd’an] ‘stupid, naive’. In the latter case the stress remains on the final syllable irrespective of the realization of /a/ in the penultimate syllable (ranging from [a] to [a], see below). The penultimate syllable also bears the word stress in compounds and in forms with the affix /-an/, the only affix beginning with a vowel, e.g., /ruma/ [r’uma] ‘house’, /sakiT/ [s’akiT] ‘sick’: /ruma s’akiT/ [ruma s’akit] ‘hospital’: /piNtu/ [pi’antu] ‘door’: /piNtu ruma/ [pintu r’uma] ‘front door’: /lapar/ [l’apar] ‘hungry’, /kəlaparan/ [kəlap’aran] ‘hungry, to starve’: /jahaT/ [j’ahat] ‘naughty’, /kəjahatan/ [kəjah’atan] ‘naughty person’: /makan/ [m’akan] ‘eat’, /makanan/ [mak’anan] ‘food’; and /fikir/ [f’ikir] ‘to think’, /fikiran/ [fik’iran] ‘thought’.

The only exception to the stress rule is formed by the doublet /fadah’al/ and /padah’al/ ‘but, on the other hand’. Historically, this

6 The Kei islanders are one of the sizable Moluccan minorities in the Netherlands who have preserved their own cultural ‘identity’. Most of them are Roman Catholic, whereas the majority of Moluccans are Protestant. Their village alliance system (pela, see note 9) and traditional dances – both of them cultural shibboleths among the Dutch Moluccans – also differ. The older Keiise speak a variety of Malay which differs from Ambonese Malay.
latter form consisted of two words: the preposition /pada/ ‘for’ and the noun /hal/ ‘case’: the stress was on the original nominal part of the construction, where it still is today, but the meaning of the construction has changed. Furthermore, /fadah’al/ is a hyper-correct form of /padah’al/. In the contracted forms /fadal/ and /padal/ the stress, in accordance with the stress rule, is on the penult: [f’adal, p’adal].

2. VOWEL PHONEMES
The 8 vowel phonemes in Melaju Sini can be charted as follows, according to place and manner of articulation:

|        | Front | Central | Back |
|--------|-------|---------|------|
| Non-low|       |         |      |
| High   | i     |         | u    |
| Mid    | I     | o       |      |
| Low    | ε     | a       | o    |
|        |       | Unrounded| Rounded|

Word-initially and morpheme-initially after a vowel, a vowel V may be realized as either [V] or [?]V. In the broad phonetic notations below, only the former realization will be indicated, with the understanding that the latter realization, which is more likely to occur in deliberately articulate speech, is always possible. Needless to say, [?] in these realizations is not phonemic.

a. Front vowels
/i/ The HIGH FRONT UNROUNDED VOWEL /i/ occurs in all positions and is realized as [i] and [I]: The realization [i] is always possible in all positions. The realization [I], however, occurs as a variant of [i] only in closed final root syllables, unless the final consonant is /T/ or /s/ and the penultimate syllable also contains /i/. Examples: /itam/ [itam] ‘black’, /tipu/ [tipu] ‘lie (v)’, /miNgu/ [mingu] ‘week’, /pipi/ [pipi] ‘cheek’, /baris/ [baris, barIs] ‘march (v)’, /sisir/ [sisir, sisIr] ‘comb (n,v)’, /garis/ [garis, garIs] ‘cross out: line (n)’, /cubit/ [cubit, cublt] ‘squeeze’, /lanjT/ [lanjt, lanjt] ‘sky, heaven’, /kupin/ [kupin, kupIn] ‘ear’, /pikir/ [pikIr] ‘think’; but /tipis/ [tipis] ‘thin’, /kikis/ [kikIs] ‘graze’, /tiNdis/ [tindis] ‘press (v)’, /cipit/ [cipit] ‘slanted’, /riNgiT/ [rington] ‘(a coin of) 2½ guilders’, /sadikIt/ [sadikit] ‘little’.

I have not found any example of a closed monosyllabic root containing
/i/. Where variation in realization is possible, all combinations occur in the relevant reduplicated forms: /baris-baris/ [baris-baris, barlis-barls, baris-barls, barls-baris] ‘march (v)’. This range of variation is also found in words which have the form of reduplications, although synchronically they cannot be analysed as such, e.g. /aNTii-aNTii/ [antii-antii, antIn-antIn, antIn-antIn, antIn-antIn] ‘earring’.

/I/ The MID-FRONT UNROUNDED VOWEL /I/ is realized only as [I]. It occurs in open and closed syllables, both word-medially and word-finally. I have not found any example of /I/ in word-initial position. Examples are: /bIsO/ [bIsO] ‘tomorrow’, /pAdIIdl/ [pAdIIdl] ‘tearful’, /kriPu/ [kriPu] ‘old, wrinkled’, /pArsINtl/ [pArsINtl] ‘lie’, /rINkI/ [rINkI] ‘hundreds of . . .’, /sIn/ [sIn] ‘no, not’, and /pAlIn/ [pAlIn] ‘very’.

/I/ is opposed to /i/, as is testified by the following (near-)minimal pairs: /blsi/ ‘iron (n)’ – /bisi/ ‘whisper’, /bagl/ ‘share, divide’ – /bagI/ ‘for’, /kIII/ ‘arm in arm’ – /kili/ ‘tickle’, /pIII/ ‘defend, fence off’ – /pili/ ‘choose’, and /klPlIn/ ‘money’ – /kupIn/ ‘ear’. In the latter example /I/ may be realized as both [i] and [I]: [kupIn, kupIn] (see above). Since [I] in final syllables of words like [pAlIn] ‘very’ and [klPlIn] ‘money’ cannot be replaced by [i], the variability in the realization of /I/ in most closed final syllables cannot be explained as the result of neutralization of /I/ and /I/ in those positions. On the contrary, /I/ and /I/ are opposed to each other also in the positions in question, but the feature of /I/ [relative highness] in those positions is optional, which makes /I/ again in these positions – a heavy phoneme (cf. Stokhof 1975; Ebeling 1967).

There are a few lexical items in which [I] alternates with [i] and/or [e]. These will be discussed in the next section.

/e/ The LOW FRONT UNROUNDED VOWEL /e/ is realized as [e] in all positions. Two near-minimal pairs attest the opposition between /I/ and /e/: /kEIE/ ‘smelly armpit’ – /kIII/ ‘arm in arm’, /teTe/ ‘breasts’ – /tltI/ ‘ancestor, forefather’. The different phonemic status of [I] and [e] is corroborated by the fact that in the majority of words they cannot replace each other: /ena/ [ena, *Ina] ‘nice’; /beres/ [beres, *bIrIs, *berIs, *bIrIs] ‘okay’; /speda/ [speda, *spida] ‘bike’; /gErI/ [gErI, *gIrIt, *glret, *gerIt] ‘trail (v)’; /bebe/ [bebe, *bIbI, *bebI, *bIbe] ‘duck (n)’; /klPlIn/ [klPlIn, *kEpIn, *kEpEn, *klPen] ‘money’; /blta/ [blta, *beta] ‘I’.

The opposition between /e/ and /I/ is testified by the (near-) minimal pairs /pepe/ [pepe] ‘vagina’ – /pipi/ [pipi] ‘cheek’, and /cokE/ ‘kill, eat

7 It is customary to separate the component parts of a reduplicated form by a hyphen. Although the phonetic information of such a hyphen is slight – it is merely an additional indication of a syllable boundary – I shall stick to this custom throughout this article.
(voraciously) — /caki/ ‘card-game’. Likewise, [i] and [ɛ] cannot replace each other in the majority of lexical items. However, as was indicated above, there are some lexical items in which alternation of [ɛ] with [i] and/or [ɪ] is found. Since there are no phonological conditions for this alternation, the variation should be interpreted in terms of lexical doublets or triplets. Alternation of the three front vowels is found in the following triplets: /brɪNti/, /brɪNti/ and /brɛNti/ ‘stop’; /prɪKsa/, /prɪKsa/ and /prɛKsa/ ‘examine’; /prɪNta/, /prɪNta/ and /prɛNta/ ‘govern, order’. That this alternation is not positionally conditioned is demonstrated by the following forms: /miNta, mɪNta/ ‘ask’ but */meNta/; /ciNta/ ‘love (n, v)’ but */cɪNta, cɛNta/; /piNtu/ ‘door’ but */pɪNtu, pɛNtu/.

Alternation of [ɪ] and [ɛ] is apparent in the doublet /aɪIr/ and /aɪɛ/ ‘water’.

b. Back vowels

/u/ The HIGH BACK ROUNDED VOWEL /u/ can be realized as [u] in all positions: /ukur/ [ukur] ‘measure (v)’, /batu/ [batu] ‘stone’, /tikus/ [tikus] ‘mouse’, /tulun/ [tulun] ‘help (v)’, /kunu/ [kunu] ‘infatuated’, /binuNku/ [binuŋku] ‘animal’.

In closed final syllables of polysyllabic stems, however, the realization has a wider dispersion. It ranges from [u] through (ʊ) to [o]. As far as can be ascertained, there are no apparent phonemic or other constraints determining which realization will be chosen. Thus the realization of /ukur/ ‘measure’ ranges from [ukur] to [ukor]; similarly the realization of /tikus/ ‘mouse’ ranges from [tikus] to [tikos], and that of /tulun/ ‘help’ from [tulun] to [tulon]. In monosyllabic words, /u/ can only be realized as [u]: /pun, pʊn/ [pun, pur] ‘possess’, /trus/ [trus] ‘immediately, continually’, /buŋ/ [buŋ] ‘elder male of the same generation’. In contradistinction to the [i] — [ɪ] variation in the realization of /i/ in closed final syllables, there are no (other) constraints on the variation in realization of /u/. As was the case with the variation [i] — [ɪ], the different realizations of /u/ occur in all combinations in reduplicated forms: /tikus-tikus/ ‘mice’ can be realized as [tikus-tikus, tikos-tikos, tikos-tikus, tikus-tikos]. The same applies to lexicalized reduplications such as /irus-irus/ ‘ladle’, the realization of which varies between [irus-irus, irus-iros, iros-iros and iros-irus].

/o/ The MID-BACK ROUNDED VOWEL /o/ is realized as [o]. It occurs in open and closed syllables word-medially and word-finally, but no examples of /o/ in word-initial position have been found, e.g.: /colo/ [colo] ‘dip’, /bilolo/ [bilolo] ‘swollen’, /loNti/ [lonti] ‘whore’, /koNdlI/ [kondl] ‘bun’, /pohon/ [pohon] ‘tree’, /tɔŋ/ [tɔŋ] ‘we’, /o/ is opposed to /u/, as testified by the following (near-)minimal pairs: /bato/ ‘cough’ — /batu/ ‘stone’: /dɔa/ ‘pray’ — /dua/ ‘two’: /polo/ ‘embrace’ — /pulu/
‘(number of) ten’; /loban/ ‘hole, aperture’ – /luban/ ‘hole (sexual connotation)’; /dolo/ ‘for a while, first of all’ – /dulu/ ‘in the past’, 2 ‘for a while, first of all’. The phonemic status of /u/ vs. /o/ is furthermore corroborated by the fact that /o/ cannot be realized as [u], while /u/ can only be realized as [o] in closed final syllables of polysyllabic stems. The existence of /pohon/ [pohon, *pohun] points to an analysis of /u/ in closed final polysyllabic root syllables as a heavy phoneme, containing the optional feature of [relative highness]. An alternative solution would be an analysis of the opposition /u/ vs. /o/ in the said surroundings as neutralized into the archiphoneme /U/ with the features non-low, back and rounded; its realization would vary between [u] and [o], unless the preceding syllable contained /o/, in which case only the realization [o] would be possible. The limited number of relevant data makes either solution rather provisional but, in view of the parallelism with the ‘heavy’ status of /i/ in closed final root syllables, I prefer the former analysis.

/ɔ/ The LOW BACK ROUNDED VOWEL /ɔ/ is realized as [ɔ] in all positions: /ɔbaT/ [ɔbat] ‘medicine’, /bɔNkɔ/ [bɔŋkɔ] ‘crooked (person)’, /beNkɔ/ [bɛŋkɔ] ‘crooked (thing)’, /rɔkɔ/ [rɔŋkɔ] ‘to smoke, cigarette’, /kɔre/ [kɔrɛ] ‘dig’, /meNcan/ [meŋcan] ‘oblique, lop-sided’ and /tep ɔs/ [tepɔs] ‘flat-bottomed’.8

Two (near-)minimal pairs testify to the opposition between the phonemes /ɔ/ and /u/: /ton/ ‘we’, and /lɔnbɔ/ ‘red hot pepper’ – /loNbo/ ‘weak’. That /ɔ/ is opposed to /u/ is proven by the following (near-)minimal pairs: /bɔta/ ‘bald’ – /buta/ ‘blind’, /bɔrɔ/ ‘crowded’ – /burung/ ‘bird’, /bɔɹɔ/ ‘scab’ – /buru/ ‘chase’. The opposition of /ɔ/ to /o/ and /u/ is furthermore corroborated by the fact that in the vast majority of occurrences replacement of [ɔ] by [o] or [u], and vice versa, results in non-existing forms. Alternation of /u/ – /ɔ/ does occur, however, as is demonstrated by the following doublets: /krusi/ and /krɔsi/, /kursi/ and /kɔrsi/ ‘chair’.

c. Central vowels
/a/ The LOW CENTRAL VOWEL /a/ is realized as [a] in all positions: /asal/ [asal] ‘if’, /mara/ [mara] ‘angry’, /baNka/ [baŋka] ‘swollen’, /bataŋ/ [bataŋ] ‘big’ and /napas/ [napas] ‘breath’. In the following (near-)minimal pairs /a/ is opposed to the other low vowels /e/ and /õ/: /ana/ ‘child’ – /ena/ ‘nice’; /kreta/ ‘wagon’ – /krete/ ‘kretet’; /kala/ ‘lose, be defeated’ – /kèle/ ‘stinking armpit’; /tulan/ ‘bone’ – /tulen/.

8 There seems to be a kind of vowel harmony between the mid-vowels /I/ and /õ/, and between the low vowels /e/ and /õ/. Combinations of /I/ and /õ/ or /e/ and /õ/ in one word do not occur. Further investigation is necessary to gain more insight into this phenomenon.
The MID-CENTRAL VOWEL /a/ is realized as [ə] in the following positions: 1 stem-initially; 2 in stressed and unstressed syllables of stems which contain no other vowels but /a/; 3 in the unstressed syllables of stems which have /a/ in the stressed final syllable and which are doublet forms of the last-mentioned group of stems. In other positions the realization of /a/ has a wider dispersion and ranges from [ə] through [ʌ] to [a]. These lower realizations are a feature of emphatic speech. Yet, the different realizations cannot be analysed as different phonemes, as the oppositions among them are not absolute. The status of /a/ in these positions is again one of a heavy phoneme with [relative highness] as its optional feature: it is opposed to /a/, whose only realization is [a]. Examples of /a/ [ə, *a] are: /ampiŋ/ [əmpiŋ, əmpiŋ] ‘delicacy made of pounded, dried and fried seeds of Gnetum gnemon’, /bəltək/ [bəltək, *bəltək] ‘very dirty’, /gəməs/ [gəməs, *gəmas] ‘frustrated’, /gəndən/ [gəndən, *gəndən] ‘stupid, naive’, /ləŋpar/ [ləmpar, *ləmpar] ‘wrapped up croquette made of glutinous rice with meat’, /gəmatər/ [gəmatər, gəmatər] ‘tremble’, /gərgətən, gərgətən/ [gərgətən, gərgətən] ‘irritated, angry’, /ləməs, ləmas/ [ləməs, ləmas] ‘weak’, /tələn, tələn/ [tələn, tələn] ‘swallow’.

Examples of the ‘heavy’ /a/, the realization of which ranges from [ə] to [a], are: /kupəs/ [kupəs, kupas] ‘peel (v)’, /ləntəs/ [ləntas, lantas] ‘and then; so what’, /maləs/ [maləs, malas] ‘lazy’, /pəntəs/ [pəntas, pantas] ‘that’s why . . . ; fit in, match (v)’, /pəsar/ [pəsar, pəsar] ‘navel’, /pətar/ [pətar, pətar] ‘turn (v)’, /bəli/ [bəli, bal’i] ‘buy’, /kənes/ [kənes, kan’es] ‘indiscreet’, /kəras/ [kəras, kar’as] ‘hard, severe, loud’, /ləkas/ [ləkas, lak’as] ‘quick’.

These latter examples show that stress is retained on the final syllable even if the realization of penultimate /a/ is /a/. Minimal pairs of /a/ vs. /a/ in penultimate position are therefore not only distinguished by the optional relative highness of /a/, but also by the different place of the word stress; compare the following (near-)minimal pairs (for contrast, stress will be indicated): /təmu/ [təmu, tam’u] ‘meet’ – /təmu/ [təmu] ‘visitor, guest’; /bəlas/ [bəlas, bal’as] (stem of numerals between 10 and 20, e.g. /səbəlas, duəbəlas/ ‘eleven’, ‘twelve’) – /bəlas/ [b’alas] ‘repay’; /bənci/ [bənci, ban’ci] ‘hate’ – /bənci/ [b’anci] ‘effeminate, sissy’.
No (near-)minimal pairs are to be found which testify to the opposition between /a/ and the other mid-vowels /I/ and /o/, but replacement of [a] by [I] or [o], and vice versa, would give rise to non-existing forms. Finally, it should be observed that /a/ is optional in the following positions:
- between a labial or velar stop and /l/;
- between a labial, alveolar or velar stop and /r/. Examples: /bəli/ [bəli, bal'i, bli] ‘buy’, /gəlap/ [gəlap, gal'ap, glap] ‘dark’; vs. /bəklətəK/ [bəklətək, *bəklətək] ‘very dirty’, /təlor/ [təlor, tal'or, *tlor] ‘egg’, /bərana/ [bərana, barana, branə] ‘give birth’, /pəran/ [pəran, paran, pran] ‘war’, /tərikəT/ [tərikət, tarikat, trikat] ‘stuck together’; vs. /labrəK/ [labrak, *labərak, *labarək] ‘smash (v)’.

3. CONSONANT PHONEMES
The 19 Melaju Sini consonant phonemes and 4 archiphonemes may be charted as follows:

| Archiphonemes | Place of articulation | Labial | Alveolar | Palatal | Velar | Glottic |
|---------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
|               | Voice                 | +      | +        | +       | +     | +       |
| Archiphonemes | Stop                  | P      | T        | K       |       |         |
| Nasal         |                       | N      |          |         |       |         |
| Phonemes      | Stop                  | p, b   | t, d     | c, j    | k, g  |         |
|               | Nasal                 | m      | n        | ŋ, ŋ    |       | h       |
|               | Fricative             | f, s   |          |         |       |         |
|               | Lateral, trill        | l, r   |          |         |       |         |
|               | Semivowel             | w      | y        |         |       |         |

The archiphonemes /P/ (labial stop), /T/ (alveolar stop) and /K/ (velar stop) occur in the following positions:
1. at the end of a word
2. at the end of the first morph of a reduplicated base
3. at the end of a morpheme if the following morpheme begins with a consonant
4. within a morpheme before a stop or fricative (rare: only in words of non-Malay origin).

In these positions the opposition /p, t, k/ (voiceless) vs. /b, d, g/ (voiced) is neutralized. In the first three positions their realization is
usually voiceless. In the fourth position, voice seems to agree with the voice of the following consonant. In the third and fourth positions the realization of the cluster of archiphoneme and following consonant is one of closed transition. In the first two positions a released realization of the archiphonemes is common only in emphatic speech; in normal speech release tends to be absent. No opposition in terms of manner of release corresponding to a semantic distinction ‘+ emphasis’ vs. ‘−’ or ‘∅ emphasis’ can be established, however, because of lack of formal and semantic discreteness. Below, absence of immediate release will be symbolized in the broad phonetic notations by [+] after the stop in question. For /K/ another realization is possible as well in non-emphatic speech, viz. [ʔ+], without there being any semantic difference between the two realizations. It should be stressed, moreover, that stem-final /K/, in contradistinction to /P/ and /T/, is always optional, i.e., it may be realized as ∅. This ∅ realization is more common for non-emphatic speech, but is not excluded completely for emphatic speech, either, and should not therefore be interpreted as phonemically different from [k]. There is one exception to this, namely the exclamation /kutuk/ ‘damned!’, which is always realized as [kutuk]. The emphatic nature of this word explains the absence of the realizations *[kutuk+, kutuʔ+]. while [kutu] is presumably precluded as a possible realization because of the existence of the word /kutu/ ‘louse’. Nevertheless, optional stem-final /K/ is also opposed to ∅, if only for the fact that words which phonemically end in a vowel cannot regularly be realized with an additional consonantal allophone of stem-final /K/: /tadak, paku, bisa/, etc., cannot be realized as *[tadak+, tadakʔ+, pakuk, pakuk+, pakuʔ+, bisa, bisa+, bisiʔ+], etc. It should be noted, though, that the existence of a ∅ realization of stem-final /K/does give rise to hyper-correct pronunciations: younger Moluccans trying to speak Standard Malay often produce forms such as [taňak] and [basak] for [tana] ‘ask’ and [bas] ‘wet’. Some examples of /P, T, K/ follow below:

/naPsuT/ [napstut, napsut+] ‘sexual desire, lust’; /sاداپ/ [sadap, sadap+] ‘nice, tasty’; /ισαP/ [isap, isap+] ‘suck’; /natsIpa/ [natsIpa] name of a beach on Ambon; /bɑNτɛT/ [bɑntet, bantet+] ‘cracked’; /pɑNτɑT/ [pantat, pantat+] ‘bottom, buttocks’; /aNaK/ [anak, anak+, anakʔ+, anak] ‘child, offspring’; /labrɑK/ [labrak, labrak+, labrakʔ+, labra] ‘hit, smash’; /maNkɔK/ [mankɔk, mankɔk+, mankɔʔ+, mankɔ] ‘coconut delicacy’; /rujaK/ [rujak, rujak+, rujakʔ+, ruja] ‘spicy fruit salad’.

I have not found any pure minimal pairs proving the phonemic status of the above-discussed archiphonemes. However, their replacement by any of the other two archiphonemes would produce unintelligible forms.

The voiced and voiceless labial, alveolar and velar stops /b, p, d, t, g, k/
occur in the consonantal positions complementary to those of the archiphonemes, i.e. in practice, before vowels and /r/ and /l/, provided these consonants belong to the same morpheme. The distribution of the voiced and voiceless palatal stops /j/ and /c/ is defective: they are only found before a vowel belonging to the same morpheme, while there is no palatal archiphoneme alongside /P, T, K/. The labial stops /p, b/ are always realized bilabially. The usual realization of the alveolar stops /t, d/ is apico-alveodental. The voiceless velar stop /k/ occurs in two allophones: after /s/ in the same morpheme /k/ may be realized as [k] or [x], in other positions the realization is always [k]. Some examples of all stops, including relevant minimal pairs, are: /batu/ ‘stone’; /binan/ ‘desperate’; /pipi/ ‘cheek’; /napan/ ‘toothless’; /bodo/ ‘stupid’; /danDan/ ‘large pan for steaming rice’; /utan/ ‘debt’; /tiNta/ ‘ink’; /jual/ ‘sell’; /baju/ ‘dress’ (n); /kaNji/ ‘starch’ (v); /coba/ ‘try’; /paci/ ‘he, him’; /kuNei/ ‘key (n), lock (v)’; /gona/ ‘irritated’; /lau/ ‘(traditional) song’; /laNgar/ ‘pass (v), visit (v)’; /kos/ ‘empty (adj)’; /laku/ ‘in great demand’; /baNka/ ‘bench’; /skaran/ [skaran, sxaran] ‘now’; /skola/ [skola, sxola] ‘school’;

/p/ – /b/: /pilaN/ ‘hit (v)’ – /bilan/ ‘say (v)’; /paNci/ ‘pan’ – /baNci/ ‘effeminate, sissy’; /kapal/ ‘ship (n)’ – /kabal/ ‘impertinent’; /kapur/ ‘chalk (n)’ – /kabur/ ‘hazy’;
/t/ – /d/: /tada/ ‘hold up (one’s hand), endure’ – /dada/ ‘breast’; /tua/ ‘old’ – /dua/ ‘two’; /gaNtn/ ‘hang up’ – /gaNdun/ ‘related to’; /pata/ ‘break (v)’ – /pada/ ‘to, for’;
/c/ – /j/: /car/ ‘look for’ – /jar/ ‘finger’; /acar/ ‘k.o. pickles’ – /ajar/ ‘learn, teach’;
/k/ – /g/: /karun/ ‘gunny sack’ – /garun/ ‘punk’; /laki/ ‘man, husband’ – /lagi/ ‘more, again’;
/p/ – /t/: /pada/ ‘for’ – /tada/ ‘hold up (one’s hand), endure’; /popi/ ‘doll’ – /topi/ ‘hat’;
/t/ – /k/: /mati/ ‘dead’ – /maki/ ‘abuse’; /kutu/ ‘louse’ – /kuku/ ‘fingernail’;
/p/ – /k/: /pasar/ ‘market’ – /kasar/ ‘rough’; /pakau/ ‘nail (n, v)’ – /kaku/ ‘stutter (v)’;
/c/ – /t/: /car/ ‘seek’ – /tari/ ‘(traditional) dance’; /kaca/ ‘mirror (n)’ – /kata/ ‘word’; /laNcan/ ‘indiscreet’ – /laNtan/ ‘lay down’;
/j/ – /d/: /jar/ ‘finger’ – /dari/ ‘from’; /paNjan/ ‘long’ – /paNdan/ ‘consider’; /aju/ ‘imitate’ – /adu/ ‘ouch’.

The voiceless labial fricative /f/ is realized labio-dentally and occurs only in initial and medial position, e.g. in: /fufu/ ‘black magic, bewitch’; /monaf/ ‘hypocritical’.

In a number of other words, which are only lexically definable, /f/ alternates with /p/: /fadah’al, padah’al, fadal/ ‘but, on the other hand’; /faluNku, paluNku/ ‘fist, hit with one’s fist’; /festa, pesta/ ‘party,
feast'; and /fihak, pihak/ 'side (n)'.

In other words, however, /f/ cannot be replaced by /p/ without change of meaning, e.g.: /fikir/ 'think' — /pikir/ 'puzzle, worry (v)'; /fikiran/ 'thought' — /pikiran/ 'problem, worry (n)'.

The following pair proves the opposition /f/ vs. /p/: /nafsuT/ 'desire, wish' — /naPsuT/ 'sexual desire, lust'.

The (voiceless) alveodental fricative /s/ occurs in all positions: /s?pi/ 'gin': /rasa/ 'feel, taste': /b?ras/ 'uncooked rice'.

Its opposition to the voiceless alveodental stop is testified by minimal pairs such as: /sian/ 'noon' — /tian/ 'stake': /g?sa/ 'burnt' — /g?ta/ 'carry': /aNpas/ 'crumb' — /aNpaT/ 'four'.

The palatal fricative /h/ is realized as [h] in initial and medial position. Intervocalic /h/ can also have the realization [x]; in this position both realizations [x] and [h] seem to be in free variation. Some examples are: /hosa/ [hosa] 'asthmatic': /hosu/ [hos] 'smell of piss (n)'; /loha/ [loha, loxa] 'baby vomit': /mahal/ [mahal, maxal] 'expensive': /paha/ [paha, paxa] 'thigh': /tuhan/ [tuhan, tuxan] 'God'.

The (voiced) alveolar lateral /l/ and trill /r/ occur in all positions: /laNtar$/ [laNtaiy] 'lay down': /raNtaiV [raNtarj] 'pots and pans': /lupa/ [lupa] 'forget': /rupa/ [rupa] 'face, appearance': /pela/ [pela] 'pela'9: /p?ra/ [p?ra] 'silver, guilder': /tali/ [tali] 'rope': /tari/ [tari] 'traditional dance': /kabal/ [kabal] 'impertinent': /kabar/ [kabar] 'news': /asal/ [asal] 'if': /asar/ [asar] 'warm up'.

Their opposition to the voiced alveolar stop is shown by the following minimal pairs:
/d/ — /l/: /dari/ 'from' — /lari/ 'run': /uda? /'shrimp' — /ulan/ 'repeat':
/d/ — /r/: /dap?T/ 'get' — /rap?T/ 'meeting, close, intimate': /dada/ 'breast' — /dara/ 'blood'.

/m, n, ŋ, ŋ/ are the nasal counterparts of /b, d, j, g/. They occur before vowels or — with the exception of /ŋ/ — at the end of a syllable. In the latter case they cannot be followed by a stop which belongs to the same morpheme (see below). Some examples of their occurrence are: /kumur/ 'wash one's mouth': /kirim/ 'send': /nada/ 'there is no...'; /kawin/ 'marry': /setan/ 'ghost': /horia/ 'parson's wife': /ni?lu/ 'k.o. tooth ache': /ni?la? /slaver, slobber': /n?n/ 'sing': /n?nir/ 'indiscreet': /mi?a/ 'oil': /naur/ 'lie (v), deceive': /bi?u/ 'confused': /pa?lu/ 'very, most (adj)'.

9 Pela is the word for the relationship between two or more villages in the Moluccas which have sworn by blood-oath to help and support each other in times of trouble, war, etc. Marriage between members of two pela villages is regarded as incest and thus forbidden.
The following (near-)minimal pairs testify to the phonemic status of the nasals in the positions indicated vis-à-vis each other and vis-à-vis the corresponding voiced stops: /namu/ 'k.o. egg-roll' – /namu/ ‘mosquito’ – /ŋamu/ ‘murmur (v)’; /nasi/ ‘cooked rice’ – /masi/ ‘still, yet’ – /dasi/ ‘tie (n)’; /tana/ ‘ground, land’ – /taña/ ‘ask’ – /tada/ ‘hold up (one’s hand), endure’; /tan añ/ ‘hand’ – /təman/ ‘friend’; /mija/ ‘oil’ – /mlja/ ‘table’; /ncaco/ ‘lie (v), deceive’ – /gaco/ ‘pawn’; /maki/ ‘abuse (v)’ – /baki/ ‘serving plate’; /ramI/ ‘crowded’ – /rabl/ ‘open widely (v)’; /maju/ ‘forward, advance’ – /baju/ ‘dress (n)’; /dansa/ ‘dance (in western style)’ (n, v) – /banṣa/ ‘people’; /utan/ ‘bush, jungle’ – /utan/ ‘debt’; /asim/ ‘saltish’ – /asim/ ‘strange, foreign’; /katoran/ ‘dust’ – /katóran/ ‘we’; /asim/ ‘sour’ – /pasan/ ‘shoot’; /raNdam/ ‘soak’ – /raNdany/ ‘k.o. meat dish’; /tanam/ ‘plant (v)’ – /tan añ/ ‘hand, arm’.

The final pairs show that /n, m, n/ are opposed to each other in word-final position as well (as indicated above, the distribution of /n/ is defective). However, there are strong indications that word-final /m/ and /n/ were once heavy phonemes with velarity as optional feature, or that the opposition between the nasals in word-final position was once neutralized to [ŋ]: for quite a number of words ending in /m/ (< *m) and /n/ (< *n) there are parallel forms ending in /n/, whereas for words ending in /ŋ/ (< *ŋ) no parallel forms ending in /m/ or /n/ exist. Synchronically, the distribution of word-final nasals can only be described in terms of doublets. Some examples of such doublets are: /tikam, tikañ/ ‘stab’; /siram, siran/ ‘pour out, sprinkle’; /itam, itañ/ ‘black’; /bəlam, bələn, bəlum, bəlun/ ‘not yet’; /akan, akan/ ‘it’; /bukan, bukan/ ‘no, not (negation of nouns)’; /bulan, bulan/ ‘moon, month’; /turun, turun/ ‘descend’.

In the position immediately before stops belonging to the same morpheme, the opposition among all four nasals is neutralized into the archiphoneme /N/ In its realization this nasal consonant assimulates to the following stop as regards place of articulation. Examples of this /N/ have been adduced throughout this paper. Compare also the following words: /piNpin/ [pimpin] ‘lead (v)’; /raNpas/ [rampas] ‘seize, rob, carry away’; /gəNbən/ [gəmbən] ‘silly’; /haNtam/ [hantam] ‘hit (v)’; /maNdI/ [mandI] ‘bathe’; /baNci/ [banci] ‘effeminate, sissy’; /ləNjən/ [lənjən] ‘gangling’; /tuNku/ [tur^ku] ‘cooking-stand’; /piNgir/ [pîngir] ‘side’.

The labial semivowel /w/ can be realized bilabially [w] in all positions and labiodentally [v] in initial and medial positions: /wajan/ [wajan, vajan] ‘pan’; /wajI/ [wajI, vajI] ‘delicacy of rice and syrup’; /wanDü/ [wandu, vandu] ‘homosexual (n, adj.)’; /liwaT/ [liwat, livat] ‘pass (v)’; /lawan/ [lawan, lavan] ‘against, adversary (n)’; /kawaT/ [kawat, kavat] ‘cable’. Examples of word-final /w/ are discussed below.
The palatal semivowel /y/ is realized as [y] in all positions: /ya/ introducing an answer to a question by a (usually elderly) person to whom reverence is due; /yan/ (relative pronoun); /yudas/ 'severe'; /moyan/ 'ghost'; /kluyu/ 'shark'; /kaya/ 'rich'. For examples of word-final /y/, see below.

As the semivowel /w/ is also velar, it is in direct opposition with the full vowel /u/. Their phonetic distinctness is apparent from a minimal pair such as /wa/ [wa, va] 'well' (exclamation expressing surprise) – /ua/ [ua, uwa] 'aunt (father's elder sister)'

10 and from the fact that replacement of intervocalic [w, v] by [u] with or without an accompanying stress shift to the new penultimate syllable would result in an uninterpretable form: /lawan/ [l'awan, l'avan, *l'auan, *lau'ar] 'against; adversary (n)'.

Word-finally the opposition /w/ – /u/ appears from the fact that the sequence vowel + /w/, as opposed to vowel + /u/, can always be realized monovocically. Moreover, the sequence vowel + /u/ is disyllabic, whereas vowel + /w/ is monosyllabic. Mark also the consequences of this for the placement of the stress in the following examples: /kalau/ [k'alaw, k'alo] 'if', /pulau/ [p'ulaw, p'uwa] 'island', /ataw/ ['ataw, /'ato] 'or', but /karbau/ [karbau] 'buffalo', /palau/ [pal'ai] 'slow'.

The argument for the phonemic status of /y/ as opposed to /i/ is parallel to the one for /w/ vs. /u/: word-initially there is the minimal pair /ia/ 'yes' (with reverence) – /ya/ 1. sentence-final tag in a question with an expected positive answer, 2. sentence-initial particle, introducing the answer to a question by a person to whom reverence is due. Word-medially replacement of [y] by [i] results in a non-existing form: /kaya/ [k'aya, *k'iaia, *ka'iaia]; word-finally, the sequence vowel + /y/ is monosyllabic and may be realized monovocically, while vowel + /i/ is always bivocalic and disyllabic: /ramay/ [r'amay, r'ampl] 'crowded', /saNpay/ [s'amay, s'ampl] 'till; arrive (v)', /raNtay/ [r'antay, r'antl] 'chain (n)', /balay/ [b'alay, b'all] 'institution', but /kimi/ [kim'ai] 'shit!, damned!', /tiNkai/ [tiNk'ai] 'capricious'.

The distribution of word-final /w/ and /y/ seems to be defective: they only occur after /a/.

For completeness sake I add two (near-)minimal pairs for the oppositions labial semivowel vs. voiced labial stop and palatal semivowel vs. voiced palatal stop: /tawar/ 'tasteless' – /sabar/ 'patient (adj)'; /yan/ (relative pronoun) – /jan/ 'don’t!'.

10 A possible transitional velar glide between /u/ and a following vowel is non-phonemic. The same applies to the palatal glide between /i/ and a following vowel, such as in /dia/ [dia, diya] 'he, she'.
III. Discussion

In order to further define Melaju Sini (MS) as a variety of Malay, I shall compare below the phonemic system of MS as described above with the phonemic systems of some of the varieties of Malay which have presumably contributed to its present form, in the first place Ambonese Malay (AM) and Standard Malay (SM).

First of all, there are obvious morphological differences between SM on the one hand and AM and MS on the other, which concern the inventory, the function and the shape of affixes. As the morphology of MS will be discussed in a separate paper, I shall confine myself here to phonological phenomena observed in monomorphemic words and roots. My sources on SM are current dictionaries of Indonesian (such as Poerwadarminta 1986) and Adelaar 1985. For AM I consulted Collins 1980 and Tetelepta et al. 1984, while additional data were provided by Donal van Minde’s preliminary reports on his linguistic fieldwork in Ambon and personal communications. Apart from a few marginal differences in the area of loan phonemes, the inventories of consonants in SM, AM and MS appear to be the same. There are marked differences, however, in the distribution of these consonants. Even more conspicuous are the differences in the SM, AM and MS vowel systems.

Although Collins does not present a phoneme inventory in his study on AM, his phonemic analysis can be inferred from his examples and his survey of salient phonemic features of AM (Collins 1980:18). Collins’ data do not contradict the conclusion of Van Minde and Tetelepta et al. that AM has a five-vowel system:

|       | Front | Central | Back |
|-------|-------|---------|------|
| High  | /i/   |         | /u/  |
| Mid   | /e/   |         | /o/  |
| Low   |       |         | /a/  |

According to Van Minde, the usual realization of the mid-front vowel is relatively high [I], whereas the mid-back vowel is usually realized as [], i.e., rather low. This five-vowel system must have arisen out of a six-vowel system which also contained a mid-central vowel /a/. This is the system which is reflected by SM (cf. also Adelaar 1985:10), where proto-Malayic *ə in stem-final syllables merged with *a into /a/ (cf. Adelaar 1985:41-48). There are no indications that AM ever differed from SM in this respect. Proto-Malayic *ə in non-final stem/syllables in AM merged with other vowels in unpredictable ways. Collins observes that it usually merged with *a into /a/, though he also presents examples of *ə becoming /i/, /e/, /o/ or /u/ (Collins 1980:18). Below follows a preliminary inventory of ‘irregular’ reflections of *ə; in the lists, SM is compared with AM and MS. As it is not absolutely certain that in SM and AM the oppositions between the nasals are neutralized before stops, I
continue to distinguish them for these varieties of Malay. The same holds for word-final stops.

SM       AM        MS
/b'asi/   /b'esi/    /bIsi/      ‘iron (n)’
/c'enkhe/ /c'enke/   /cINkI/     ‘clove’
/p'eti/   /p'eti/   /pIti/      ‘box, chest’
/d'ekat/  /d'ekat/  /dekaT/     ‘close, near’
/d'enar/  /d'enar/  /deynar/    ‘hear, listen’
/l'eneder/ /l'eneder/ /leNdeter/ ‘mucus’
/t'ena/   /t'ena/   /tena/      ‘middle’
/p'egan/  /p'egan/  /pegan/     ‘hold, seize’
/nagri/   /negri'/  /negri/      ‘village, country’
/m'anan/  /man'an/  /manan/     ‘win’
/tar'013/ /tar'013/ /taronj/     ‘eggplant, aubergine’
/p'oro/   /poro, paruT/ /poro, topo/ ‘belly’
/t'opo/   /topo, topo/ /topo, topu/ ‘clap, applaud’
/k'onto/  /koNto, kaNtuT/ /fart (n, v)’
/c'olo/   /colo, caluP/ /colo, colombo/ ‘dip’
/l'ombo/  /loNbo/   /lombo/      ‘soft, weak’
/p'olo/   /polo/    /polo/       ‘embrace’

Some examples of AM /a/<*ə are:

SM       AM       MS
/balahl/ ‘split’ /bal'a; ‘split’ /bola/       ‘split (v), hit’
/barkolah/ /bakal'ai/ /bakulai/ ‘fight (v)’
/barsi/   /bars'i/   /borsi/      ‘clean’
/capat/   /cap'at/   /capaT/      ‘quick’
/jempol/  /jamp'ol/  /jaNpo/      ‘thumb; O.K.’
/kabun/   /kab'on/   /kabun/      ‘garden’
/lakas/   /lak'as/   /lakas/      ‘quick’
/rab'us/  /rab'us/   /rabus/      ‘cook, boil (trans.)’

/səbalah/ /sabal'a/ /sabola/     ‘side’
/təlur/   /tal'or/   /talor/      ‘egg’
/təman/   /tam'an/   /taman/      ‘friend’
/təndan/  /tand'an/  /tandana/   ‘kick’.

From these lists the following tendencies are apparent:
1. Where AM has the stress on the final syllable, MS has preserved /ə/ in the penult. In this respect it resembles SM.
2. Where AM has the stress on the penultimate syllable (concomitant with a change of *ə into a front or back vowel), MS follows AM.
However, alongside the AM-like forms, MS often has parallel forms which agree with SM.

3 MS differs from both SM and AM in that it shows a phonemic split in front vowels < *a: where SM has /a/ and AM /e/, MS has /i/ in some words, /e/ in others. Further investigation into the possible conditions for this split is necessary, but can only be conducted on the basis of a more complete lexical inventory of AM. This also holds for the split in the MS back vowels, which, however, seems to be lexically much more limited. It is possible that the richness of the Dutch vocalic system has functioned as a catalyst in this development.

4 Where AM has word-final /n/ (according to Collins 1980:18 the only word-final nasal possible), MS has a nasal corresponding to the one of the SM cognate. Above, however, we have seen that in a number of MS lexical items an ‘AM’ form occurs alongside the ‘SM’ form. The items with which this is considered possible differed with different informants.

5 SM word-final stops in the above lists tend to be reflected as Ø in AM. MS follows AM in this respect, although parallel forms which resemble the SM ones do also occur.

To conclude, the above observations may be tentatively summarized as follows: MS is based on AM but has been subject to restructuring in the direction of SM, at least as regards the phonemic build-up of its lexical morphemes. In this connection there is one salient aspect of the MS phonemic structure which cannot be explained by either AM or SM, however. This is the fact that /a/ frequently occurs in MS final syllables. Of the 14 lexical items listed above, the majority appear to be of Javanese origin. Compare the following list of cognates (the Javanese forms are from Pigeaud 1948, the Jakarta Malay forms from Abdul Chaer 1976, and the Sundanese forms from Eringa 1984), in which the spelling is that used in the said sources, with Javanese ‘u’ instead of ‘oe’:

| MS          | Javanese | Jakarta M. | Sundanese |
|-------------|----------|------------|-----------|
| /gəməs/ ‘frustrated’ | gemes    | gemes      | gemes     |
| /ɡəNdən/ ‘stupid’    | gendeng  | gendeng    | gendeng   |
| /ləNpor/ ‘rice croquette with meat’ | lemper | lemper | lemper |
| /ɡəmrətər/ ‘tremble’ | gemeter | gemeter | gemeter |
| /ɡərgətən/ ‘angry’   | gregeten | —         | —         |
| /ləməs/ ‘weak’       | lemes    | lemes      | lemes     |
| /məsəs/ ‘lazy’       | males    | males      | males     |
| /pəntəs/ ‘that’s why: fit in, match (v)’ | pantes  | pantes    | pantes    |
| /pəsər/ ‘navel’       | puser    | puser      | puseur    |
| /pətər/ ‘turn (v)’    | puter    | puter      | puter     |
| /tələn/ ‘swallow’     | —        | telen      | telen     |
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The origin of /baktatak/ 'very dirty' is unclear (it does not occur in my sources for Javanese, Jakarta Malay or Sundanese); /laNtas/ 'and then' has the cognate lantas in Javanese and Jakarta Malay, while /kupas/ 'peel (v)' only has cognates in Jakarta Malay and Sundanese, viz. kupas.

Given the high percentage of correspondence with languages spoken in Java for the words which do not agree with AM and SM, the conclusion seems justified that the third language or set of language varieties which contributed to the development of MS was of Javanese origin. It may be assumed that this particular language was indeed the so-called Tangsi Malay as used in army barracks in Java.

Map showing Dutch municipalities with Moluccan communities

Scale: 1:2,000,000

*Atlas Molukkers*, C.P.S. Hoevelaken, 1983
Den Haag: Van Haeringen.
| 1. Delfzijl | 33. Culemborg |
| 2. Appingedam | 34. Winterswijk |
| 3. Hoogeveen | 35. Breukelen |
| 4. Groningen | 36. Maarssen |
| 5. Marum | 37. Wormerveer |
| 6. Foxhol | 38. Huizen |
| 7. Oosterwolde | 39. Leerdam |
| 8. Drachten | 40. Alphen a/d Rijn |
| 9. Assen | 41. Woerden |
| 10. Smilde | 42. Capelle a/d IJssel |
| 11. Hoogeveen | 43. Moordrecht |
| 12. Zwolle | 44. Ridderkerk |
| 13. Rouwveen | 45. Krimpen a/d IJssel |
| 14. Nijverdal | 46. Cuyk |
| 15. Rijssen | 47. Helmond |
| 16. Wierden | 48. Nistelrode |
| 17. Almelo | 49. Waalwijk |
| 18. Deventer | 50. Breda |
| 19. Twello | 51. Tilburg |
| 20. Eerbeek | 52. Vught |
| 21. Vaassen | 53. Koudekerke |
| 22. Lunteren | 54. Middelburg |
| 23. Barneveld | 55. Vlissingen |
| 24. Apeldoorn | 56. Oost-Souburg |
| 25. Bemmel | 57. Gennep |
| 26. Elst | 58. Geleen |
| 27. Opheusden | 59. Sittard |
| 28. Tiel | 60. Venlo |
| 29. Zevenaar | 61. Venray |
| 30. Doesburg | 62. Weert |
| 31. Nijmegen | 63. Echt |
| 32. Ede | 64. Maastricht |

(Heer)
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