

ANIMACY AND ITS EFFECTS IN PAPUAN MALAY MORPHOSYNTAX

Chrisma Fernando Saragih

Abstrak

Tulisan ini membahas struktur dan dampak kebahasaan dalam morfosintaksis bahasa Melayu Papua. Melayu Papua merupakan salah satu dialek bahasa Melayu yang digunakan di wilayah paling timur Indonesia, yaitu di Provinsi Papua dan Provinsi Papua Barat. Metode yang digunakan adalah metode kualitatif. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan cara merekam dan mencatat data kosakata maupun kalimat. Kemudian analisis dilakukan dengan menyusun data berdasarkan hierarkinya. Hasil penelitian ini adalah ditemukannya struktur dan dampak kebahasaan dalam morfosintaksis bahasa Melayu Papua. Struktur tersebut dapat terlihat pada kata-kata turunannya, pemilihan kata depan, dan kata ganti.

Keywords: animacy, effects, Papuan Malay, and morphosyntax.

1. Introduction

Papuan Malay is a variety of Malay spoken in Western part of Papuan island which belongs to Indonesia. Here, the term of 'Papuan Malay' refers to a variety of Malay spreading along the north Coast of Papuan Island as shown in the map below.



Until recently, there is no written grammar on Papuan Malay was available. The information given here is mainly based on my observations as a native speaker of Papuan Malay. However, some of the informations come from several sources who have written about Papuan Malay. Papuan Malay is a Malay-based language spoken in the Western part of Papuan Island, Indonesia. It is one of the Austronesian languages of New Guinea (Foley, 1986). In the past, it was a pidgin used as a lingua franca along the coastal areas, where there was a lot of trade between the people from the island and seafaring Malay traders from the west (Roosman, 1982: 95). During the time, the island was a colony of the Netherlands, Papua Malay was used by missionaries to spread the Scriptures of God among Papuan people, especially among those living in the coastal areas in the North. It was at the time also enforced through education and administration (Adelaar and Prentice, 1996). At this moment, Papuan Malay is a creol and automatically becomes the mother tongue of the younger generations of the Papuan, as well as of other ethnical groups living in Papua. However, since Indonesian had been introduced as the standard language around 1963, the domain of Papuan Malay had been changed. It has lost its prominent status and now it is, a colloquial language used at home, on the market and in informal communication. Phonologically, Papuan Malay has the simple vowel phonemes *i, e, a, o, u*, but lacks of the schwa. The consonant phonemes are: *b, p, d, t, k, g, m, n, ny, ng, s, h, c, j, r, l, w, y* (Burung, 2008). Syntactically, it has medial medial word order (SVO) as presented in (1) and it is syntactically a left – headed language as in (2)

(1) *Sa makan ikan.*

1SG eat fish

'I eat fish'.

(2) *batu bokar itu*

stone big DEM

'that big stone'

Many interesting linguistic phenomenas occur in Papuan Malay's features. As its name, it is actually considered as an Austronesian language but it also has some Papuan language tendencies. However, until now, there is no written standard yet for Papuan Malay as well as its grammar. This paper attempts at describing the effects of animacy found in Papuan Malay morphosyntax.

Animacy can be simply described as a grammatical and/or semantic category of nouns based on how sentient or alive the referent of the noun in a given taxonomic scheme is. Indeed, animacy is something related to how we differentiate animate from inanimate things. Some experts determine animacy into two ways: animacy used in biological perspective and linguistic perspective. Biologically, animacy refers to animate and inanimate things, while linguistically, animacy is marked out by looking at an entity's ability. For example, humans are considered as animate because they can do everything while the other animates such as trees, worms in some languages are taken into account as inanimate because of their lack of ability in doing something (Kittila, Vasti and Ylikoski, 2011). As an extra linguistic conceptual property (Comrie, 1989), animacy plays a role in determining grammatical categories in a language. Thus,

it can be said that linguistic also distinguishes the stratification of words or phrases. Some words are able to be used just by animate and cannot be used by inanimate or vice versa. Data for this paper are taken from some recordings of Papuan Malay conversation and also Bible stories in Papuan Malay. In addition, I also use my intuitions as a native speaker of the language. Then, analysis of the data is based on the hierarchy of animacy scale (Comrie, 1989):

Human > Animate > Inanimate

The paper is organized as follows: section 1 (introduction), section 2 (animacy and genitive variation in Papuan Malay), section 3 (animacy and preposition choice in Papuan Malay), section 4 (animacy and third plural appositive pronoun in Papuan Malay) and section 5 (conclusion).

2. Animacy and Genitive Alternation in PM

In English, it is clear that animacy affects the genitive variation (Rosenbach, 2007). Animate things tend to apply *s-genitive* (pre-nominal position); whilst inanimate things apply *of-genitive* (post nominal position). The same case, the influence of animacy for genitive alternation, also occurs in Papuan Malay. Animate things especially the first rank, humans, always take genitive marker in showing possession, non-human animate can use or be without genitive marker, while inanimate things do not use genitive marker. This case is shown in data in the sentences below:

- (3) *Yesus pu mama sama Maria*
 Jesus GEN Mother PREP Mary
 'Jesus' mother is Mary.'

- (4) *Yohan pu kamar*
 Johan GEN bedroom
 'Johan's bedroom'

- (5) *anjing pu makan-an*
 dog GEN eat-NOM
 'the dog's food'

- (6) *makan-an anjing*
 eat-NOM dog
 'the dog's food'

- (7) *jendela kamar*
 window bedroom
 'the window of the bedroom'

- (8) **kamar pu jendela*
 bedroom GEN window
 'the window of the bedroom'

- (9) **Mama Yesus sama Maria*
 mother Jesus PREP Mary
 'The mother of Jesus is Mary.'

As in sentence (3) and (4), humans always apply genitive marker *pu* literally meaning "have". However, when *pu* is not used in sentence like (9), the sentence becomes ungrammatical. On the other hand, inanimate things do not use *pu* as in (7). When inanimate takes *pu* like in (8), it becomes ungrammatical. The different case happens for non-human animate. As shown in sentence (5) and (6), *anjing* 'dog' can take *pu* or be without *pu*. Sentences (5) and (6) are acceptable in Papuan Malay.

On the one side, it is also found that noun scale indicating the choice of genitive does not depend merely on biological sense, but also the way referents are conceptualized (as more or less animated). Animacy as an extra linguistic factor crucially depends on whether and to what extent speakers treat referents linguistically as if they were animate. Consider the following sentences.

- (10) *mobil pu alat-alat*
 car GEN RED-tool
 'car's spare part'

- (11) *perahu pu mesin*
 boat GEN engine
 'boat's engine'

- (12) *akar pohon*
 root tree
 'the root of the tree'

- (13) **pohon pu akar*
 tree GEN root
 'the tree's root'

There are some exceptions for some nouns in Papuan Malay such as *perahu* 'traditional boat' or nowadays, people treat *mobil* 'car' as animates such as in (10) and (11) while *pohon* 'tree' is considered as inanimate such as in (12) and it is slightly weird to say sentence (13).

3. Animacy and Preposition Preference in Papuan Malay

Beside genitive variation, in Papuan Malay, animacy also affects the preference of preposition. Thus, the use of some prepositions will be based on whether the object is animate or inanimate. Aissen (2003) marks out this case as differential object marking (DOM). In Papuan Malay, DOM is more sensitive to animate proper. This prominence can be assessed along different scale of animacy (cf. de Hoop and Lamers, 2006). Although animate objects of preposition and inanimate objects of preposition have their own prepositions, animate object of preposition can take inanimate preposition but not vice versa (cf. de Hoop and Malchukov, 2008) as shown in the sentences below.

- (14) *de pi sama de pu om*
 3SG go PREP 3SG GEN uncle
 'He goes to his uncle (in Jakarta)'.
- (15) *Yusuf dan Maria pi ke Betlehem*
 Joseph CONJ Mary go PREP Bethlehem
 'Joseph and Mary go to Bethlehem'.
- (16) **Yusuf dan Maria pi sama Betlehem*
 Joseph CONJ Mary go PREP Bethlehem
 'Joseph and Mary go to Bethlehem'.
- (17) **de pi sama pasar*
 3SG go PREP garden
 'He goes to the market'.
- (18) *depi ke de pu om*
 3SG go PREP 3SG GEN uncle
 'He goes to his uncle'

As can be seen from the data above, when the objects of preposition is animate such as *de pu om* 'his/her uncle' in sentence (14), preposition *sama* is used. However, when object of preposition is an inanimate such as *Betlehem* 'Bethlehem' in sentence (15), preposition *ke* is applied. The sentence is ungrammatical if the object of preposition is an inanimate but it takes animate preposition *sama* such as in (16) and (17). On the other hand, animate object of preposition can take *ke* as a preposition such as in (18). Both *sama* and *ke* here mean 'to'.

In another context, *sama* also means 'with (together with)'. In Papuan Malay, there are two prepositions, namely *sama* and *deng* meaning 'with'. The use of these prepositions depends on the objects of preposition, whether they are human animates or non-human animates as shown in the sentences below.

- (19) *de pi sama Musa dan Yakop ke kebun*
 3SG go PREP Moses CONJ Jacob PREP garden
 'He goes together with Moses and Jacob to the garden'.
- (20) *de pi deng anjing-anjing ke kebun*
 3SG go PREP RED-dog PREP garden
 'He goes together with the dogs to the garden'
- (21) **de pi sama anjing-anjing ke kebun*
 3SG go PREP RED-dog PREP garden
 'He goes together with the dogs to the garden'

When the objects of preposition is human, like *Musa* and *Yakop* ‘Moses and Jacob’, are humans, preposition *sama* takes place (19). In contrast, when the objects of preposition is non-humans, *anjing-anjing* ‘dogs’, *deng* is used (20). It is weird to say sentence like (21).

4. Animacy and Third Plural Apposition in Papuan Malay

Another effect of animacy in Papuan Malay morphosyntax is the use of apposition pronoun, third person reference. Briefly, pronominal system in Papuan Malay can be shown below as quoted from Donohue and Sawaki (2007).

TABLE 1. PRONOMINAL FORMS IN PAPUAN MALAY

Person	Independent	Bound
1SG	<i>saya</i>	<i>sa, sa?</i>
2SG	<i>ko:</i>	<i>ko</i>
3SG	<i>dia, de</i>	<i>de</i>
1PL	<i>kitong, tong</i>	<i>tong</i>
2PL	<i>kam, (kamo(ra)ng)</i>	<i>kam</i>
3PL	<i>dorang, dong</i>	<i>dong</i>

The appositive pronoun indicates plurality of the head noun of the noun phrase. Note that both the long form *dorang* and the short form *dong* of the third plural pronouns may be used for human animate as in sentence (22) and (23) but non-human animate can take the short form (24) only, while the long form cannot be applied for non-human such as in (25).

- (22) *bapa dong su makan*
 father 3PL REAL eat
 ‘(My) Father and (my) father’s friend have already eaten’.

- (23) *bapa dorang su makan*
 father 3PL REAL eat
 ‘(My) father and father’s friend have already eaten’.

- (24) *babi dong su makan*
 pig 3PL REAL eat
 ‘The pig and other pigs have already eaten’.

- (25)* *babi dorang su makan*
 pig 3PL REAL eat
 ‘The pig and other pigs have already eaten’.

5. Conclusion

So far, this paper has discussed the effects of animacy on Papuan Malay morphosyntax by giving supporting data. Animacy in Papuan Malay is based on biological sense though in some cases linguistic animacy also occurs. The results show that animacy affects the use of some grammatical categories in Papuan Malay such genitive

alternation, preposition preference and third plural apposition pronoun. It also shows that in Papuan Malay animacy is a genuine factor in those grammatical variations. In summary, this paper provides evidence that Papuan Malay is included as one language of the languages in which animacy plays an important role in determining some morphosyntax features.

List of Abbreviations

CONJ	Conjunction
GEN	Genitive
NOM	Nominalization
PREP	Preposition
REAL	Realized Aspect
RED	Reduplication
1SG	First person singular
2SG	Second person singular
3SG	Third person singular
1PL	First person plural
2PL	Second person plural
3PL	Third person plural
*	Ungrammatical

6. References Cited

- Adelaar, K. Alexander, and D. J. Prentice. 1996. 'Malay: Its History, Role and Spread'. In *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, ed. by S. A. Wurm, Peter Muhlhausler, and Darrell T. Tryon, 673–93. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aissen, J. 2003. 'Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* Volume 21, 435–483.
- Burung, W. 2008. 'Melayu Papua: A Hidden Treasure' in *International Conference on Language Development, Language Revitalization and Multilingual Education in Ethnolinguistic Communities*. 1-3 July 2008 in Bangkok, Thailand.
- Comrie, B. 1989. *Language Universal and Linguistics Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Donohue, M. and Sawaki, Y. 2007. 'Papuan Malay Pronominals: Forms and Functions'. *Oceanic Linguistics*, Volume 46, Number 1, June 2007, pp. 253-276 (Article).
- de Hoop, H., and Lamers, M. 2006. 'Incremental Distinguishability of Subject and Object'. Kulikov, L., Malchukov, A., de Swart, P. (Eds.), in *Case, Valency, and Transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin. pp. 269–291.
- de Hoop, H., and A. Malchukov. 2008. 'Case Marking Strategies' *Linguistic Inquiry*. Number 39 (4), 565 – 587.

- Foley, W. A. 1986. *The Papuan Languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kittila, Vasti and Ylikoski. 2011. *Case, Animacy, and Semantic Roles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Roosman, Raden S. 1982. 'Pidgin Malay as Spoken in Irian Jaya'. *The Indonesian Quarterly* 10(2): 95.104.
- Rosenbach, A. 2007. 'Animacy and Grammatical Variation – Findings from English Genitive Variation'. *Lingua* 118 (2008) 151–171.