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The idea for this bibliography grew out of Linguistics 770, ‘The languages of Borneo’, a graduate seminar held periodically in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa. In teaching this course the first author has adopted a heuristic approach, using photocopies of his 1971 fieldnotes on languages of central and northern Sarawak. At the beginning of the semester a complete inventory of fieldnotes that have not yet been incorporated into published work is made available, and each student then ‘adopts’ two languages, writes progress reports on the analysis of the phonology, morphology and syntax, and develops sketch grammars in lieu of a final exam or term paper. As an extra-credit project students are given the opportunity to participate in compiling a bibliography of the languages of Borneo, provided that it is compatible with their overall workload. Although the same plan has been followed several times previously without significant results, the class taught in Spring, 2013 turned out to be different, and has led directly to the present manuscript.

Several people have helped to make this a better piece of work. First, we would like to thank Victoria Yen-hsin Chen, Jonathan Cheng-chuen Kuo and Matt Magnuson, three of the four students in the Spring, 2013 seminar, for their initial efforts at data collection for particular political divisions within Borneo. While each student contributed something to the project, in the end it was Alex Smith who simply refused to let go until the work was done, hence the co-authorship that can be seen here. We also received help with the Malagasy entries by the direct assistance and good offices of Edward Keenan, and we would like to express our appreciation to him and to Dr. Baholy Ralalaohervony, who assisted in the translation of Malagasy book and article titles.

In addition, we contacted a number of scholars with a publication record on the languages of Borneo or Madagascar who responded to email requests asking for current CVs that enabled us to incorporate their most recent published work. Without their cooperation we would no doubt have missed some things that are now included. Finally, the first author would like to thank the many native speakers of Bornean languages with whom he worked, first in Hawai’i and then during doctoral dissertation fieldwork in Miri and Marudi, Sarawak from April to November, 1971, as their contributions provided the material for most of his own publications that are included here. At the time nearly all of these were secondary school students at Tanjong Lobang College, Miri, or Marudi Government Secondary School, eager to teach a foreigner who was equally eager to learn about their languages, and they left happy memories for a researcher who unfortunately was never able to go back. Some are no longer living, and those who are alive are in their late 50’s. Here, in enduring gratitude are their names:

**East-West Center, Hawai’i (June 1969-February, 1970)**

Angki Kaboy (home: Kanowit; Kanowit Melanau)
Gerawat Tuan (home: Bario; Kelabit)
Tanjong Lobang College, 4th Division, Sarawak (April-June, 1971)

Aminah binti Haji Yusuf (home: Miri; Sarawak Malay)
Umar bin Hamzah (home: Kampung Sebiew; Bintulu)
Win Karang (home: Long Wat; Kenyah)
Baru Langub (home: Long Semado(h); Lun Bawang/Lun Dayeh)
Henry OраЪang Luhat (home: Uma Juman; Kayan)
Hang Tuah Merawin (home: Kampung Teh; Mukah Melanau)
Pito bin Mantali (home: Kampung Pujut; Miri)
Siri bin Narudin (home: Kampung Jemuring Matu; Matu Melanau)
Osman bin Perseh (home: Kampung Mesjid; Balingian Melanau)
Jaini bin Seleh (home: Kampung Teh; Dalat Melanau)
Frederick Liso Senap (home: Long Napir; Kelabit)

Marudi Government Secondary School, 4th Division, Sarawak (June-November, 1971)

Andrew Jau Ajang (home: Uma Bawang; Kayan)
Anthony Ajang (home: Batu Belah; Berawan)
James Ape (home: Kampung Kekan; Dalat Melanau)
Francis Asa (home: Long Ikang; Kenyah)
Carter Balang (home: Bario; Kelabit)
Thomas Andrew Belulok (home: Kuala Tutoh/Long Kiput/Long Tutoh; Kiput)
George Bidui, a.k.a. George Bidol (home: Long Terawan; Berawan)
Uning Bong (home: Long Labid; Penan/Kenyah)
Magdalen Bungan (home: Long Semiang; Murik)
David Galang (home: Long Luyang; Sebop/Kenyah)
Seri Hossen (home: Kampung Narum; Narum)
Francis Kuleh Jau (home: Long Sela’an; Kenyah)
George Jengang (home: Long Jegan; Berawan)
Ngau Jok (home: Long Atip; Kayan)
Yakob Keso (home: Long Lamai; Penan/Kenyah)
Urkert Kusing (home: Pa’ Dalih; Kelabit)
Tom Lanau (home: Long Atun; Lepu Anan Kenyah)
Jonas Lian (home: Long Dunin; Kenyah)
Dominic Lusat (home: Long Anap; Kenyah)
John Malang (home: Kuala Tutoh/Long Kiput/Long Tutoh; Kiput)
Langat Maran (home: Long Lellang, Kelabit)
Sylvester Sarnagi (home: Kampung Ukong; Bisaya)
Abu Seman (home: unknown; Bisaya)
Jamali bin Serugi (home: Kampung Jerijeh; Sar IEEE Melanau)
Madunna Siti (home: Long Merigam; Penan/Kenyah)
Victoria Tan (home: Long Teru; Berawan)
Jolly Udau (home: Long Banga’; Sa’ban)
Tingang Uking (home: Long Jeeh; Kenyah),
John Wan Usang (home: Long San; Kenyah)
Olivia Yon (home: Batu Belah; Berawan)
INTRODUCTION

It has been over half a century since the publication of Cense and Uhlenbeck (1958), the only comprehensive bibliography devoted exclusively to the languages of Borneo. Since that time the field of Bornean linguistics has grown dramatically, and there is a pressing need for a new and greatly expanded volume to replace or supplement the earlier work. To be a true replacement it would be technically necessary for the present book to include everything mentioned in the 1958 publication, together with newer work. However, that seemed undesirable for at least two reasons. First, despite the convenience of having both the older and the newer material together in a single volume this would involve a great deal of duplication. Second, half a century ago there was insufficient material to do a book-length bibliography of the languages of Borneo without scavenging the most obscure and marginally relevant publications. As a result, many of the 323 works cited by Cense and Uhlenbeck (1958) contain only a handful of lexical items, mostly recorded by nineteenth-century colonial officials, and so fall below the threshold of what we would today consider worthy of inclusion. In the end, then, we decided to produce a volume that is largely supplementary (or complementary) to the earlier one and to include only the most relevant sources from that study, amounting to a very small percentage of the total.

An added feature of the present bibliography is its incorporation of work on Malagasy, a decision that might surprise those whose familiarity with the languages of Borneo is purely descriptive. However, readers who are aware of the wider linguistic history of the island will know that since Dahl (1951) it has been generally accepted that Madagascar was almost certainly settled from the Barito river basin of Kalimantan, and that the various dialects of Malagasy can thus be regarded in a historically more inclusive sense as part of the Bornean linguistic picture, a viewpoint that is reflected, for example, in Hudson (1970). Although the discovery is more recent and not yet so widely acknowledged, much the same can be said for the Sama-Bajaw languages, spoken by traditional boat nomads who roamed over much of Indonesia and the southern and central Philippines, as these also show unmistakeable signs of an origin in the Barito river basin, probably during the same epoch as the Malagasy (Blust 2005a, 2007). Some Sama-Bajaw communities are resident in Borneo, and so would be included even in a bibliography that is more strictly defined by current location. However, our net is cast wider in this work, and linguistic publications on all Sama-Bajaw communities are noted, whether these communities are resident in Borneo, the Philippines, or various parts of central and eastern Indonesia.

Finally, although there is good reason to believe that Malay and the Chamic languages also derive ultimately from populations that moved out from southwest Borneo to eastern Sumatra, the Malay peninsula and coastal regions of Thailand and Vietnam, this was an earlier event, probably dating to between 2,000 and 2,500 years ago. Given these differences of timing it was decided to include Malagasy and the Sama-Bajaw languages, but not the Chamic languages or the Malayic languages that lie outside Borneo within the compass of our research.
A bibliography of this kind obviously will benefit the course from which it grew, since future offerings of *The languages of Borneo* will be able to draw on it as an established resource. However, we expect that it should be of value to others as well. As is the case for many other fields, the professional literature in linguistics has grown enormously in recent decades, and even with the assistance of ever-improving technology it can be challenging to keep abreast of all that has been done. Having a reference tool like this should be of use to anyone wishing to quickly obtain information on the languages of Borneo. Moreover, since the bibliography is partially annotated some idea of the content, structure and value of many of the publications can be obtained before investing the time and trouble to obtain copies for personal inspection.
OVERVIEW OF THE LANGUAGES OF BORNEO

Physical and cultural background. At roughly 287,000 square miles, Borneo is the world’s third largest island after Greenland and New Guinea. Politically it is divided between three nations. The largest part, Kalimantan, which makes up about 73% of the island’s area, is a possession of the Republic of Indonesia, while the states of Sabah (former British North Borneo) and Sarawak belong to the Federation of Malaysia, and the oil-rich nation of Brunei Darussalam is an independent Islamic sultanate. Despite its size Borneo’s population is less than 19 million, and its population density is the lowest of any major island in Indonesia, at less than 56 persons per square mile (cp. Seram: 65.8/sq. mi., Sumba: 159/sq. mi., Sumbawa: 223/sq. mi., Sulawesi: 238/sq. mi., Sumatra: 249/sq. mi., Flores: 350/sq. mi., Ambon: 1,474/sq. mi., Lombok: 1,740/sq. mi., Bali: 1,900/sq. mi., Madura: 2,207/sq. mi., and Java: 2,756/sq. mi.). This low population density, together with the traditionally low level of political integration (that is, no overarching state-formation such as was found centuries ago in southern Sumatra or over much of Java) created conditions favorable to extensive linguistic differentiation, although all indigenous languages of Borneo are Austronesian, and apart from a few recent intrusions from the southern Philippines, they descend from languages used by immigrants who probably reached the island within the past four millennia (Bellwood et al 2011).

Borneo is preeminently an island of rivers. The central uplands that run along much of the border separating Kalimantan from Sarawak are the source of many of the great rivers of the island, including the Baram and Rejang/Rajang of Sarawak, and the Kapuas, Barito, Mahakam, and Kahayan of Kalimantan. Sabah is more fragmented by mountains, with only one comparatively long river, the Kinabatangan of eastern Sabah. Patterns of migration and settlement appear to have followed the rivers in many cases, and in the central uplands it is relatively easy to cross over from the headwaters of one river system to those of another that leads to the opposite side of the island, a pattern that is fairly clear in the distribution of Kayan dialects, which are found in the upper courses of the Mahakam, Kahayan and Kapuas rivers of Kalimantan, and the Baram and Rejang rivers of Sarawak.

Among distinctive cultural traits that are associated with much of Borneo are the use of longhouses rather than individual family structures, the traditional distension of earlobes by heavy brass earrings, and the presence of small populations of forest nomads in addition to much larger populations of sedentary agriculturalists. The first of these features is found over much of Sabah, and central and western Borneo, but is rare or absent in the southeast among such groups as the Ngaju and Ma’anyan. Since longhouses are also found in Sumatra, and among Mon-Khmer speakers on the Southeast Asian mainland, but nowhere else in the Austronesian world, it is likely that this trait was acquired by contact with Mon-Khmer speakers during the initial Austronesian settlement of island Southeast Asia. The second trait is found in other parts of the Austronesian world and elsewhere in traditional societies, but is relatively rare in island Southeast Asia. The third trait is one that is rare among non-negrito populations in island Southeast Asia, but is attested in a few scattered
populations, as the Tasaday of the southern Philippines, the Kubu of Sumatra, the Toala of south Sulawesi, and the Kadai of the Sula archipelago in eastern Indonesia.

Traditionally the native peoples of Borneo have been known by outsiders as ‘Dayaks’, generally regarded as a corruption of the widespread Austronesian term daya ‘upriver, toward the interior’. A fundamental ethnic distinction that has developed over much of the island through centuries of contact and cultural influence is that between Malay and Dayak, and in particular between Malay as the medium for introducing Islam vs. the traditional animism of the native population. This is perhaps most clearly embodied in the common expression masuk Melayu (lit. ‘enter Malay’) in the meaning ‘convert to Islam’, a process that has been operating for centuries, and appears to be accelerating at the present time.

**Multiple layers of Malay(ic).** The history of Malay association with Borneo is very complex. Hudson (1970) spoke of ‘endogenous’ and ‘exogenous’ Bornean groups, and included Malay in the latter. However, there is good linguistic evidence that Malay and its closest relatives in southern Sumatra reached their historical locations from southwest Borneo, where a number of Malayic languages are still spoken by indigenous, longhouse-dwelling animistic populations known variously in the literature as ‘Kendayan Dayak’ (Cense and Uhlenbeck 1958), ‘Malayic Dayak’ (Hudson 1970), or Kanayatn (Adelaar 2005). It has been argued that the Malayo-Chamic group of languages arose from a major series of migrations out of southwest Borneo during the first two or three centuries BCE (Blust 1994), and that this migration may have been responsible for the distribution of ironworking technology over much of western Indonesia and adjacent parts of mainland Southeast Asia (Blust 2005b). What complicates the story of Malay contact with Borneo is that some centuries later, after the rise of the Indianized state of Sriwijaya in southern Sumatra, Malay speakers from Sumatra returned to Borneo in connection with inter-archipelagic trade networks that lasted until the arrival of technologically superior European competitors at the beginning of the colonial period, settling areas different from those their ancestral Malayo-Chamic ancestors had left. The most important of these geographically displaced Malay dialects is Brunei Malay, which is surrounded by languages that are not closely related to it. Like other geographically displaced Malay dialects found over much of Indonesia, Brunei Malay appears to have taken root in its present location because of the role of Malay-speaking merchants during the heyday of the spice trade, which brought cloves, nutmeg and other valued commodities from the central Moluccas to locations in western Indonesia from where they could be transported to China or India.

**Malay and the origins of Malagasy and Sama-Bajaw.** Although an awareness of the connections has only emerged gradually, the history of Malagasy and the Sama Bajaw dialects appears to have fundamental ties with the role of pre-colonial Malay-speaking traders. As already noted, it is now all but universally accepted that the Malagasy originated in the Barito basin of southeast Kalimantan (Dahl 1951, Adelaar 1989, Dahl 1991). Adelaar (1989) has argued cogently that the Malagasy did not embark on the voyage to Madagascar unassisted. Rather, they were most likely accompanied on the earliest voyages by Sriwijayan Malays, who must have been far more experienced sailors. Given the limited source material relevant to answering such questions, the nature of this relationship must remain speculative, but it seems likely that Sriwijayan Malays traded with the coastal and moderately inland
peoples of the Barito basin for jungle products, and through this trade relationship, a portion of the indigenous population of this region was drawn out into the wider trade circuit. For reasons that may never be known, they followed the Strait of Malacca to the head of the Bay of Bengal, thence to India, Sri Lanka, the southern edge of the Arabian peninsula, and the coast of east Africa until they discovered the large and apparently still uninhabited island of Madagascar.

The coastal migration route of the Malagasy is marked at various points by the presence of the outrigger canoe, an Austronesian cultural invention that is not known anywhere outside the Austronesian world or areas that are known to have been in contact with Austronesian-speaking peoples. These areas include the Nicobar and Andaman Islands in the Bay of Bengal, where poorly-made outrigger canoes are made, Sri Lanka, where outriggers are used to stabilize large cargo ships, and the Mozambique coast of east Africa facing Madagascar, where some Bantu-speaking peoples traditionally used simple outrigger technology with their canoes.

The precise dating of the Malagasy migration has remained a matter of considerable controversy. A range between the 7th and 13th centuries has been suggested by Adelaar (1989:34), and a more exact date probably will be impossible until a much more intensive archaeological exploration of the island has been undertaken. In any case, given the common acceptance that the Malagasy probably originated in southeast Borneo within the past fourteen centuries (and perhaps more recently), the decision was made to include Malagasy among the ‘languages of Borneo’ both in teaching the course on this topic, and in compiling the bibliography that grew out of it.

As stated above, Blust (2005b, 2007) has argued that the Sama-Bajaw also originated in the Barito river basin of southeast Borneo, and like the Malagasy, owe their origin to trade contacts with Sriwijayan Malays. Like many Malay dialects, Sama-Bajaw dialects are geographically displaced. Although it is most closely related to the Barito languages of southeast Borneo, Sama-Bajaw is found over a territory that includes both the central and southern Philippines, and various parts of Indonesia-Malaysia, from western Sabah to the northern Moluccas. Sama-Bajaw dialects are also saturated with Malay loanwords, in some cases strikingly similar to those borrowed by the Malagasy from Sriwijayan Malay maritime traders. Among the most significant of these loanwords are the terms of the Malay sailing compass (Adelaar 1989:9-11, Blust 2005b:52). Finally, while many Sama-Bajaw groups are now settled on land, traditionally they lived in houseboats, a rare adaptation in the Austronesian world that must have been historically secondary (Blust 1976, 1995).

The question naturally arises why a land-based population would adopt a migratory or at least shifting lifestyle aboard houseboats that allowed them to spread rapidly across much of island southeast Asia, where they still speak dialects of a single language. Given the large number of loanwords in Sama-Bajaw dialects that are no longer in contact with Malay it is simplest to assume that a more intensive contact existed in the past. Moreover, given the similar pattern of distribution for Malay and Sama-Bajaw dialects, it would appear that the two groups once collaborated in collecting the most valuable trade commodity of the archipelago, namely the cloves, mace and nutmegs that grew exclusively in the central
Moluccas and that had to be transported much further west in order to reach the major markets of India and China.

As with the migration from southeast Borneo to Madagascar, the dating of the Sama-Bajaw exodus from the Barito river basin is unsettled, and probably will prove far more difficult to ascertain, since unlike the Malagasy the Sama-Bajaw are not traditionally associated with any specific area of land on which archaeological sites might be located and dated. However, the pattern of Malay loanwords in both languages suggests a similar contact experience, which in turn probably implies a similar time-frame (within a few centuries) for both migrations. The difference between the migrations of the Malagasy and the Sama-Bajaw was then primarily in their directionality and type of adaptation (migration to a ‘new world’ and ultimate separation from the Malays for the Malagasy, conversion to a life on houseboats for purposes of pan-archipelagic trade and ongoing collaboration for centuries with the Malays for the Sama-Bajaw).

Inventory of languages. Compiling a list of languages may seem like a simple task. However, when a serious effort is made to create a comprehensive language inventory it becomes clear that the language/dialect distinction repeatedly raises its ugly head, and nowhere more seriously than where dialect chains or networks make it difficult to apply, if not entirely meaningless. A chaining situation is found where adjacent language communities ABCDEF..... share enough similarity for mutual intelligibility to exist, but where non-adjacent communities have greater difficulty in comprehending one another’s speech in proportion to their distance in the chain. Thus, communities A and B will be considered dialects of a single language, as will those of B and C, C and D, and so forth, but speakers of A and C may have serious difficulty understanding one another, and speakers of A and D may find comprehension impossible. Where, then, do we draw the language boundary? If between A vs. BCD then we are immediately confronted with a conundrum, since while A and D may reasonably be considered different languages this is not true of A and B, and speakers of B and D might reasonably consider their forms of speech to be divergent dialects of a single language. A little experimentation quickly shows that this situation prevails wherever a line of separation is drawn, unless there is a major break somewhere in the chain. An interpretation that is commonly adopted in such cases is that there is in reality a single language with multiple dialects, some of which are not mutually intelligible. This solution helps to avoid the arbitrariness (and unworkability) of drawing lines at various places in a dialect chain that force us to recognize dialects of the same language under more than one language name. However, the recognition of an unbroken dialect continuum as a single language opens up the possibility of a paradox: if one or more links in the chain should happen to disappear what was a single multidialectal language suddenly becomes two or more languages (Grace 1962).

There seems to be no easy answer for what to do with such all too common situations, and in the present bibliography we cannot guarantee that we have been completely consistent in applying the language/dialect distinction. Rather, what we have tried to do is use the names that appear in the literature for language groups in Borneo, since that is the material that must serve as our primary resource. Keeping this proviso in mind we will attempt to provide an inventory of the languages of Borneo before considering the published work that has been
done to describe their structure, functions and history. A source of information that can be used to begin this process is *Ethnologue*, published periodically by the Summer Institute of Linguistics International, and now in its 17th edition (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013). In compiling a list of Bornean languages we have in general included only languages that are indigenous to the island or for which there is historical evidence of a Bornean origin, as with Malagasy and Sama-Bajaw. Although Chinese-speaking communities have been established in various parts of Borneo for several centuries, it was decided not to include these in the present work, since they have a distinct origin, and are perhaps better treated as part of a larger study of the immigrant Chinese of Southeast Asia.

In the following discussion we begin by providing a unified alphabetical list of the languages of Borneo, generally following *Ethnologue*, with information on location and subgroup affiliation attached to each language. Departures from this procedure are discussed briefly below. In many cases *Ethnologue* appears to overdifferentiate, as where it gives five listings for Kayan, although the probability is high that these are all dialects of a single language. Without published data for most of these, however, it is impossible to decide such questions, and the *Ethnologue* decisions are respected until they can be shown to be wrong. In other cases *Ethnologue* appears to alternately overdifferentiate and underdifferentiate, as where it gives Uma’ Lasan separately from what it calls ‘Mainstream Kenyah’ (here called ‘Highland Kenyah’), although this probably is better considered a Kenyah dialect, yet it does not mention Òma Lóngh (Soriente 2006, Blust 2007b), which on grounds of intelligibility must surely be considered a distinct language. In still other cases distinct languages such as Sekapan (Ray 1913) in Sarawak are simply omitted. In addition, there are errors in the classification of some languages, as with Tagal Murut and Paluan, both of which are listed as belonging to the Dayic branch of North Sarawak, but are actually Murutic languages of Sabah. Some categories, such as ‘Kayanic Kenyah’ are also puzzling, since Kayan and Kenyah are very distinct languages/language groups. Finally, there appears to be some duplication, as where Kendayan/Kanayatn and Malayic Dayak are listed separately, the first with a population of 331,700 in 2007 and the second with a population of 520,000 in 1981, yet they have essentially the same referent (Hudson 1970, Adelaar 1991, 2005).

The following are the languages of Borneo generally following *Ethnologue* 17, but modified where the first writer has firsthand knowledge that suggests a different picture. Each language name is followed by subgroup affiliation where this has been established, then location within Borneo by political region, and finally by estimated ethnic population and date when this estimate was made. Alternate language names are separated by slashes, and some minor groups of recent immigrant populations (as speakers of Cocos Islands Malay or Tausug from the southern Philippines) have been ignored, although larger and more longstanding communities, such as the Buginese of East Kalimantan, are included. Question marks for subgroup affiliation indicate uncertainty about statements in the literature because of a paucity of published data:

- Abai Sungai (Paitanic; Sabah; 500 in 2000)
- Ampanang (Greater Barito?; Kalimantan; 30,000 in 1981)
- Aoheng/Penihing (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 2,630 in 1981)
- Bahau (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 19,000 in 2007)
Bajau, West Coast (Greater Barito; Sabah; 55,000 in 2000)
Bakati’ (Land Dayak/Bidayuh; 4,000 in 1986)
Bakati’, Rara (Land Dayak/Bidayuh; 12,000 in 2004)
Bakati’, Sara (Land Dayak/Bidayuh; 4,000 in 2004)
Bakumpai (Greater Barito?; Kalimantan; 100,000 in 2003)
Balau (Malayo-Chamic; Ibanic; Sarawak; 5,000 in 1981)
Banjarese (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 3,502,300 in 2000)
Basap (?; Kalimantan; 15,000 in 2007)
Basap, Sajau (?; Kalimantan; 6,000 in 1981)
Bekatan (?; Sarawak; extinct in 20th century)
Bekati’ (Land Dayak; Kalimantan, Sarawak; 23,300 in 2000; see Bakati’)
Belait (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Brunei; 1,000, date unspecified; = Lemiting in Ray 1913)
Benyadu’ (Land Dayak; Kalimantan; 54,000 in 2007)
Berawan, Central (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; 1,500 in 2010; includes the dialects of Batu Belah and Long Teru)
Berawan, East/Long Jegan Berawan (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; 1,100 in 2010)
Berawan, West/Long Terawan Berawan (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; 1,000 in 2010)
Bidayuh, Bau (Land Dayak; Sarawak; 29,200 in 2000)
Bidayuh, Biatah (Land Dayak; Sarawak, Kalimantan; 72,380 in 2000)
Bidayuh, Bukar Sadong (Land Dayak; Sarawak, Kalimantan; 49,100 in 2000)
Bidayuh, Tringgus-Sembaan (Land Dayak; Sarawak; 850 in 2007)
Bintulu (North Sarawak isolate; Sarawak; 4,200 in 1981)
Bisaya, Brunei/Tutong 1 (Dusunic, Bisaya group; Brunei; 57,600 in 2007)
Bisaya, Sabah (Dusunic, Bisaya group; Sabah; 15,800 in 2000)
Bolongan/Bulungan (Murutic; Kalimantan; 30,000 in 2002)
Bonggi (Bonggi; Sabah; 1,400 in 1990)
Bookan/Baukan/Tengara (Murutic; Sabah; 1,700 in 2000)
Buginese (South Sulawesi; historical immigrants from Sulawesi; 400,000 in Kalimantan in 1981)
Bukat (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 400 in 1981)
Bukitan/Baketan (Melanau-Kajang?; Kalimantan, Sarawak; 570 in 2000)
Burusu (?; Kalimantan; 4,350 in 2007)
Chavacano (Spanish-based creole; Sabah; historical immigrants from Mindanao; 9,200 in 1981)
Dali’ (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; extinct in 20th century)
Dohoi/Kadorih/Ot Danum (Barito; Kalimantan; 78,800 in 2007)
Dumpas (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,100 in 2000)
Dusun, Central/Central Kadazan (Dusunic; Sabah; 141,000 in 1991)
Dusun Deyah (Barito; Kalimantan; 20,000 in 1981)
Dusun, Kimaragang (Dusunic; Sabah; 25,000 in 2007)
Dusun Malang (Barito; Kalimantan; 4,500 in 2003)
Dusun-Murut (Murutic; Sabah; 1,000-1,200 in 1985)
Dusun, Rungus (Dusunic; Sabah; 60,000 in 2009)
Dusun, Segama/Upper Kinabatangan (Paitanic; Sabah; 5,000 in 2000)  
Dusun, Sugut/Sugut Kadazan (Dusunic; Sabah; 12,200 in 2000)  
Dusun, Tambunan (Dusunic; Sabah; 15,600 in 2000)  
Dusun, Tempasuk/Tindal Dusun (Dusunic; Sabah; 6,000 in 1981)  
Dusun Witu (Barito; Kalimantan; 5,000 in 2003)  
Gana/Keningau Dusun (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,000-2,000 in 2000)  
Hovongan (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 1,000 in 1991)  
Iban (Malayo-Chamic; Sarawak, Brunei; 694,400 in 2004)  
Ida’an (Northeast Sabah?; Sabah; 5,500 in 2000)  
Iranun/Ilanun (Danaw; Sabah; historical immigrants from Mindanao; 15,000 in Sabah in 1981)  
 Jangkang (Land Dayak; Kalimantan; 37,000 in 2007)  
Javanese (?; Sabah; historical immigrants from Java; 300,000 in Sabah in 1981)  
Kadazan, Coastal (Dusunic; Sabah; 60,000 in 1986)  
Kadazan, Eastern/Labuk-Kinabatangan Kadazan (Dusunic; Sabah; 20,600 in 2000)  
Kadazan, Klias River (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,000 in 1984)  
Kajaman/Kejaman (Melanau-Kajang?; Sarawak; 500 in 1981)  
Kalabakan/Kalabakan Murut/Tawau Murut (Murutic; Sabah; 2,230 in 2000)  
Kanayatn/Kendayan (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan, Sarawak; 331,700 in 2007)  
Kayan, Baram (North Sarawak, Kayanic; Sarawak; 4,150 in 1981)  
Kayan, Busang (Kayanic; Kalimantan; 3,000 in 1981)  
Kayan, Kahayan river (Kayanic; Kalimantan; 2,000 in 1981)  
Kayan, Mahakam (Kayanic; Kalimantan; 1,300 in 1981)  
Kayan, Mendalam (Kayanic; Kalimantan; 1,500 in 1981)  
Kayan, Rejang (North Sarawak, Kayanic; Sarawak; 3,030 in 1981)  
Kayan, Wahau (Kayanic; Kalimantan; 500 in 1981)  
Kelabit (North Sarawak, Dayic; Sarawak, Kalimantan; 4,000 in 2011)  
Kembayan (Land Dayak; Kalimantan; 11,000 in 2007)  
Keninjal (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 32,000 in 2007)  
Kenyah, Highland (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Sarawak, Kalimantan; 32,000 in 2007)  
Kenyah, Lebu’ Kulit (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Kalimantan; population unknown)  
Kenyah, Long Wat (North Sarawak, Kenyah; 600 in 1981)  
Kenyah, Lowland (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Sarawak; population unknown, but includes  
  Long Ikang, Long San and Long Sela’an)  
Kenyah, Óma Lóngh (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Kalimantan; population unknown)  
Kenyah, Uma? Lasan (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Kalimantan; 1,250 in 1981)  
Kenyah, Wahau (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Kalimantan, Sarawak; 9,000 in 2007)  
Kereho (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 500 in 2003)  
Kiput (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; 2,460 in 1981)  
Kohin/Seruyan (Greater Barito?; Kalimantan; 8,000 in 2003)  
Kota Marudu Talantang (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,800 in 2000)  
Kota Marudu Tinagas (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,250 in 1985)  
Kuijau (Dusunic; Sabah; 7,910 in 2000)  
Lahanan (Melanau-Kajang; Sarawak; 350 in 1981)  
Lawangan (Barito; Kalimantan; 100,000 in 1981)  
Lelak (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; extinct in 20th century)
Lengilu (North Sarawak, Dayic; Kalimantan; 3 in 2000)
Lobu, Lanas (Paitanic; Sabah; 2,800 in 1986)
Lobu, Tampias (Paitanic; Sabah; 1,800 in 1985)
Lotud/Dusun Lotud (Dusunic; Sabah; Paitanic; 5,000 in 1985)
Lun Bawang/Lun Dayeh (North Sarawak, Dayic; Sarawak, Brunei, Sabah, Kalimantan; 47,500 in 2007)
Ma’anayan (Barito; Kalimantan; 150,000 in 2003)
Malay, Berau (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 11,700 in 2007)
Malay, Brunei/Kedayan (Malayo-Chamic; Brunei; 215,000 in 1984)
Malay, Bukit (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 59,000 in 2007)
Malay, Kota Bangun Kutai (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 80,000 in 1981)
Malay, Sarawak (Malayo-Chamic; Sarawak; number of speakers unknown)
Malay, Tenggarong Kutai (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 210,000 in 1981)
Maloh/Embaloh (South Sulawesi?; Kalimantan; 10,000 in 1991)
Melanau, Central/Sarikie Melanau/Mukah-Oya Melanau/Dalat Melanau/Balingian Melanau (Melanau-Kajang; 113,280 in 2000)
Melanau, Daro-Matu (Melanau-Kajang; 7,600 in 1981)
Melanau, Kanowit-Tanjong (Melanau-Kajang; 500 in 2000)
Melanau, Sibu (Melanau-Kajang; 420 in 1981)
Minokok (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,200 in 2007)
Miri (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; population unknown)
Modang (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 15,300 in 1981)
Mualang (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 40,000 in 2007)
Murik (Kayanic; Sarawak; 1,120 in 1981)
Murut, Beaufort (Murutic; Sabah; 1,200-1,700 in 1982)
Murut, Kalabakan (Murutic; Sabah; population unknown)
Murut, Keningau (Murutic; Sabah; 7,000 in 2000)
Murut, Okolod (Murutic; Kalimantan, Sabah; 4,970 in 2000)
Murut, Selungai (Murutic; Kalimantan, Sabah; 1,240 in 2000)
Murut, Sembakung (Murutic; Kalimantan, Sabah; 3,180 in 2000)
Murut, Serudung/Tawau Murut (Murutic; Sabah; 350-450 in 2000)
Murut, Tagal (Murutic; Sabah; 13,000-14,000 in 2000)
Murut, Timugon (Murutic; Sabah; 7,000-8,000 in 2000)
Narum (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Sarawak; 3,000 in 2012)
Ngaju Dayak (Barito; Kalimantan; 890,000 in 2003)
Öma Lôngh (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Kalimantan; 3,000 in 2004)
Paku (Barito; Kalimantan; 3,500 in 2003)
Paluan (Murutic; Sabah; 55,000 in 2000)
Papar/Bajau Bukit (Dusunic; Sabah; 1,000 in 2000)
Penan Bah/Penan Biau (Rejang-Sajau?; Sarawak; 450 in 1981)
Penan, Eastern (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Sarawak; 10,000 in 2011)
Penan, Western (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Sarawak; 3,400 in 2007)
Punan Aput (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 370 in 1981)
Punan Batu (Melanau-Kajang?; Sarawak; 30 in 2000)
Punan Merah (Kayanic?; Kalimantan; 140 in 1981)
Punan Merap (?; Kalimantan; 200 in 1981)
Punan Tubu (?; Kalimantan; 2,000 in 1981)
Putoh (North Sarawak, Dayic; Kalimantan; 6,000 in 1981; possibly a Lun Bawang dialect)
Remun (Malayo-Chamic, Ibanic; Sarawak; 3,500 in 2000)
Ribun (Land Dayak; Kalimantan; 45,000 in 1981)
Sa’ban (North Sarawak, Dayic; Sarawak, Kalimantan; 1,960 in 2000)
Salako/Selako/Badameà (Malayo-Chamic, Kendayan; Sarawak; 10,700 in 2000)
Sanggau (Land Dayak; Kalimantan; 45,000 in 1981)
Seberuang (Malayo-Chamic; Kalimantan; 37,000 in 2007)
Sebop (North Sarawak, Kenyah; Sarawak; 1,730 in 1981)
Sebuyau (Malayo-Chamic, Ibanic; Sarawak; 9,000 in 1981)
Segai (Kayanic; Kalimantan; 2,000 in 1981; possibly a Modang dialect)
Sekapan (Melanau-Kajang; Sarawak; 750 in 1981)
Semandang (Land Dayak; Kalimantan; 20,000 in 2004)
Seron (Melanau-Kajang?; Sarawak; extinct in 19th century)
Sian (Melanau-Kajang?; Sarawak; 50 in 2000)
Siang (Barito; Kalimantan; 60,000 in 1981)
Taboyan/Tawoyan (Barito; Kalimantan; 20,000 in 1981)
Taman (South Sulawesi?; Kalimantan; 30,000 in 2007)
Tatana/Tatana’ (Dusunic, Bisaya group; Sabah; 5,500 in 1982)
Tidong (Murutic; Kalimantan, Sabah; 47,000 in 2007)
Tobilung/Tebilung (Dusunic; Sabah; 8,850 in 2007)
Tombonuwo/Lingkabau (Paitanic; Sabah; 10,000 in 2000)
Tring (North Sarawak, Dayic; Sarawak; 550 in 2000)
Tunjung (Greater Barito?; Kalimantan; 50,000 in 2008)
Tutong/Tutong 2 (North Sarawak, Berawan-Lower Baram; Brunei; 16,600 in 2006)
Ukit (Melanau-Kajang?; Sarawak; 120 in 1981)

Nearly all languages of Sabah have a Philippine-type structure, in which the verb may take at least three different affixes marking voice (also called ‘focus’). Most researchers divide them into four major groups: Dusunic, Murutic, Paitanic and Bonggi. Ida’an appears to constitute a fifth branch, although it may subgroup with Bonggi (Blust 2010: 63).

The only indigenous language groups of Brunei that are not found more commonly in other areas are Belait, Brunei Malay/Kedayan, and Tutong/Tutong2. However, Belait is an immigrant group from the Baram river basin of northern Sarawak that apparently arrived within the past century, and Brunei Malay was introduced to Brunei Bay (Bandar Seri Begawan) in pre-Islamic times, probably through the extensive trading network of Sriwijayan Malays.

The languages of northern Sarawak are transitional between Philippine-type languages with a conservative four-voice ‘focus’ system and western Indonesian languages with an active/passive voice system similar to, but not identical to that of Malay. No language of Sarawak preserves the four voices typical of Philippine languages, although Lun Dayeh reportedly preserves a three-way contrast (Clayre 1991), and several other languages retain affixation that was earlier associated with the voice system, but now functions only in nominalizations or in verbal constructions that do not express voice distinctions.
Nearly all languages of northern Sarawak show evidence that the PAN voiced obstruents *b, *d, *z, *j, *g have split according to conditions that are largely, but not completely predictable. The results of this split are typologically unusual, in that they produced a series of true voiced aspirates in Kelabit-Lun Dayeh, corresponding to implosives in Bintulu, and to such unexpected outcomes as the alternation of b with s in Kiput (Blust 2003). Because of the very specific and unusual nature of this innovation it has been used to establish a North Sarawak subgroup, although one that remains somewhat open-ended, since the phonological evidence for inclusion in this group is sometimes ambiguous (Blust 1969, 1974, 2006). The classification of the remaining languages of Sarawak remains problematic. The extensive Melanau dialect chain, reaching from Balingian in the north to the Rejang delta in the south, and up the Rejang river at least as far as Kanowit, may belong to a larger Melanau-Kajang group that also includes Kejaman, Lahanan, Sekapan and perhaps some other languages of the upper Rejang and areas across the border in Kalimantan, but this remains to be firmly established. A few other remnant and extinct populations of this area also remain unclassified, as Sian/Sihan, Ukit and Seru. Further south the Land Dayak (Bidayuh) languages form a rather distinct group with no immediately apparent ties to other languages of the region.

The best-established linguistic grouping in Kalimantan probably is the Barito Family (Hudson 1967), which also (in extended form) includes Malagasy, and the Sama-Bajaw languages. Many dialects of Kenyah, Kayan and Kelabit-Lun Dayeh are found in Kalimantan as well as in Sarawak, but large areas of Kalimantan remain poorly described, and the classification of languages such as Basap, Tunjung, or even Modang is still unclear.
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OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE ON THE LANGUAGES OF BORNEO

Background: previous bibliographies of the languages of Borneo. In 1955 The Royal Institute for Linguistics, Geography and Ethnology (Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde) in The Hague, Netherlands, published the first of a series of detailed bibliographies on the languages of Indonesia (including Malaysia and Brunei). It was titled Bibliographical Series 1: Languages of Sumatra. Three years later the second title in this series appeared as Bibliographical Series 2: Languages of Borneo (Cense and Uhlenbeck 1958). In time eight volumes appeared, covering the whole of the former Netherlands East Indies and the linguistically and culturally inseparable regions bordering them. Apart from Timor, Borneo is the only island covered in this series with a colonial history that was not exclusively Dutch. As a result, a significant part of the material reviewed was published in English, unlike the great majority of citations in the other volumes.

In the nearly sixty years since this landmark bibliographical series was initiated, and the more than twenty since it ended, there was been an explosion of research activity on the languages of insular Southeast Asia, much of it in English, Malay and Indonesian. This has resulted in several bibliographies that either focus on the languages of Borneo, or include them within a wider bibliographic compass. The most comprehensive of these are Avé, King and de Wit (1983), a multi-topic bibliography for the Indonesian province of West Kalimantan, Rousseau (1988), which covers the anthropology and linguistics of a region defined by general ethnographic rather than political boundaries, Collins (1990), which focuses exclusively on language, and more particularly on the Malay dialects spoken in Borneo, and Combrink, Soderberg, Boutin and Boutin (2008), which covers the linguistics and anthropology of Sabah in fine detail. However, none of these bibliographies covers work on languages for the whole of Borneo, and therefore none of them can claim to be a successor to Cense and Uhlenbeck (1958). By contrast, it is the specific aim of this book to provide a modernization of the broad coverage of work on the languages of Borneo that characterized the Cense and Uhlenbeck volume.

In any bibliography the question arises where to draw the line between what should properly be included and what should not. There are two general considerations that affect this decision. One is the criterion of relevance. Some publications by social anthropologists, scholars in related disciplines, missionaries or others, may contain scattered remarks on language (short lists of kinship terms, directional terms, or the like), but the content may be too restricted for such publications to be considered works of real significance to linguists or others concerned with the indigenous languages of Borneo. A few descriptions of kinship terminology are included in the present collection if they are relatively comprehensive, and a few ethnobotanical studies have also been included if they provide a particularly rich inventory of plant terms with Linnaean binomials, but most studies of this kind have been omitted as of only marginal significance to the study of language. The second criterion is accessibility. Published works by their nature are publicly available, whether they were produced on paper or electronically. Unpublished works, however, are much more difficult to treat. In general we have decided to include unpublished doctoral dissertations, both
because one expects them to be major contributions to knowledge, and because they are normally available by request through the main library of the university in which they were defended. Unpublished Master’s and Batchelor’s theses are also included, although these may often be more difficult to obtain. Unpublished conference papers, on the other hand, comprise a category of manuscripts that is far less secure in terms of accessibility. In many cases conference ‘papers’ are simply collections of notes that provided the foundation for a 20-minute (or, in the case of keynotes, 50-minute) talk, and requests for access to them are likely to be met with protests that nothing is ready for public viewing. In view of this common situation we have excluded unpublished conference papers from the bibliography. Somewhat similar is the case of Indonesian manuscripts that are described by the rubric ‘laporan penelitian’ [research report], since these appear to be internal government documents rather than genuine publications. Finally, government publications that provide no names of authors are cited as ‘Anon’ rather than by the name of the government organization that sponsored the work.

The division of labor in creating this bibliography has been split between computer-searching for sources, and producing the finished product. The search for sources began during the Languages of Borneo class, in which three of the students were actively involved: Victoria Yen-hsin Chen, Jonathan Cheng-chuen Kuo and Alexander D. Smith. Of these, Smith has continued the search most actively, and has located most of the Malagasy material that appears in this book, as well as most sources written in Indonesian. Blust has supplied most material for Sarawak, Brunei and Sabah, and has been responsible for the organization and general writing of the volume.

Organization. Initially it was decided to organize the entries into general categories based on the nature of the material, and to subdivide these categories by regions of Borneo (Sabah, Brunei, Sarawak, Kalimantan). The categories chosen to organize the material were the following:

1. bibliography
2. dictionary
3. vocabulary
4. pedagogical grammar
5. descriptive grammar
6. shorter descriptive study
7. longer descriptive study
8. theoretical study
9. comparative study
10. sociolinguistic study
11. ethnolinguistic study
12. texts
13. survey
14. review
15. other
It seemed best to treat previous bibliographies separately, so the total body of material collected was divided into 1. Bibliographies and 2. Publications on particular languages or collections of languages. We thus had a category for all dictionaries which was then subdivided into Sabah, Brunei, Sarawak and Kalimantan, a category for vocabularies/wordlists with a similar division by political region, and so forth. The idea of this organizational schema was to facilitate access to materials of a particular kind: for anyone interested in dictionaries of the languages of Borneo, for example, they could all be found in a single location. However, in attempting to implement this plan we encountered certain problems, as with dictionaries or vocabularies of languages found in more than one political division of Borneo. Perhaps the most serious problem we struggled with was how to fit some publications into any of the relatively well-defined categories, and this led us to create category 15, ‘other’. While this provided a solution of sorts, it did not seem entirely satisfactory, and in the end we decided to abandon this organization, and instead give a comprehensive listing of all non-bibliographic works by author’s last name. To allow the kind of information retrieval we had hoped to capture with the original schema we have provided three keywords with each dictionary entry: 1. type of work, 2. area represented, and 3. language in which the text is written or the glosses appear. Thus, Mataim Bakar (1990) reads 1. shorter descriptive study, 2. Brunei, 3. Malay, while Rabenilaina (1974) reads 1. descriptive grammar, 2. Madagascar, 3. French. In cases such as Ray (1913), which covers the entire island, we have indicated ‘Borneo’ rather than listing each political subdivision separately. We made a spirited attempt to annotate as many entries as possible where we felt competent to do so, but this soon began to appear like an endless task, and one that was often only possible where physical copies of publications could be obtained. Annotations appear after entries as ‘COMMENT’, and are identified by authorship as (AS) or (RB).

**Research methodology.** The processes involved in the research and organization of resources for the present volume are complex, and demanded large amounts of time and effort for what was often a small payback. There is no single and straightforward way to gather a comprehensive list of relevant resources, and one must instead rely on a variety of online tools to locate and verify sources for inclusion. Online tools, while highly convenient, are only semi-comprehensive at best, and inaccurate and misleading at worst. For a number of resources that are gathered online it remains absolutely necessary to locate a hard copy for verification, or at the very least to find photographs of the work to verify online information. This of course only adds to the length and complexity of the initial research. The processes involved in the current volume are detailed below, with comments on the usefulness of certain tools and suggestions for future researchers.

A number of online tools were used to compile this bibliography. The most helpful and far-reaching of these was WorldCat, an online catalogue of library holdings accessible by those associated with an academic institution. According to WorldCat, users have immediate access to the holdings of over 10,000 libraries worldwide. Indeed, many of the sources listed in the bibliography are exceptionally rare, appearing in only a handful of libraries worldwide. Rarity is not necessarily an obstacle to reading these works, because many are accessible via interlibrary loan, as long as the researcher is associated with an academic institution. The major strength of using a tool like WorldCat is the ability to locate rare resources. On the other hand, a drawback to working through online library catalogues is that the most recent
publications are often not included. Research for this bibliography took place in 2013 and resources available from WorldCat were rarely more recent than 2010. It was thus necessary to supplement searching library catalogues with alternative online research tools such as Academic Search Premier (EBSCO) which often includes more recent publications, Microsoft Academic Search which organizes sources based on author and number of citations, JSTOR which provides a catalogue of publications by journal, and Google Scholar among others.

In addition to online resources we found it necessary to engage in hands-on research. Older numbers of journals are often not available online, and those that were published before the push for online availability usually must be scanned individually. Needless to say, not all journals have gone through this arduous process and many remain available only as hard copies. Google has been involved in much recent digitalization of older works which are made available free of cost, assuming that there are no current copyright claims. Google Books proved invaluable while searching for hard copies of The Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine, a journal from the late 1800’s that was published by the London Misisonary Society. This journal has numerous linguistics articles that are included in the present volume. The age and rarity of the publications however, made retrieving basic information like page numbers prohibitively difficult. To make matters more complex, volumes 1-8 of The Annual were rebound and published in two sets of four volumes. Volumes 1-4 were published from 1875-1879, but were bound together in 1885 and published as volume 1, numbers 1-4 with continuous pagination. The same was done with volumes 5-8, which were reprinted in 1896 as volume 2 numbers 5-8. Seeing references to a single article with inconsistent dates, volume numbers, and page numbers is frustrating to say the least. With the photocopies made available online however, the authors were able to have consistent referencing to this journal. In the present volume years, volume numbers, and page numbers for The Annual reflect those of the re-bound volumes, which are more readily available in libraries and through interlibrary loans.

While the push for online availability of scholarly materials has made research like that which was undertaken for this bibliography easier, one cannot rely solely on online materials if the product is to be considered accurate and comprehensive. An example showing how necessary hard copies are comes from Richardson (1885) in the current volume. This large dictionary of Malagasy comes with a 50 page forward written by William Cousins. Certain online resources list Cousins as a co-author while others list only Richardson. Because a hard copy was available to us this issue was resolved by consulting the book, which lists only Richardson as author. Without a hard copy it would have been impossible to know who to list as author(s), and this may have resulted in an inaccurate listing in the bibliography. Mislabeled online sources are not at all unusual. This is especially true when working with sources in languages other than English. It was common while conducting the initial search for materials for the present volume for editors and publishing houses to be mistakenly listed as co-authors. When dealing with large amounts of data these types of mistakes may go unnoticed by the researcher who has to check the accuracy of thousands of sources. Because the main goal of many organizations is to digitize as many volumes as possible, quality often takes second place to quantity. This is not meant to minimize the importance of making
resources available online, but it nevertheless underlines the responsibility of the researcher to track down and double check online references with hard copies and photocopies.

From the onset of data collection one is faced with the reality that the number of resources available will likely remain greater than the number of resources that can be gathered and organized into any bibliographic work. While Borneo has been comparatively neglected by linguists, there still exists a large backlog of relevant material that must be included, as well as a more recent increase in academic interest and work on the languages of this area. In order to deal with the large volume of data available, the researcher needs to break up the project into smaller, more manageable tasks that can be completed one by one, slowly consolidating over time into a larger and more comprehensive work. This is partially represented in the original organization of the current volume which was separated into sections based on type of work and geographic area. The data collection process takes this one step farther. Two lists were created to aid in the collection of data, a list of authors and a list of languages. The compilers then had to check these lists one item at a time collecting as much information as possible on each language and author. This task alone is responsible for the majority of sources that appear in the present volume.

After gathering as much information as possible from the list of individual languages one then can begin to compile a fairly comprehensive list of authors. The process of gathering information again involves a sometimes tedious search. It may be possible to locate an author’s personal webpage or official university page which generally contains a full or select list of publications. In other cases one must scour the internet for information, creating a patchwork of references on authors who have not made a list of publications available online or who conducted their research before online listing was common. Both the search for information on individual languages and the search for information on individual authors can be completed using the online tools mentioned above in conjunction with simple searches using any popular search engine, or by contacting the authors directly.

In addition, there were certain obvious ‘targets’ to check in terms of well-established publication outlets. All issues of *The Sarawak Museum Journal*, *The Sabah Museum Journal*, and the *Borneo Research Bulletin* were carefully screened to find any item that should be included in the present collection, and similar but less exhaustive attention was paid to several more general journals that sometimes include publications on the languages of Borneo, as the *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* in The Netherlands, *Pacific Linguistics* in Canberra, Australia, and *Oceanic Linguistics* in Hawai’i.

The foregoing procedures constituted the first phase in assembling relevant material. The second phase consisted of locating as many existing lists of references as possible, and searching through them for additional entries. This phase was the most labor-intensive, as it often involved hours a day reading through lists of references, only a small percentage of which turned out to be useful. An important decision was how much to include of material present in earlier bibliographies, as Cense and Uhlenbeck (1958) for the languages of Borneo as a whole, or Collins (1996) for the Malay dialects of Borneo.
This process was then repeated with the references found in the works already listed. That is, for each entry cited it was also necessary to inspect all references at the end of that source to ensure that nothing further was missed. Following such a multi-branching approach is not easy or time efficient, but in order to create a truly comprehensive work it is necessary. The bibliography that follows contains over 1,400 entries from more than 700 authors as a result of using a thorough methodology in data collection. Although the goal is to create a definitive work of all relevant references on the languages of Borneo, there will always be some sources that are overlooked. Using the methodology outlined above however, the authors have taken steps to minimize the number of missed sources with enough confidence to publish a bibliography that can truly be called comprehensive within its scope and focus.

**The material.** The material included in this bibliography is divided into three parts. Part 2.1 lists all known bibliographies that relate directly or indirectly to the languages of Borneo. This is separated from the main listing because it is fundamentally different in nature: rather than providing information on any of the languages of Borneo the entries in this section refer to other sources where such information can be found, and in some cases can serve to supplement the citations in the present work. Part 2.2 cites works of a more general nature that refer in passing to one or more languages of Borneo, but do not focus specifically on them. Part 2.3 cites works that are concerned specifically with languages of Borneo, Madagascar or the diasporic Sama-Bajau. This is the main body of the bibliography, and it contains a list of all sources we have been able to locate in alphabetical order by author’s last name.

Malaysian and Indonesian names present a referencing problem for a work written in English, as they are often cited in the order GIVEN NAME-FAMILY NAME, and some writers (as the Malaysian linguist Asmah Haji Omar) would be difficult to recognize if cited in the form Haji Omar, Asmah. However, other Malaysian and Indonesian scholars use the Western naming order, particularly where they have co-authored a publication with an English-speaking writer. In general we have tried to following the order FAMILY NAME-GIVEN NAME, but have made exceptions where this would appear awkward, as noted above.

**SOURCES AND ABBREVIATIONS**

**AAMM:** *The Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine* (The London Missionary Society, Antananarivo; from 1875 to 1878 and 1881 to 1896)

**BAM:** *Bulletin de l’académie malgache* (Tananarive; since 1902)

**BKI:** *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* (Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, The Hague and Leiden; since 1851)

**BMJ:** *Brunei Museum Journal* (Brunei Darussalam; since 1969)

**BRB:** *Borneo Research Bulletin* (Borneo Research Council, Phillips, Maine and College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia; since 1969)
DB: Dewan Bahasa (journal of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, or National Language Institute, Kuala Lumpur; established as Balai Pustaka; since 1956)

ILDEP: Indonesian Languages Development Project (jointly sponsored by the University of Leiden and the Indonesian government for upgrading the linguistic training of Indonesian teachers during the 1970s and 1980s)

JMBRAS: Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (Kuala Lumpur; succeeded JSBRAS in 1923 as Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; later changed to its present title)

JSBRAS: Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (Singapore; 1878-1924)

KITLV: Koninklijk Instituut voor taal-, land-, en volkenkunde (Leiden, but formerly The Hague; since 1851)

LI: Linguistik Indonesia

NLLT: Natural Language and Linguistic Theory

NUSA: Linguistic studies of Indonesian and other languages in Indonesia (Jakarta; began as Miscellaneous studies in Indonesian and languages in Indonesia; since 1975)

PJL: Philippine Journal of Linguistics (Manila; since 1970)

OL: Oceanic Linguistics (Honolulu; since 1962)


SEAS Bulletin (Kuala Lumpur, Southeast Asian Studies Regional Exchange Program; since 1994)

SIL: Summer Institute of Linguistics (Wycliffe Bible Translators)

SMJ: The Sarawak Museum Journal (Kuching; since 1913)

SPLC: Studies in Philippine languages and cultures. (Summer Institute of Linguistics, Manila; began as Studies in Philippine linguistics (SPL); since 1977)

SSJ: Sabah Society Journal (Kota Kinabalu; since 1961)

VKI: Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut (The Hague and Leiden; since 1851)
PART 2.1: PREVIOUS BIBLIOGRAPHIES


COMMENT. This index contains a list of every article published in the *Borneo Research Bulletin* from 1969 to 2012, organized alphabetically by title. This website also contains two separate lists with the same information, one organized by author’s last name and the other by volume number. (RB)


Wurtzburg, C. E. 1927. *An index to all the journals (no. 1-86) of the Straits branch of the Royal Asiatic Society from its foundation until its change of title to Malayan branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and to Notes and Queries I to IV*. Singapore: Fraser & Neave. 101 pp.

PART 2.2

WORKS OF WIDER SCOPE THAT REFER TO LANGUAGES OF BORNEO, MADAGASCAR OR THE DIASPORIC SAMA-BAJAW


COMMENT. This is a memorial volume conceived to honor the memory of David John (‘Jack’) Prentice, a pioneer researcher on the Murutic languages of Sabah, and an important contributor to studies of Malay. It contains a preface and twelve chapters, six of which are concerned with languages of Borneo. (RB)


COMMENT. A broad survey volume with numerous contributors. Four chapters concern languages relevant to this bibliography: Sama (Bajau) by Jun Akamine, Kimaragang Dusun by Paul Kroeger, Belait by Adrian Clynes, and Malagasy by Janie Rasoloson and Carl Rubino. (RB)


COMMENT. This slender volume contains the proceedings of a 1986 conference sponsored by the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka in Kuala Lumpur on the origins of Malay. It contains seven papers, written by Robert Blust, Bernd Nothofer, K.A. Adelaar, Harimurti Kridalaksana, John U. Wolff, D.J. Prentice, and Hein Steinhauer. These papers cover a fairly wide range of topics, but several of them question the traditional view of Malay as originating in Sumatra (a view that was clearly influenced by the fact that the earliest
historical records of a Malay-like language are found in connection with the Indianized state of Sriwijaya from the 7th century onward). An alternative hypothesis is presented which suggests that before its development in southern Sumatra, Malay evolved out of a linguistic complex in southwest Borneo, a theme that was explored in greater depth at a similar conference hosted by the Institute of the Malay World and Civilization (ATMA), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia fourteen years later in 2000 (Collins and Sariyan 2006).


COMMENT. A multilingual phrasebook with introduction providing basic cultural guidelines for travelers, tables of pronouns, greetings and leavetakings, compliments and courtesy, and a variety of other useful expressions in four local languages as well as Pilipino and English. Sinama and Yakan are relevant for the present volume. (AS)


COMMENT. This article makes two major contributions. The first is an overview of voice in the languages of Nusantara (Indonesia and Malaysian Borneo). The author describes four basic types of voice systems, 1) languages with voice morphology inherited from Proto-Austronesian, 2) languages with a mixed voice morphology, 3) languages with isolating voice morphology, and 4) languages with no voice morphology. The first category is subdivided into languages that have simplified the original four voice system into an active/passive contrast (Indonesian type), and languages that preserve the original voice system to some degree (Tagalog type). The second contribution of the paper is an analysis of the ergative properties of the languages of Nusantara with respect to the diversity of voice systems described earlier. The paper contains a number of editorial errors, not the least of which is the lack of a fourth section (the section numbering is 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, with no mention of why the numbering skips section four). (AS)


COMMENT. This book is concerned with political oratory in Malagasy society and its transformation under Western cultural influence. (AS)


COMMENT. This collection of 443 new Austronesian etymologies uses material drawn from a number of the languages of Borneo (Bintulu, Dali’, Dohoi, Iban, Kadazan, Kapuas, Kayan, Kelabit, Kenyah, Matu Melanau, Ngaju Dayak, Oya Melanau, Tanjong, Piching Land Dayak, Rungus Dusun, Singhi Land Dayak, Siang, Tebeduh Land Dayak), as well as Malagasy, considered in a broader comparative context. Much the same applies to Blust (1973b, 1980, 1983/84, 1986b, and 1989). (RB)


COMMENT. A preliminary reconstruction of the pronoun system of Proto-Austronesian and an exploration of the subgrouping implications this entails. It is argued that all Austronesian languages outside Taiwan share certain innovations in the pronouns, of which the most
important are the shift of PAN *-mu ‘2pl genitive’ to PMP *-mu ‘2sg genitive’, and the paradigmatic leveling in PAN *iten ‘1pl incl. absolute possessor’, *amen ‘1pl excl. absolute possessor’ to PMP *aten, *amen in the same meanings. The simplest explanation for these shared innovations is that they continue a single change in a language (Proto-Malayo-Polynesian) ancestral to all Austronesian languages outside Taiwan. Although evidence for the first of these innovations is spread throughout the Austronesian language family, critical evidence for the second is found chiefly in languages of the Philippines and Sabah. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper documents four distinct methods of marking the vocative forms of nouns, and shows that the variable forms of such reconstructions as *ina/tina ‘mother’ and *ama/tama ‘father’ involve a generally fossilized referential prefix *t- or *ta-. (RB)


COMMENT. Relying on the distribution of cognate sets this paper and its sequel (Blust 1991) documents the existence and relative antiquity of two taboos found in an area covering part of the Philippines and Borneo. The *busun taboo appears to have involved offenses against status, and the consequence of violating it was an inflated abdomen. The *baliw taboo, also called the ‘thunder complex’, involved punishment for offenses against the thunder god (in particular, treating animals as humans, or engaging in other acts that reflect a confusion of categories), and resulted in lightning strikes, floods and punitive petrification. There are distributional grounds for believing that the latter taboo was acquired by speakers of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian from a preexisting Negrito population in the northern Philippines, and then transmitted as part of their native cultural heritage as they expanded southward and eastward into the western Pacific. (RB)


COMMENT. As part of a general critique of the lexicostatistically-based claim that Malay, Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, Acehnese and the Lampungic subfamily form a linguistic subgroup, this paper proposed that Malay and the Chamic languages form a genetic unit that originated in southwest Borneo, a claim that was further developed in later work. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper examines two linguistic etymologies and extracts culture-historical inferences from them. The first of these is the Proto-Malayo-Polynesian reconstruction *liaŋ* ‘cave’, which retains this meaning in a number of languages reaching from the northern Philippines to northern Vanuatu, but has come to refer to the ironwood mortuary pillars called *lejang* or *lijeng* by the Berawan, or to ordinary graves or cemeteries called *liaŋ* by the Baram Kayan or the Kenyah of Long Anap or Long Wat. As with English words like ‘pen’ (< Latin *penna* ‘feather’), or clock (< Anglo-Saxon *clugge* ‘bell’), the etymology of these burial terms in languages of northern Sarawak encodes evidence of an earlier cultural practice (writing with feather quills for ‘pen’, public time-keeping with church bells for ‘clock’, and cave burial for reflexes of *liaŋ*). Although the practice of cave burial had become moribund or defunct in northern Sarawak by the time of first Western contact, the inference that it existed among prehistoric speakers of North Sarawak languages is supported by evidence from both linguistics and archaeology. (RB)


COMMENT. This is a follow-up to Blust (1981), which further documents the distribution of the ‘thunder complex’ among three Austronesian-speaking groups in southeast New Guinea. (RB)


COMMENT. Social anthropologists with an interest in diachronic issues are rarely trained in historical linguistics, and this paper aims to show why the Comparative Method of linguistics should be better known and appreciated among them. It starts by documenting the need to
reconstruct four sibling terms for Proto-Malayo-Polynesian that expressed the meanings ‘elder parallel sibling’, ‘younger parallel sibling’, ‘male cross sibling’ and ‘female cross sibling’. Based on statistical correlations in broad cross-cultural sampling, it follows that PMP probably had descent groups (implied by the cross/parallel distinction in sibling terms). In addition it is shown that the monomorphemic cross sibling terms (PMP *ñaRə ‘brother of a woman’, *betaw ‘sister of a man’) were replaced in numerous languages throughout the Malayo-Polynesian branch of Austronesian by terms that appear to have had the meaning ‘male/female’ or ‘male child/female child’. Structural arguments from possessive constructions show that the latter actually meant ‘member of the ‘male’ group/member of the ‘female’ group), where ‘male’ and ‘female’ have the abstract classificatory sense common in systems of dualistic cosmological classification (sky/earth, right/left, male/female, wife-givers/wife-takers, etc.). The use of structurally identical terms for the wife-giving (‘male’) and wife-taking (‘female’) groups in systems of asymmetric alliance make it clear that the original monomorphemic cross sibling terms were replaced within a context of favored matrilateral cross-cousin marriage which must, therefore, have existed in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian society. Although most of the support for this argument comes from the Batak languages of northern Sumatra and a variety of languages in eastern Indonesia, critical support for the four-term sibling terminology is supplied by NgajuDayak. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper argues that the Malayic and Chamic languages form a larger Malayo-Chamic subgroup that arose from a migration out of southwest Borneo in the first few centuries BCE. The argument holds that a single multi-dialectal language community populated large portions of the east coast of Sumatra, the Malay peninsula, and the Gulf of Thailand and South China Sea as far north as central Vietnam. The historical kingdom of Funan in the Mekong delta, and such late historical states as Langkasuka and Tambralingga in the northern Malay peninsula may have been built upon this same population base. Later southward expansions, first by the Khmer, and then the Thai, split this extensive dialect chain into two distinct parts: a northern segment that evolved into Chamic and a southern segment that continued to evolve, along with stay-at-home communities in southwest Borneo, into the Malayic branch of Austronesian languages. (RB)


COMMENT. Passing comments are made on how the system of four morphologically marked voices that was inherited from Proto-Austronesian has been simplified in various of the languages of Borneo south of Sabah. (RB)


COMMENT. Homorganic nasal substitution of the type *pukul* ‘hit’ : *memukul* ‘to hit’ in Malay/Indonesian is a common phonological process in the formation of active verbs in most languages of the Philippines, western Indonesia, Malagasy, Palauan and Chamorros. This paper surveys the rich patterns of variation that this process shows over a wide range of languages, and argues that past attempts to describe it have been overly simplistic, and driven by theoretical preconceptions that do not always fit the data well. In addition to Malagasy, Bornean languages used to illustrate the patterns of variation include Tombonuwo, Timugon Murut and Kadazan Dusun of Sabah, Bario Kelabit, Kiput, Mukah Melanau, Kayan, Long Anap Kenyah and Iban of Sarawak, and Ngaju Dayak of Kalimantan. (RB)


COMMENT. Most sound changes are phonetically motivated, but some present a serious challenge to this view. This paper reviews ten sound changes in Austronesian languages that can be characterized as ‘bizarre’. Seven of these are found in languages spoken in Sarawak, six of which are native to the basin of the Baram river. Not only do many of the languages of this area show exceptionally rich histories of change, but some of these changes are extremely difficult account for in terms of phonetic motivation, as with *b > -k-* in Berawan, or *g > p-, j-, -p* in Sa’ban. Northern Sarawak can thus be called a ‘hot spot’ of phonological change in comparison with many other areas where sound change has proceeded more slowly, and along more well-trodden paths. (RB)


COMMENT. This is the first single-authored survey of the entire Austronesian language family. It contains several separate sections on both Borneo and Madagascar, as in National languages and lingua francas (38-41), Language distribution by geographical region (61-66), and Sound systems (173-179), as well as scattered comments and illustrations throughout the text. A second edition was prepared and published online in 2013. (RB)


COMMENT. A theoretical study which argues that patterns of dissimilation in many
languages are governed by avoidance of two marked segments or structures within the same phonological domain. The avoidance of multiple instances of NC clusters in Ngaju Dayak figures prominently in the discussion. (RB)


COMMENT. This volume contains the proceedings of a conference held at the University of Luzern on June 28-29, 2010, celebrating the sesquicentennial of the birth of the important Swiss Indonesianist Renward Brandstetter (1860-1942). Although he was an armchair linguist who never left Europe, Brandstetter’s interests ranged widely over the languages of insular Southeast Asia, and in addition to other areas, passing reference is made in this book to his work on Malagasy and Ngaju Dayak. (RB)


COMMENT. A frequently-visited website that contains semantic equivalents of a variant of the Swadesh 200-word basic vocabulary for over 400 languages. The ABVD began with a set of 231 hand-copied lists from Blust that were entered into a computer in Auckland, and then expanded through the inclusion of many other languages, and the participation of many other contributors. It is now probably the largest linguistic database on the Internet, and has been used with phylogenetic methods derived from Bayesian inference to generate a number of hypotheses about the subgrouping of the Austronesian languages and the timing of their dispersal southward into insular Southeast Asia and eastward across the Pacific. (RB)


COMMENT. This open access online resource probably is the largest and most detailed comparative dictionary currently available for any language family. As of December, 2013 it contained 18,495 lexical reconstructions for nine distinct proto-languages, including 1,362 for Proto-Austronesian, 2,899 for Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, 6,330 for Proto-Western Malayo-Polynesian, and 1,684 for Proto-Oceanic. Among the more than 700 languages that provide supporting evidence for these reconstructions are some 70-80 from Borneo, with Iban cited in over 1,100 cognate sets, Ngaju Dayak in 684, Kayan in 640, Malagasy in 618, Kelabit in 563, Kadazan Dusun in 417, Kenyah in 336, Mukah Melanau in 261, Bintulu in 206, and other Bornean languages in smaller numbers of comparisons. (RB)


COMMENT. This well-known book provides phonological and grammatical sketches of a number of the languages of Melanesia, reaching from New Guinea in the west to Fiji in the east and the Loyalty islands in the south. The sections of interest to the present volume are in Chapter II, where Codrington assembles vocabularies of 70 words, and grammatical notes on various Melanesian languages which are compared with corresponding features of Malay, Malagasy, and Maori. His list of topics includes demonstrative particles, articles, personal articles, pronouns, personal pronouns, suffixed pronouns, possessives, interrogative pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, nouns, independent forms of nouns, classes of nouns, construct nouns, prefixes to nouns, collective nouns, reduplication of nouns, plural of nouns, prepositions, adverbs, adjectives, verbs, verbal particles, verbal suffixes, prefixes to verbs, reduplication of verbs, and passive verbs. The remainder of the book deals exclusively with Melanesian languages and is not relevant for this bibliography. A much more detailed examination of pages 36-192 is given in Richardson (1887). (AS)


COMMENT. An important summary of comparative Austronesian linguistics up to the late 1960s or early 1970s, this book is primarily a critique of the work of Isidore Dyen. According to the preface the manuscript of the first edition was completed in 1971, and revisions were made to the second edition up to June, 1976. Although it is valuable for its systematic approach and careful weighing of evidence, it is now very much dated by research that has taken place over the past four decades. (RB)


COMMENT. This is a follow-up to Dahl (1976). While the first book was primarily a critique of the approach of Isidore Dyen to phonological reconstruction in Austronesian, this second book surveys the more recent literature in comparative Austronesian linguistics, and provides a useful critique of a number of proposals by different writers. (RB)


COMMENT. This is the foundational work for all modern research in Austronesian comparative linguistics. Volume 1 proposes a reconstruction of ‘Proto-Indonesian’ based on systemic comparison of the lexicons of Tagalog, Toba Batak and Javanese. Volume 2 then tests the adequacy of this reconstruction against eight other languages in island Southeast Asia and the Pacific, one of which is Ngaju Dayak. Volume 3 is a vocabulary of ‘Uraustronesisch’ which includes much material from Ngaju Dayak in addition to the other ten languages that are systematically compared in volumes 1 and 2. (RB)

COMMENT. This article marks a major departure from the methodological principles followed by Otto Dempwolff (1934-1938) in his foundation-laying work on the comparative phonology of Austronesian languages. In it Dyen argues that Dempwolff’s *R may have represented as many as four distinct phonemes. Important sources of data for the argument come from Ngaju Dayak and Malagasy. (RB)


COMMENT. This ambitious work was and remains the largest lexicostatistical classification ever undertaken. It examined Swadesh 200-item lists for 371 language communities which were reduced to 245 Austronesian languages that were then classified in a hierarchical family tree. Because variation in retention rate was not considered to be a possible disturbing factor its conclusions were seriously distorted, resulting in an inference that the Austronesian homeland was probably in the region of New Guinea and the Bismarck archipelago. A small number of Bornean languages were included in the database for this study, including Sampit, Katingan and Ngaju Dayak of southeast Kalimantan, and three languages of Sabah, one of which was identified only as ‘Murut’. (RB)


COMMENT. This valuable compilation of data on kinship terminologies throughout the Philippines includes data on Yakan. (RB)


**COMMENT.** Reference to Bornean languages appears only in volumes 2 and 3, and then only in passing. (RB)


**COMMENT.** Although AFLA conferences rarely touch on languages of Borneo, an AFLA conference would hardly be complete without at least two or three papers on Malagasy, which is almost always richly represented. (RB)


**COMMENT.** Contains two articles listed in the present volume, one by John Edwards and the other by Gary Jones, Peter W. Martin, and A. Conrad K. Ozóg, dealing with bilingualism in Brunei Darussalam and the policy of *dwibahasa* which mandates bilingual education in Malay and English. Passing remarks are made on the indigenous languages of Brunei, and language shift and attitude. (AS)


COMMENT. A theoretical account of anaphora in Toba Batak of northern Sumatra, and Malagasy. (AS)


COMMENT. This theoretical work analyzes the syntax of possessive constructions in ten languages of Western Indonesia. One of these (Iban, with examples from Asmah Hj. Omar, 1981) is relevant to the present volume. Other languages discussed are Buginese, Indonesian, Lampung, Madurese, Muna, Toba-Batak, Tondano, Tukang Besi, and Wolio. (AS)


COMMENT. This is in some ways an odd book, combining papers on linguistics with others on such disparate topics as management and tourism. It contains twelve papers on language divided into three subsections: 1. Language use, identity and change, 2. Linguistics, and 3. Language variation, which is again somewhat odd, since all of the papers in category 3 fit comfortably into category 2. The volume was, unfortunately poorly produced. In the copy at
my disposal pages 43-58 are missing, and in their place a repetitive insertion of pages 139-154 appears instead. In addition, the contribution by LaLani Wood terminates mid-sentence at the bottom of page 201, indicating further missing pages. (RB)


COMMENT. This is the commonly accepted standard reference for an inventory of the world’s languages, locations, number of speakers, etc. It contains one version of a complete list of the languages of Borneo. (RB)


COMMENT. This book contains selected works from the fourteenth meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA XIV) held on May 4-6, 2007, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (AS)


COMMENT. An ambitious attempt to map the world’s languages. Like most works of global scope, detail is sacrificed in the name of comprehensiveness, and this is perhaps more true of Borneo than many other locations for which better descriptive data is available. (RB)


COMMENT. This book contains selected proceedings of the second meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Society (AFLA-2), held at McGill University in 1995. This is AFLA’s first published proceedings. The first ‘conference’ was a small group of linguists and students who met at the University of Toronto in 1994. There, the name AFLA was chosen and the conference has since grown substantially. (AS)


COMMENT. This website, mainained by the University of Oxford, contains links to some 23 separate works written by Charles Randriamasimanana, most of which draw primarily or exclusively on data from Malagasy. The files are separated into three main categories: phonetics/phonology and morphology, syntax and semantics, and lexicon. These are further divided into separate documents dealing with case, control, passives, passive roots, types of verbs including weak vs strong verbs, pronouns, prepositions, adjectives, adverbs, nouns, epenthesis, affixation, stress, coordination, and a range of grammatical functions. The files themselves are at times difficult to read. They are plain text files and require a certain amount of effort on the part of the reader to make sense of their density of information. However, due to the large number of works and their broad range, this website has much to offer. (AS)


COMMENT. As its title indicates, all of the languages from which data is cited in this book are located in the Philippines. However, since this includes Samal, a Sama-Bajaw dialect of the Sulu archipelago, it is included here. (RB)

**COMMENT.** An ambitious undertaking that includes many maps showing the distribution of terms relating to rice in all its manifestations throughout Southeast Asia, including Borneo. Although it produced little new knowledge for either descriptive or comparative purposes, this atlas is valuable as a compilation of terminology for rice agriculture over a wide area. (RB)


**NOTE:** There are different listings for this reference that are difficult to reconcile with one another. Jacqueline M.C. Thomas and Lucien Bernot are given as editors on the spine of the book. However, in library holdings Jacques Barrau is usually listed as editor because his is the first name on the list. The full list of editors in alphabetical order appears on the title page inside the book: Jacques Barrau, Lucien Bernot, Georges Condominas, Mariel Jean Brunhes Delamarre, Francis Leroy, Alexis Rygaloff, and Jacqueline M.C. Thomas. (AS)


COMMENT. An ambitious work produced as part of the Intercontinental Dictionary Series, originally under the direction of Mary Ritchie Key. This massive compendium of data compiled by over 80 authors consists of two volumes of descriptive studies and three volumes of comparative studies. The descriptive studies are useful, although they are very short, averaging some 10-15 pages, with some are much shorter than this. These include a single language of Borneo (Timugon Murut), and Malagasy. As for the 2,255 page comparative section, it would have been far more useful if it had used a lexical template more relevant to Austronesian languages than to the Indo-European family that served as its model. (RB)


COMMENT. A misguided attempt to rebuild the comparative phonology of the Austronesian languages from the ground up. Volume 1 provides sketches of the historical phonology of 38 languages, including Kelabit and Ngaju Dayak from Borneo, and Malagasy. The material and analyses in this book are often problematic, and at variance with the primary sources from which they are drawn. (RB)


COMMENT. This practical booklet contains over 50 sentences based on a questionnaire that was translated into 24 languages of the Philippines, one of which is Samal. The data is useful in providing a quick impressionistic overview of structural differences across a range of language communities from the far north to the far south of the Philippine archipelago. (RB)


This is the main body of the bibliography. It includes all references to descriptive, comparative and theory-oriented work on languages of Borneo that we have been able to find subsequent to the material published in Cense and Uhlenbeck (1958). In the interest of continuity, the more important works cited in this earlier bibliography are repeated here, but the many minor works that these authors were obliged to include because of the paucity of material available to them are ignored.


COMMENT. This is a basic grammar of the Belait language of Brunei. Chapter 1 is an 18-page introduction which provides population figures, maps pinpointing the location of the Belait-speaking community, and descriptions of the methodology of data collection, among other topics. Chapter 2 is a 42-page description of the phonology, Chapter 3 a 116-page account of the syntax, Chapter 4 a 48-page description of verbal morphology, and Chapter 5 a 4-page summary of conclusions. These five chapters are followed by a list of references, a Belait-Malay vocabulary of about 500 items, a list of the subdistricts of the Belait administrative district, 39 pages of texts, and two pages showing the counting system. (RB)


COMMENT. A classic dictionary of the Malagasy language. The material is printed in 10 point type and double columns, with many morphological derivatives given under the base forms. In size and detail it is somewhat longer than the slightly earlier Malagasy-English dictionary of Richardson (1885), but unlike the latter, which includes 59 pages of front material on the grammar, this dictionary begins abruptly with the letter ‘a’. (RB)


COMMENT. This was the first important critique of Dahl (1951). Although Adelaar agrees with the basic hypothesis that Malagasy is a Southeast Barito language that reached east Africa through at least one migration from Indonesia, he argues persuasively in this paper and in later works that the ancestral Malagasy almost certainly did not undertake this journey alone, since their closest relatives in Borneo are land-oriented, and not seafaring people. Through a careful study of the semantic content of Malay loanwords in Malagasy, as well as a consideration of the 7th century Kota Kapur inscription of Bangka and other relevant linguistic facts he concludes that the ancestral Malagasy were assisted, and probably accompanied on their voyage along the coasts of India, Saudi Arabia and east Africa by Sriwijayan Malays who in all likelihood were already familiar with the trade routes around the rim of the Indian Ocean. He concludes that the Sanskrit loanwords in Malagasy that Dahl (1951) used to date the settlement of Madagascar to the 4th century AD were almost certain acquired through the medium of Malay, and that the dating of the migration cannot be made more precise than sometime between the 7th and 13th centuries. (RB)


COMMENT. This book, which draws on data from Standard Malay in the Malay peninsula, Minangkabau and Seraway of southern Sumatra, Banjar Hulu and Iban of southern Borneo and Jakarta, is the most important comparative study to date of Malay and its closest relatives. It contains a detailed account of the historical phonology of the languages, information on word structure, affixes, and selected features of the lexicon, including the treatment of semantic fields or subsystems such as times of the day, directional terms, numerals, basic kinship terms, pronouns and body parts, as well as a 200-item basic vocabulary for Proto-Malayic. The published work began as a 1985 doctoral dissertation in the Department of Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania (Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost Azië en Oceanië) at the University of Leiden; in 1994 it was translated into Indonesian as bahasa Melayik purba (Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa). (RB)


COMMENT. This paper attempts to integrate data from Salako into the reconstruction of Proto-Malayic, as carried out in Adelaar (1992a). It is concluded that although Salako adds little or nothing to the reconstruction of Proto-Malayic phonology beyond what is already available from languages such as Banjarese, it is more conservative than standard Malay or most other Malay dialects in both lexicon and morphology. One of the unexpected benefits of learning about Salako is the light it sheds on Old Malay inscriptions, which often contain affixes or vocabulary not found in the better-known Malayic languages that have survived to the present. (RB)


COMMENT. In this paper the author argues, following an earlier suggestion by Hudson (1978) that the Tamanic subgroup of the upper Kapuas drainage, commonly regarded on lexical grounds as a branch of Malayic, is better analyzed as a member of the South Sulawesi subgroup, and is especially close to Buginese. (AS)


COMMENT. This is the first detailed description of the syntax of any Tamanic language. The article offers a preliminary sketch of Embaloh, a Tamanic language spoken on the Ambalo and Palin tributaries of the Kapuas river in West Kalimantan. The sketch is quite short, and serves as a basis for syntactic arguments later in the paper. The author presents arguments for an ergative analysis of the language based primarily on morphological evidence, where A and O are marked identically, and by the use of an antipassive. The appendix gives a thirteen page text from the first half of an Embaloh narrative. The text is fully glossed and is the main source for example sentences throughout the article. (AS)


COMMENT. This comparative work focuses on four subgroups present in Borneo. These are 1) the Southeast Barito subgroup, which includes Malagasy, 2) the Malayic subgroup, 3) the Tamanic languages which Adelaar includes in the South Sulawesi subgroup, and 4) the Land Dayak languages. Concerning the latter, the author notes similarities with Aslian languages (the indigenous languages of peninsular Malaysia) and suggests either a historical shift from Aslian to Austronesian in the Land Dayak languages or a shared substratum in Aslian and Land Dayak. Adelaar is careful to point out that it is too early to make any strong claims, but proposes evidence for a possible connection in the existence of preploded nasals in both Aslian and Land Dayak as well as two shared lexical items, ‘to die’ kəbəs and ‘to bathe’ mamuh. (AS)


**COMMENT.** This is the first grammar of any of the Malayic Dayak languages of West Borneo. It provides an introduction to the region and to the ethnic and linguistic setting, a description of the language vitality and the relevant scholarly literature, a sketch grammar of 65 pages, 20 texts totaling 135 pages, and a Salako-English lexicon with about 2,200 base entries, together with a larger number of affixed forms. Semantic information in glosses is minimal. (RB)


COMMENT. This is a critique of the treatment of Malagasy data in Wolff 2010. Adelaar directs attention to several errors in Wolff’s analysis of the historical phonology of the language, and reminds the reader that the Austronesian settlement of Madagascar almost certainly involved a prior stop on the Mozambique coast after sailing along the littoral of mainland Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, the Arabian peninsula and the Horn of Africa. (RB)


COMMENT. A useful introductory vocabulary of Kelabit which makes a conscientious effort to strike a balance between ‘traditional’ spellings, that are often haphazard and based on individual whim, with the phonetic reality as reflected in symbols drawn from the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). This is a difficult task, since practical orthographies are often emotion-laden, and an outsider to the language community must contend not only with the fact that he is often trying to find a more accurate representation of the language than native speakers themselves are accustomed or willing to use, but also with the reality that native speakers often disagree about such matters among themselves. Amster seeks a compromise by cross-referencing many terms that differ in the vowel symbol used by most Kelabit speakers and its actual phonetic or phonemic value, as with adto (see edto), edto [ʌdʰɔ] ‘day’. This is certainly commendable for an anthropologist, but as this example illustrates, his orthographic transcriptions, which presumably aim to be phonemic, are more nearly phonetic, while his phonetic transcriptions are more nearly phonemic, since [dt] ~ [dth] is a single consonant pheme in the language, as shown inter alia by alternations between the plain voiced stops /b/, /d/, /g/ and the voiced aspirates, and by single consonant correspondences in most other dialects of Kelabit to the voiced aspirates of Bario and Long Lellang. (RB)


COMMENT. This is one of the few wordlists published to date for any of the Samalan-speaking communities of Sulawesi, and the only one to my knowledge for southern Sulawesi. The dialect represented here reportedly is spoken on both sides of the channel separating the islands of Muna and Buton from the larger island of Sulawesi. Despite its brevity (200 words) the vocabulary is valuable in showing the areal adaptations that characterize this dialect, most notably the merger of final stops as glottal stop and of *-m and *-n as the velar nasal after the highly distinctive change of *-ŋ to -h, as seen in PMP *tiup > tiuʔ ‘to blow’, *kulit > kuliʔ ‘skin’, *manuk > ma-manɔʔ ‘bird’, *buaq > buaʔ ‘fruit’, *enem > enay ‘six’, *quzan > uray ‘rain’, next to pisah (Malay pisay) ‘banana’, and sarah (Malay saray) ‘nest’. (RB)


COMMENT. Despite its phonetic shortcomings this article still contains the longest published vocabulary available for any Melanau language. The exact number of Melanau words cited is difficult to determine, as the material is presented in the form of nearly 2,800 English headwords followed by Melanau equivalents, some of which occur after multiple headwords. In addition a four-page supplement contains about 180 Melanau verbs in their active, passive and imperative forms to illustrate varying patterns of affixation, including the striking use of ablaut in bases that contain a penultimate schwa, although this is not explicitly discussed. (RB)


COMMENT. This is one of a series of official administrative reports, with short wordlists and texts from various languages in the Malayic Dayak-Kendayan region of southwest Borneo. Linguistic information is minimal. (AS)


COMMENT. Perhaps the most useful introduction to the Dusun languages of Sabah prior to the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, this short paper contains a valuable summary of earlier literature, and ends with a Swadesh 200-word list for Rungus Dusun. Unlike later studies that use a locally adapted variant of the Swadesh list, this paper reproduces the original list in its entirety, and substitutes a dash for Rungus equivalents of environmentally meaningless categories such as ‘freeze’, ‘ice’ and ‘snow’, or for categories that are otherwise difficult to elicit, as with ‘rub’, ‘some’, and ‘with’.


**COMMENT.** According to the introductory remarks this mimeographed work was prepared by the Appells for their second year of fieldwork among the Rungus to facilitate communication in the collection of ethnographic data. Despite its provisional nature it is a treasury of linguistic and cultural information. Following a page of phonetic information in which nine vowels are distinguished (but not as phonemes) there is a 238-page section of alphabetized Rungus-English vocabulary, with an average of about 16 entries per page, hence around 3,808 entries. Most of these are base entries, although some entries involve the same base morpheme, as with *adau*, *tadau* ‘today’, *adau-adau* ‘every day’, or *duvo* ‘two’, *duvo nopud* ‘20’, *duvo nopud Umiso* ‘21’, and *duvo novuku* ‘first and second joint of index finger’. This section is followed by a 126-page English-Rungus reverse index, and then a splendid 182-page organization of vocabulary by 48 semantic fields, some of which are very long (agriculture, 28 pages, religion 32 pages), and some others only a page. By eliciting data to flesh out these semantic fields the collection of lexical material achieves a richness of cultural detail unmatched in most dictionaries. There are, *inter alia*, 19 distinct terms for varieties of bananas, nine terms for varieties of hill rice and four for wet rice, 14 terms for growth stages of rice, and among body-part terms 7 distinct terms for ‘clitoris’. Although it contains very little morphological information, and is thus less useful to linguists interested in structural properties of the language, it is a pity that it was never revised and published in a more permanent and polished form, given its obvious value to cultural anthropologists and historical linguists. (RB)


COMMENT. A speculative piece that tries to use the name ‘Bisaya’ in Sabah and Brunei, and ‘Bisayan’ in the Philippines to argue for a specific historical connection that is not supported by either linguistic or cultural data. (RB)


COMMENT. An exceptionally rare source and one of the earliest records, after de Houtman (1603), of European scholarship commenting on the relationship between Malagasy and other Austronesian languages, in this case, between Malagasy and Malay. (AS)


Asmah Haji Omar. 1978c. The syntax of the adjective and the nominal clauses in Iban. In Zamora, Sutlive and Altshuler: 45-60. Keywords: 1. shorter descriptive study, 2. Sarawak, 3. English.


COMMENT.  This is a rather superficial paper that contains a number of factual errors, as in writing Kelabit ēdaḥ ‘one’ for correct ədhəh, duah ‘two’ for correct duəh, lima ‘five’ for correct liməh, etc., describing data from Long Terawan Berawan as ‘Kenyah’, and proposing “subgroups” based on shared similarity rather than exclusively shared innovations, thereby combining the Lower Baram language Narum with Kenyah, and reiterating the common misconception that Bintulu is a Melanau language.  (RB)


COMMENT.  The core of this book is a collection of sketches of 18 languages of Malaysia, most of which are confined to Sabah and Sarawak.  Despite its size and scope this ambitious volume is useful only as an elementary introduction to the indigenous languages of Malaysia.  Among its more attractive features are black and white, and color photographs of the native people, various of their arts and crafts, and the physical environment in which they live.  The format adopts a template with two major divisions: 1. ethnographic(al) background, and 2. language.  The first of these is further subdivided into subsistence economy, religious beliefs and customs, arts and crafts, and social organization.  The second is subdivided into phonology, morphology, word classes, phrases, imperative and propositive, simple and complex sentences, and answers to yes-no questions.  Since language sketches average 33 pages they are inevitably superficial.  More seriously, the material is marred by multiple errors of fact or interpretation (or both).  Errors that could easily have been avoided include the following: 1. For reasons that are not explained, Bisaya is written ‘Bisayah’, 2. the Berawan language of Long Terawan is called ‘Kenyah’, 3. the often-repeated myth that Bintulu is a Melanau language is perpetuated, 4. the phonemic bilabial and alveolar implosives of Bintulu are ignored despite the prior work of Blust (1973), and 5. the voiced aspirates of Bario Kelabit are said (p. 549) to be allophones of the plain voiced stops in defiance of minimal and near-minial pairs such as iban ‘parent-in-law’ vs. ibəŋ ‘hindrance, intervention’, tudu? ‘seven’ vs. tudəʔ ‘salt’, or ruguʔ ‘thin, of people or animals’ vs. ugəʔ ‘stop suddenly, of whirling motion’.  Its surface attractiveness notwithstanding, then, for anyone who is not already familiar with the languages of Sarawak this is a book that must be used sparingly and with caution.  (RB)

Asmah Haji Omar. 1989. The Iban verbal symbols as descriptive instrument in Iban folk tales. SMJ Special Issue no. 4, pt. 4, 40.61: 69-78.  Keywords: 1. other, 2. Sarawak, 3. English.

COMMENT. This short article reports on academic research on the languages of Sarawak up to the time that it was presented at the Second Biennial International Conference of the Borneo Research Council at Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, in July, 1992. However, fewer than one-fifth of the studies of Sarawak languages cited in the present bibliography with dates of 1990 or earlier are mentioned in this survey, and of those that are mentioned most are minor works, while studies of considerably greater length and significance are ignored. (RB)


COMMENT. This little book, published in Kalimantan rather than Jakarta, is refreshingly different from most Indonesian publications on language, which follow a government-designed template that is monotonously repetitive from one description to the next, despite the obvious differences of content. Rather than having the structure of a formal grammar it contains 10 chapters and three appendices that appear to be designed more for self instruction than for purely scientific pursuits. The reason for this structure is apparent from remarks in the foreward to the book, which notes that the Bakumpai language has been used for generations in the city of Banjarmasin and its surroundings, but that the younger generation at the beginning of the 21st century was increasingly switching to the use of Banjarese, putting their heritage language at risk in the years to come. (RB)


COMMENT. Originally published in *The Sarawak Gazette*, this article provides a short discussion of an ethnic group that was reportedly reduced to 18 men, 14 women and four children in 1901, and that has since passed into history. It includes an English-Malay-Sru (Seru) vocabulary with 171 entries, some of which contain more than a single morpheme. As the only extant record of this now extinct language of central Sarawak this is a valuable, if limited, contribution. (RB)


COMMENT. This is easily the largest Dutch work dedicated exclusively to a Bornean language during the colonial period, most other publications being traveller’s accounts with only passing remarks on language. The material was collected through the medium of Malay beginning in 1898 when Barth received an order from the Dutch East Indies government to accompany the University of Leiden professor A.W. Nieuwenhuis on his second expedition through Borneo from the upper Kapuas to the upper Mahakam river. The manuscript was finalized during a stay in Holland during 1909. Although Barth distinguishes between what he calls ‘Busang’ and ‘Kayan’, it is clear from the material in his dictionary that Busang is simply another Kayan dialect. The dictionary begins with a 16-page introduction to the area, and a list of abbreviations used in the text. This is followed by a Busang-Dutch vocabulary of 228 pages that contains between 2,000 and 2,300 bases as well as a number of affixed forms, a comparative vocabulary of what he calls Busang, Kayan, Penihing, and Long Gelat (Modang), a 7-page text of a traditional story, a Busang translation of the Lord’s Prayer, and a 51-page Dutch-Busang index. Despite the shortcomings of its untutored phonetics, the Long Gelat vocabulary remains the most extensive published material available for any dialect of Modang, which remains seriously underdescribed. (RB)


COMMENT. A major contribution to the linguistic documentation of Madagascar, this dictionary contains a 58 page introduction to the grammar of the Tañala dialect, seven pages of references, and 819 pages of lexical entries in 10 point type and double columns. It probably is the most important bilingual dictionary of any form of Malagasy since the lexicographic work of Abinal and Malzac more than a century earlier. (RB)


COMMENT. An early account (and still one of the few) of the peoples of northeast Borneo. It provides a brief sketch of the village life of the Bolongan (Bulungan) and Tarakan people collectively (and perhaps uniquely) called ‘Tidong’ in this publication, including photographs. This is followed by a 33-page sketch of the grammar of the two languages, a 6-page text (‘The tailed man of Silimbatu’), and a 46-page annotated English-Tarakan-Bolongan vocabulary of about 1,400 entries, with occasional (very rare) references to ‘other Tidong dialects’. (RB)


**COMMENT.** A major contribution to the lexicography of Sama-Bajaw languages, this book provides a rich documentation of the lexicon of a land-based Samalan-speaking group of the southern Philippines. Following a 10-page introduction the main body of the dictionary contains 438 pages of Yakan entries in double columns and 10-point type. Abundant morphological information is included with the lexical bases, and many affixed forms are illustrated in sample sentences. This is followed by an English-Yakan index of 74 pages, and 33 appendices that represent semantic fields (plants, animals --- creatures on land, birds, fish and things of the sea, natural phenomena, sea and navigation, numbers, agriculture, etc.). (RB)


COMMENT. A preliminary report on the phonology and some structural features of this important language isolate within the North Sarawak group that also includes a vocabulary of 458 items. The transcription of forms is more accurate than the pioneering work in Roth (1896), but less accurate than the description in Blust (1973). In particular, the labial and postalveolar implosives are usually written correctly (or at least as preglottalized stops) in intervocalic position, but in initial position there are errors and inconsistencies, as where buk ‘head hair’ is written boq, and the contrasting forms for ‘fresh water’ and ‘two’ (baʔ and ba) are written variously as baaʔ or baaʔ ‘water’ vs. baa ‘two’. Moreover, in a few cases the recognition of the b : h contrast is overextended by writing an implosive where there is none, as with saba for correct saba ‘woman’. (RB)


COMMENT. This carefully conducted study documents the contracted spheres of use of several of the indigenous languages of Sarawak that were much more multi-functional a generation or two ago. Increasing educational opportunities and the attractions of larger cities for the economic advantages they offer have led to an increasingly greater use of Malay among members of the younger generation, raising concerns about the future survival of these smaller languages. One of the more interesting features of this paper is its documentation of inter-speaker variation in the use of native vs. borrowed words for particular semantic cagegories. (RB)


COMMENT. An account of the historical development of the implosive stops /ɓ/ and /ɗ/ in
Bintulu. In general these segments reflect the Proto-North Sarawak consonants written *bh, *dh, and so correspond to the voiced aspirates of languages such as Bario Kelabit. Since the PNS plain voiced stops *b and *d became continuants /v/ and /r/ both initially and intervocalically, implosion must have been allophonic at an earlier time (with /b/, /d/ = (-)[ɓ]-(-)[ɗ]-, but [b], [ɗ]/N__, or __#). However, the change of early 20th century Bintulu gw (Ray 1913) to /b/ in the modern language restored the phonemic status of at least the labial member of this consonant group, making it more economical to write both as phonemic implosives. (RB)


COMMENT. This dissertation argues for a North Sarawak subgroup of Austronesian languages that is defined by a highly distinctive sound change that produced a series of phonemic voiced aspirates in the Bario dialect of Kelabit, labial and alveolar/retroflex implosives in Bintulu, a full set of labial, alveolar, alveopalatal and velar implosives in some Lowlan d Kenyah dialects, voiceless stops corresponding to these in Highland Kenyah, and other oddities in cognate forms, as Kiput /s/ corresponding to Bario Kelabit /bh/. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper challenges both a phonetic, and a phonological claim about language universals. The phonetic claim prevailing at that time was that true voiced aspirates (stops that begin voiced and end voiceless, with voiceless onset to a following vowel) are theoretically possible, but unattested in human languages. The phonological claim was that no phoneme system will have a series of voiced aspirates without a corresponding voiceless series. Bario Kelabit and some other Kelabit-Lun Dayeh languages in northern Sarawak have a series of unit phonemes bh, dh, gh (commonly written bp, dt, gk by native speakers) that violate both of these claims, and so constitute a double counter-universal to widely accepted ideas in linguistic theory. (RB)


COMMENT. This article demonstrates that Murik, which is otherwise almost totally neglected in the literature on Sarawak, is genetically close to Kayan, but falls outside the range of Kayan dialect variation, and hence must be considered a distinct language. It provides a sketch of the phoneme inventory, evidence for medial nasal-stop clusters in Proto-Kayan-Murik, sets of personal pronouns, demonstratives, numerals, kinship terms, an alphabetized vocabulary of somewhat over 500 items, including both bases and affixed forms, and an appendix with lexicostatistical counts to show that on a variant of the Swadesh 200-item list less only about 65% of the basic vocabulary of Murik is cognate with that of
selected Kayan dialects, as opposed to over 80% cognation among Kayan dialects themselves. (RB)


COMMENT. This is a short sketch of the phonology and morphology of a Kayan dialect spoken on the Baluy branch of the Rejang river in central Sarawak, based on approximately 18 hours of fieldwork undertaken in 1971. It includes data on personal and possessive pronouns, numeration and numeral classifiers, kinship terms, active and fossilized affixes, a discussion of morpheme structure constraints, and an inventory of phonological processes. In addition, it contains a vocabulary in phonemic notation of about 640 base forms and a number of additional affixed forms that are cited under the base. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper draws attention to an unusually large number of cognate forms shared by Iban and Malay that differ in meaning in ways that can be characterized fairly strictly as antonymous. Based on comparison with systems of antonymy in other language families it is suggested that at some point in the history of Iban semantic reversal must have served a function that it no longer has, presumably as a strategy used in ‘speech disguise’. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper demonstrates that Tring, which is spoken in the same longhouse as Long Terawan Berawan, is a Kelabitic dialect that shares certain features of its phonological history with Sa’ban. It is argued that these features probably were acquired during a period of fairly intense contact when the Tring were a refugee population seeking asylum among more settled groups. (RB)


COMMENT. This is a short sketch of the phonology and morphology of one member of the Melanau dialect chain, which stretches some 150 miles along the coast of Sarawak, from around the mouth of the Rejang river north to Balingian. It is based on approximately 18
hours of fieldwork undertaken in 1971. In addition to the grammatical sketch, it contains a vocabulary in phonemic notation of approximately 790 base forms, along with a number of morphological derivatives which are cited together with the base. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper contains a vocabulary of about 1,500 lexical items for the Bario dialect of Kelabit. Affixed forms are included under the base where they are known, and homophonous bases are distinguished by subscript, as with aban1 ‘because; unless’ and aban2 ‘quarrel over possession of something’. The vocabulary is preceded by an 11-page introduction that surveys the literature, discusses inadequacies in the published sources, states the goals of the paper, and discusses the analysis of the data. (RB)


COMMENT. Some of the Land Dayak languages of southern Sarawak have added –s after *-i and –ch ([x]) after *-a and *-u. This parallels the addition of final stops in the history of Maru, a Tibeto-Burman language of Burma. However, the possibility cannot be ruled out that this unusual sound change involved addition of –h followed by palatal or velar coloring of the glottal fricative from the preceding vowel. (RB)


COMMENT. The Berawan languages of northern Sarawak have developed geminate consonants under a condition that is so unusual that for some years it was overlooked as a factor governing this change. The onset of open final syllables geminated. Following this change final glottal stop was lost and in Long Terawan and Batu Belah (but not Long Jegan) –h was added after original final vowels, giving rise to such initially puzzling developments as *mata > LT mattəh, BB mattah, LJ matta ‘eye’ vs. *mataʔ > LT, LJ mata ‘raw’, or *Ribu > LT, BB gikkuh, LJ gikkəw ‘thousand’ vs. *Ratus > LT, BB gitoh, LJ getoʔ ‘hundred’. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper surveys the typologically rare phenomenon of verbal ablaut in a number of the languages of coastal and inland Sarawak. It is argued that ablaut arose from the Proto-Austronesian infixes *-um- and *-in- in bases that contained a penultimate schwa which deleted when placed in the environment VC__CV, with subsequent simplification of consonant clusters. Because the most richly attested systems are found in coastal areas, as
with Mukah Melanau, it is assumed that this innovation started along the coast and gradually
diffused upriver into some interior areas. (RB)


COMMENT. Dempwoff (1922) noted some interesting properties of nasal spreading in
Ngaju Dayak, specifically alternations of the palatal glide with a palatal nasal in paradigms
such as *kayu* ‘wood’: *maŋañu* ‘gather (fire)wood’. This paper argues that allophonic
nasality in all languages of Borneo for which we have adequate phonetic data, is from onset
to coda, or left-to-right, and that it often spreads into the next syllable unless blocked by a
consonant other than a glide, largyngal or lateral. In Narum of northern Sarawak an
alternation of full phonemes parallel to but distinct from that in Ngaju Dayak is seen, where
nasal spreading through *l* leads to alternation with *n*, as in *pulaut* ‘latex’: *munaut* ‘gather
latex’. In addition to nasal spreading the paper discusses nasal preplosion and postplosion,
and argues that preploded final nasals may have arisen as a strategy to block contragrade
nasal spreading. (RB)

*Pagtanáw: essays on language in honor of Teodoro A. Llamzon*: 29-52. Manila: The
Linguistic Society of the Philippines. Keywords: 1. comparative study, 2. Sabah, 3.
English.

COMMENT. Traditionally, and in such classifications as Dyen (1965) the languages of
Sabah have been included with those of the Philippines. This is largely based on the
presence of Philippine-type verb systems in most or all languages of Sabah, as opposed to
languages further south, and on the presence of some exclusively shared vocabulary. This
paper argues that the observed typological similarities in syntax, even where they involve
genetically related affixes, have no value as subgrouping evidence, since they are generally
demonstrable retentions from Proto-Austronesian. It is further noted that there is at least as
much exclusively shared vocabulary linking the indigenous languages of Sabah with the non-
Philippine-type languages of the North Sarawak group, and important evidence of
exclusively shared phonological innovations which set the North Sarawak and Sabahan
languages apart from members of the Philippine group. (RB)

Blust, Robert. 2000. Low vowel fronting in northern Sarawak. *OL* 39: 285-319. Keywords:

COMMENT. A number of the languages of northern Sarawak have historically fronted the
low vowel *a* under conditions that remain theoretically challenging. In all recorded cases
low vowel fronting has taken place only where a voiced obstruent occurs earlier in the word.
However, details of this change differ so fundamentally cross-linguistically that they are
most simply explained as products of independent (but perhaps contact-induced) change. In
the Berawan languages the fronted vowel must immediately follow its conditioning
consonant. In Miri, on the other hand, only last-syllable *a* is fronted, and this can occur
even where the conditioning consonant is separated from it by −VC. Most surprisingly,
fronting in Miri skips over an immediately following penultimate low vowel to target a low vowel in the final syllable. Low vowel fronting is suspended in all languages by blocking consonants, but again the set of blocking consonants differs across languages, including nasals in some languages, but only voiceless stops in others. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper lists 643 Sa’ban reflexes of Proto-Kelabit-Lun Dayeh reconstructions as a basis for understanding its complex and rich historical phonology. Among other things it documents the shift of an inherited pattern of penultimate stress to a new pattern of final stress, and the dramatic effects this has had on the appearance of the language. These effects include: 1. the creation of a pattern of dominant monosyllabism, 2. a wide variety of initial consonant clusters, including geminate consonants that occur only word-initially, 3. a number of new and areally unique speech sounds, including voiceless sonorants, and 4. a fundamental transformation of the morphology. As a result, Sa’ban is a typological anomaly within Kelabit-Lun Dayeh, regarded by many speakers of other dialects as a fundamentally different language. (RB)


COMMENT. Many of the languages of northern Sarawak have complex histories of phonological change, and Kiput is one of the more intriguing of these. This paper provides a detailed outline of changes that transformed Proto-North Sarawak to Kiput, producing such oddities as *bh (> f) > s, and glide fortition that transformed the automatic transitions [j] and [w] after high vowels to [ʧ] and [f], as in *lia > ʧcih ‘ginger’, or *dua > dufih ‘two’. (RB)


COMMENT. Kayan dialects in Sarawak present a historical puzzle: in some dialects original final glottal stop has been lost, and original final vowels have added a glottal stop, thus appearing to interchange glottal stop and zero, as in *mata > mataʔ ‘eye’, but *m-ataʔ > ata ‘raw’. At first sight this appears to be a change of the type described by the ‘alpha-switching rules’ of early Generative phonology. However, other dialects show that all vowels were lengthened before final glottal stop, glottal stop was then added after final vowels, producing length contrasts in all vowels before final glottal stop, short high vowels were then lowered before final glottal stop, and final glottal stop was lost after long vowels. The outcome was a ‘switch’ in which ‘X’ became ‘Y’ and ‘Y’ became ‘X’, but not as the result of a single change. (RB)

COMMENT. To date this is the only descriptive sketch available for this language. It is based on approximately 18 hours collection time, and includes 42 pages on the morphology and phonology of the language, together with a vocabulary of about 800 base forms and a number of morphological derivatives. (RB)


COMMENT. The Malay word *besi* ‘iron’ has spread to a number of the languages of western Indonesia through a process of borrowing that probably extended over several centuries. However, evidence from Bidayuh and Melanau languages shows that this word has been borrowed twice, first from a Malayic language that may not yet have evolved into any known form of Malay, and second from Malay once the latter had become a language of major regional importance and a source of loanwords in many of the languages of insular Southeast Asia. Based in part on this double layer of borrowing it is proposed that iron-working technology in insular Southeast Asia first developed in a southwest Bornean language community ancestral to Malayic and Chamic, and from there was carried north to mainland Southeast Asia, where the word *besi* was borrowed into some Mon-Khmer languages, such as classical Mon. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper revisits the vowel deletion hypothesis proposed in Blust (1974), and shows that the historical mechanism which gave rise to the voiced aspirates of Bario Kelabit and corresponding segments in other North Sarawak languages probably was gemination followed by terminal devoicing rather than deletion of a vowel between a voiced obstruent and a sibilant. This interpretation of the historical data is more consistent with the synchronic phonology, in which allophonic gemination after a stressed schwa affects nearly all consonants, but where voiced geminates are expected voiced aspirates appear instead. (RB)


COMMENT. It has long been recognized that the Sama-Bajaw languages, which are spoken over a wide and broken territory in the Philippines and Indonesia, are not native to the Philippines. However, apart from a few vague references to a Bornean origin in earlier
publications, no evidence was ever presented to document their closest genetic connections. This paper shows that the Sama Bajaw languages are most closely related to the Barito Family of southeast Kalimantan, and through these to Malagasy. Following earlier work by Adelaar, it is argued that both the Malagasy and the Sama Bajaw were drawn out of the interior of southeast Borneo by contact with the Malay-speaking trading network of Sriwijaya. From this point the Malagasy proceeded westward in one or more movements, taking them to the east coast of Africa and ultimately Madagascar. The Sama-Bajaw, on the other hand, remained in insular Southeast Asia, where they evidently collaborated intensively with Malays in managing the lucrative spice trade from the Moluccas to China, India and beyond. The traditional life on houseboats that has only disappeared in most communities in recent decades, is interpreted as a residue of the earlier role of the Sama-Bajaw as traders who needed a high degree of mobility in order to move goods over long distances on an annual basis. (RB)


COMMENT. ‘Kenyah’ is a cover term for a wide array of dialects and perhaps languages scattered over much of central Borneo on both sides of the Sarawak/Kalimantan border. Most forms of Kenyah show relatively modest amounts of sound change as compared with other North Sarawak languages such as Sa’ban or the Berawan-Lower Baram languages. However, Òma Lóngh is one Kenyah dialect that has ‘gone wild’ in its phonological history, producing dramatic typological restructuring that transformed the Proto-Kenyah system of four vowels to an 8-vowel system, and introducing such unusual features as word-final palatals and a word-final voiceless velar nasal. (RB)


COMMENT. The position of the languages of Sabah has long puzzled linguists. Typologically they are close to most languages of the Philippines, and in addition languages of the Greater Central Philippine group and languages of Sabah share some basic vocabulary apart from all other Austronesian languages. However, the languages of Sabah and the non-Philippine-type languages of northern Sarawak share as much or more basic vocabulary exclusively of other languages, and show evidence of a shared split of the PAN voiced obstruents. The simplest explanation of the distributional facts appears to be that all of the languages of Borneo for which comparative data is currently available except the Barito languages of Kalimantan, form a subgroup that also includes Malay and the Chamic languages of mainland Southeast Asia. The Greater North Borneo hypothesis thus claims that the southward movement of Austronesian speakers out of the Philippines not only split into streams that populated Borneo, Sulawesi and the northern Moluccas separately, but that an important split must have occurred as well between those pioneering groups that followed the South China Sea side of Borneo as against those that followed the side facing the Makasar Strait. (RB)


COMMENT. A detailed account of the main phonological features of Bonggi (earlier called ‘Banggi’), a language that prior to Boutin’s work was practically unknown to linguists. Bonggi phonology is strikingly different in certain respects from that of any other language of Sabah, or of neighboring areas in the southern Philippines. Its most notable feature probably is the presence of preploded word-final nasals reminiscent of the patterns of nasal
allophony found in Land Dayak languages far to the south. Other features of the phonology that mark this language as distinctively different from most or all others in the region are the rounding of labial and velar consonants before back vowels, place-based vowel harmony, and the historical metathesis of rV before dental consonants. (RB)


COMMENT. Bonggi is the only language in Sabah with preploded nasals, and the distributional pattern that these follow generally conforms to the similar phenomenon in Bidayuh, some neighboring Malayic Dayak languages, Tunjung, and other Southeast Asian languages (both Austronesian and Austroasiatic) outside Borneo, namely that word-final nasals are preploded unless the final syllable of a word has a nasal consonant onset. What is unique about Bonggi is that medial /l/ is converted to a glide and transposed before the first vowel of a disyllabic base in words that have undergone nasal substitution to form active verbs. Since this happens after a word-final nasal has been preploded, it results in a preploded nasal following a nasalized vowel, as in /ŋ/ + /tɔlɔn/ > noidn [nõjdn] ‘swallow something’, a pattern that has not been reported in any other systems of nasal preplosion in Borneo or elsewhere. (RB)


COMMENT. The author provides an analysis of Bonggi locative predicates through the theoretical lens of Role and Reference Grammar. (AS)


COMMENT. Although we have not seen this work it can reasonably be assumed that it is an English translation of Brandstetter (1893), since Brandstetter published only in German, and
there clearly was a need among English-speaking scholars in Madagascar for an English translation of this piece. (RB)


Keywords: 1. comparative study, 2. Sabah, Brunei, 3. English.


Keywords: 1. descriptive grammar, 2. Madagascar, 3. French.


Keywords: 1. shorter descriptive study, 2. Madagascar, 3. French.


COMMENT. This book contains five chapters on Land Dayak languages in western Kalimantan. The chapters are written by Shin Chong, James T. Collins, Albertus, and Sujarni, and are listed separately in this bibliography. In addition to the five chapters, there are four comparative word lists at the end of the book titled as follows: list one, Enam varian Bidayuhik di lembah Sekadau, list two, Kalimantan Barat, Varian Tengon di sempadan Kalimantan Barat dan Sarawak, list three, Varian Bidayuhik di hilir Sungai Kualan, Kalimantan Barat, and list four Varian Simpang di Borneo Barat Daya. The first list compares Malay, Nanga Rakan, Lubuk Tajau, Leminang, Nanga Mongko’, Selampong, and Canayan. The second compares Malay, Tengon Kadik I, Tengon Kadik II, Tengon Kulum, and Tengon Pelai’. The third compares Malay, Meraban, Lelayang, Selimbong, and Stontong. Finally, the fourth compares Malay, Kualan, Semandang, Banyur, and Sajan. The lists are identical 200 item wordlists that compare local Bidayuhik (Land Dayak) variants with standard Malay. The names of the different dialects are in several cases likely nothing more than the names of the villages where the forms were recorded and in some cases very little variation can be seen between them. With preploded final nasals, the lists sometimes write tn and less frequently ’n though it is not clear on what basis the different forms were chosen. It may be that different researchers made recordings at different villages and slightly different transcriptions remained in place in the final published volume. Word final glottal stop is usually written consistently, although it is unpredictably left out with some variants. Again, this may simply be a case of multiple researchers using different transcription practices. (AS)


COMMENT. This is the first of a two-volume festschrift honoring James T. Collins for his many contributions to Austronesian linguistics, with special reference to his work on the languages of Borneo. Some papers are in English, and others in Malay/Indonesian, reflecting the key role that Collins has played for many years in connecting the Malay world and the Western world through the medium of scholarship, some of it expressed through English and some through Malay/Indonesian. (RB)


**COMMENT.** This is a preliminary examination of the extensive sound changes that have affected both the phonological typology and the morphology of Sa’ban. These changes are inferred through a direct comparison of Sa’ban with Lun Bawang/Lun Dayeh rather than through a reconstructed proto-language, but the results are very much the same. (RB)


**COMMENT.** This is a valuable survey of the voice-marking strategies employed by 15 Bornean languages ranging from Banggi and Balambangan islands north of Sabah, to southeast Kalimantan. Sketches of individual languages include information on noun markers (the V or CV particle that marks one nominal argument as having special prominence in relation to the affixed form of a verb), pronouns, word order and verbal morphology related to voice-marking. As others have noted before, there is a steady decline from more-or-less full-blown Philippine-type verb systems in most of Sabah, to reduced systems of morphologically-marked voice distinctions further south. Although she mentions it only in passing, Malagasy, which subgroups with Ma’anayn (one of the 15 languages in her sample), has a fully developed voice system, and this implies that many other languages in southeast Kalimantan must have retained a similar system before the Malagasy departure. (RB)


**COMMENT.** An important paper which attempts to show the transition from the Philippine-type verb systems of most languages in Sabah to the reduced active-passive systems of most Bornean languages further south. Clayre choose Lun Dayeh and Sa’ban to illustrate this
change, in part because these languages are closely related, yet typologically quite distinct, and in part because the writer possessed field materials that made a fairly detailed discussion possible. Although neither Lun Dayeh nor Sa’ban is a Philippine-type language as that term is normally understood, the first language comes close to this characterization, having three morphologically-marked voice (or ‘focus’) distinctions in the imperfective and perfective aspects of the declarative mood, and a fourth voice that appears only in certain forms of the imperative mood. Similarly, it has three partially distinct pronoun sets, one for the syntactic ‘pivot’, and two for the non-pivot (actor/genitive vs. non-actor). Sa’ban, by contrast, has reduced the voice system to a simple contrast of actor and undergoer, and the pronouns are reduced to two full sets and one vestigial set. The paper concludes with an examination of the voice systems of the otherwise completely unknown Kelabitic dialects of the Kerayan river basin in Kalimantan. (RB)


COMMENT. This study documents the use of numeral classifiers in ‘Melanau’, without further specification of the dialect described. However, since the study reportedly was done for H. Stephen Morris of the Department of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics, it presumably represents the Oya locus within the Melanau dialect chain. Nine classifiers are identified and illustrated, of which six have a nominal meaning of their own. These systems are much less developed than those of traditional peninsular Malay or some other languages of western Indonesia, but are richer than anything reported in the Philippines. Information is also given on terms used to quantify mass nouns, on the pronominal use of classifiers and on semantic groupings of nouns, most of which consist of rather run-of-the-mill names of fruits, fungi, birds, fish and the like. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper shows that the term ‘Kutai Malay’ encompasses two rather distinct Malay dialects spoken along the Mahakam river and its tributaries in East Kalimantan. While the standard (Tenggarong) variety, used in the former Sultanate of Kutai, is fairly similar to Standard Malay, the upriver variant at Kota Bangun differs in several intriguing features that had previously eluded explanation. Briefly, PAN *a and *e (schwa) merged as pre-KB *a, and a from both sources then raised to schwa after voiced stops. Collins correctly identifies the historical processes that led to the current situation, but then concludes against the evidence of both Sarawak Malay and Tenggarong that the merger of schwa with *a was an innovation in the common ancestor of all Bornean dialects of Malay. Although he could not yet have been aware of it, it is noteworthy that the raising of *a to schwa in the Kota Bangun dialect parallels low vowel fronting in the languages of northern Sarawak and various of the languages of northeast Luzon in its effects on vowel height (Blust 2000). (RB)


COMMENT. An important paper which shows an especially close connection between two dialects of Malay that are widely separated today: Brunei Malay and the Malay of Bacan island in the northern Moluccas. While a subgrouping tie between two dialects that lie over 900 miles apart may seem *a priori* unlikely, the improbability disappears in view of the known historical function of Malay as the dominant language of the spice trade that moved cloves, nutmeg and mace from the islands of the Moluccas westward to Brunei as a major
entrepot for the lucrative Chinese market. This is thus a key study in demonstrating the value of comparative linguistic data as a supplement to documentary history. (RB)


COMMENT. A valuable general discussion of homeland theory in linguistics, and its specific application to determining the homeland of Malay. Following brief discussions of linguistic paleontology, the center of gravity, and areal correspondence as alternative approaches to determining primary centers of language dispersal, two widely divergent proposals for the Austronesian homeland are discussed. The first of these, which identified the coastal region of Vietnam and Cambodia as the likely Austronesian homeland, was favored by the Dutch Austronesianist Hendrik Kern in 1889, and the more recent one, which finds Taiwan the most plausible starting point of the Austronesian migrations, was proposed by Otto Dahl, Robert Blust, and other scholars in recent times. The reasons for this wide discrepancy are given a careful assessment, and the proposals of several writers for Borneo as the homeland of Malay are then given thorough consideration in the light of the methodological issues identified with regard to the Austronesian homeland question. (RB)


COMMENT. This book, with a cover suggestive of a lurid novel, contains the proceedings of a small conference held at the Institute of the Malay World and Civilization (Institut Alam dan Tamadun Melayu, or ATMA), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, on April 10-11, 2000. The conference theme was Borneo as the homeland of Malay, or more properly, the Malayic languages. Chapters 1 (‘Homelands and the homeland of Malay’ by James T. Collins), 3 (‘Whence the Malays?’ by Robert Blust), and 4 (‘Observations on phenomena shared by west Borneo Malayic languages and Sasak as well as Madurese’ by Bernd Nothofer) were contributed by comparative linguists. Chapter 2 (‘Borneo as the homeland of Malay? The perspective from archaeology’ by Peter Bellwood) was written by an archaeologist, and Chapter 5 (‘Seawards, Landwards. Can we make historical sense of the Borneo as the homeland of Malay hypothesis?’ by Bernard Sellato) was done by a social/cultural anthropologist. Collectively, these five papers give a well-rounded view of ideas about the homeland of Malay from three different disciplinary perspectives. (RB)


COMMENT. This dictionary is a valuable document on the Samalan-speaking peoples of the southern Philippines. It contains a short introduction to the location and people, followed by
46 pages on how to use the book, a guide to spelling Mapun words, a description of phonological alternations, and brief outlines of major grammatical features. The main body of the dictionary is 544 pages of 10-point type in double columns, followed by an English-Mapun index of 91 pages. (RB)


COMMENT. This carefully conducted study of language endangerment found that the Iban and Murut (Lun Bawang) languages in Brunei are being learned by the great majority of members of the younger generation, and that the survival of these languages is therefore guaranteed for the time being in comparison with the languages of such minorities as the Tutong, Dusun, Penan or Belait. One factor that appears to favor the survival of Iban and Murut is that there are many speakers of these languages outside Brunei, while this is not true of any of the most highly endangered minority languages. However, the reader is warned that current trends may not be indicative of future developments, since a slow shift to Malay as the favored language of daily communication appears to be taking place with many speakers of all languages in Brunei, and this probably will result in reduced vitality of both Iban and Lun Bawang in Brunei in the coming years. (RB)


COMMENT. This brief contribution was written in response to Eugenie J.A. Henderson, who in 1965 proposed a set of areal features which she regarded as characteristic of Southeast Asian languages. It basically follows a checklist deriving from Henderson’s proposal, and notes that most features characteristic of mainland Southeast Asian languages are lacking in Mēntu Land Dayak. However, because Henderson’s data sample included material on a language identified only as ‘Land Dayak’ (actually Bukar Sadong), Court attempts to generalize about areal features in the Land Dayak area. The most striking feature he finds is the presence of preploled nasals in final position if the terminal syllable does not have a nasal onset, and he ends by raising the rhetorical question “Could it be that this play
of postnasalization or, as we prefer to call it, preplosion is a feature peculiar within the Indonesian and southeast Asian area to Mëntu Land Dayak?”. However, it is now clear that final nasal preplosion has a scattered distribution over a number of both Austronesian and Austroasiatic languages in island and mainland Southeast Asia. (RB)


COMMENT. This article contains a correspondence between Cousins and J. Duffus and W. Dening, two missionaries who worked in Malaysia. These letters discuss similarities between Malagasy and Malay, with Duffus giving a short overview of Malay and a 70-item comparative wordlist. The Malay section of this wordlist shows both English-based orthographic peculiarities and errors, as in coolit for kulit ‘skin’, occasional e for i, omission of schwa or writing it with a as in ampat ‘four’, and only sometimes recording final h: oobah (ubah) ‘change’ but dua pooloo ‘ten’ for duapuluh. Dening gives a 25-item comparative word list with a more consistent orthography and a brief, and sometimes Eurocentric five-point comparisson of morphology between the two languages. (AS)


COMMENT. A short comparative wordlist of entries collected from Steere’s *Hand-book of the Swahili Language* (3rd ed., 1884) that the author thought shared some features with
Malagasy. The wordlist contains 52 entries and notes possible loans from French and Arabic. (AS)


COMMENT. More a review of the literature than a collection of original observations, the author compares theories of African and Malayo-Polynesian origins of the Malagasy with the first being discarded outright and the latter accepted as the most likely. Cousins provides evidence from published works dealing with shared vocabulary and shared morphology. His conclusions of the Malayo-Polynesian origins of Malagasy match those of many of his contemporaries and were hardly new at the time. (AS)


COMMENT. A great classic that finally solved the problem of the origin of the Malagasy. Dahl was the first to propose that Madagascar was settled by a migration from southeast Borneo, based on unmistakeable evidence of exclusively shared linguistic innovations linking Malagasy (Merina) to Ma’anyan of southeast Borneo. As better descriptive data was made available for the languages of the Barito river basin in southeast Kalimantan it became clear that Malagasy is a member of the Southeast branch of the Barito subgroup of Austronesian languages, and that it consequently belongs in an immediate genetic unit with Ma’anyan and several other languages rather than with Ma’anyan alone. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper re-examines the four voice or ‘focus’ system generally hypothesized for Proto-Austronesian: actor focus marked by *-um-, goal focus marked by *-en in the imperfective and zero in the perfective, referent focus marked by *-an, and the instrument focus, marked by *Si-. Dahl notes that Malagasy has clear reflexes of each of the first three focus- or voice-marking affixes, but that for *Si- it has a- rather than the expected **i-*. As a result of progress in the description of Formosan aboriginal languages during the 1970s he was able to show that several Formosan languages have a form that together with Malagasy a- appears to point to PAN *Sa-, which he labeled ‘moving object focus’. Subsequent work, however, has shown that PAN *Sa- was an instrumental voice marker very much like *Si-.* (RB)


COMMENT. This was the last major publication in Dahl’s long and distinguished career. In it he amended his earlier account of the Malagasy migration from southeast Borneo by addressing modifications proposed in Hudson (1967) and various publications of K. Alexander Adelaar, most notably Adelaar (1989). As a result he largely accepted the proposals of the latter scholar that the Malagasy probably did not make the voyage to Madagascar alone, but were in all likelihood assisted by Srivijayan Malays, who were far more experienced sailors, and who undoubtedly were already familiar with at least the eastern half of the Indian Ocean as a result of centuries of commercial contacts. (RB)


COMMENT. This examination of the notions ‘subject’, ‘predicate’ and ‘topic’ in Malagasy was published after Dahl’s death on November 11, 1995, at the age of 92. It was presented by him 15 months earlier at the Seventh International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, held in Leiden, Netherlands, and was the last publication in an academic career that spanned nearly 60 years. (RB)


COMMENT. Primarily an anthropological source, with some mention of broad social aspects of language as well as some words relating to the conceptualization of time and relationships. (AS)


COMMENT. This article represents the beginning of Dahle’s published works in *The Annual* concerning Arabic loans in Malagasy. He begins by demonstrating the Arabic origins of the names of the days of the week and months, as well as a description of the western zodiac in Malagasy astrology, which exists in the naming of certain days of the month. Other Arabic loans concern terms of salutation (the well known *salama*), terms for dress, money, musical instruments, books and writing, and other miscellaneous words. The author does make note, when appropriate, of shared Arabic loans in Malagasy and Malay such as Malagasy *soratra* ‘writing’ which Dahle claims is from the Arabic *surat* ‘a line in the Koran’, but is also present in Malay as *surat* ‘letter’. The Arabic influence on Malagasy is expanded upon in the following article in vol. 3.1 of *The Annual*. (AS)


COMMENT. This article seeks to identify and discuss proposed Swahili loans in Richardson (1885). Dahle estimates that about 250 words are identified as such, but points out that many of these are Arabic loans, others don’t show convincing semantic agreement, and since others are found in many Bantu languages, they could have entered Malagasy by various alternative paths. The author gives a detailed analysis of 108 words that are marked as Swahili and concludes that 60 are actually Arabic, 26 are not to be considered loans at all (included are words of obvious Austronesian origin, such as *hoho* ‘fingernail/toenail’ next to e.g. Malay *kuku*), nine are of ‘genuine African’ origin (this term is vague and not elaborated in the article, but may refer to a Bantu substratum), three are of unknown origin, three are correctly marked as Swahili, two are French, two more are Persian, one is oddly marked as Peruvian, one is Spanish, though brought to Madagascar by Arab traders, and one word marked as French is of Swahili origin. (AS)


COMMENT. This article contains two parts. The first describes the development and influence of the Arabic script in Malagasy. This includes a full list of characters, and a discussion of the inventions of new writing conventions and symbols for non-Arabic phonemes in the Malagasy language. The second is a discussion of Arabic loanwords in Malagasy, and the adaptation of non-native Arabic sounds. This ends with a moderately sized word list of Arabic loans in Malagasy, about five pages with double columns. (AS)


COMMENT. In this very short essay (only a single page) Jacques Dez discusses the chronology for loss of the velar nasal, “(n) vélaire”, in the Merina dialect of Malagasy. He uses two pieces of evidence to show a timeline for this development: 1) the existence of literature from 1825-1830 that describes Merina as a dialect without a velar nasal, and 2) documents from as late as 1785 which include a velar nasal. Dez challenges assumptions that the loss of the velar nasal was an ancient development. At the end of the paper he expresses doubts that a sound change could have happened so suddenly, and asks whether a state of diglossia might have existed in which one group retained the velar nasal (recorded in the late eighteenth century) and another lost it (recorded in the early nineteenth century). This question probably is unanswerable, but the essay nevertheless offers an intriguing glimpse into specifics of the linguistic history of the standard dialect of Malagasy. (AS)

Keywords: 1. comparative study, 2. Madagascar, 3. French.


COMMENT. This vocabulary, made by a British colonial official during a 13-year residence in the Baram District of Sarawak, is one of the longest for any of these three languages/language complexes in the first half of the twentieth century. It contains the numerals 1-10, 11, 12, 23 and 100 in each language and this is followed by a 767-word vocabulary arranged alphabetically by the English gloss. Some details of the phonetic description are inaccurate, but overall this is a more reliable source than many of its contemporaries. (RB)


COMMENT. This dictionary is ordered alphabetically according to entries in the Betsileo dialect, and also includes the equivalents in Ambaniandro (Hova) and French. Entries are accompanied by special remarks and expressions in both Malagasy and French. The book is organized in a tabular format, with rows and columns, rather than the more familiar dictionary format, and there is little cross referencing or derivational explanation. (AS)


COMMENT. A valuable collection of texts from the Mualang Dayaks of the upper Kapuas river in West Kalimantan, divided into six main sections: 1. myth-songs (sung myths), 2. forest-songs (sung by men and boys when on extended jungle trips for hunting or collecting plant materials), 3. songs in the bee-tree (sung when on honey-collecting trips), 4. a song of praise, 5. a lullaby sung by mothers to young children while their father was on a headhunting expedition, 6. a rhyming song sung to welcome in a taken head. These consist of both spoken and sung portions, written in double columns, with the Mualang on the left and the Dutch translations on the right. (RB)


COMMENT. This entry is something of a mystery. In Internet sources it is given with the title *Morfologi dan sintaksi bahasa Banjar Hulu* with a title in which a core word is misspelled and then corrected in square brackets. However, reference to the original shows that the correction has been added electronically, and does not exist in the publication itself. Even more puzzling, this appears to be identical to a co-authored publication of the same length and title minus the error that was published six years earlier (Durdje Durasid and Djantera Kawi. 1978. *Morfologi dan sintaksis bahasa Banjar Hulu*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa. 95 pp.). (RB)


**COMMENT.** This paper revisits the interpretation of Ngaju Dayak historical phonology in Dempwolff (1937). It concludes that Dempwolff reversed the native and borrowed lexical strata in the language, and shows convincingly that Dempwolff’s ‘old speech stratum’ (adopted from theories of Walther Aichele) is not due to borrowing from a lost literary language on Borneo as he believed, but is actually the native vocabulary, while the vocabulary showing ‘regular sound correspondences’ is a loan stratum acquired through centuries of trade contact with Banjarese Malays. (RB)


**COMMENT.** Although phonologically very innovative dialects of Malay reportedly are found in the upper Kapuas basin (James T. Collins, p.c.), the material presented in this book this dialect looks virtually identical to standard Malay. (RB)


COMMENT. This well-constructed dictionary on the Bara dialect, spoken in south-central to southwestern Madagascar, is a valuable resource for anyone with a grasp of the Italian language. The dictionary is printed in double columns and offers example sentences for many of the entries. Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the book is the inclusion of high quality photographs on semi-glossy paper placed throughout the dictionary. The photographs detail the physical characteristics of the Bara people, aspects of their culture and daily life, and the natural environment in which they live. A majority of the photographs are in black and white, but a number are also in color. These features make this dictionary stand out among a large inventory of Malagasy dictionaries. (AS)


COMMENT. This general description of the Punan Busang includes a comparative vocabulary of about 200 words for the Punan Busang, Punan Bah, Punan Batu, and Punan Lusong, which appears to show a particularly close relationship between the Punan Busang and Punan Batu. A noteworthy feature of the historical phonology of Punan Busang is the development *q>k* in words such as *daRaq> dak ‘blood’, *liqeR> luk ‘neck’, and *taneq > tanok ‘ground’, a change known from no other language of Borneo. In addition, ten pages are devoted to bird names, with identifications by Linnaean binomials. (RB)


COMMENT. Although it exists only in manuscript form, this vocabulary has been cited in a number of earlier sources, and is evidently accessible to interested scholars. (RB)


COMMENT. This is the oldest dictionary of any Austronesian language outside the Philippines. Given its rarity and value it has gone through two reprints, the first in 1905, and the second in 1910. (RB)


COMMENT. According to the editor’s preface in Richardson (1885) this was the first ‘complete Malagasy dictionary’, done under the auspices of the London Missionary Society. While the use of ‘complete’ might well be contested by most linguists and many native speakers, it seems clear that this was the first Malagasy-English dictionary, several earlier dictionaries having been compiled by French scholars. According to Richardson (1885:v), part I was done by J.J. Freeman, and part II by D. Johns, both employed by the London Missionary Society. (AS)


COMMENT. A copy of this rare dictionary is held in the British Museum as British Museum Ms. Add. 18, pp. 118-120. (AS)


COMMENT. A copy of this rare dictionary is held in the British Museum as British Museum Ms. Add. 18, pp. 121-125. (AS)


COMMENT. While this is a type of languages documentaion that is relatively rare, no indication is given of the provenance of these songs, and since many distinct Kenyah groups reside in the Baram river basin, their value as cultural documents is somewhat diminished. (RB)


COMMENT. This book contains just under 3,000 entries representing the Lepo’ Tau dialect spoken at Long Moh, Sarawak. Not all entries are bases, and morphologically related forms are often cross-referenced. Glosses are moderately detailed. (RB)


COMMENT. This piece contains very little substantive information, and its title betrays the loose, impressionistic criteria that many early researchers on the languages of Sarawak used in classifying local languages. Kiput is a close relative of Narum, Dali’, Miri, Belait and other Lower Baram languages that have had a distinctly different history than any of the Kenyah languages (Blust 2002a). As in other parts of the world, speakers of small minority populations will sometimes fabricate a connection with larger groups in order to avoid tedious explanations of ‘who they are’ when asked by outsiders. (RB)


COMMENT. By far the most extensive collection of lexical data on any of the Kelabit-Lun Dayeh languages. Entries include both bases and affixes forms, the latter often being listed twice, once as derivatives of the base and again as a cross-referenced word. The dialect represented is not identified in the text of the dictionary, but is one in which the original voiced aspirates have been reduced to simple consonants. (RB)


COMMENT. A classic anthropological study written with unusual charm, this little book contains numerous passages in Bidayuh as spoken at Mentu Tapuh. These are taken from songs that complement the text and enliven it as the reader is led through the tale of a Land Dayak folk hero to an understanding of the culture that produced it. (RB)


COMMENT. This important publication, which began as a doctoral dissertation at the Free University of Amsterdam, is the only grammar done to date for any of the languages of eastern Sabah. It contains *inter alia* sections or subsections on dialects, typology, earlier research, fieldwork, consultants and methodology, language and culture, phoneme inventory, phonotaxis, morphophonology, reduplication, post-lexical processes, affix slots, morphological typology, the distinction between inflection and derivation, parts of speech, verbal clauses, existential predicates, questions, imperatives, actor voice class prefixes, the undergoer voice incomplete, completive aspect, the dependent, non-volitive mood, irregular verbs, reciprocals, causatives, petitives, manner nominalizations, nominal and prepositional phrases, quantifier expressions, possession, demonstratives, aspectuals, negation, auxiliaries, adverbs, discourse markers, interclausal relations, pragmatics, word order and genre, three appendices, references and an index. The appendices include A: five stories totalling 45 pages of text together with interlinear glosses and free translations, B, a vocabulary of about 2,000 words, and C, a list of all texts collected. (RB)


COMMENT. A brief and somewhat dense description of the pronouns of Busang (Kayan) and Long Gelat (Modang). For both languages a four-way number distinction is recognized between singular, dual, plural (3 to 10 people), and plural (over 10 people). Following the usage in other parts of the Austronesian world and elsewhere, the first of the two plural categories might better be termed ‘paucal’. Possessive pronouns are formed by inflecting the base *anu* ‘which one?, thing mentioned’ in Busang, and *nə* in Long Gelat. (RB)


COMMENT. This hard to locate piece provides a brief sketch of the Lebbu and Basep, two of the most seriously underdescribed ethnolinguistic groups of Kalimantan. The linguistic data given is frustratingly sparse, being limited to some 30 words of Lebbu Inaran in footnote 2, and a small number of words scattered through the text. The first of these is compared with two Basep word lists drawn from an unpublished vocabulary collected by the Dutch government linguist W. Korn, and it is concluded that Basep, Lebbu and Bolongan belong to a previously unrecognized, and still unnamed subgroup (RB)

COMMENT. An English abstract of this working paper was published in the Borneo Research Bulletin in 1996. (RB)


COMMENT. The earliest grammar of any language of Borneo, and still one of the most complete. The writer was a Swiss missionary employed by the Netherlands Bible Society who lived among the Ngaju people from 1850-1856, during which time he completed a 374-
page grammar, a 638-page dictionary, and a Bible translation. This exceptional grammar begins with an overview of the dialect picture for the Ngaju area, including a discussion of the ritual language (basa Sangiang) and the language of songs. Chapter 1 then discusses the orthography and pronunciation of the language, Chapter 2 treats word-formation, Chapter 3 covers a wide range of grammatical topics including word-classes (articles, substantives, adjectives, number words, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections), and Chapter 4, almost unique for its time, is titled ‘Syntax’, and covers general syntactic rules and remarks in relation to the various word classes. In many ways prefiguring the working methods introduced into the American linguistic scene by Franz Boas and his students, the grammar is supplemented with a 136-page text (the Augh olo balian hapan tiwah, a shamanistic rite) with annotations. (RB)


COMMENT. Although it was published over a century and a half ago, this arguably is the finest dictionary yet done for any language in Borneo. It contains 638 pages of Ngaju Dayak to German text in double columns and 8 point type, with considerable attention to semantic detail. Base entries are typically 25-40 lines in length, and contain a wealth of morphological information, as well as cross-references to variant pronunciations of the same form, particularly g/k variants. (RB)


COMMENT. Contains brief observations on linguistic similarities and differences among nomadic groups in Borneo in an attempt to determine whether they have one origin or multiple origins. (AS)


COMMENT. A small dictionary intended for use by beginning level language learners. The title indicates that the dictionary contains the “7,000 most used Malagasy words”. Derived forms are listed both separately and under the root definition in an attempt to aid beginning level Malagasy learners. (AS)


COMMENT. This historically precious manuscript was produced after the first Dutch voyage to island Southeast Asia at the onset of the seventeenth century. Since travel by ship at that time required months to traverse the distance between western Europe and the Indies, the first and subsequent commercial expeditions stopped at Madagascar to take on fresh water, firewood and foodstuffs before continuing across the Indian Ocean. As a result of the efforts of the Dutch crews to learn some of the local language in both of these widely separated points, it was almost immediately recognized that Malagasy and Malay share many features of lexicon, and so must have a common origin. (RB)

COMMENT. An important collection of comparative vocabularies for 20 language communities in the Barito river basin and neighboring areas of southeast Borneo, along with comparable data for Bahasa Indonesia and Malagasy. The material for indigenous groups represents perhaps seven or eight distinct languages, three of which are traditionally known as Ot Danum, Ngaju Dayak and Ma’anyan. The vocabularies consist of a 215-item Swadesh list, an additional 104 terms chosen for relevance to the local physical or cultural environment, and 52 kinship terms defined by explicit kin specifications (e.g. Sb+, Sb-, Co 1 – Co 5, PaBr+, PaBr-, etc.). Among the most valuable features of this material are its illumination of dialect differences within Ngaju Dayak, the establishment of a Barito subgroup of languages to which Malagasy clearly belongs, and the sole published vocabulary for Tunjung of the Lake Jempang region to the west of Samarinda. Despite its carefully constructed elicitation schedule for kinship terms, however, it overlooked the crucially important cross-sibling terms Ṇahe ‘brother (woman speaking), betaú ‘sister (man speaking)’, which were recognized for Ngaju Dayak by Hardeland (1859), and related forms of which may exist in other languages of the area (Blust 1993). (RB)


COMMENT. A pioneering study that drew a sharp line between Land Dayak and Malayic Dayak languages in West Kalimantan and adjacent portions of southern Sarawak. Through this paper it was made clear that there are many indigenous, longhouse-dwelling communities ofanimists that speak Malay-like languages in western Borneo. Although Hudson himself believed that these were due to back-migration from southern Sumatra, other scholars who have benefitted from his documentation have reached the contrary conclusion that Borneo was the homeland of Malay, an originally local language that entered history and greatly expanded its cultural influence centuries later as the language of the Indianized state and major entrepot of Sriwijaya in southern Sumatra. (RB)


COMMENT. A provisional classification of the languages of Sarawak, with occasional references to other parts of Borneo. This often-cited paper is valuable in some respects, but also contains features that must be treated with caution, as the assignment of Malay, Iban, the Idahan group, the Murut-Tidong subgroup, and the Dusun-Bisaya subgroup to an [Exo-
Bornean’ category, and the existence of a ‘Rejang-Baram group’ for which no evidence of exclusively shared innovations is given. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper is the first “systematic investigation of the acquisition of Malagasy.” It presents findings from a longitudinal study of children of 19-32 months of age. The findings are used to argue in favor of an analysis where promoted topic arguments are
A’-elements. The paper also postulates a developmental stage in Malagasy acquisition that parallels root infinitive stages in various European languages. (AS)


Inagaki, Kazuya. 2006a. *A dictionary, texts and papers on Kadorih: based on the results of field surveys conducted in Indonesia in 2006*. Kyoto: Kyoto University. 349 pp. Keywords: 1. dictionary, longer descriptive study, 2. Kalimantan, 3. English.


COMMENT. This article gives a detailed description of word duplication in Kadorih, a West Barito language spoken in Kalimantan. The author presents arguments for two types of duplication: repetition and reduplication. Repeated words are interpreted as intonational phrases while reduplicated words are interpreted as intonational words. A reduplicated word carries a single intonation, shown in the paper as level with a fall at the end of the word. Repeated words on the other hand have two intonational patterns, rising throughout each word. The article also gives a thorough description of the functions of reduplication, which is used to express plurality, intensity, diminution, and, when interrogative pronouns are reduplicated, indefiniteness. (AS)


COMMENT. This book is something of a surprise, since a shorter publication (52 pages) with the same title was published by the Pusat Bahasa in Jakarta only six years earlier (Darmansyah, Durdje Durasid, Nirmala Sari, and Aris Djinal 1994). Following the foreword and acknowledgements, the body of the book is divided into three chapters: 1. Introduction, 2. Data analysis, 3. Conclusions. As is standard in government-sponsored Indonesian publications on language, the introduction sketches the background to the study, states the problem addressed, the goals of the work, the theory adopted, the methods used, and sources of data. Chapter 2 is fairly rich, with 24 pages of data tables in 10-point type and phonetic transcription. This is followed by tables of the vocoids, diphthongs, and ‘contoids’ of Maanyan. Although it is frowned upon by some theoreticians, the term ‘diphthong’ is used here, as in descriptions of many non-Oceanic Austronesian languages, for vowel-glide sequences such as -ey or –uy. (RB)


COMMENT. A standard field report done within the framework of the second five-year plan of the Indonesian national government to advance national culture, this book consists of a 16-page introduction describing the Bukit community (about 5,000 people scattered through the
Meratus mountains of Central Kalimantan in the headwaters of various tributaries of the Barito river), a 10-page chapter on phonology, a 50-page chapter on morphology, and a 12-page chapter on syntax. In addition, there are three appendices, the first a vocabulary of around 400 words, the second consisting of three texts with Indonesian translations, and the last a set of five maps showing first the general area in Borneo and then the specific locations of each of the communities visited in the course of the field study. (RB)


COMMENT. This anthropological thesis contains a 12-page glossary of Kelabit terms in the Pa’ Dalih dialect, which differs in some details from the better-known dialect of Bario, but resembles it in many other ways. Although she cites linguistic sources that provide correct phonemic representations of many of these terms in Bario Kelabit, the author prefers her own transcription of language data, which unfortunately often omits final glottal stop (baa for baaʔ ‘wet’, doo for dooʔ ‘good’, migu for miguʔ ‘shy, ashamed’, etc.) final /h/ (raya for rayə ‘big, important’, ubi ‘root, roots’ for ubih ‘tuber’, lun tau for lun tauh ‘our people’, etc.), and penultimate schwa between a stop and a liquid (bra for bəra ‘husked, uncooked rice’, krid for korid ‘vegetable side dish eaten with rice’, ngebru ‘to renew’ from base bəruh ‘new’, etc.). (RB)


COMMENT. Edward Keenan has been kind enough to inform us that this is a collection of Malagasy newspaper articles, carefully translated and arranged according to length and difficulty, which is helpful for people trying to learn Malagasy. In addition it contains a slightly updated version of the original grammar of Malagasy by Rev. W.E. Cousins, the original of which appeared with the Richardson dictionary in 1885. (AS)


Jorgensen, S. E. 1896 [1882]. Classification of Malagasy consonants, and some of their changes. AAMM 2.6: 197-200. Keywords: 1. shorter descriptive study, 2. Madagascar, 3. English.


COMMENT. This is a massive undertaking which was completed over an eight year period by a committee of the Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association in conjunction with members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Malaysia Branch. It contains about 3,300 base forms, but over 25,000 additional affixed forms, thus providing a treasure-trove of data on the morphology of the language. All entries contain a Kadazan Dusun form in boldface type followed by a Malay translation equivalent in plain font, and then an English translation in parenthesized italics. In addition to its main section the dictionary also contains a 55-page introduction covering the history of the lexicography project, the purpose of the book, and general linguistic information, including explanations of the orthography, data on personal pronouns and demonstratives, phonological alternations, and morphology. It concludes with a 268-page glossary of affixed forms that are accompanied by coded grammatical information. (RB)


COMMENT. This substantial dictionary of Timugon Murut is a product of cooperative work carried out between Richard and Kielo Brewis of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Sabah Branch, the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (formerly ‘The Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association’), and members of the Timugon community. Following 62 pages of introductory matter the main body of the dictionary contains 842 pages of Timugon Murut word bases in double columns and 8 point type, many of which are accompanied by one or more affixed forms. All glosses and explanations are in Malay. The main body of the dictionary is followed by an ‘Indeks Melayu-Murut Timugon’, which consists of 55 pages of one-word semantic equivalents, a 37-page summary of main features of the grammar, a 73-page sketch
of various features of Timugon Murut culture, two pages of names of malevolent nature spirits, a one-page glossary of linguistic terms in Malay, and three pages of references. (RB)


COMMENT. This carefully constructed study contains six chapters, three appendices, an extensive set of references, three maps and a page of biodata. Chapter 1 is a 19-page description of the problem addressed, the goals and potential importance of the study, the theory and model followed, the phonological system of Dusun, and several other topics. Chapter 2 is an attempt to reconcile two approaches to language comparison that are called ‘analisis kontrastif’ and ‘analisis kesilapan’. The first of these can readily be translated as ‘contrastive analysis’, and is used in the sense that this term is normally understood. The second term was evidently coined by the Malaysian linguist Nik Safiah Karim to refer to what is described as “a use of language that deviates from the language system or rules of language that are agreed upon, either on the level of expressions, choice of words, or the structure of phrases or larger pieces of text.” This approach is then pursued through Chapters 3 and 4, which describe the prepositional systems of Dusun and Standard Malay, and finally Chapter 5, which provides a contrastive analysis of the use of prepositions in these two languages, and Chapter 6, which devotes 70 pages to an ‘analisis kesilapan’, described here more succinctly as an analysis of errors not as random deviations from expectation, but rather as these reflect prior knowledge of a different language and so constitute interference effects in second language learning. (RB)


COMMENT. An overview of the Dusun Deyah language of southeast Kalimantan. Like most Indonesian publications this one follows a rather fixed template, starting with a
description of the background and problem addressed, the goals of the investigation, methods of data collection, and theoretical basis of the work, all briefly outlined in chapter 1. Chapter 2 provides five pages of data on the sociocultural background of the language community described. Chapter 3 is a 10-page description of the phonology, chapter 4 a 40-page description of the morphology, chapter 5 a 40-page description of the syntax, and chapter 6 a two-page summary of conclusions. In addition there are three appendices, the first an 8-page set of conversations in parallel columns of Dusun Deyah on the left and Indonesian on the right, the second a basic vocabulary list of about 350 words, and the third a 16-page fieldwork questionnaire showing the general outlines of the procedure followed in collecting the data for this study. (RB)


COMMENT. This article gives a quantitative corpus analysis of the use of “nonactive” verbs in Malagasy novels and newspapers as compared to the use of passive verbs in other languages (typically English). The authors find a high percentage of nonactive verbs in Malagasy texts which are used much more frequently than passives in English texts. This feature is common in Austronesian languages and especially those with a Philippine type voice system. The authors conclude that nonactive verbs are best “analysed as transitive verbs rather than derived intransitives with agent phrases expressible as optional adjuncts”.

(AS)


COMMENT. This early resource offers a 14 page grammatical introduction, followed by a 27 page English-Malagasy vocabulary in double columns. There is also a short section on “phrases” which includes names of months, days of the week, and short simple sentences. The final section is a series of stories in Malagasy totaling over 18 pages. Most of the stories are not translated into English, however, and an understanding of the language is consequently required to make use of them. (AS)


COMMENT. This is the most extensive vocabulary for any of the languages of eastern Sabah. The first 108 pages consist of Tombonuwo lexical items arranged by semantic field (world; flora; wild animals; body; postures, actions; emotions, values; communication; way of life; eating and drinking; society; beliefs, arts; possessions; descriptives; linguistics). This is followed by an alphabetically arranged vocabulary of about 3,300 words in a Tombonuwo-Malay-English section (pp. 109-164), followed by reverse indexes in Malay (pp. 165-197), and English (pp. 199-236). (RB)


COMMENT. The term ‘Paitanic’ is used for a group of five named languages in northeast Sabah that form links in an apparent dialect chain. This paper presents two types of evidence for making the language/dialect distinction: lexicostatistics and intelligibility testing. It concludes that there are four mutually unintelligible languages in this group: Upper Kinabatangan, Tambanua, Abai Sungai, and Lingkabau. The position of Lobu as a distinct language remains unclear, and it is possible that Upper Kinabatangan is a cover term for two separate languages. (RB)


COMMENT. This important survey volume summarizes the state of knowledge of workers in the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Sabah branch regarding the number and size of languages in Sabah, their geographical locations, and degrees of relationship during the early 1980s. Since it’s purpose was ostensibly to determine how many sites were needed for scriptural translation the focus is entirely on the ‘externals’ of the languages. As a result, despite its size, it is devoid of linguistic data of any kind. (RB)


COMMENT. One of the more useful contributions to Bornean linguistics by a social anthropologist, this paper contains a short introduction on the Maloh (Embaloh, Taman, Kalis) language with comments on previous literature, dialect differences, and a proposed phoneme inventory. This is followed by an alphabetical listing of about 630 Maloh lexical items with English glosses that on the whole are more nuanced and informative than is typical for most short vocabularies on the languages of Borneo. (RB)


Kroeger, Paul R. 1985. Linguistic relations among the groups in the Kota Marudu district. *BRB* 17: 31-46. Keywords: 1. other, 2. Sabah, 3. English.


COMMENT. This is a valuable historical study which begins by observing that many nouns in Dusunic languages differ in that the form in one language begins with a vowel, while in another it begins with *t*- as in Rungus Dusun *asu*, Kimaragang Dusun *tasu* ‘dog’, or Rungus Dusun *onsi*, Kimaragang Dusun *tonsi* ‘meat’. Since this correspondence cannot be explained as the result of a regular sound change Kroeger seeks an explanation in fossilized morphology. Through a careful examination of morphological paradigms in several forms of Dusun he is able to show that the ‘moveable *t*-’ in Kimaragang words like *tasu* ‘dog’ almost certainly arose through the capture of a preposed definite article/demonstrative *ti*, with reanalysis of the following noun as containing the consonant of the grammatical marker. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper describes a phonological constraint in Kimaragang Dusun and some other Dusunic languages of Sabah, whereby the sequence *oCa* is disallowed, and leads to extensive vowel alternations in affixed bases, but the reverse sequence *aCo* remains unchanged. Kroeger calls this sequencing restriction ‘vowel harmony’, but this usage deviates from standard descriptions of vowel harmony, which require all vowels within a given phonological domain to agree in the features [front], [high], [round] and the like without regard to sequencing. The Dusunic phenomenon thus appears to be more appropriately described as a ‘sequencing constraint’ than a harmonic requirement. (RB)


Kroeger, Paul R. To appear. Nominal and emphatic negation in Borneo. In In Sercombe, Boutin, and Clynes. Keywords: 1. theoretical study, 2. Sabah, 3. English.


COMMENT. This book is a preliminary dialect geography of the Pontianak district in the province of West Kalimantan. It begins with a summary statement of the purpose of the work which is written in Indonesian and translated (very poorly) into English. The main body of the work is a set of 100 maps showing the distribution of local forms for target terms in Indonesian over four language sites. The mapping is crude, and minimally informative throughout. (RB)


Linggi, Datin Amar Margaret. The language of Iban weaving. In Collins and Hermansyah: 140-146. Keywords: 1. other, 2. Sarawak, 3. English.


COMMENT. A doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Hawai‘i in December, 2012. The material in this dissertation represents a small part of the material collected through one of the most extensive fieldwork programs undertaken in the past half century, reaching from northeast Luzon through Sabah and northern Sulawesi, with particularly fine-grained coverage of Sabah. A number of separate topics are addressed, only a few of which are directly relevant to the present bibliography. (RB)


COMMENT. This book contains the most comprehensive survey data yet published for the languages of Sabah, with a comparative vocabulary of about 600 lexical items for 46 languages representing the entire linguistic landscape of northern Borneo --- primarily Sabah, but also including portions of Brunei, Sarawak, and northeast Kalimantan. In addition to the comparative vocabulary, sets of functors pivotal to the working of the voice system and other grammatical systems are given for all languages. (RB)


COMMENT: A short vocabulary of 36 words with Malay equivalents. (AS)


COMMENT. This paper discusses the place of Belait among the languages of Brunei, and concludes that it is an intrusive member of the Lower Baram subgroup whose closest relatives are found in northern Sarawak. More specifically, it notes that members of the current Belait community speak essentially the same language that Ray (1913) called ‘Lemiting’, and that this is known as ‘Lemeting’ in other contexts. A 385-word vocabulary is appended, and it is clear from this that the closest living relative of Belait is Kiput, spoken very near the junction of the Tutoh and Baram rivers (Blust 2002a, 2003). Belait is somewhat more conservative than Kiput in preserving the velar nasal word-finally, in not undergoing the shift of word-final *-k to glottal stop, in not having undergone final devoicing of stops, in not having merged final liquids with *n, and in various other ways, including differences in the class of blocking consonants for the historical change of low vowel fronting (Blust 2000). (RB)


**COMMENT.** A valuable study documenting language use among the diasporic Kelabit who have taken up residence in coastal towns to reap the benefits of better employment opportunities. The great majority of these are said to live in Kuching, Bintulu, Miri or Limbang in Sarawak, and in the oilfields of Brunei, where they are surrounded by speakers of other languages who greatly outnumber them. It was found that even under these adverse circumstances if both parents were Kelabit the language transmitted to children was generally Kelabit, but if only one parent was Kelabit the rate of transmission of the language was much lower, with both English and Malay being favored alternatives. (RB)


COMMENT. This research note is a reaction to an earlier note by Kimball which claimed that word-medial /h/, which has been lost between unlike vowels in the spoken forms of standard Malay, is also being lost in Brunei Malay. Maxwell notes that Kimball’s claims were based on the Barunay subdialect of Brunei Malay, and that the Kadayan subdialect preserves this segment more faithfully, in many cases in the same lexical items in which it is retained in Banjarese. (RB)


COMMENT. A useful inventory and typology of oral literature genres among the indigenous peoples of Sarawak, but one without data samples. (RB)


COMMENT. An interesting account of the Kedayan version of a widespread cultural feature in insular Southeast Asia. Going beyond most anthropological accounts, this short description combines ethnographic observation with etymological information in an attempt to tease out the conceptual underpinnings of this type of behavior. (RB)


COMMENT. This report of a field expedition up the Balui river and some of its tributaries provides several types of vocabulary for Long Gang and Sambup Kenyah, near Long Jemulai on the Belaga river. Items collected include a set of consanguineal and affinal kin terms, death names, and a variant of the Swadesh 200-word basic vocabulary. (RB)

COMMENT. A report of observations about the natural and cultural environment made along the Balui river and its tributaries in the late twentieth century. Contains a 200-word Swadesh list for the Sihan, one of the most underrepresented ethnic groups in Sarawak, with a population estimated at 117 individuals in 1992. A major ethnological question addressed is whether the Sihan are the same group as the elusive Punan Batu. The available linguistic evidence suggests that they are different, but the author remains agnostic about this question. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper argues that the Rejang language of southern Sumatra shares phonological and morphological parallels with Malay, and with Mukah Melanau of coastal Sarawak that are most plausibly due to areal influence in Borneo, followed by a migration to Sumatra. Since most or all of these could have arisen independently, their use as subgrouping evidence remains an open question. (RB)
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COMMENT. This pedagogical grammar contains 25 lessons with topics ranging from ‘Meeting a friend’ and ‘Going to someone’s house’ (Lessons 1 and 2) to ‘Traditional medicine’ and ‘Marriage negotiations’ (Lessons 24 and 25). They thus progress from relatively culture-free activities to those that require a deeper appreciation of the Kadazan way of life. Each lesson begins with a conversation between two people (examples: Lesson Three, ‘Studying the language’, has a conversation between a Kadazan person and someone who is studying the language, Lesson Ten, ‘The death of a neighbor’ has a conversation between two neighbors who discuss the death of someone in the village, Lesson Nineteen, ‘Domestic animals’, has a conversation between a husband and wife about the pigs they are raising). The conversations are followed by notes on language structure, drills and vocabulary. The authors no doubt drew extensively on their own experience in learning the language to write this book, and it appears likely that anyone with sufficient motivation and
application could learn basic conversational Kadazan through studying these well-planned lessons. (RB)


COMMENT. A valuable body of material collected over a lifetime of study of the Oya Melanau. Although this work is primarily anthropological in orientation it contains a substantial amount of language data relating to traditional culture, including a 21-page glossary provided by Beatrice Clayre, and a list of spirits and other beings that are mentioned in the texts. (RB)

Moulton, J.C. 1921. Points of the compass in Brunei Malay. JSBRAS 83: 75. Keywords: 1. ethnolinguistic study, 2. Brunei, 3. English.


**COMMENT.** This dictionary is a major achievement by a member of the Sarawak Bidayuh community for the Bidayuh people as a whole. It consists of a short introductory section which briefly discusses pronunciation and orthography, followed by 670 pages of Bidayuh-English entries in 12 point type and double columns. The dialect chosen is that of Pûrûh, which is said to have been spoken at Pûrûh Rabak Mikabuh “from time immemorial.” Since the total number of bolded headwords is over 10,500, this must be considered one of the most complete dictionaries for any of the languages of Borneo. The introductory material would have benefitted from contact with a linguist, and the organization could be improved in places, as where some entries are listed both under the simple base and separately under a prefixed form, but on the whole this is a masterful achievement. (RB)


COMMENT. A classic paper that cuts through the utter confusion in the earlier literature (and some more recent literature) in the use of the terms ‘Penan’ and ‘Punan’. Following earlier work by Leach, Needham made it clear that the Punan Ba/Punan Bah are not nomadic, and probably never have been, and that the endonym for nomadic and some formerly nomadic settled groups in Sarawak is ‘Penan’, not ‘Punan’, the latter form being the Kayan term for the same groups. What Needham was not in a position to know is that all Sarawak Penan languages are members of the Kenyah group, an observation that has clear relevance to the issue of pristine nomadism vs. devolved agriculturalists. (RB)


COMMENT. This short sketch contains a fairly complete set of kinship terms from both Eastern and Western Penan. All terms are cognate, and the only differences between them are minor details of phonology. No indication is given as to which particular communities of ‘Eastern’ or ‘Western’ Penan are represented. (RB)


COMMENT. This outstanding contribution to the dialectology of the South Barito district begins with a 12-page introduction that lists the 146 villages sampled and their assignment to 12 kecamatan, tables of population, and various other topics, such as language use in the family, in schools, in government offices, in the market, in religious observances, and in situations of bilingualism. This is followed by an 11-page chapter that provides generalizations about the types of sounds found in Ngaju Dayak, Maanyan, Bakumpai, Lawangan, Paku and Banjarese. The main body of the book is Chapter 3, ‘Analisis data hasil penelitian’ (analysis of the data resulting from the investigation), which contains 216 pages of lexical items in six parallel columns, the first in Indonesian and the next five in the villages sampled. This includes a 211-word list for 145 villages followed by 210 maps that plot the geographical distribution of forms for a given meaning in fine detail. This book sets the standard for other work in the dialectology of any region of Indonesia. (RB)


Noor Azam Haji-Othman. To appear. Teaching an unwritten language: Tutong language. In Sercombe, Boutin and Clynnes. Keywords: 1. other, 2. Brunei, 3. English.


COMMENT. This paper provides a brief, but comprehensive overview of the languages of Brunei Darussalam, based entirely on a variant of the Swadesh 200-item basic vocabulary. It recognizes the following linguistic units: 1. Malay isolects (Kedayan/Kadayan, Kampung Air, Brunei Malay, Peninsular Standard Malay), 2. Tutong, 3. Belait, 4. Dusun, 5. Penan, 6. Mukah, 7. Murut (Lun Bawang), and 8. Iban. Although it is generally valuable, the paper is marred by several errors. The first of these is the statement (153) that Kampung Air “uses –ŋku before heads with a final vowel”, when what clearly was intended was “after heads with a final vowel.” The same error is repeated in a statement about the suffixed possessive pronoun –ku or –ŋku in Brunei Malay. The second error is the statement (155) that “The closest relative of Tutong and Belait in Brunei is the Dusun language.” But Dusun is a Sabahan language, while Tutong, Belait and Penan are all members of the North Sarawak group (Blust 1969). Two pages later it is stated in contrast to the statement just made that Tutong, Penan and Mukah are most closely related, and some lexicon that appears to be shared exclusively is given as evidence for this claim. It is surprising that the appendix, which provides comparative vocabularies for eleven language communities, together with a table of cognate percentages, makes no reference at all to Blust (1974), where the same type of data and calculations are given for 56 languages. (RB)


COMMENT. Text with word level glossing and free translations. (AS)


COMMENT. This is a searching study of language contact between the Sama-Bajaw and Tausug of the Sulu archipelago in the southern Philippines, done with great care and insight. It contains a considerable quantity of language data, much of it organized into appendices based on semantic fields. Data is drawn from twelve Sama-Bajaw languages, most of them with dialect distinctions. The book concludes with 14 appendices, the first on identification of data sources, the second presenting the case for an East Mindanao subgroup that includes Tausug, Butuanun, Surigaonun, Mamanwa, Kamayo and Mansakan, the third containing the word lists used for lexical comparisons (the Swadesh 100-item list, a 193-word list drawn from the Swades 200-item list, and the 372-item list in Reid (1971), the fourth a list of problem reconstructions of Proto-Sama-Bajaw phonemes, and a number of others, of which the most important are wordlists for marine and land taxa, reconstructions relating to the preparation and eating of food, reconstructions for cultigens, for agriculture and animal husbandry, for hunting, for protected and wild useful plants and forest products, for fishing, and for cockfighting. (RB)


COMMENT. This detailed study includes information on genus, species, vernacular name, description, habitat and function for 144 species of identified plants. (RB)


Peill, A. P. 1889 [1887]. Have we a ‘possessive case’ or a ‘construct state’ in Malagasy? 
_AAMM_ 3.3 (no. 11): 310. Keywords: 1. other, 2. Madagascar, 3. English.
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COMMENT. Despite its title the author begins this paper by stating “This paper is, first of all, a study of the Brunei Malay vowel system.” It is preoccupied with the fact that unlike Standard Malay, Brunei Malay has only three contrastive vowels: /a/, /i/ and /u/. This leads the author to the conclusion that Proto-Malayic had a similar three vowel system, despite the problems this creates for explaining the origin of the schwa in a number of Malay dialects, including standard Malay, Sarawak Malay, Jakarta Malay, and Natuna Malay, among others. (RB)
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COMMENT. This pioneering study, originally defended as a doctoral dissertation at the Australian National University in 1969, was the first systematic grammar of any of the languages of Sabah. Although it is replete with tagmemic formulas that sometimes impede reading, the great merit of this book is the abundance of data given to illustrate patterns of structure. The main body of the work is devoted to a grammar of Timugon Murut, but goes beyond this central aim. Chapters include 1. Introduction, 2. Phonology, 3. Basic verbal clauses, 4. Basic non-verbal clauses, 5. Morphology, 6. Clause exponents and orderings, 7. Phrase constructions, 8. Non-basic clauses, 9. Texts, and 10. Outline studies of other Murut languages. Texts are relatively limited (33 pages of data plus translations and commentary). The final chapter provides brief sketches of 1. subdialects of Timugon, 2. dialects of Lowland Murut, 3. the Highland Murut language, and 4. the Okolod Murut language. (RB)


COMMENT. This paper draws attention to what appears to be a parallel unconditioned split of Proto-Austronesian *b* in Javanese, Kadazan Dusun and Timugon Murut, and argues on the basis of overlap in lenited reflexes in all three languages that Proto-Austronesian *b*
represents two distinct phonemes. However, the split of *b in medial position is largely conditioned by the presence or absence of an immediately preceding schwa, and although this condition cannot explain the word-initial correspondences, there are many exceptions to the two correspondence classes that Prentice sets up, seriously weakening the force of his argument. (RB)


COMMENT. This book, along with the second volume (see Rabenilaina 1984 below) may be of limited use to the modern Malagasy scholar. The books are written in Malagasy, so making use of them demands a strong grasp of the language. Additionally, they seem to be
written from the now out of date theoretical framework of 1970’s generative grammar, with phrase re-write rules and corresponding trees, making the books useful for little more than a study of the history of Malagasy theoretical linguistics. (AS)


COMMENT: According to Edward Keenan this is a useful work which updates Richardson (1885), and Abinal and Malzac (1888). It is primarily a Malagasy-French dictionary, although there is a very brief French-Malagasy section at the end. (AS)


COMMENT. This is a useful article in summarizing basic observations about the distribution of verb-initial and verb-medial Austronesian languages. However, it states erroneously that SOV and OVS typologies are not found in Austronesian languages, despite the well-known occurrence of several dozen SOV Austronesian languages in Southeast New Guinea and the island of Bougainville in the western part of the Solomons chain, and the less well-known occurrence of a few OVS Austronesian languages in the Indonesian province of Papua. (RB)


**COMMENT.** A fundamental resource for anyone seeking a lexical overview of the languages of Borneo as a whole. Contains the equivalents of 211 English words for 104 language groups, as well as separate sections on pronouns and numerals. In general semantic categories are culturally appropriate (the first ten items are: 1. areca nut, 2. arm, 3. arrow, 4. ashes, 5. bad, 6. bamboo, 7. banana, 8. barter, 9. basket, 10. belly). The orthography is imperfect, as it overlooks distinctions such as plain vs. implosive stops, but is superior to many sources from its time, reflecting the standing of Ray as an important early scholar of Austronesian languages. (RB)


COMMENT. An English-Singhi (Senggi) Land Dayak vocabulary compiled by a Catholic priest. It totals about 2,700 English entries, but the number of Singhi forms may be greater, since many English words are given multiple Singhi equivalents. However, because of the type of organization adopted (seeking the equivalents of English lexemes) semantic information is minimal. (RB)


COMMENT. This is an unusual combination of descriptive and comparative-historical analysis in a single volume. According to the preface (p. x) this book began with the collection of a comparative wordlist as part of the Bidayuh Language Development Project from March, 2001 to December, 2002. The elicitation list that was used began with 346 items collected “from 27 regional varieties of Bidayuh as well as Rara and Salako,” but in the course of data collection about 50 additional words were added, bringing the total to just under 400 items. Based on this material the authors provide a valuable discussion of nasality in Bidayuh phonology, and of nasals in Bidayuh morphology. The bulk of the volume (over 300 pages) is devoted to a reconstruction of Proto-Bidayuh, with distinctions made between three levels: Proto-Land Dayak, Proto-Bidayuh, and Proto-Bakati’. Reference is also made
to higher-level proto-languages, but the treatment on this level lacks consistency, as the forms are cited from multiple sources, some of which are long out of date. (RB)


COMMENT. This is one of the few publications available for Modang of East Kalimantan, a language which --- like Sa’ban in Sarawak --- has undergone dramatic typological changes in relation to its neighbors. The basic change from a predominant disyllabism to a predominant monosyllabism that allows previously impossible initial consonant clusters and some new consonants is well-described, but some details of the phonetic description are problematic. It is claimed, for example, that Modang has word-final voiceless implosive stops “as in Maanyan”, but cross-linguistically implosives are almost invariably voiced and pre-vocalic, and Maanyan has never been reported as having them. (RB)


COMMENT. This work marks a clear advance over earlier dictionaries of Iban. It contains a 30-page introduction which includes 6 pages of references to publications on Iban language and culture, and over 400 pages of double columns in 8 point type. Some entries are very long, as that for *gawai* ‘religious rites accompanied by festivity, feast, festival’, which occupies two full pages of text, and includes a rich body of cultural information. (RB)


COMMENT. A reprint of a vocabulary by Robert Drury published as part of a larger autobiographical work in 1729. Richardson adds a comparison to “Modern Malagasy” which is to be understood as the Hova (Merina) dialect of the late 1800’s. The list has 654 total items. Being such an old source, the entries from Drury’s 1729 vocabulary have several orthographic and phonological oddities influenced by English spellings including as the use of "augh, ough, or aough" for words ending with "ao", word-initial "c" for "k", omission of vowels (especially unstressed "a"), and use of double letters throughout. Richardson’s addition of modern words uses the standard orthography. (AS)


COMMENT. This dictionary, accompanied by a 50-page ‘Concise introduction to the Malagasy language’ written by W.E. Cousins, remains the most complete English-language source on the lexicon of Malagasy. At 832 pages in 8 point type and double columns it contains over 12,000 base forms and many more morphological derivatives. Although the dictionary is primarily concerned with the standard dialect of Merina, it contains numerous forms marked ‘Provincial’. Generally these are given without specific indication of dialect region, although occasionally this can be determined from the details of lengthier glosses. Swahili loanwords are clearly distinguished (although errors of identification occur), and
compared with their source language, and occasional comparative remarks are made with regard to related words in Malay. (RB)


COMMENT. Richardson gives a detailed review of Robert Codrington’s 1885 book, *The Melanesian Languages* in which he compares the vocabulary and grammar of several Melanesian languages with Malagasy, Malay and Maori. The author notes errors in Codrington’s comparisons and deficiencies in the sources that he used to make those comparisons. (AS)


COMMENT. A useful introduction to Tindal Dusun based on notes collected during a 15-week Field Methods course at the University of Hawai‘i in 2004 (RB).


COMMENT. This paper re-examines the conclusions of Adelaar (1992a), and makes two novel claims: 1. that the language conventionally called ‘Old Malay’ was not Malayic, and 2. that the internal subgrouping of the Malayic subgroup divides a set of Malayic Dayak
languages including Salako, Ahe and Belangin from all other Malayic languages. The first claim appears to be largely a terminological issue, but the second advances beyond Adelaar (1992) in at least making an explicit subgrouping proposal, and proposing evidence for it. More seriously, for unexplained reasons it is claimed that “we are not yet in a position to put forward any hypothesis according to which Proto Malayic is subgrouped with some other group or groups within Malayo-Polynesian.” At no point does Ross address the claims for a Malayo-Chamic subgroup (Blust 1981b, 1994) and the Malayo-Chamic hypothesis is thus essentially dismissed with no reference to the relevant literature. (RB)


COMMENT. An English-Kayan wordlist that contains about 1,540 English terms and one or more Kayan equivalents. Because it is organized around English semantic concepts semantic information for the Kayan forms is minimal. In addition the orthography is not fully consistent, representing underlying penultimate schwa as zero between p_r or h_C, but as e between p_l: gall : pro’, ill : prah, pillow : hlen, cool: hngem, but jump : pelagang, rice (sticky) : pelubak, etc. (RB)


COMMENT. An interesting account of a rarely-discussed topic. Many Kayan names, both male and female are derived from common words, some of which are rather surprising. Male names include Apuy ‘fire’, Basah ‘wet’, Ivey ‘whirlpool’, and Nyipa’ ‘snake’, while female names tend to draw on words that are ‘gentler’. These include Bawang ‘lake’, Bulan ‘moon’,
Pidang ‘flower’, but also Uring ‘shinbone’. A separate section discusses priestly names such as the male name Lidem ‘dark’, and the female name Tening ‘clear, limpid’. (RB)


Keywords: 1. comparative study, 2. Madagascar, 3. English.

COMMENT. A short comparison between the Betsileo dialect of Malagasy, spoken in the Arindrano district, and the Hova (Merina) dialect. Topics discussed include absence of prenasalized stops in Betsileo, as in maba ‘crocodile’ (Hova mamba), velarization of n, as in mangisa ‘to count’ (Hova manisa), and lowering of final y [i] to e as in onge ‘river’ (Hova ony). The author also provides 30 examples of other sound correspondences between these Malagasy dialects. In addition, there is a list of 16 different lexical items and a comparative list of month names, a half page comparison of Bible translations, and a single paragraph on accent and intonation. This article does not provide much information for a researcher attempting a more comprehensive comparison, but nevertheless gives a glimpse into early efforts at Malagasy dialectology. (AS)


COMMENT. This is a massive compilation of traditional prayers, songs and other types of oral literature of several of the indigenous peoples of Sarawak. Volume 1 includes 220 pages of Iban texts, including such genres as cradle songs sung while swinging a child, and songs to set the cradle swinging. This is followed by 399 pages of Bidayuh texts, including a fertility prayer for one who has no child, spells to speed childbirth, a chant for the newborn child, and a blessing for a child eight days after its birth, and then 21 pages of Melanau texts, including a song sung while rocking a child, a swinging-game song, a prayer uttered before taking a honeycomb from the bees, and a boat song. Volume 2 continues with 390 pages of Kelabit texts, 34 pages of Kayan texts, 131 pages of Kenyah texts, and 51 pages of Penan texts. Remarks on language are not those of a linguist, but all-in-all this is a very important contribution to the study of the oral literature of Bornean peoples. (RB)


COMMENT. This is a collection of five Penan Urun songs with English translations. It is noted that the vocabulary in these songs is from the everyday colloquial language rather than being drawn from a special song-language register, as is more commonly the case in the oral traditions of Bornean peoples. (RB)

COMMENT. The language name in the title of this book has not previously appeared in the literature on Borneo. The authors note that it is spoken only in two small villages, Bintang Ara and (Muara) Malungai in kecamatan Bintang Awai, kabupaten Barito Selatan, and that it has previously been regarded as a dialect of Lawangan, the larger language that surrounds it, and that serves as a local lingua franca. Two maps are provided showing the location of the Bawo-speaking villages. These are followed by a 10-page introductory chapter, a 22-page chapter on phonology, a 32-page chapter on morphology, a 14-page chapter on syntax, two pages of conclusions, a page of references, and four appendices. The language is unusual in western Indonesia in that the authors recognize 9 vowel phonemes: /i/, /e/, /E/ ([ɛ]), /a/, /a/, /u/, /o/, /ɔ/, /U/ (described as mid-back unrounded). However, these are often written inconsistently, as with /ine/ (p. 16) vs. /inE/ (p. 18) ‘mother’, /oro/ (p. 19) vs. /ero/ (p. 20) ‘far’, /kone/ (p. 19) vs. /kɔne/ (p. 24) ‘person’, and /bolum/ (p. 19) vs. /bolum/ (p. 25) ‘to live’. In addition, of the 14 words used to illustrate the phoneme /a/, 13 are written instead with /e/, and for reasons that remain inscrutable, all voiced obstruents (/b/, /d/, /j/, /g/), nasals (/m/, /n/, /ñ/, /ŋ/; each of the last three written as /n/ in their Table 2), liquids (/l/, /r/), and glides (/w/, /y/) are said to be ‘bulat’ (rounded), while voiceless obstruents (/p/, /t/, /k/, /ʔ/, /s/) and /h/ are ‘tak bulat’ (unrounded), a phonetic characterization that appears totally unfounded. (RB)


COMMENT. This brief report gives 58 words in Sihan and Kayan, and eight equivalents in the neighboring Punan Bushang and Aput languages. The latter forms (I, you, we, father, mother, brother, sister, aunt) are almost identical with their Sihan counterparts, suggesting a community of origin that is consistent with Sihan traditions of having formerly been nomadic. (RB)


COMMENT. One of the rare accounts of ethnomycolgy in island Southeast Asia, this paper provides a detailed account of Iban classification of fungi (cover term: kulat), and uses for the various types. The list of edible fungi includes 43 named varieties, and the list of inedible fungi includes 22. The widespread belief in other Austronesian-speaking groups that fungi spring up after lightning strikes, or that they are associated with ghosts (Blust 2000), do not appear to be part of the Iban conception of these special plants. (RB)


COMMENT. This short paper by four employees at Universiti Brunei Darussalam, outlines a plan to produce a linguistic atlas of Borneo. It evidently was conceived, at least in part, as a reaction to the shortcomings in Moseley and Asher (1994) where this broader work touched on Borneo, and on Brunei in particular. The programmatic remarks that lay out the work to be done are bold and exciting, but so far nothing further has come of them. (RB)


COMMENT. This article presents a vocabulary of about 800 words for Bonggi of Banggi and Balembangan islands, and West Coast Bajau of Sabah. It was elicited in Malay, and is organized alphabetically by the Malay gloss (abang, abu, abuk, ada, etc.). Although it leaves much to be desired in phonetic detail the vocabulary provides the first indication of preploded final nasals in Bonggi, as seen in the citations asap : goudn ‘smoke’ (< *Rabun ‘mist, haze’), bakar : nutugn ‘burn’ (< *tutuŋ ‘ignite, burn’), bambu : torign ‘bamboo’ (< *teriŋ ‘bamboo sp.’), or semblan : siabm ‘nine’ (< *siam). (RB)


COMMENT. A useful dictionary of Iban, now superseded by Richards (1981). Scott was a phonetician, and one of the special features of this dictionary that did not appear in earlier works was the recognition of glottal stop as a phoneme in word-final position. This clarification of Iban phonetics led in turn to several comparative papers in which final glottal stop in Iban was compared with a similar segment in other languages in an attempt to account for this feature (not shared with e.g. Malay) by the reconstruction of a Proto-Austronesian glottal stop. (RB)


COMMENT. Despite its brevity this paper must be recognized as an important pioneering study. Although he draws on earlier observations about Mualang Dayak by the Dutch missionary P. Donatus Dunselman, Scott offers what seems to be the earliest account of
preploded final nasals in any of the languages of Borneo done by a trained phonetician. He evidently was the first to note that word-final nasals in many Land Dayak languages are automatically preploded unless they form the coda of a syllable with nasal onset, and he also appears to have been the first to draw attention to medial postploded nasals (nasal consonants followed by an oral vowel). (RB)


COMMENT. An intriguing research note that presents evidence for masculine, feminine and neuter gender in the personal pronouns of several languages spoken by still poorly documented nomadic groups in the Muller-Schwaner mountains of Central Kalimantan. This typological feature is otherwise unreported in any Austronesian language that has not been in contact with a Papuan language, and the social forces that gave rise to the innovation remain completely unknown. (RB)


Sercombe, Peter G. 1996a. Ethnolinguistic change among the Penan of Brunei: some preliminary observations. *BKI* 152: 257-274. Keywords: 1. sociolinguistic study, 2. Brunei, 3. English. (Also published as ‘Ethnolinguistic change among the Penan of Brunei: some initial observations’ in Odé and Stokhof: 695-711).


COMMENT. This paper is primarily concerned with what is commonly called ‘Eastern Penan’ (the Penan spoken in Sarawak east of the Baram river). However, it carefully reviews statements in the literature relating to the linguistic position of Penan as a whole, noting that researchers have generally placed this language in the Kenyah subgroup. A distinction between linguistic classification and ethnic origin is underscored, since the default interpretation of ethnic history is that it coincides with linguistic classification, but a minority view regards all nomadic groups in Borneo as relics of a pre-Austronesian past that have undergone language shift. Sercombe avoids taking sides in this debate, but he questions the plausibility of the substratum hypothesis in accounting for the relative uniformity of Penan dialects across Sarawak and apparently parts of Kalimantan, at least with regard to Eastern Penan. The terms ‘Eastern Penan’ and ‘Western Penan’ have been used rather freely since Needham (1954a), and it would be helpful if linguistic criteria for distinguishing between them were made explicit, but to my knowledge this has never been done, forcing most readers to accept the distinction without the benefit of evidence. (RB)


Sercombe, Peter, Michael Boutin, and Adrian Clynes, eds. 2014. Advances in research on linguistic and cultural practices in Borneo: a memorial to Peter Martin. Williamsburg, VA: Borneo Research Council.


COMMENT : A personal correspondence between Sibree and Robert H. Codrington. The published letter was written by Codrington, and notes similarities between both the
languages and customs of the Malagasy and those of “Western Polynesian”, chiefly Mota island in the north of what was then the New Hebrides (now Vanuatu), and Fiji. (AS)


COMMENT. A Chinese-Iban phrasebook. (AS)


COMMENT. This paper describes an attempt to determine the genetic relationships of the languages of Sabah using lexicostatistics. It is divided into 1. Butung language (an intrusive population from Buton island southeast of Sulawesi), 2. Javanese stock, and 3. the North-western Austronesian superstock. The latter in turn is divided into 3.1. the Lundayeh language, 3.2. the Banggi language, 3.3. the Illanun language, 3.4. the Suluk language, 3.5. the Bugis subfamily, 3.6. the Ida’an/Begahak subfamily, 3.7. the Malayic family, 3.8. the Bajaw family, and 3.9. the Bornean stock. The use of ‘stock’ with Javanese is unusual, in that this term is commonly used as a cover term for a collection of distantly related languages, yet Javanese is at best a single language with moderate dialect diversity and no clearly-established subgrouping connections with other languages of western Indonesia. The so-called ‘North-western Austronesian superstock’ appears to be one of those fabrications that easily arise in lexicostatistical classifications, grouping diverse languages that are selected on the grounds of haphazard accidents of history, into a single group that has no identity exclusive of other languages (Illanun and Suluk, for example, are members of the Greater Central Philippines group, which includes many other languages not mentioned here, and similar comments could be added about the ‘Bugis subfamily’ and the ‘Malayic family’, which cannot be shown on the basis of exclusively shared innovations to belong to the collection assembled here unless it includes virtually all of the languages of the Philippines and western Indonesia-Malaysia). Only on the level of the ‘Bornean stock’ does this classification begin to approximate what is likely to be historical reality by dividing the languages of Sabah into Tidong, Murutic, Paitanic and Dusunic. However, even here the name is misleading, as it excludes indigenous Sabahan languages such as Ida’an and Bonggi, and has nothing to say about the languages of other regions of Borneo. (RB)


COMMENT. A valuable, if preliminary and frustratingly sparse description of the linguistic situation in the Long Pujungan district of East Kalimantan. The languages, which were surveyed with a 732 item list, together with “some phrases and elementary sentences” (715), fall into two Kenyah clusters, described as Kenyah I (three isolects), and Kenyah II (five isolects), the Nyibun isolect, which reportedly shows both Kenyah and Kayan characteristics, Pua’, which appears to stand apart from both Kenyah and Kayan, while subgrouping with
them, Penan Benalui, which is said to be “separated from the Kenyah grouping”, and Saben, a Kelabitic language (a variant of Sarawak Sa’ban?). The linguistic data given to support these statements is far too limited to permit an independent judgment, and one can only hope they will be published in full or otherwise made available to the interested academic public.

(SB)

Keywords: 1. comparative study, 2. Kalimantan, 3. Indonesian.

Keywords: 1. comparative study, 2. Kalimantan, Sarawak, 3. English.


COMMENT. A valuable collection of data on two little-known dialects of Kenyah spoken on and between the Sesayap and Kayan rivers of East Kalimantan. All Kenyah text (even-numbered pages) is translated into both Indonesian (odd-numbered pages, left column) and English (odd-numbered pages, right column). The main body of the book begins with an explanation of the orthography, as Òma Lóngh is phonetically unusual for a Kenyah language. It then provides nine texts in Òma Lóngh totaling 105 pages, an Òma Lóngh-Indonesian-English glossary of 50 pages (about 1,900 forms), and six texts in Lebu’ Kulit totaling 113 pages, followed by a Lebu’ Kulit-Indonesian-English glossary of 40 pages (about 1,600 forms). (SB)


COMMENT. This is a detailed dictionary of one of the major languages of central Borneo, based on a cluster of closely-related dialects (Uma Peliau, Uma Pu, Uma Semuka, Uma Paku, Uma Beluvuh, Uma Bawang, Uma Belun) spoken in the Baram river basin of northern Sarawak. It contains perhaps 10,000 entries, with affixed forms generally given under the base, and numerous cross-references. Glosses are culturally sensitive and more detailed than in many other dictionaries, reflecting the many years of intimate acquaintance that the author spent as a missionary among the Kayan. A shorter version of this work (389 pp.) was privately published in 1980 in the town of Marudi, Baram District. Because its predecessor was long difficult to obtain, this publication is especially valued in making the data much more accessible. (RB)


COMMENT. A very preliminary sketch of some structural features of Tuaran, Putatan, Papar, Bundu, Tambunan, Tahgas and Rungus Dusun, along with a vocabulary of 207 lexical items. This has been completely superseded by the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Sabah, and by other researchers on individual Dusunic languages, both indigenous and foreign. (RB)


COMMENT. A major study of the oral traditions of the Kejaman and Sekapan people of the upper Rejang river in central Sarawak. Chapter 3, ‘Language’ contains 13 pages of basic information on orthography and grammar. The main body of this work is the corpus of texts, and notes on these, and this contains a large amount of lexical material. (RB)


COMMENT. This study of a Land Dayak language in the province of West Kalimantan, Indonesia, focuses entirely on the phonology. It contains an introductory chapter of five pages sketching the background to the study, the problem it addresses, its goals, theoretical orientation, and the method and technique of investigation. Chapter 2 is a 54-page description of the phonetics of the language, much of it consisting of data in vertical columns with large amounts of white space. Chapter 3 is a 53-page account of the phonemic...
structure, chapter 4 a brief set of suggestions for a practical orthography, and chapter 5 a very brief conclusion. The book concludes with an appendix of about 300 words. The language name ‘Bedayuh/Bidayuh’ ([bidayuh]) is a cover term for a number of distinct communities in southern Sarawak and adjacent parts of Kalimantan. The reader is told that this language is spoken in the districts (kecamatan) of Sekayam and Sanggau, which lie along the Indonesian border with east Malaysia, but other reports on this area suggest considerable dialect variation, and a more precise identification of the community or communities described would have been helpful. (RB)


COMMENT. Although its entries appear in 10 point type and double columns, this dictionary contains less material that might be expected from the surface description. In most dictionaries of Austronesian languages that have a reverse index the main body of the dictionary is far longer than the English-Austronesian portion. However, this dictionary is exceptional in that the Iban-English portion occupies only pages 1-295, while the reverse index takes up the remainder of the dictionary (p. 299-925, or 627 pages in all). Glosses provide minimal detail, far less culturally informative than those scattered through the colossal *Encyclopedia of Iban Studies* by the same authors, or those in Richards (1981).


COMMENT. A monumental work of scholarship, this four-volume work catalogues virtually everything imaginable about the Iban world, from renowned Ibans to features of traditional and modern culture. A number of culturally important vocabulary items are included, with extensive explanations and cross-references. (RB)


COMMENT: A comparative vocabulary of 115 words in English, Malay, and a number of indigenous languages of insular and mainland Southeast Asia, identified as: Îrânûn, Dûsûn, Bûlûd Ôpie, Sulus, Nias Islands, Kian Dyak. Punan Dyak, Mêlano Dyak, Bûkûtan Dyak, Land Dyak, Balau Dyak, Tagbenûa, Pêrak Sêmang, Do, Chendariang Sakei, Kinta Sakei, Samoe, Sêmang of Ijoh, and Sêmang of Ulu Selama. (RB)


COMMENT. This beautifully constructed book consists of 10 units that are further divided into 60 lessons. Most units (all but 3 and 4) begin with a reading of one to two pages followed by exercises. The final 34 pages provide answers to the questions asked in the exercises. My initial impression was that this is a ‘teach yourself Iban’ publication, but closer inspection showed that it is monolingual, and so is designed for Iban-speaking children. Since this is a rare genre it is hard to find a standard of comparison, but the planning and execution appear to be excellent in all respects. (RB)


COMMENT. This survey of the Land Dayaks of Sarawak is based on a two or three-week stay in the greater Kuching area during the late 1960s. It was originally published by the Regional English Language Centre in Singapore in 1970, then translated into Malay in 1987,
and finally republished in English in 1996. Despite the brevity of his stay Topping made a useful contribution, chiefly in supplying a version of the Swadesh 200-item basic vocabulary for eight Land Dayak communities: Tapuh, Lundu (Pueh), Bau, Kuap, Taba‘, Teng Padawan, Tebeduh and Piching. This provided a better picture of how similar these languages are to one another than had previously been available, and laid the foundations for further comparative work. (RB)


COMMENT. This description contains a detailed 62 page Sama-Indonesian-English word list with double columns. The word list is also given, with less detail, in Indonesian-Sama and English-Sama. (AS)


COMMENT. This is the most ambitious attempt yet to provide a comprehensive classification of the varieties of Malagasy. The authors accept the Malagasy-Maanyan hypothesis of Dahl (1951) and then proceed to compare a variant of the Swadesh 100-word basic vocabulary for eighteen Malagasy speech communities. By varying the cognate percentage intervals used to distinguish groups they construct three phylogenetic trees. In two of these trees Malagasy divides into Tankarana in the far north vs. the rest. In the third Malagasy divides into Tankarana in the far north, Tsimihety just to the south of Tankarana, and the rest. All three trees show the standard dialect of Merina subgrouping most closely with Sihanaka and Betsileo. In the fashion of the day the authors then apply the standard glottochronological formula in a futile attempt to provide a chronology of splits between these communities. (RB)

COMMENT. Text with word level glossing and free translations. (AS)


COMMENT. According to the Preface this and other volumes in the same series form part of an initiative by the National Language Center of the Department of Education of the Republic of Indonesia to make local language materials available on a broad basis for scholars or other interested persons. The express goal is to publish local equivalents of the 200-word Swadesh list for a range of villages representing distinct languages or dialects of the same language in each major administrative district surveyed. The volumes that we have seen are numbered 1-8, but we have not seen volumes 4 and 6. The actual wording, written
by Dendy Sugono, Head of the National Language Center and repeated verbatim in each volume, states that the goal of this project is a “mapping” of languages throughout Indonesia (“Pusat Bahasa, melakukan penelitian bahasa daerah dalam rangka pemetaan bahasa-bahasa di Indonesia”), but no maps are included in the volumes we have seen.

Very generally, the contents of the six volumes we have inspected cover the following language communities:

Vol. 1, Sangau and Sintang counties (kabupaten): 24 villages, representing 44 languages, as named by the speakers themselves (Malay, Ribun, Peruan, Tebas, Mayan, Jongkang, Muduk, Tanap, Galik, Bisomu, Keramei, Taman, Jawan, Ketungau, Kodat, Junpor Tjandong, Sanggau Malay, Pandu, Taba, Mualang, ‘Dayak’, Sami, Muduk, Tingin, Kopa, Iban, Jangar Tanyung, Kopo, Matek, Mayau, Sumu, Banyuke, Kembayan Malay, Somu, Jangkang, Bungau, Sesang, Kerambai, Senangkan, Paus, Mahap, Mentukak, Benawas, Javanese).


Vol. 7, Province of South Kalimantan: 32 villages, representing 14 languages (Banjar Hulu, Bukit, Labuhan, Banjarese, Berangas, Maanyan, Lawangan, Dusun Deyah, Javanese, Buginese, Samihim, Bakumpai, Banjar Kuala, Bakumpai Hulu).

Vol. 8, Berau county (kabupaten), and the special administrative districts of Samarinda and Balikpapan: 22 villages, representing 9 languages (Banua, Bajau, Banjarese, Basab, Gaay, Kenya Badeng, Punan, Basab, Segai).

Many of these ‘language’ names do not appear in any work published outside Indonesia, and it can only be assumed that they are names of dialects or subdialects of languages that are not made sufficiently clear by the general description. Others are meaningless, as with the multiple reporting of ‘Dayak’ as the language of a given village.

The concept of this series is excellent, but the execution leaves much to be desired. In volume 1, for example, the ‘language’ names given as ‘Mayan’ and ‘Mayau’ are evidently the same name with different typographic interpretations of the original handwritten document, and the reader is led to suspect that Jongkang/Jangkang, Junpor Tjandong/Jangar Tanyung, and Sumu/Somu each owe their apparent distinctness to a similar accident. Other inconsistencies, unfortunately, abound. In volume 2, for example, Desa Munyub Irir appears as entry 3 in Table 2, while Desa Muyub Ulu, appears as entry 8. However, in the list of
villages following this table these two are reversed (3 = Desa Muyub Ulu, 8 = Desa Munyub Irir), while in the wordlists entry 3 appears as Mayub Ulu. Similar problems occur in all six volumes, and familiar language names are often misspelled, as with ‘Kenya’ for ‘Kenyah’, or ‘Lundaye’ for ‘Lun Dayeh’. This is not to say that the material collected lacks value, but given the number of errors that escaped the editing process the reader will be advised to use this material with caution. (AS/RB)


Whittier, Herbert L. 1974. The meaning of the terms Long, Uma’ and Lepo among the Kenyah. BRB 6.1: 3-4. Keywords: 1. other, 2. Sarawak, 3. English.


COMMENT. This small grammar of Malay as it is spoken in Sabah is a revision of a 2000 MA thesis defended at the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. It contains five chapters, an equal number of appendices, and both author and subject indices. Following a 15-page introduction that situates the language in space, and discusses the issue whether Sabah Malay can legitimately be considered distinct from Standard Malay, chapter 1 provides a 13-page review of relevant literature, and chapter 2 devotes another 13 pages to discussing the methodology and design of the study. Chapter 3, is titled ‘Phonological structures of the Sabah Malay dialect in comparison to Standard Malay’, and chapter 4 ‘Social functions of the Sabah Malay dialect’. Chapter 5 contains a succinct conclusion, followed by references and five appendices that show the types of questionnaires used to collect the data for the study. Chapter 3 contains most of the ‘meat’ in this book. The Sabah dialect is described as having three vowels (/i/, /u/, /a/), in contrast to the six-vowel system of Standard Malay, and the same 18 consonants, except that the velar fricative of Standard Malay corresponds to an alveolar trill in Sabah Malay. The reader is told (p. 41) that “In the 200-wordlist collected, a glottal stop [ʔ] is added at the end of all words that do not end in another consonant.” However, this is not reflected in the data samples given, where mata [mata] ‘eye’ and ada [adaʔ] ‘have’ apparently contrast in this feature, a difference that is attributed to speech styles (present in ‘wordlist style’, but absent in casual conversation). This is a matter of some comparative interest, since many of the Malay loanwords in languages of coastal Sarawak differ from Standard Malay in having what appears to be a historically secondary final glottal stop. (RB)

Wong, Jane Kon Ling. 2005. Kelabit names and titles: semantics and pragmatics. Kota Kinabalu: Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, Universiti Malaysia Sabah. 73 pp. Keywords: 1. ethnolinguistic study, 2. Sarawak, 3. English.

Wong, Jane Kon Ling. 2006. The changes and influences of the ngadan i’it in the Kelabit naming system. In Chong, Harun and Alas: 201-212. Keywords: 1. ethnolinguistic study, 2. Sarawak, 3. English.


COMMENT. This article represents a survey to determine Bible translation needs in connection with the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). As in other parts of the world, lexicostatistical percentages provide the primary data that SIL uses to estimate degrees of intelligibility among distinct language communities. Wordlists were collected from 53 communities, and these showed that most data sites tested are home to closely-related dialects of Malay, which fell into five geographically-named clusters, with basic vocabulary cognate percentages ranging from 68% to 92%. Samples of lexical data provided show that communities in the Northwest Isolect Cluster have preploded final nasals, much like the neighboring Kanayatn and Bidayuh communities to their west, while communities in the Northeast Isolect Cluster have simple voiceless stops from original final nasals, showing that they passed through a stage in which they also had preploded nasals that have since simplified to voiceless stops. In addition to these five Malayic isoelect clusters the reader is told (201) that “there are a few indigenous communities which speak Mandawai. The
percentage of shared vocabulary”. Since Mandawai is otherwise completely undocumented it would have been useful to see some data from this language, but the article terminates abruptly in mid-sentence as just quoted, with References following immediately at the top of page 202. (RB)


COMMENT. A difficult to find source with a list of 513 words in Tagalog and two Malagasy dialects, Tandroy and Betsileo. Words are separated into 22 semantic categories and several are given with example sentences. The University of Hawai‘i and the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London both have a copy in their holdings. (AS)


## INDEX OF LANGUAGE NAMES AND LANGUAGE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/Group</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abaknon. See Sama-Bajaw</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahe</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aoheng</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apo Duat</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arut</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badameà. See Kendayan/Kanaytn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakatik/Bakati’, 58, 181, 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakumpai</td>
<td>158</td>
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