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ABSTRACT

This paper gives an overview of the four principal and nine minor dialects of Pamona, as described by the Dutch linguist Nicolaus Adriani in 1914. Although Adriani’s description of Pamona dialects is approaching one hundred years old, a serious follow-up survey to verify or amend it has never been conducted, even though for the minor dialects Adriani often had to rely on minimal information. Since Adriani’s day, two dialects have been reclassified as separate languages, while a third is probably extinct. For many others we are still in need of fuller and more reliable information.
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Overview of Pamona dialects
(per Nicolaus Adriani)

by David Mead

Introduction

Pamona, or Bare’e as it was formerly known, must be regarded as one of the best-described languages and peoples of Sulawesi, owing to the linguistic and ethnographic work of Nicolaus Adriani and Albertus C. Kruyt in the early decades of the twentieth century. In this paper I return to what Adriani had to say about Pamona dialects, particularly as laid out in the third volume of De Bare’e-sprekende Toradja’s van Midden-Celebes, published in 1914.1 Although this work bears both their names, the third volume was primarily authored by Adriani, the linguist of the two. I have three reasons for summarizing what Adriani wrote about Pamona dialects.

First, there seems to be a general assumption that Adriani has already said all there is to say about Pamona dialects. Despite that Adriani’s description is nearly a hundred years old, no one has attempted a serious follow-up survey either to verify or to amend his statements on Pamona dialects. Furthermore, over the decades people have forgotten how tenuous even some of Adriani’s conclusions were. For some of the ‘outlier’ dialects, Adriani himself had to rely on scanty information provided to him by civil servants, military officers, and the such. In fact data on one variety was so minimal that Adriani actually misclassified it as a dialect of Pamona, when it was something else entirely, and no one even realized his error until ninety years after the fact!

Second, there is still a need for Pamona dialects to be sorted out. The list of Pamona dialects in the latest (16th) edition of the Ethnologue (Lewis 2009:432) does not match the dialect list in Salzner (1965:14), and neither of these in turn matches the Pamona dialects presented on Adriani’s Schetsstaalkaart van Celebes (Language Sketch Map of Celebes) and listed in the accompanying key (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:351).2 Furthermore even this map and its key omit dialects which Adriani himself discussed in prose sections earlier in the book. What is needed is a bona fide list of all Pamona dialects, which at the same time weeds out what may be alternate names for the same dialect. I attempt this for the reader below.

1 The first two volumes of this work, published in 1912, were republished as three volumes in 1950-1951 (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche). The original third volume, however, was never republished.

2 See also Sneddon’s (1983a, 1983b) presentation of Pamona dialects, which follows Adriani’s map point by point. A high-quality scanned version of Adriani’s original color map, but not the accompanying key, can be viewed online at the website of the Royal Tropical Institute. Visit http://www.kit.nl/ and follow the link Information Services > Dutch Colonial Maps. Adriani’s map should not be confused with K. F. Holle’s Schets-staalkaart van Celebes, published 1894, and which Adriani’s map was intended to update; see further Noorduyn (1991:3 ff.).
Third, I intend for this work to serve as a guide for collecting adequate data on all Pamona dialects. While there appear to be four dialects which are broadly spoken in the Pamona heartland, Adriani also listed a number of smaller dialects spoken either on the periphery of the Pamona area or even in enclaves separated from it. Today people have raised the alarm that children in the heartland are no longer learning Pamona (Lampung Ekspres News 2009; Harian Mercusuar 2009). If the language is vulnerable here, then how much more so in these smaller, peripheral communities! Our opportunity to collect a full range of dialectal information may be slipping away. In fact a colleague and I failed in our 2006 attempt to collect information on the so-called Sinohoan dialect. By the time we made it there it had vanished, leaving the world with only three words, recorded by a Dutch civil servant a century prior, as the only record of its former existence.

Here follow the results of my reexamination of Adriani’s information on Pamona dialects. Although I began with three somewhat disparate lists (the Ethnologue’s, Salzner’s and Adriani’s himself; see discussion above), the results turned out satisfying, even if I say so myself. I first present what I term the four major dialects of Pamona, followed by nine supposed minor dialects. This of course may not match the Pamona dialect situation today, but it at least represents it as understood by Adriani, compiled and presented in an orderly way for an English-speaking audience. Since it was common in the early twentieth century to also identify each variety by its word for ‘no,’ I continue that practice below.

One thing to which I cannot speak, however, is which of these ‘dialects’ are truly dialects, and which are to be understood merely as subdialects. Since nothing was quantified, we only have Adriani's impressions to rely on. Indeed, Adriani’s information on some of the minor varieties was so limited that he himself didn’t know.

**Major dialects of the Pamona heartland**

The Pamona area is centrally located in the island of Sulawesi (see Figure 1 on page 6 below). While the area around Lake Poso can be considered the heart of the Pamona language area, it is spoken more broadly than that, including: along the southern coast of the Gulf of Tomini; south of Lake Posso in the upper basin of the Kalaena River, which drains into the Gulf of Bone; eastward in the upper valley of the Laa, which drains into the Gulf of Tolo; northeasterward in the nearby mountains of the eastern peninsula of Sulawesi, particularly along the Bongka River; and finally in scattered outposts along the coast of the Gulf of Tolo. The dialect situation in Pamona has been described in Adriani and Kruyt (1914:15–32). Summarizing from their discussion, it is possible to distinguish four broadly spoken dialects:

- A central dialect, in which the negator is bare’e, spoken to the east of the Poso River and around Lake Poso, including by the To Lage, To Wingke mPoso, To Onda’e, To Rano, To Palande, To Lamusa; in the east bordering the Mori area by the To Pada, To Pakamba, To Watu, To Kalae, To Tananda and To Pu’u mBana; and also by the To

---

3 These six Pamona peoples were in fact vassals to the Mori kingdom (Kruyt 1900:462-463).
Pebato on the west side of the Poso River, although their variety deviates slightly from the others. Following Kennedy (1935:506), this could be referred to as the Lake Poso dialect.

- A northern dialect or subdialect spoken along the south coast of the Gulf of Tomini. This variety also uses the negator bare’e, but it is marked vis-à-vis the central dialect by influence from Parigi, and by ‘loss’ of many Pamona words and expressions known in the interior. Adriani’s own description of the differences is interesting, to say the least, as it reveals his romantic affection for the more ‘untouched’ speech of the interior.

Het Strand-Bare’e is nl. de taal van Mohammedaan geworden Toradja’s en deze leiden nemen voor en goed de gewoonten, die dwingen tot het gebruik van wisseltermen, niet meer in acht. Daar de kleinhandel al hunne gedachten inneemt, zijn hunne gesprekken ook enge van kring en minder interessant dan die der Bovenlanders; hunne taal is veen eentoniger dan het Binnenlandsche Bare’e en hun stijl veel minder levendig en kleurrijk. Hoe meer men het O. gaat, hoe sterker het Strand-Bare’e dit karakter vertoont. Op de hoofdplaats Todjo zelf is het ’t ergste. — Beach Bare’e is principally the language of Torajans who have become Muslim, and these people have in large measure adopted the customs which have forced the use of alternate terms to no longer be kept in mind. Because all of their thoughts are preoccupied with petty trade, their conversation is also more narrow in focus and less interesting than that of the Uplanders; their language is more drab than that of the Interior Bare’e and their style much less lively and colorful. The further east one goes, the stronger the Beach Bare’e exhibits this character. It is the strongest in the chief place of Tojo itself. (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:18)

Unsurprisingly, two pages later Adriani wrote that Pamona people themselves did not distinguish between these two varieties, saying only that people of the interior knew, in some undefined way, that their speech differed from that on the coast. Adriani referred to the coastal variety as Strand-Bare’e, which Sneddon (1983) renders as ‘Beach Pamona.’ Following Kennedy (1935:506) it could perhaps be referred to as the Poso-Tojo dialect—if indeed it even deserves dialect status.

- A southern dialect or subdialect, in which the initial b of the negator was dropped, spoken by the To Pu’u mBoto, the To Binowoi (negator are’e) and—even further to the south on the other side of the Takolekaju mountains—by the To Salu Maoge

---

4 Parigi is a dialect of Kaili spoken on Gulf of Tomini coast to the west of the Pamona area. In Adriani and Kruyt (1899:18), the authors also mention Bugis influence.
At one point, Adriani remarked that these varieties could be called the Are’e dialect, there apparently being no satisfactory cover term for these three people groups or their particular variety of Pamona (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:18). However, in the key to his map, he elevated the name Pu’u mBoto as a cover term (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:351).

An eastern dialect in which the negator is taa. This dialect is spoken along the Gulf of Tomini northeast of Tojo; in the interior along the course of the Bongka River; and from there southward as far as the Gulf of Tolo coast. It is also spoken in the Togian Islands. The eastern dialect can be further divided into two subdialect areas: on the mainland, Ampana, including Wana (which have tare’e ‘there is not’ as the negator of existence); and in the islands, Togian (which uses tanjo’u ‘there is not’). The To Wana have become well known as one of the few people groups of Sulawesi who have resisted adopting modern ways (see Atkinson 1989 inter alia), and in recent years have even become a tourist draw for visitors to the Morowali Nature Preserve. However, Adriani saw no reason to distinguish Ampana and Wana linguistically, writing that:

Het Ampana’sch, naar zijne ontkenning taa geheeten, wordt ook gesproken door de To Wana (‘boschbewoners’), die aan den bovenloop der Bongka-rivier wonen. — Ampana, named ta after its negator, is also spoken by the To Wana (‘forest dwellers’), who live on the upper course of the Bongka River. (Adriani 1900:539).

Togian and Ampana, on the other hand, are distinct. See especially Adriani (1898:547–553) and the section devoted to Togian (and by way of comparison, Ampana) in “De talen der Togian-Eilanden” (Adriani 1900:539–566). Of the four principal dialects of Pamona which Adriani outlined, Ampana was the most divergent, and in the native conception was viewed as a separate language:

Naar de voorstelling der Toradja’s is het Ampanasch eene afzonderlijke taal, immers: de To Ampana gebruiken de Taa-taal en niet de Bare’e-taal. Beneden komen we nog even terug op het Ampanasch: hier zij vooraf reeds gezegd dat het dezelfde taal is als het Bare’e en als een dialect darvan te beschouwen is, zij het dan ook als het meest zelfstandige der dialecten van de Bare’e-taal. — According to the perception of the Torajans, Ampana is a separate language, or at least: the To Ampana use the Taa language and not the Bare’e language. Below we come back around a bit to Ampana: here let it already be said beforehand that it is the same language as Bare’e and is to be considered a dialect thereof, be it then also as the most independent of the dialects of the Bare’e language. (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:19).

---

5 Grimes and Grimes (1987:57), whose word list comes from Salu Maoge, refer to it as the Tomoni dialect.
Minor dialects of the Pamona periphery

Let me say at the outset that a division into four ‘heartland’ and nine ‘peripheral’ dialects does not originate with Adriani. Rather, it is my overlay on top of Adriani’s data, my way of presenting Adriani’s Pamona dialects. Apart from perhaps the first two listed below, Lalaeo and Rapangkaka, these nine dialects have three things in common: (a) they were located on the periphery of the Pamona language area, or even separated from it as enclaves in the midst of other languages; (b) they were spoken by small communities, in some cases in only a single village; (c) while they all gave the appearance of being distinct enough to require recognition, for the most part Adriani lacked sufficient information to be able to classify them further. For example, for the several communities located on the Gulf of Tolo, Adriani’s primary sources of information was a report by the civil servant O. E. Goedhart (1908), and personal communication with the civil administrator at Kolonodale, Lieutenant I. Troostwijk. As limited as his information was, Adriani did his best to process it and present it in his own 1914 publication, rather than simply ignore it. Apart from Lalaeo, for which Adriani had his own data, one could say that the following dialects were presented ‘as is,’ and ‘awaiting further research.’

- Lalaeo on the Gulf of Tomini between Tojo and the Ampana dialect area (negator aunde’e, unde’e, nde’e). On his Schetsstaalkaart, Adriani also indicated a Lalaeo community on the Gulf of Tolo southwest of Tokala, even though this second community is unmentioned in the text. Adriani had sufficient information on Lalaeo to consider it a transitional dialect (overgangsdialect) between the central (bare’e) and eastern (taa) dialects, although closer to the former (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:19); see also Adriani and Kruyt (1899:34–37) where they discuss the Lalaeo dialect.

- Rapangkaka on the Bongka River in eastern Sulawesi (negator aria). Apart from location and negator, no other information is presented (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:7). Adriani failed to locate it on his Schetsstaalkaart, and at present I have not been able to determine whether Rapangkaka was located on the lower or upper course of the Bongka River. Its placement in Figure 1 is a bit guesswork.

- Laiwonu in Jalaja village, immediately to the north of Berau on the north coast of the Gulf of Bone (negator iba)6 (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:15). The Laiwonu variety had been influenced by Bugis and Wotu (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:18). This variety was known to and mentioned by Adriani as early as 1899, under the name ‘Todjaladja’ (Adriani and Kruyt 1899:19), but fifteen years later they still had not had opportunity to investigate it sufficiently themselves (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:20).

- Batui (negator baha). Based on a single datum obtained from Goedhart (1908:477)—namely baha, the word for ‘no’—Adriani classified Batui as dialect of Pamona (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:14). When additional data was collected on Batui in 2006, it

---

6 A negator iba is also known from the central dialect, but only from poetry (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:20).
Notes to the map: (a) Lalaeo dialect has two locations; (b) Rapangkaka dialect location is uncertain, 'somewhere' on the Bongka River; (c) Sinohoan dialect is now extinct; (d) Batui, thought by Adriani to be a Pamona dialect, is now known to be a separate language closely related to Saluan; (e) Tombelala is now classified as a separate language closely related to Pamona.

Figure 1. Pamona dialects, following Adriani 1914
was discovered not to be a dialect of Pamona, but rather a separate language closely related to Saluan, thus not even within the Kaili-Pamona subgroup of languages (!) (Mead and Pasanda In progress).

- **Sinohoan**, named after a village\(^7\) on the Gulf of Tolo in the Saluan area where it was formerly spoken (negator *daido, ido*, also *idore’e ‘there is not’) (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:14). This variety is extinct; at least when a colleague and I visited this village in 2006, no one knew of any remaining speakers. In this case, Goedhart’s description is probably sufficient that, despite extremely limited data, Sinohoan can be classified as a dialect of Pamona.

*De overige bewoners van dit kleine district, de zoogenaamde Sinohowanners, spreken een taal die een mengelmoes geheeten mag worden van verschillende andere; toch komen daarin ook woorden voor die men in de andere in het landschap Banggaai gesproken wordende talen niet terug vindt (voor „neen” bestaan b. v. de woorden „ido” en „daido”), doch dit aantal is betrekkelijk zoo gering, de overeenkomst met de „ta”-taal zoo groot en het getal van hen, die haar spreken, zoo klien— ± 40 weerbare mannen—, dat ik vermeend heb die taal niet naast de bovengenoemde te mogen noemen. – The remaining inhabitants of this small district [= Batui], the so-called Sinohowanners, speak a language which may be called a mishmash of various others; nevertheless there are encountered words therein which are not to be found back in the other languages spoken in the Banggai region (the words ‘no’ include e.g. *ido* and *daido*). But the number of them is so scant, the similarity with the Taa language so great, and the total of them who speak it so few—roughly 40 adult men—that I had the notion possibly not to name this language next to the above-mentioned ones. (Goedhart 1908:477)

- **Tobau** (Tobao, Tobalo) in Karaupa and other villages on the northern border of the Bungku area, just south of Tomori Bay (negator *bae*, a shortened form of *bare’e*)\(^8\) (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:16; Mead and Mead 1991). Adriani did not give the form of the negator, but I provide it here from my own field notes. His information that they were Pamona-speaking came from the civil administrator Lieutenant I. Troostwijk (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:16, footnote 3).

- **Topada** near Bente village in the Bungku area on the Gulf of Tolo (negator *nde’e* or *unde’e*) (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:14; Mead and Mead 1991). Based on a consideration of negators, one must suppose that Topada and Lalao are the same variety or closely related (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:14).

---

\(^7\) Today officially Sinorang village, but in Saluan its name is articulated [sino’hoʔan].

\(^8\) Even in other areas the standard negator *bare’e* is sometimes shortened e.g. to *be’e, bee,* and *be* (Adriani 1928:s.v.).
• Tokondindi (or Tokandidi) in Wata village in the Bungku area on the Gulf of Tolo (negator *dore’e*) (Goedhart 1908:516; Adriani and Kruyt 1914:13; Mead and Mead 1991).

• Tombelala immediately to the north of the town of Bungku on the Gulf of Tolo (negator *baria*) (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:13). Although related to Pamona, Tombelala is sufficiently divergent in terms of word stock to be considered a separate language (Mead and Mead 1991:128).

Sadly, few have since taken up the call to collect more reliable information on these ‘outlier’ varieties, even though it is possible that some of them may be on the verge of disappearing. We don’t need to consider a source written a century ago to be our ‘final word’ on Pamona dialects, but if no one takes up the call to conduct even a lexicostatistical analysis—let alone an in-depth dialect geography study—we may have to.

References


---

9 Adriani reported, “Van de Dore’e-, Baria- en Nd’e-talen zegt Lt. Troostwijk dat zij reeds aan het uitsterven zijn; alleen de oudere lieden kennen ze nog” (Lieutenant Troostwijk says of the Dore’e, Baria and Nd’e languages that they are already dying; only the older people still know them) (Adriani and Kruyt 1914:14). In 1988 I was able to obtain 200-item word lists for all three—which I hope to publish in the near future—but I regret having not spent more time collecting a fuller amount of data.
harianmercusuar.com: Korannya Rakyat Sulteng. Online. URL: 


Mead, David; and Edy Pasanda. In progress. An initial appreciation of the dialect situation in Saluan and Batui. To appear in SIL Electronic Survey Reports.


Würm, Stephen; and Shirô Hattori (eds.) 1983. Language atlas of the Pacific area, part II: Japan area, Taiwan (Formosa), Philippines, mainland and insular South-east Asia. (Pacific linguistics, C-67.) Canberra: Australian National University, Australian Academy of the Humanities and The Japan Academy.