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The element *nu*—sometimes reduced to a nasal *m*, *n*, *ng*, etc.—is often inserted between the two elements of a compound in Pamona (Bare‘e).

Adriani relates this *nu* to *anu* ‘thing,’ a form which in various languages also serves as a formative in independent possessive pronouns (‘mine,’ ‘yours,’ etc.), as an indefinite pronoun, as a relative pronoun, and as an interrogative pronoun. According to the author, *nu* also bears relationships to the so-called ligazones of Philippine languages, and even to the nasal coda of the Malayo-Polynesian transitive verb prefix. The element *nu* (or one of the nasal allomorphs) is usual in most Bare’e compounds; compounds without *nu* reflect an older stage of the language.
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Concerning the ligature in

Bare’e and some related languages

by

Dr. N. Adriani

A genitive relationship in Bare’e is expressed in two ways: first, by simple coordination; second, by interposing a sound which, according to circumstances, has the forms nu, m, n (dental), ng and ñ (palatal), and which in this article is called a ligature. In both types of compounds the second word is always the modifier, the first the modified. Not the least difference is to be observed in the translation: both the first as well as the second sort of compounds express the genitive relationship, which we tend to elucidate in various ways in our language.

If one were to keep track of the cases in which nu or a particular nasal is inserted, versus when simple compounding is used, then one would see that in by far the most cases the ligature is present, and it is only missing where phonetic reasons make clear its absence. For the sake of convenience, one could then speak of the disappearance of the ligature, even though these same phonetic circumstances make it clear that such a ligature never could have acquired a place.

Between the words where the concerned particle occurs, it is not the first or modified word, but rather the second or modifying word which the phonetic alternations register. Seeing that all words in Bare’e end in a vowel, an accumulation of consonants can never be spoken of, and the particle, as nasal, by the nature of things assimilates to the following consonant. The ligature is thus more closely connected with the following word than with the preceding word.

In order to get an overview of the various cases in which the ligature is or is not used, and in which form, we shall give in succession examples of genitive relationships in which

---

1 [translator’s note: I want to thank René van den Berg for his comments on a previous version of this paper. The Bare’e language is today referred to as Pamona. The name used by Adriani derives from the indigenous word for ‘no, not,’ bare’e. For how the spelling of Pamona words has been updated in this translation, see the Postscript.]

2 [translator’s note: The rendering of this important word as ‘ligature’ is not entirely adequate. The English word carries with it the added notion of binding two things together, whereas Adriani’s original term, tusschenzetsel, simply means something which comes in between, an ‘inset,’ ‘insert,’ or ‘insertion,’ if you will.]
the particular words in each set begin with a different sound, insofar as these sounds occur as word onsets in Bare’e.

Vowels

*a*: wo’o nu ana ‘child’s head’; ata nu ala ‘roof of a rice barn’; pani nu alo ‘wing of the hornbill’; silo angga name of the Evening Star (literally ‘spirit flame’); puyu nu ancami ‘sticky sap of the kweni mango’; kareke nu apu ‘the flickering of the fire’; Ta-Aji ‘uncle of Aji.’

*e*: tandu nu engo ‘tip of the nose’; kaju engo ‘nose bone’; pebete nu eo ‘sunrise’; mata eo ‘body of the sun, sundisc’; ra enu ‘the eye of a bead’; tongo eo ‘midday’.

*i*: taono nu ike ‘handle of the bark cloth beater’; tandu nu iku ‘tip of the tail’; engko nu imbu ‘mischief of the water spirits’; pepa nu inda ‘burden of debt’; banua nu ine ‘mother’s house’; ada nu Isilamu ‘customs of the Moslems’; ada iwali ‘customs of war.’

[o]: kawau nu olu ‘stink of flatulence’; pela nu oria ‘durian rind’; wata opili ‘trunk of the ironwood tree’; ira oguu ‘leaf of the horsetail pine (Casuarina)’; Ta-Onggu ‘uncle of Onggu.’

*u*: karoso nu ue ‘power of the current’; ue uja ‘rain water’; tandu uase ‘point of the axe’; ada umapo ‘customs for a prohibition day’; kasondo ulaya ‘abundance of cargo’; mata ue ‘well of water’; jiju nu uani ‘bee sweetness (honey)’; Ta-Urama ‘uncle of Urana.’

Consonants

*b*: kuli-mbia ‘shell of a mollusk’; tondo-mbaula ‘buffalo horns’; waya-mbonde ‘garden fence’; wuku-mbuyu ‘shin bone’; paku-mbaju ‘clothing pin’; ngisi-mberese ‘thunder wedge’; Ta-mBarisi ‘uncle of Barisi’; Ta-Bolokue ‘uncle of Bolokue.’

*d*: wawo-ndiki ‘instep of the foot’; wiwi-ndopi ‘edge of a plank’; pamula-ndunia ‘beginning of the world’; jila-nduata ‘snake’s tongue’; nguju-nduanga ‘forecastle of a

---

3 [footnote 1, p. 497] The usual translation of Malay expressions such as mata hari, Sangirese mata-ng-čelo, Galela a wàngé ma lako (see further Kern, De Fidiaal, p. 170, in voce singa) as ‘eye of the day’ seems less correct to us. In most Malayo-Polynesian languages the words for ‘day’ and ‘sun’ are identical, so that in the concerned expression mata can be better considered a classificatory word. In Baree, the ‘sun’ is usually called eo or reme, and then only mata eo or mata ndeme if one would distinguish the sun itself from ‘daylight, sunlight.’ It is also this way in Sangirese with čelo, in Galela with wàngé, and in Fiji with singa (see Codrington, The Melanesian Languages, p. 93). In Malay, hari also means ‘sun’ in the expressions hari hidup, hari mati.

4 [translator’s note: A ‘thunder wedge’ is a stone believed to be deposited by a lightning strike, or to be the physical manifestation of lightning. Adraini (1928), in voce berese, identifies thunder wedges as a kind of fossil, namely a belemnite. In other parts of Indonesia, the stones identified as thunder wedges are ancient stone chisels; see Van Limburg Brouwer (1868).]
boat'; *watu-ndasi* ‘weight of a weigh-beam’; *Papa-i-nDori* ‘Father of Dori,’ *Indo-i-Duma* ‘Mother of Duma.’

g : *kayoro-ngganci* ‘string of a toy top’; *engo-ngguma* ‘nose of the scabbard,’ that part through which the waist band runs; *dungko-nggola* ‘a tiny bit of sugar’; *witi-nggoranggo* ‘crocodile’s hind foot’; *ira-nggoa* ‘milo leaf’;  

5 *Ta-ngGapu* ‘uncle of Gapu’; *Ta-Gintu* ‘uncle of Gintu.’

j : *pela-njole* ‘milo leaf sheath’; *soo-njoiia* ‘binding material for the floor slats’; *unta-njila* ‘tip of the tongue’; *loge-njaya* ‘mire of the path’; *koro-njapi* ‘cow’s body’; *wuyu-nggola* ‘a tiny bit of sugar’; *engo-nnguma* ‘nose of the scabbard,’ that part through which the waist band runs; *dungko-nggola* ‘a tiny bit of sugar’; *witi-nggoranggo* ‘crocodile’s hind foot’; *ira-nggoa* ‘milo leaf’;  

5 *Ta-ngGapu* ‘uncle of Gapu’; *Ta-Gintu* ‘uncle of Gintu.’

y : *witi yali* ‘fly’s leg’; *pu’u yangi* ‘heaven beginner,’ horizon; *payompo yangi* ‘appellation for the north as well as the south’; *ra yoku* ‘hole of an armband’; *wuku yali* ‘ankle bone’; *baju nu yunuku* ‘the clothing of my friend’; *ri ra yopo* ‘in the interior of the forest.’


l : *wata loka* ‘banana trunk’; *uuw lelangi* ‘pith of the silar palm’; *none lanta* ‘posts of the rice barn’; *rui laurro* ‘rattan thorns’; *wawu Lamo* ‘pigs of the gods,’ wild pigs (so named because they don’t belong to anyone); *pandika lana* ‘cask for oil’; *iku langgoe* ‘tail of the civet’; *Papa-i-Lantigimo* ‘Father of Lantigimo’; *Ta-Lasa, Ta-Londe.*

m : *toyu manu* ‘chicken egg’; *ana mata* ‘pupil of the eye’; *lai nu manu* ‘cock’s tail’; *sea nu munti* ‘bird’s nest’; *peta nu manu* ‘chicken nesting basket’; *wata momongo* ‘areca palm trunk’; *Papa-i-Melempe, Ta-Makajama.*

ny : *iku nu nyara* ‘horse’s tail’; *polega nyara* ‘horse play’; *Papa-i-Nyo.*

ng : *wuyua nguju* ‘moustache’; *oyo ngisi* ‘gap between the teeth’; *ri ra nganga* ‘in the inside of the mouth’; *ira ngo’a* ‘rattan leaf.’

n : *ira nunu* ‘banyan leaf’; *pu’u muntu* ‘origin of the story’; *kadago naminya* ‘the delight of its taste’; *tongo nawu* ‘middle of the field’; *kasondo nojo* ‘quantity of mosquitoes’; *Ta-Nimbulu.*

5 [translator’s note: Dutch miloe, but perhaps maize (*Zea mays*) should be understood; see Adriani (1928) in voce goa.]
6 [translator’s note: Dutch miloe, but perhaps Job’s tears (*Coix lacrima-jobi*) should be understood; see Adriani (1928) in voce djole.]
p: wingke-mPoso ‘bank of the Poso River’; dodo-mpale ‘span of the hand’; yayu mpancowe ‘rice pestle for the pancowe celebration’; wata mpae ‘rice stalks’; Pue-mpalaburu ‘Lord of the heavens’; tawu-mpanaguntu ‘gun stock’; songko-mpetoro ‘Resident’s hat’; Ta-mPasebe, Ta-mPilosi, Papa-i-Piti.

r: tongo-ndo’u ‘forehead’; tinja-ndindi ‘stanchion for the wall’; untu-ndano ‘point of the lake’; powotu ndaego ‘words of the raego dance’; anu ndonguku ‘something of my wife’s’; tosu ndui ‘prick of a thorn’; karara-ndeme ‘sunburn’; Pue-raoa ‘Lord of the air’ (name for the cuscus).

s: ue-ncusu ‘breast sap,’ milk; mata-ncalira ‘blade of the weeding knife’; tonci-nciro ‘bracken bird’; pandika-ncolo ‘matchbox’; Ta-nCuigi ‘uncle of Suigi’; anuncema ‘whose thing?’; lara-ncagala ‘pockmark’; mata-ncopu ‘blowgun dart.’

w: uta-mbawu ‘pig brains’; paka-mbalisu ‘pig paka, wild paka’ (a plant); pu’u-mbana ‘beginning of the forest’; tadu-mburake ‘wurake priest’; buyu-mbayau ‘cavernous mountain’; bone-mbinanga ‘sand of the river’s mouth’; Tandu-mbone ‘Sand Cape’; wo’o-mbose ‘handle of the paddle’; ue-mbio ‘foam of cooking rice.’

The examples given here teach us the following:

If the onset of the modifying word is an a, i, or o, the ligature is often used, but only in the form nu; less often no ligature is present. Preceding an e or u, usually no ligature is found.

Preceding b, d, g, j, k, p, r, s, t and w, in by far the most cases the ligature is customary. Preceding the dentals t and d, even to this extent, that also even following the name marker t the onset of the following word is nasalized, whereas otherwise this i itself replaces the ligature. Preceding all these letters the ligature shows up as a certain nasal, or rather as a nasalizing of the onset of the modifying word, whereby respectively the nasalized onsets originate: mb, nd, ngg, nj, ngk, mp, nd, nc, nt, mb.

As for the onsets which cannot be nasalized, namely y, l and the nasals, in a few cases the modifying word in a genitive relationship has as onset the ligature in the form nu. Mostly, however, they are compounded by simple parataxis with the word that they modify.

In view of the tendency to nasalize—which is very great in Bare’e—as well as to shorten—[p. 501] especially when the ligature stands clasped between two word which, as a compound, are articulated with one primary stress—one should be inclined to identify the nasal ligature with another Bare’e nu. First and foremost, the origin and meaning of this nu thus requires investigation.

The Bare’e-speaking population make use of nu when they cannot immediately find a suitable word or a good phrase to commence with or put forward, such as with our
absent-minded or stammering speakers, who seek their words while holding onto a sound like a drawn-out schwa. For example, someone is asked, *Yunumu, i sema to’onya?* ‘Who is your friend?’ but he cannot immediately come up with a name, because he is used to calling his friend by his teknonymic appellation or addressing him as *bale* ‘friend.’

He thus thinks slowly about an answer: *Nu* (with very drawn out *u*) . . . . . *i Anu, i Tepo* . . . . . *o banya i Tepo, nu* . . . . . *i Mampo.* In such cases *nu* also frequently occurs as genitive particle, where otherwise a certain nasal would be employed, for example *banua-ncema ri ndate? Banua nu . . . kabosenya* (in fast speech: *banua-ngkabosenya*) ‘whose house is up there? The house of . . . . the village head’; *ota situ ndapokuja? Gala nu . . . mbawu* ‘what is this bran for? For . . . . the pigs.’ Especially in this last example *nu* must be serving as a filler, because it occurs yet once again in its other form in order to compound *gala* (noun ‘part, portion’) with *wawu.*

The longer form *anu,* known from so many Malayo-Polynesian languages, is completely synonymous with *nu.* Both forms also occur next to each other in Sundanese. In general one can say that the form *anu* is more usual in the west, while *nu* (Melanesian languages and Fiji *no*) is usual in the east. It is this form of the [p. 502] ligature, *anu,* which finally explains its nature. Namely, *anu* is a relative pronoun in Bare’e. While *anu* is not as actively used as we use ours in Dutch, nonetheless it exhibits the same function. Examples: *banya makole majaa, tau sondo anu majaa* ‘the prince is not bad, it’s the people who are bad’; *pesuwu pae mami, pesuwu tungka maboko, anu riyombo-yombo,* *anu ri woto* ‘bring our rice, bring stout sugar palm, which is in the lowness, which is in the heights’; *yaku anu tukaka, si’a anu tua’i* ‘I am the older, he is the younger brother.’

As can easily be determined from the above, the ligature *nu* in Bare’e is identical with the relative pronoun. Nevertheless it would be less correct to explain the meaning of the concerned particle from its function as a relative pronoun. As Mr. Alb. C. Kruyt elucidates in his “Grammaticale schets der Baree-taal,” the meaning of *anu* is that of ‘thing, something, that.’ This meaning can be considered the original, and from this the following meanings then originate:

1. that of indefinite pronoun, ‘thingamajig’
2. that of ‘possession, belongings, property’

In this last meaning *anu* is used with the personal possessive suffixes in order to indicate ‘my, his, her, your, our, etc. property, of mine, of his, of ours, etc.,’ Bare’e *anuku, anumu, anumi, anumami,* etc. Linked with other pronouns, free-standing nouns, etc. it has the same meaning, for example: *anu-ncewa?* ‘whose?’; *anu-ngkabosenya* ‘property of the chief’s’; *anuku banya, anu-ndongoku* ‘not mine, my wife’s.’

---

7 [footnote 1, p. 501] Bare’e *pompeindo* or *pompeambe;* the form is *Papa-i-Anu, Indo-i-Anu,* or *Nene-i-Anu, Ta-Anu, Tete-i-Anu.*

8 [footnote 1, p. 502] For the meaning of this formula, see Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap vol. 39, p. 143 [= Kruyt (1895–1897); see references for full citation].
This last meaning is that of *anu* (*nu*) as genitive particle. *Duanga-nu makole* thus means, ‘boat, something of the chief’s, that of the chief’s’; *topi-ndongonya* ‘sarong, something of his wife’s; *sia-mbatuam* ‘headcloth, something of your slave’s,’ provided that one can equate the nasal with *nu*.[p. 503] That such a use of *anu* closely borders on the use of the same particle as possessive pronoun requires no demonstration, not any more than it separately requires to be proved that *anu* as ligature also has already undergone the weakening of its meaning from ‘thing, something’ to that of relative pronoun, seeing as how *paku-mbaju* can be better explained as ‘pin, that of the jacket’ than with ‘pin, thing of the jacket.’

The above gives an overview of the syntactic use of the ligature *anu, nu* or nasal, without going into its etymological meaning. In Baré there is data available which points to the original meaning of the ligature, and which demonstrates that it has not always had its present syntactic value. In sentences such as *tesebu nu ngoyu* ‘spread by the wind’; *bare’e ndaliu nu eo* ‘not penetrated by the sun’ (of a plant); *nato’o-ntau* ‘said by the people,’ one could think that the ligature had the meaning of our ‘by’ with the passive and that—just as with the ligature in Sangirese (Sprakkunst, p. 189)—it sets apart the agent of the preceding passive form. However, a form such as *nawai-i-nTa-Lasa* ‘given by Ta Lasa’ speaks against this interpretation, because the name marker *i* is always equal to the ligature in syntactic value, which would mean that there should be two present here. A form such as this is then also to be entirely equated with *Indo-i-nDuma, Papa-i-nTapula*, and is nothing other than a phenomenon of nasalization brought about by the meeting of two words which are compounded. Nasalization in such cases is much favored in Baré, especially with the voiceless consonants. ‘Child’ is *ana*, ‘small’ *kodi*; ‘small child’ is now *ana-ngkodi*. Through word repetition the stem *putu* becomes *putu-mputu*, from *puri* through reduplication *ndapu-mputu*. From combining the words *mekoyo* ‘carry on the back in a basket’ and *kariki* ‘armpit’ comes *mekoyo-ngkariki* [p. 504] ‘carry the basket with the armpits’ (in other words, with the straps under the armpits, such as a soldier with his backpack), and *mekoyo-mbo’o* ‘identical, with the carry strap in front of the head (*wo’o)*; *meeli* ‘look around,’ compounded with *taliku* ‘back, behind’ as modifier, becomes *meeli-ntaliku* ‘look around behind’; thus a cliff with a wide gap, located here in the interior, carries the name of *Batu-ngkunganga* ‘Gaping Stone’ (*kunganga* ‘gape’); thus one says *i-Tua*, another *i-nTua* ‘Mister.’

Similar examples, easily multiplied, perforce compel the thought that a nasal, sometimes expanded to a nasal particle, readily becomes used with the compounding of two words. The genitive associations are at present the most used and tightest compounds, and here the use of the particle has become as law, where phonetic circumstances don’t allow the nasal. That in certain cases one finds *nu*, and as mentioned above this *nu* is the same as *anu*, which has a certain syntactic value, does not speak against this interpretation. *Anu* or *nu* is a filler in all its functions, and although already long ago it acquired ‘civil rights’ as

---

[9] [translator’s note: By ‘word repetition’ (*woordherhaling*) Adriani refers to two-syllable reduplication, and by ‘reduplication’ (*reduplicatie*) specifically one-syllable reduplication. In fact the form *putu-mputu* may be a misrepresentation, as his dictionary gives only *jori putu-putu* and *jori mputu-mputu* ‘growling, rumbling of the stomach’ (Adriani 1928:127)]
an independent word, nevertheless it betrays its character everywhere upon closer examination. Following the various ages of its development, we find that the nasal ligature expanded under favorable circumstances to a word, in the same form as in which outside of such a connection it also became used to fill a void in running speech. Simultaneously with this independent form, it has acquired a separate meaning, and at present has become a grammatical necessity with genitive relationships, while in other relationships it is often used or not according to pleasure.

It is noteworthy that Dr. A. A. Fokker has recently expressed a similar opinion concerning the etymological significance of the coda of the well-known nasal prefix which forms transitive verbs in Malayo-Polynesian languages. On page 24 of his thesis, and later yet in the Indische Gids [p. 505] of 1895, page 1585, he describes the nasal of this prefix as entirely phonetic. Mā, formerly a separate word, was attached to the word stem with a nasal consonant, which in a later period became still more closely connected with it so that the stem even loses its onset letter, provided that it was a voiceless or glottal stop, and the entire compound became inseparable. The first stage is still the usual in Bare’e, for example: mo-mpaho, mo-ngkae, mo-ntima, mo-ntuntu, with which forms such as mo-meka (pekə) and mo-nuntu are far and away in the minority.11 Cases in which a k has disappeared have yet to come to my awareness. Also with some prefixes, which are otherwise added to the stem word without anything intervening, one sometimes finds a nasal used, for example nda-mbulere next to ndabulere, ba-ntieli (from tieli and ba). This is especially used with the prefix ka-: ka-mbamba (bamba); ka-ncoe (soe); kangi-kdo-ngkido, next to mo-kido; ka-mpile-mpile, etc.12 With the repeated forms of the last two examples, we see immediately that the nasal is entirely one with the onset of the stem. The nasal is thus here a ligature of entirely the same nature as that with the genitive relationships. Although at present the ligature has an established syntactic value, there are a number of cases in which nothing of it can be perceived, and we have to consider these cases as remnants of a former stage, whereby they point the way for us toward a clearer

10 [footnote 1, p. 505] People are still so little accustomed to the loss of a voiced consonant following nasalization that the form monuntu next to the older form montuntu has even given rise to the use of nuntu next to tuntu (Ponosakan tuntu, Sawu tutul ‘story’).

11 [translator’s note: With glosses mopaho ‘plant (with dibble)’; mongkae ‘dig,’ montima ‘take,’ montuntu ‘speak, say, pronounce,’ monuntu ‘handle a word, deal with a matter, articulate its meaning’; momeka ‘fish, angle’ (Adriani 1928:s.v.).]

12 [translator’s note: These forms—or the closest that I can recover from Adriani (1928:s.v.)—along with their glosses are:

nda-mbulere ‘unfolded,’ cf. ma(nga)bulere ‘unfold’;
tieli ‘disdainfully or mockingly turn the head away after inspecting something’ + ba indefinite particle ‘perhaps, or’;
kambamba (not found), bamba 1. ‘triangular side piece of a Torajan roof,’ 2. ‘river mouth’;
kancoe-ncoe ‘swinging back and forth,’ soe ‘a swing, a hanging sarong (for a baby)’;
kangi-kdo-ngkido ‘glittering, sparkling,’ mongkido (not mokido) ‘glitter, sparkle’;
kampile-mpile ‘turning, swinging, swerving to and fro,’ pile ‘curved to the side, turned, slanting.’]
idea of the meaning which we have attached to the ligatures. The various forms of the ligatures are called ‘ligazones’ by the Paters Grammatici of the Philippine languages, but it is clear that these ligatures sooner divide than join. Seeing that wuyu mata means ‘eyelash,’ in the expression wuyu-mbaula it is not the ligature which joins wuyu ‘hair’ [p. 506] and baula ‘buffalo’ into the compound ‘buffalo hair.’ Compounds with the ligature are more or less disrupted thereby, and it leaves no doubt whether they are newer than those in which the elements are closely joined and are not separated by anything. The expression ue mata, the only expression which the Bare’e have for ‘tear,’ certainly represents the older stage. Compare further that which Professor Kern says in Fidjetaal, pp. 119 ff.

That anu has developed in specific ways in related languages as it has in Bare’e can be briefly traced in the Philippine languages.

In Tagalog\textsuperscript{13} anó? is the interrogative pronoun for things, ‘what?’ In the form no it occurs as the interrogative pronoun of persons: sì no ‘who?’ nì no ‘whose?’ The change from indefinite to interrogative pronoun is a very small one. Anó is also joined with possessive suffixes, e.g. anómó itong tano ‘this man is your what?’ With the prefix ma- it becomes the predicate: maano ‘what is? how is? how is it situated?’ e.g. maano kaio ‘how goes it with you?’

Following the results of Professor Kern’s research in Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, 1876, pp. 138 ff., we have to consider the ‘ligazones’ in Tagalog as relative pronouns and as indicators of a partitive relationship. That the Tagalog ‘ligazones’ have a much broader function than the ligature of Bare’e is immediately obvious. The particle in Bare’e is just as much an indicator of a partitive relationship as in Tagalog. And even though the forms which they have in Tagalog give no inducement by themselves to equate them with anu, nu, nevertheless, owing to what has been said above, this is highly likely.

\textit{Bisaya.} Just as in Tagalog, sì no? is ‘who?’ and ano? is ‘what?’ Following Padre Figueroa,\textsuperscript{14} with verbal prefixes it is used in the meaning of ‘do, make,’ e.g. nagaano ka ‘what were you doing?’ However, [p. 507] from the example it is clear that the meaning is ‘do what? make what?’ just as in Tagalog.

Padre Figueroa discusses the ‘ligazones’ on pp. 12–14. He mentions that there are indeed seven, of which immediately for us ka and kag are left out of consideration, like the prefix ka known already from Sangir (Spraakkunst, p. 80). In the examples given by Padre Figueroa, ka has the collective meaning which is discussed in Sangireesche Spraakkunst, p. 82. His example usa katawo fully agrees with Sangirese sêng katau. Remaining are an, in, nga, and n or ng. Of these, the first two are mentioned as articles. Because Bare’e does not have these, they fall out of our comparison, although in passing one could remark that they do not differ in nature from the forms found so far.

\textsuperscript{13} [footnote 1, p. 506] Totanes, published 1865, pp. 16, 17.

\textsuperscript{14} [footnote 2, p. 506] Arte del Idioma Visaya de Samar y Leite, 1872, p. 28.
Nga is the most usual linking sound in Bisaya and is through and through a relative pronoun. Concerning *n, ng*, one can say—just as with Tagalog *ng, n*—that it has become a genitive marker, in function directly comparable with Bare’e *n*, etc., although here just as in Tagalog there is no corroboration that they are to be identified with *anu, nu*.

*Ibanag* has *nini* ‘who?’ and *ani* ‘what?’ thus cognates of the Tagalog and Bisayan forms. We can thus say that in addition to *anu* and *nu*, *ano* and *no*, also *ani* and *ni* occur. Rodriguez’s dictionary also reports the stem *ani* as a verbal form, for example *anian* or *inani* ‘affected with what? provided with what? in order to do what?’ e.g. *anian nak-kagi na*? ‘he speaks in order to do what?’

The accent in these languages falls on the syllable *no, ni*, perhaps a demonstration that *nu* is the source of *anu*.

As genitive particle, Padre de Cuevas reports *na*,15 or rather *na* (with nasal coda) because the beginning of the following word is doubled, e.g. *nat-tolai* ‘of the people,’ in which it is the nasal that assimilates. *Na* is also reported as the genitive of *i* (definite article), e.g. *i ikararuá* ‘the soul,’16 thus in *na* the article must be implied, and it [p. 508] may thereby be equated with Tagalog *nang*, so that the *n* of *na* is actually the linking element.

Concerning the ligazones *a* and *nga*, as usual Padre de Cuevas helps us more quickly and thoroughly forward than his colleagues. On pp. 69 ff. the function of *a, nga* as relative pronoun is thoroughly treated. The two forms are synonyms (p. 80): *(ng)a* does not occur as a genitive particle. The relationship with *na* is likewise not to be denied.

*Sangirese*. Here *anu* is an indefinite pronoun ‘thing,’ just as it also is in Malay, Javanese, Bare’e, etc. It is used of persons and things. The verbal form *manganu* can take the place of any verb, if one can’t or won’t state the correct verb, e.g. *i sie mĕkĕkoa a’? kai manganu . . . . . . . wamundalé* ‘what is he doing? He is um . . . . . rowing.’ The local passive form *ianuang* or *anuang* means ‘be made into, be provided with, be affected with,’ e.g. *anuang si sie* ‘made to be his,’ *anuang ana-e* ‘made to be his child,’ *anuang matane* ‘be supplied with eyes.’

The use of Bare’e *anu* as ‘possession, property’ is also clearly found back in Sangirese, although more limited. The expressions mentioned on p. 278 of the *Spraakkunst, solong anuku*, etc. clearly indicate this. The original meaning of these expressions is given in the note: ‘at my house’ (*su anuku*) literally ‘at my property.’ It is notable furthermore to compare Siau17 *koa*, which is entirely identical with Tagalog, Ibanag *kua*, Bentenan *kuat*


16 [footnote 2, p. 507] *Ikararuá* is a derivation of *dua* ‘two,’ and is etymologically equivalent to *kakĕduang*, the duplicate of the person whom the one in the underworld (*binangunang*) interrogates. See *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 1894, p. 108 [= Adriani’s “Sangireesche Teksten”].

17 [translator’s note: Siau and the later-mentioned Manganitu are dialects of Sangir.]
(Bugis gau, Makasarese, Javanese, Bare’e gawe). Tagalog now uses kuàn (kua + an), and Bisaya kuan, for anu ‘things,’ etymologically synonymous with Siau, Sangirese koa-teng, but syntactically with anuáng, the two values of which are once again synonymous in the meaning ‘be made into.’ Thus also in Tagalog kua and anó are fundamentally synonyms. Finally, that Manganitu also further uses pia ‘be’—synonym [p. 509] with anu and Siau koa—lines up with the use of words for ‘be’ in the meaning ‘have.’

The genitive particle in Sangir is n (after an open syllable), u (after a half or loosely closed syllable)[18]. See Spraakkunst, p. 220. The relative pronoun for persons is i-sai-n, for things apa-n. Because i sai and apa by themselves are interrogative pronouns, it is thus the n which makes them relative. The character of the n as a relative pronoun is also very clear from various Sasambo verses, e.g. bawowone-n-pinêbio ‘her ditty that was used to narrate’ (Sasambo I, 9); ini-n-pondol u arunde ‘this here is it, that are remnants of the dead ones’ (Sasambo I, 25). Here is thus, just as in Tagalog, etc., the deictic pronoun followed by the ligazón, something which the Sangirese only do from time to time in poetry.

The ligature is regularly used between the passive and the agent (Spraakknust, pp. 189, 192), a particular case of the usual function of the genitive.

As far as the forms n and u are concerned, at first sight these appear to have nothing to do with each other. As a ligature, the form n may be expected in a Philippine language. Concerning the u, the hypothesis speaks for itself that it is, just like the n, a constituent of the particle nu. This particle itself no longer encountered, but has remained preserved in these two remnants. Only of the n do we see the same in other languages; the shortening of nu to u can be explained from the aversion to piling up consonants, since with this hypothesis we are not required to suppose anything other than that the n disappears following closed syllables, that is to say, after loosely closed syllables it is assimilated into the nasal coda of the preceding word, and after half-closed syllables it is omitted. In such cases, Tagalog also withholds its ligazón.

The use of nu and the nasal next to each other in entirely analogous constructions and even by each other in the very same [p. 510] expressions compels us to think that nu and the nasal are one. This is not demonstrated. However, if we apply to Bare’e what Prof. Kern says in Fidjitaal, pp. 119–121 concerning the delineated genitive in the Malayo-Polynesian languages, then this much can be taken for certain:

One has to seek old genitives in Bare’e in those combinations where a ligature cannot easily find a place; that such constructions actually are old is demonstrated by examples such as: ue mata, silo angga, mata eo. The combinations with the nasal ligature are the

[18] [translator’s note: By ‘half closed’ (Dutch half gesloten), Adriani means a syllable which is closed by an unreleased consonant. By ‘loosely closed’ (Dutch los gesloten), he means a syllable which is closed by a nasal. All other syllables in Sangirese are open. See Adriani (1893:8–9).]

oldest examples of the analytic construction in Bare’e, while those with *nu* are the youngest and also the least obligatory. One person says *kaju engo*, the other *kaju nu engo*. The latter would certainly be used if someone, who was merely talking about a *kaju*, was not clear enough for another, then the other would then ask, *kaju nunja, bara kaju nu engo? ‘kaju of what? perhaps the nose bone?’ Likewise I sometimes ask someone for a piece of fungus (*waru*), and he asks me back, *bara waru nu konau ndaperapi? ‘do you want some fungus of the sugar palm?’ Here the modifier is clearly felt to be something incidental, because usually *waru* is clear enough. Otherwise, one would always say *waru ngkonau*. Perhaps the safest one could go, would be to consider *nu* to be an imitation of the *nasal* ligature, and—in the connection mentioned by Dr. Fokker—to seek a precedent of the use of the latter in the joining of the nasal prefix to the verbal forms.

Poso, August 1896.

**Postscript: Spelling of Pamona words**

[by the translator]

In order to reflect modern orthographic conventions, the spelling of Pamona words has been consistently updated, namely *dj* → *j*, *tj* → *c*, *nj* → *ny*, and *j* (elsewhere) → *y*. In this very early work, Adriani did not symbolize word-medial glottal stop in Pamona words (as he did later, using apostrophe, e.g. Baree, later written Bare’e). Conversely he overtly symbolized certain transition glides, a convention which he later dropped, e.g. *ejo ‘day, sun,* later written simply *eo*. Using Adriani’s 1928 dictionary as my guide, I have made the following updates to the spelling of various Pamona words (Adriani’s 1897 form on the left, the form used in this translation on the right).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>baree</th>
<th>bare’e</th>
<th>‘no, not’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>berise</td>
<td>berese</td>
<td>‘lightning strike’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puu</td>
<td>pu’u</td>
<td>‘trunk, base, origin’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rou</td>
<td>ro’u</td>
<td>‘forehead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too</td>
<td>to’o</td>
<td>‘name’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woo</td>
<td>wo’o</td>
<td>‘head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banuwa</td>
<td>banua</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batuwa</td>
<td>batua</td>
<td>‘slave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duwanga</td>
<td>duanga</td>
<td>‘boat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duwata</td>
<td>duata</td>
<td>‘python, snake’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gowa</td>
<td>goa</td>
<td>‘maize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamowa</td>
<td>Lamoa</td>
<td>‘gods’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langgowe</td>
<td>langgoe</td>
<td>‘civet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngowa</td>
<td>ngo’a</td>
<td>‘kind of rattan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puwe</td>
<td>pue</td>
<td>‘lord’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raowa</td>
<td>raoa</td>
<td>‘atmosphere’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruwi</td>
<td>rui</td>
<td>‘thorn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sowe</td>
<td>soe</td>
<td>‘swing, hanging sarong (for baby)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tuwa  tua  ‘sir’ (cf. Malay tuan)
tuwai tuai’i  ‘younger sibling’
uwani uani  ‘honey bee’
uwase uase  ‘axe’
uwe ue  ‘water’
wujwuwa wayuwa  ‘hair (of the head)’
djoja joja  ‘floor’
dunija dunia  ‘world’
ejo eo  ‘sun, day’
ijaku yaku (from i + aku)  ‘I’
liju liu  ‘beyond, past’
orija oria  ‘durian’
seja sea  ‘nest’
sija sia  ‘piece of cloth’
sija si’a  ‘he, she, it, they’
tijeli tieli  ‘disdainfully turn the head away’
wiijo wio  ‘foam (of cooking rice)’

Although not found as entries in his dictionary, I have also hazarded to update the spelling of the following words:

bijia bia  ‘kind of mollusk’
Karijango Kariango  person’s name
Suwigi Suigi  person’s name
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