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Abstract

Rembong-Wangka is an Austronesian language, which together with other little described languages, belongs to the Manggaraic subgroup of Austronesian. One aim is to present information about them, as well as other languages in the area, drawn from not readily accessible sources, including archival material, and information collected by the author in Flores. An estimation of the number of speakers of Rembong-Wangka, the dialects and a map of settlements where the language is spoken, are given. The second aim is to describe adnominal possessive constructions, and the third to discuss etymologies of morphological elements in these constructions. The material to answer these questions was collected during two short field trips. Written glossed texts in a Rembong-Wangka corpus constructed by the author were used and analysed in the FLEX program.

In pronominal possession, the possessor can be expressed by pronominal enclitics or oblique pronouns. The latter of these two strategies is more emphatic. Non-pronominal possession can be expressed by juxtaposition or with a Possession Construction Marker (PCM). Juxtaposition is used mostly for non-prototypical possession or possession-like relationships and PCMs mainly for prototypical possession. The etymology of the oblique pronouns is discussed, as well as the possible etymological connections of Central Flores PCMs with different words in Rembong-Wangka.
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Conventions

The term ‘corpus’ refers to the still unpublished corpus which includes the Rembong-Wangka texts from Verheijen (1977b) and Verheijen (1988), and has been entered into the FLEEx program.\(^1\) The word ‘text’ refers to these texts.

In the example sentences in this thesis, the sentence number in FLEEx is given, together with the name of the text, and the name of the lect, which is the name of the kampung (settlement) or administrative division where the text was recorded. If the lect is not one of the dialects or subdialects mentioned in the last paragraph of section 2.2 in this study, the name of the dialect (or subdialect in the case of Rembong-Riung Barat) is given in parentheses after the name of the lect. Because several texts in Verheijen (1988) are said to be from Wolo Mézéq, that name is used in the examples, even though the dialect of these texts is called Maronggëla in the last paragraph of section 2.2. The subdialects are referred to as dialects except in the end of paragraph 2.2. If lects which are not (sub)dialects are referred to together with (sub)dialects, all are called lects. For the location of kampungs mentioned in the examples and at other places in this study, see Map 1 and Appendix 1.

The numbering of the texts follows the numbering in Verheijen (1977b) and Verheijen (1988), except that a 0 (zero) has been put before texts no.1-9 in Verheijen (1977b), 70 before texts no.1-9 in Verheijen (1988) and 7 before texts no.10-99 in Verheijen (1988). The texts no.100-103 in Verheijen (1988) have been numbered 800-803. The text in Dadu (n.d.:192-193) has been numbered 804.

A number in parentheses after the name of a lect indicates how many times the form under discussion occurs in that lect in the corpus.

In the spelling of place names, [ǝ] (<e>) and [e] (<é>) are differentiated for kampungs, but not for higher level administrative units where <e> is written in both cases, except in kelurahan Lémpang Paji. However, it was not possible in all cases to decide the vowel sound in the first syllable in the names cited from GeoNames. In such cases, <e> was written.

The orthography used for Rembong-Wangka is that described in section 5.1.2, but when comparing Rembong-Wangka with other languages or when talking about etymology in section 5.3, IPA is used.

Words from Indonesian languages are in italics.

Unpublished manuscripts are referred to with n.d. (no date) for the year, even though they in fact are dated in some cases.

\(^1\) Anyone who is interested can get access to, the still unfinished, corpus by asking me at mawonali@gmail.com. A permission to use and publish published and unpublished manuscript materials of Pater Verheijen has been given to me by the SVD Provincial superior Netherlands-Belgium Province.
1 Introduction

Rembong-Wangka is one of about seven languages in the Manggaraic subgroup of the Austronesian languages. These languages are spoken on the western part of Flores, one island among the Eastern Small Sunda Islands (Indonesian: Nusa Tenggara Timur). The only relatively well described language in the Manggaraic subgroup is Manggarai, the by far biggest language. Of the other languages, only the Wangka dialect of the Rembong-Wangka language is described in a non-Indonesian language (Schmidt 2013). That study is a PhD, but some features, including adnominal possession, of the language are described quite summarily. Because of this, it is motivated to write a study of adnominal possession, mainly based on another dialect of the language. The reason for studying Rembong-Wangka was that it was decided the initial decision that the study should mainly be based on written material, because it was not possible for me to make a sufficiently long fieldwork trip to base a study on that, and the written material for the other small Manggaraic languages were deemed not to be sufficiently extensive.

Except studying adnominal possession, another aim of the present study is to present what is known about the basic facts, mainly concerning Rembong-Wangka, but also other undescribed Manggaraic languages, and their relation to other languages in the area, based on published and unpublished sources and information I collected while in Flores. This should be considered as one research question, but the results are, a bit unorthodoxically for a M.A. thesis, presented in the background chapter.

My own data was collected in 2016, when I made a short visit to some areas where the Manggaraic languages Kolor, Kepo’ and Rajong are spoken, and in 2019, when I made a field study of about 1 month in Lémpang Paji, where the Rembong dialect of Rembong-Wangka is spoken.

The study about adnominal possession in this study is based on the texts in Verheijen (1977b), Verheijen (1988) and the translations in Verheijen (1977b), Dadu (1998) and Dadu (n.d.). Information about the interpretation of the texts were obtained during the fieldwork in 2019, but the fieldwork was not specially focused on possession. For information about the language I would like to thank Ignatius Egy Dadu, a former language assistant of Pater Verheijen, Benedictus Solang (‘Bensol’), Dor² in Lémpang Paji, and Paulus Runtung, Dor in Kai. I would also like to thank Andreas Andy Nanga, the son of Ignatius Egy Dadu, for help with practical things, the Pastor in Lémpang Paji, who provided accommodation in the pastorate for me, and the Lurah (administrative head) in Lémpang Paji for help and accommodation when I first arrived in Lémpang Paji.

To prepare the texts for linguistic analysis, these and the Indonesian translations were scanned and entered in the FLEx program, where they were glossed. This work started in 2018 and has not been entirely finished yet. The plan is that this material, when finished, will be uploaded on the Internet and in pertinent archives, such as the SOAS Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR), as a reference for those interested, including the native speakers. For this reason, the translations, the glossings and the translations of the dictionary entries in that material will be in both Indonesian and English.

Except providing data on Rembong-Wangka in the context of the Manggaraic languages and analysing adnominal possession, this study also argues that most formative elements relevant for adnominal possession are enclitics. The etymology of some elements used in adnominal possession is treated, and it is hoped that this will contribute to some small extent to grammaticalization studies and comparative Austronesian studies.

---

² Traditional ritual leader. In Indonesian Tuan tanah ‘Lord of the land’.
2 Background

2.1 The languages most closely related to Rembong-Wangka.

In this section, the genealogical position of Rembong-Wangka is described. Basic information about the languages of the Manggaraic subgroup is included, because very little is known of most of these languages, and it is not completely clear how many separate languages there are. This uncertainty includes the status of Rembong-Wangka, which is sometimes thought to be a part of a Rembong-Riung language, which comprises Rembong-Wangka and Riung.

According to Eberhard et al. (2020), Rembong-Wangka is one of the 30 languages in the Bima-Lembata subgroup, which is not further subdivided, and where Bima on Sumbawa and all the languages of Flores, including smaller nearby islands, are included. According to Hammarstöm et al. (2020), Rembong-Wangka is one of the 24 languages in the Flores-Sumba-Hawu subgroup, where the languages of western and central Flores, Sumba, Sabu and Ndao are included. The Flores-Sumba-Hawu subgroup is subdivided into Flores barat and Sumba-Hawu, and Flores barat is in its turn subdivided into Manggaraic (7 languages) and Central Flores-Paluqe (8 languages). According to Hammarstöm et al. (2020), Rembong-Wangka is one of the Manggaraic languages, which are spoken on western Flores and the small island of Komodo, of which the biggest and best described is Manggarai. The subdivisions of the Manggaraic languages according to Hammarstöm et al. (2020) is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The Manggaraic languages (in bold) according to Hammarstöm et al. (2020), with the number of speakers according to Eberhard et al. (2020), and the kabupatens (regencies) where they are spoken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komodo</th>
<th>Manggarai Barat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Komodo</td>
<td>Manggarai Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai</td>
<td>900,000; Manggarai Barat, Manggarai, Manggarai Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riung</td>
<td>14,000; Ngada, Nagekeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rembong-Wangka</td>
<td>5,000; Manggarai Timur, Ngada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepo’</td>
<td>6,000; Manggarai Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waerana-Razong</td>
<td>6,000; Manggarai Timur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The language situation in the geographical area between the two relatively big languages Manggarai and Ngad’a ((nxg), 60,000 speakers) in Manggarai Timur and northern Ngada is not so clear, and will be treated shortly in this section.

Because the terminology of the Indonesian administrative system will be used, it is necessary to explain that terminology here. The administrative system of Indonesia consists of several levels. On the highest level, there are 34 provinsi (province). One of these is Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT), which consists of 22 kabupaten (regency). Of the 9 kabupaten on the island of Flores (including the small surrounding islands), one is Manggarai Timur, which consists of 9 kecamatan (district), and one is Ngada, which consists of 12 kecamatan. Every kecamatan consist of a number of desas (administrative villages) and kelurahans (much like desas, but generally more town-like). In every desa or kelurahan there is genererally a number of kampungs (settlement) which have no administrative standing. In the following, the Indonesian terms will be used. Kedaluan was an administrative division during the Dutch colonial era, which generally was intermediate in size between a kecamatan and a desa.

The foremost expert on Manggarai and also other Manggaraic languages, Pater Jilis Verheijen, had some doubts about if Kepo’ and Rajong are dialects of Manggarai or languages of their own. According to his lexicostatistical computations, Kepo’ shars 74% of its basic vocabulary with Manggarai, and Rajong 67% (Verheijen n.d.b:2-4).

Kepo’ is spoken in kampung Mok in the administrative village (desa) Mbengan. The Kepo’ speakers now living in Mok moved from the kedaluan Biting in the early 19th century (Erb 1987:35). In Lémpang Paji it was said that Kepo’ is still spoken in the kampungs Mimor, Bebong, Sapok, Dujuk, Pinggang and
Kajan in Biting, but according to information in Mok, they were not aware of Kepo’ being spoken in Biting any more. Razong/Rajong is still spoken in two separate areas, one in kampung Nunur (‘Rajong kecil’) in the village Mbengan and one other area further north (‘Razong besar’). Kolor is spoken in the following desas in kecamatan Kotakomba: Rongan Koe, Watu Ngene, Tanah Rata, Komba, Bamo, Gunung Mute, Gunung Baru, Lembur, Ruan, Mbengan and Rana Kolong.3

Verheijen (1991) divides Manggarai into five main dialect groups, West Manggarai (Manggarai Barat), Manggarai SH, Central Manggarai (Manggarai Tengah), East Manggarai (Manggarai Timur) and Far Eastern Manggarai (Manggarai Timur Jauh). East Manggarai is spoken in the former kedaluans Congkar, Biting and Manus. Of these, Manus seems sometimes to be regarded as a language of its own (Arka 2016:7).3 Verheijen (1991:4,6-8) considers Riung, which he calls Far Eastern Manggarai, to be a dialect of Manggarai. As subdialects he mentions Bar, Riung, Toring, Tado, Nggolonio, Langkosambi, Nanganumba, Mbaï, Keja and Mulu/Welas, while Schmidt (2013:70) mentions Sambinasi, Riung, Bekek, Lengkosambi, Nggolonio, Mbay, Keja and Welas. Schmidt (2013:71) says that the lects directly south and southeast of the Rembong-Riung area, Namut, Nginamanu, Poma and Ramba, “are usually regarded as ‘strange’ or ‘aberrant’ dialects, but due to the political boundaries nevertheless culturally accepted as Riung (Rémon, p.c.).” The only material for several of these lects are the 200 words lexicostatistical lists in Aritonang et al. (2002) and an unpublished wordlist of 11 lects spoken in the kecamatans Wolomeze, Riung and Riung Barat (Rémon n.d.).

A very rough list of the percentage of cognate words in some lects based on the word lists in Aritonang et al. (2002) is given in Table 2, but it has to be kept in mind that the figures are extremely unreliable and certainly too low. This is due to the general unreliability of these lists, the fact that different persons collected the lists, that all 200 words are not listed for all lects and that the handwriting of the informants seems to have been misinterpreted in some cases. Add to that that my judgement of cognates is not always certain and that suspected loanwords (not very many) are not excluded.6 The percentages are very unreliable, but perhaps still give an indication that some lects, like Namut and Ramba, could be considered to be languages of their own.

Table 2: Lexicostatistical computations of percentage of cognate words between seven lects in western-central Flores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wangka</th>
<th>Namut</th>
<th>Ramba</th>
<th>Nginamanu</th>
<th>Ngad’a</th>
<th>So’a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riung</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangka</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namut</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramba</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nginamanu</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngad’a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 11 lects in Rémon (n.d.) can preliminarily be divided into 4 languages: Keja, Mulu/Welas, Tadho and Bar represent the Riung language, Terong, Riqa and Wie represent Rembong-Wangka, Ramba and Poma should represent one language, which also include other lects, and Namut and Nginamanu should

---

3 Personal information from Ignasius Dequirino. According to Verheijen & Dadu (unpubl.) Kolor is spoken in the kampons Waérana, Rasen Ranameti, Rëndok, Mundé, Mbermbungus, Lawén, Waoubouk. Mbapo, Rana Kolong, Sambikoë, Lété, Bonggirita, Kopalando. Ritapada, Dalur and Lait.

4 Schmidt (2013:68) says that Manus is synonymous with Eastern Manggarai, which means that it should include the lects spoken in Manus, Biting and Congkar.

5 As an example, the wordlist called Rambangaru is obviously not from that place in north-eastern Sumba, but rather from somewhere in south-eastern Sumba.

6 Non-exclusion of loanwords would probably in most cases cause the percentage of shared vocabulary to be to high. However, in the present case the Indonesian loanwords were mostly recorded only by one lect for a given word, and this would cause the percentages to be to low.
probably be considered to constitute one language. Table 3 gives a lexicostatistical comparison between these 11 lects.

Table 3: Percentages of shared cognates of 100 words from the 11 lects in Rémon (n.d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mulu/Welas</th>
<th>Tadho</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Térong</th>
<th>Riqa</th>
<th>Wué</th>
<th>Poma</th>
<th>Ramba</th>
<th>Namut</th>
<th>Nginamanu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keja</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulu/Welas</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadho</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Térong</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riqa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wué</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the division between Riung and Rembong-Wangka is by no means certain. The Riung lects Bar and Tadho share up to 74% cognates with Rembong-Wangka lects, while Bar shares only 72% cognates with Keja, which is regarded as a Riung lect. This indicates that Rembong-Wangka and Riung could possibly be considered to constitute one language (‘Rembong-Riung’), which is in fact the view of Rémon (personal communication) and as it seems also of Schmidt (2013) (see section 2.2 below).

Namut (under the name Namu) is considered a dialect of Rembong-Wangka in Eberhard et al. (2020) and in Hammarström et al. (2020). This is definitely incorrect. The unanimous view of people I spoke to in Maronggél (kecamatan Riung Barat) was that the lect was incomprehensible and very different from their lect. I visited Namut and recorded a wordlist of nearly 700 words. It seems clear that Namut is more closely related to the Ngad’a group of languages. It was said that it was most similar to the Ngina manu lect, which accords well with the fact that the original kampungs of Namut and Ngina manu were very close to each other and the results in Table 3. According to Nao-Cosme Rémon (personal information) Namut and Nginamanu constitutes a dialect chain, and consequently Namut-Nginamanu should be considered a language of its own. Rémon also thinks that Ramba (desa Turaloa), Poma (desa Denatana Timur), Wolokuku (desa Mainai) and possibly Sekojawa (desa Mainai), all in kecamatan Wolomeze, and Nagerawe (desa Nagerawe, kecamatan Boawae) constitutes another dialect chain. Before this chain could be said to constitute a language, the relation to the other lects in kabupaten Nagekeo has to be investigated.

Summarizing this section, information about where the smaller Manggaraic languages are spoken is given, an rough estimation of the relationship between the languages spoken in the northern parts of

---

7 In Hammarström et al. (2020), Namut-Nginamanu is, for the first time, given as a language of its own, based on the information in Rémon (n.d.).

8 The basis for the wordlist was the Leipzig-Jakarta 100 word list (Tadmor 2009:69-71). However, because not every word in the list was found in Rémon (n.d.), or a translation was not given for all lects, the following exchanges were made: ‘mosquito’ for ‘ant’, ‘to burn (transitive)’ for ‘to burn (intransitive)’, ‘chicken’ for ‘bird’, ‘sour’ for ‘bitter’, ‘to hold’ for ‘to carry’, ‘to break’ for ‘to crush/grind’, ‘to work’ for ‘to do/make’, ‘to search’ for ‘to hide’, ‘fontanel’ for ‘navel’, ‘afraid’ for ‘to run’, ‘sun’ for ‘shade/shadow’ and ‘tree’ for ‘wood’.

9 Information from the Kepala desa in Namut.

10 Because the number of shared cognates between Namut and Nginamanu is only 67% in Table 3, it could be possible that Namut and Nginamanu should be considered to be two languages. Another alternative is that Namut-Nginamanu-So’a-Ngad’a should be considered a dialect chain of one language.

11 From the information given by Rémon, desa Tedamude (kecamatan Aesesa) should also be included.
the *kabupaten* Manggarai Timur and Ngada was attempted, and an indication of the uncertainties of the language divisions in the area was made.

### 2.2 Rembong-Wangka and its dialects

Schmidt (2013:89) concludes: “the evidence suggest [sic] to group Manggarai and Riung more closely together than Rembong, but include Rembong in a dialect continuum Manggarai-Riung-Rembong, rather than separating Rembong from Manggarai-Riung as its own languages as Verheijen (1991) proposed.” However, Schmidt sometimes speaks about the ‘Riung language’ (Schmidt 2013:1,6,111) or the Rembong-Riung language (Schmidt 2013:69,90), including the Rembong-Wangka and Riung languages in Hammarstöm et al. (2020), but excluding Manggarai. Rémon (2012:38) follows personal information from Schmidt in regarding Glottolog’s Rembong-Wangka and Riung as constituting one language. Bolong & Sungga (1999:22) also talk about the Riung language. However, no arguments for a Riung language which is spoken in the whole of the *kecamatan* Riung and Riung Barat (and Manggarai Timur) are given, and before focused research about the differences and similarities between the different lects in western Flores has been done, it seems best to stick to the classifications in Hammarstöm et al. (2020) and Eberhard et al. (2020), viewing Rembong-Wangka and Riung as two languages of their own.

The name of the language as given in Hammarstöm et al. (2020) and Eberhard et al. (2020), Rembong-Wangka, seems to be well chosen, because in Manggarai Timur, the western part of the area where the language is spoken, the language is called Rembong. and the most eastern dialect, except the small dialect Wué, is Wangka, which is described in Smith (2013). In the *kecamatan* Riung Barat, where most of the other dialects of the language are spoken, there seems to be no established name of the language. I asked several people in Maronggêla, the capital of Riung Barat, what the language was called, and always received the answer that they did not know or I got no answer at all.

Rembong-Wangka is spoken in the *kecamatan* Elar, Elar Selatan and Sambi Rampas in the *kabupaten* Manggarai Timur, and in the *kecamatan* Riung Barat, Riung and Wolomeze in the *kabupaten* Ngada. The *desas* and *kampungs* where Rembong-Wangka is spoken are shown in Appendix 1, and the *kampungs* in Map 1.

Schmidt (2013:1) says that Riung, which probably includes what is here regarded as two languages, Rembong-Wangka and Riung, is spoken by 15,000 people and the Wangka dialect by 5,000 people. It seems that these numbers only include speakers in *kabupaten* Ngada, because he says that “[i]n Elar and Aesesa districts there are probably around another 15,000-20,000 speakers of Riung-Rembong speakers. [sic]” (Schmidt 2013:8). Thus, it seems that Schmidt estimates the combined number of Riung and Rembong-Wangka speakers to 30,000-35,000.

In Table 4, the size of the population in the administrative units where Rembong-Wangka is said to be spoken, based mainly on Indonesian government statistics, and in the case of Wangka on Schmidt’s estimate, is given. The population in the *kampungs* Wué, Ladar and Kaong is not counted, because it is not possible to know the number of speakers of Rembong-Wangka there from the available data, but they are certainly not many. It is not known how many persons have abandoned the language and speak only Indonesian in the area, but outsiders, like administrative personnel from the outside, traders, teachers, pastors and medical personnel are certainly quite few. Possibly more important are women from other areas who have married Rembong-Wangka speaking men. According to Schmidt (201:18), about 10% of the school children in Wangka speak only Indonesian. Based on the count in Table 4, it can probably be said that at most 20,000 persons speak Rembong-Wangka.
Table 4: An estimation of how many persons approximately live in the areas where Rembong-Wangka is spoken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative division or dialect</th>
<th>Number of speakers/persons</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wangka dialect</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Schmidt (2013:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kec. Riung Barat(^{12})</td>
<td>8,603</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Ngada (2019a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desas Taen Terong, Taen Terong I, Taen Terong II in kec. Riung</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Ngada (2019b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desa Latang in kec. Riung</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Ngada (2019b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelurahan Lempang Paji in kec. Elar Selatan</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Manggarai Timur (2019b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desa Sangan Rasan in kec. Elar Selatan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Ignatius Egy Dadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desas Golo Lizun and Legur Lai in kec. Elar</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Manggarai Timur (2019a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desas Golo Leboq and Kazu Wangi in kec. Elar</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Manggarai Timur (2019a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desa Nampar Sepang in kec. Sambi Rampas</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Manggarai Timur (2019c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,272</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Map 1, still inhabited kampungs, where Rembong-Wangka is spoken, are shown. All kampungs which are found in GeoNames (geonames.org) in the area where Rembong-Wangka is spoken according to the map in Verheijen (1977a) (Map 2 in this study) are included at the coordinates indicated in GeoNames. The exceptions are that Wué is the only kampung which is included in kecamatan Wolomeze, because other languages are spoken in the other kampungs there, that desa Wolomeze II, where Namut (not to be confused with Namut near Wangka) is spoken, is excluded, and that the kampungs Ladar and Kaong are included. Places, like Lempang Paji, which are marked as ‘fourth-order administrative division’ in GeoNames are not included. In addition to the names of places found in GeoNames, the names of kampungs from where there are texts in the corpus have been included, with the exception of Tégéq, which is now uninhabited. In these cases, the coordinates have been estimated by comparing a map of Rembong-speaking kampungs in kabupaten Manggarai Timur prepared for me by Ignatius Egy Dadu or the map in Rémon (2010:143) with the position of kampungs with coordinates in GeoNames. The kampungs for which the coordinates were estimated are: Kai, Kanun, Mbawar, Tenga, Léngké, Lemaq, Kepan, Bou and Wué. However, it seems that such estimates are quite inexact, so other kampungs found in the map from Manggarai Timur have not been included. Schmidt (2013:10-14) has many kampungs in his maps of the Wangka-speaking area, but those not found in GeoNames have not been included either. This means that not all known Rembong-Wangka-speaking kampungs are included in Map 1. Abandoned kampungs have not been included in Map 1, but are found in Appendix 2. The language of some kampungs in peripheral areas is not always certain. It concerns the areas in the west (e.g. Ara), areas close to the Riung language, and in the south, close to the Rajong language. In these areas, it is possible that the Biting dialect of Manggarai, Riung and Rajong respectively are spoken in some kampongs where according to the map Rembong-Wangka is spoken. If Rembong-Wangka is still spoken in Mbarungkeli and Pandulundur is uncertain. It seems quite clear that it is not spoken anymore in Kubur-Saka, where it was spoken according to Map 2. In kecamatan Elar, the map in Schmidt (2013:7) includes the whole of desa Golo Munde, whereas Map 1 only includes the kampungs Ladar, Kaong and

\(^{12}\) Except desa Wolomeze II, where Namut is spoken. Of the 2793 persons in the desas Benteng Tawa and Benteng Tawa I, perhaps at least some speak Rajong.
Lai near the eastern border of the desa. In addition Schmidt (2013:7) also includes the desas Tenomese and Rana Gapang, where, according to my information, there are no Rembong-Wangka speakers.

### Map 1: Rembong-Wangka-speaking kampungs

According to oral tradition, speakers of Rembong-Wangka have during history moved from one place to another. Often, it is told that they moved from a mountain or came from another island. A very commonly mentioned origin is from the mountain Wolomeze south of Namut. In some cases, they first went from there to Niki, another mountain. Those that came from the sea generally came from Goa or Wolio on Sulawesi, but in one case they were said to come from Paluqé, a small island north of Flores and northeast of the Rembong-Wangka area (Rémon 2010:143 and Appendix 2 in this study).

According to Eberhard et al. (2020) and Hammarstöm et al. (2020), Rembong-Wangka has three dialects, Rembong, Wangka and Namu. On the map in Verheijen (1977a) (Map 2) four or five dialects of Rembong are marked, Rembong, Térong, Wangka, Wué, and possibly Namut, which Verheijen thinks could be a language of its own. He mentions several subdialects of Rembong in his dictionary (Verheijen 1977a:VII), namely Kai, Kigit and Mbwawar in kabupaten Manggarai Timur and Bou-Munting, Nampé(q), Faté/Waté, Riqa, Teding, Téong and Waru-Kia in kecamatan Riung Barat, Térong-Mawong and Wangka in kecamatan Riung and Wué in kecamatan Wolomeze. Schmidt (2013) proposes the following dialects of Rembong-Wangka: Lémpong Paji, Mbarungkéli, Waté, Munting, Térong, Wangka and Wué. Bolong & Sungga (1999:22), mention the dialects Maronggela-Muntin [sic], Waté-Ria,
Téong-Nampé, Térong-Rawuk, Mbazang-Damu, Wangka and Mbarungkélé in the Rembong-Wangka area, and addition Riung, Bekek, Lengkosambi and Turaloa as Riung dialects.

A preliminary conclusion about the dialects of Rembong-Wangka is that the main dialects are:

1. Rembong-Riung Barat, which includes the lects spoken in the kecamatan Elar, Elar Selatan and Sambi Rampas and the lects spoken in kecamatan Riung Barat, except the Manggarai, Rajong and Kepoq languages and the Ladar Kaong dialect of Rembong-Wangka in kabupaten Manggarai Timur, and Namut in kecamatan Riung Barat.

2. Ladar Kaong in kecamatan Elar

3. Térong in kecamatan Riung

4. Wangka in kecamatan Riung

5. Wué in kecamatan Wolomeze

Subdialects of Rembong-Riung Barat is Rembong (includes the Rembong-Wangka lects spoken in the kecamatan Elar, Elar Selatan and Sambi Rampas, except Kigit and Ladar Kaong), Kigit, Lanamai (includes Téong-Nampé), Riqa (includes Waté), Bou-Munting, Maronggélá (includes Waru-Kia and Wolo Mézéq in the texts) and perhaps Mbazang-Damu, for which no material is available and where possibly Rajong is spoken.

Map 2 shows the Rembong-Wangka speaking area in Verheijen (1977a). The main dialects are shown and are the same as in this study, except that Ladar-Kaong is not included, and the status of Namut is marked as uncertain. A permission to use and publish published and unpublished manuscript materials by Pater Verheijen was given by the SVD Provincial superior Netherlands-Belgium Province.

---

In D Or. 684 38, p.21, Verheijen writes "Lijkt veel op Rmb" about Ladar Kaong. On pp.13-14 in the same document, a wordlist with 163 words in Ladar Kaong is found. In Lempang Paji I was told that Ladar Kaong probably is a dialect of Rembong.
Summarizing this section, the question if Rembong-Wangka was accepted as the name of the language, although some uncertainty if Rembong-Wangka should be combined with Riung as one language was uttered. The number of speakers was estimated to be not more than 20,000 and 5 main dialect divisions were posited. The kampungs where the language is spoken were shown in a map.

2.3 Theoretical background

The descriptions and analyses in this study are meant to conform to Basic Linguistic Theory as described in Dixon (2012). Dryer describes Basic Linguistic Theory in the following way:

Basic linguistic theory differs most sharply from other contemporary theoretical frameworks in what might be described as its conservativeness: unlike many theoretical frameworks that assume previous ideas only to a limited extent and freely assume many novel concepts, basic linguistic theory takes as much as possible from earlier traditions and only as much as necessary from new traditions. It can thus be roughly described as traditional grammar, minus its bad features (such as a tendency to describe all languages in terms of concepts motivated for European languages), plus necessary concepts absent from traditional grammar.

(Dryer 2006:210-211)

For the possessive construction, especially the character of the possessor and the possessee for the different constructions have been paid attention to. To decide which functional elements are enclitics and which are suffixes, the Zwicky-Pullum criteria as cited by Spencer & Luis (2012:108) are used (see p.16 below). In the chapter about possession, prototype theory as described in Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001) is used (see p.26 below). Only constructions of which there are examples conforming to her definition of prototypicality are considered to be possessive constructions. An attempt to find examples of possessive constructions which conform to the source schemas, which according to Heine (1997) are often the source of grammaticalization of possessive constructions, are made. For Austronesian etymological analysis, Blust, generally Blust & Trussel (2016), is followed.

2.4 Literature about Rembong and closely related languages

In this section, printed and unpublished sources about Rembong-Wangka and other Manggarai languages are reviewed, for Manggarai and Komodo only the main sources. The main sources for some Central Flores languages, which are used in section 5.3, are also mentioned, as well as a comparative work for languages spoken on Flores.

The main resources for the Rembong-Wangka language are Verheijen (1977b), which contains texts in the Rembong and Kigit subdialects with Indonesian translations, Verheijen (1988), which contains Rembong-Wangka texts in several lects, of which some are included in Dadu (1997), which also contains an Indonesian translation, and most in Indonesian translations in Dadu (n.d.), Verheijen (1977a), which is a Rembong-Indonesian dictionary, and Verheijen (1978), an Indonesian-Rembong dictionary. The dictionaries contain forms from many lects. A description of the Wangka dialect is found in Schmidt (2013). Two articles by Rosen (1977, 1983) deal with the similarities and differences between the Rembong and Wangka dialects. Arndt (1935) and Bolong & Sungga (1999) contain traditional prayers in several Rembong-Wangka lects. Erb (1987) is an anthropological description of Rembong, Rajong and south Biting, which contains ritual texts in the different languages and an analysis of the directionals. In Quaaden (2009), texts of songs (goqét) in East Manggarai dialects, Rembong and Rajong are found. Needham (1985) contains an analysis of Rembong-Wangka kinship terms. Réémon (2012) contains useful maps and descriptions about the historical movements of Rembong-Wangka and Riung speakers, according to tradition. I was not able to consult the short morphological sketch of Rembong by Antonius Porat (2000). Verheijen (n.d.b) contains a very short comparison between the Manggarai languages, including a lexico-statistical computation. Verheijen started to write a Rembong grammar, but it was never completed. Parts of it are found mixed up with other materials in Verheijen (n.d.a). The only information for the Ladar Kaong dialect is the wordlist Kepoq (n.d.c:13).

Manggarai is relatively well-described, with two grammars (Burger 1946, Semiu 1993) and a dictionary (Verheijen 1967, 1970). Among the grammars, the one by Burger is by far the more
comprehensive one, but the author died before he could rework it for publication (see Gonda’s introduction in Burger 1941:16-17), so it was published in a form probably not intended by the author in all respects. The grammar is very rich with examples, which are translated, but not glossed. Semiun’s grammar can be regarded as a sketch grammar. It describes, Kempo, a dialect in western Manggarai, which is quite far from the area where Rembong is spoken. The most important resource for Manggarai is Verheijen’s dictionary, which is perhaps the most comprehensive dictionary for any language in eastern Indonesia. It is especially important due to its rich inclusion of dialect words and the precise indication of where a certain word is used. A drawback is that the easternmost dialects, Congkar, Biting and Manus, which are closest to the area where Rembong is spoken, are not included. For the differentlects of Riung, there are texts published in Verheijen (1989:1635-1719). Texts, a glossary and a very short grammatical sketch of Komodo are found in Verheijen (1982). For Kolor, a short description by Porat et al. (1993/94) exists. Unpublished wordlists (Kolor-Indonesian and Indonesian-Kolor) are found in Verheijen & Dadu (n.d.).

The major language to the southeast of Rembong is Ngad’a, for which there exist an old (Arndt 1933) and a modern sketch grammar (Djawani 1983) and a dictionary (Arndt 1961). Kéo is another Central Flores language for which a comprehensive grammar is found in Baird (2002).

Elias (2018) is a comparative work about the Central Flores languages. Fernandez (1996) is a comparative work on Flores languages, in which the author tries to prove that all the languages of Flores form one subgroup. Data from Rembong, Manggarai and Komodo are included. Verheijen (1984) contains much materials on plant names in Manggarai languages.
3 Aims and research questions

3.1 Aims and motivations for the study

Schmidt (2013) is a study of the Wangka dialect of Rembong-Wangka, so it is not obvious why another study of the same language is needed. One reason is that the materials used for this study make it possible to compare different dialects of the language, even though the main part is from the Rembong subdialect, while in Schmidt’s study, only the Wangka dialect is treated. Another reason is that Schmidt’s grammar is in most parts a sketch grammar, and it seems motivated to study some aspect of the grammar more closely. Adnominal possession is treated very shortly (pp.138-140) in Schmidt (2013) and deserves a more detailed treatment. The genitive enclitics and the oblique pronouns obviously have to be investigated in that context. To make the study more useful for Austronesian historical linguistics, etymologies of the investigated elements and comparisons with the corresponding elements in the most closely related languages are included.

3.2 Research questions

1. Information will be collected about where Rembong-Wangka and other small Manggaraic languages are spoken, the number of speakers, and dialects of Rembong-Wangka and its relation to other neighbouring languages. This research question has been treated in chapter 2.

2. The adnominal possessive constructions will be investigated. This will be treated in section 5.2. Background information for this section is given in section 5.1.

3. The etymologies of the key morphological elements used in adnominal possession and differences with other dialects will be noted and a comparison with closely related languages be made. This will be treated in section 5.3.

---

14 What Schmidt (2013:157) calls ‘subject agreement clitics and possessive clitics’ are called nominative enclitics and genitive enclitics respectively in this study. The reason is that the genitive clitics sometimes used in contexts where there are no obvious possessive relation. The use of case-terminology in a case where there is no morphological case follows the practise of Klamer (1998:62).

15 What Schmidt (2013:143) calls ‘possessive pronouns’ is called oblique pronouns because it is also used for a pronominal actor in the quite common ‘passive or patient-focus construction’ (Schmidt 2013:250).
4 Method and data

4.1 Methods of data collection

The main method of data collection was the construction of the corpus of Rembong-Wangka texts (see section 4.2.1). Information obtained during the 4 weeks’ fieldwork in Lémpang Paji during in August 2019 and the short field trip in 2016 is also used.

4.2 Procedure of data collection

4.2.1 Corpus construction

The materials used are the Rembong-Wangka texts in Verheijen (1977a) and Verheijen (1988). These texts were digitized in the following way:

1a. The texts in Rembong-Wangka from Verheijen (1977a) and Verheijen (1988) were scanned to Word files with the ABBYYFineReader 11 (Professional Edition) program for optical character recognition.

1b. Indonesian translations in Verheijen (1977a), Dadu (1997) and Dadu (n.d.) of most of the Rembong-Wangka texts were scanned in the same way as in 1a.

2. The Word files of both the Rembong-Wangka texts and the Indonesian translations were corrected manually by comparing the scans with the originals. Hyphens, page-numbers and titles not at the beginning of texts were removed. Only very obvious mistakes in the original texts were corrected, and in most cases a note about the correction was made in the text.

3. The Rembong-Wangka texts were entered, one by one, into the FLEx program. The number of texts is 175, the number of tokens more than 114,00016 and the number of sentences more than 10,634.

4. The Indonesian translations were entered sentence by sentence at the appropriate places.

5. The Rembong texts were analysed and glossed. In the Baseline of FLEx only clitics were separated from their hosts. In the Analyse window, affixes and the parts of compounds and reduplicated words were separated. The words (including names), clitics, affixes and parts of compounds were entered into the dictionary. Compounds with non-trivial semantics were also entered into the dictionary. Some reduplications were included in the dictionary. The glossing was done with the help of the dictionary, Verheijen (1977b), and the Indonesian translations. This step is not yet finished, but most has been done.

(In connection with 4. and 5. a second correction of the scans is done, and probable mistypings in the original texts were corrected and annotated in the scans. The corrected text is entered into FLEx).

6. An English translation was made. Only a small part of this has been completed so far.

4.2.2 Basic information about the content of the corpus

Given that the differences between dialects is one focus of this study, the division into lects used in this study and the amount of text available for each lect are given in Table 5, while the year of recording of each story is given in Table 6. The numbering of the texts is that in the corpus. The same numbering is used to indicate from which text the examples in this study are taken. The numbers after the text number are the paragraph and sentence numbers in FLEx.

---

16 The exact number of tokens and different words cannot be given yet, because the separation of the clitics has not been made in all cases yet. The number of different words probably exceeds 7,000.
Table 5: The texts for each lect entered into the corpus of Rembong-Wangka from Verheijen (1978b)\textsuperscript{17} and Verheijen (1988), the number of words for each lect and the proportion of the number of words for each lect to the number of words in the whole material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Numbering of text in the corpus</th>
<th>Number of words\textsuperscript{18}</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lémpang Paji\textsuperscript{19}</td>
<td>01-04, 09, 10, 16-18, 20-25, 27, 32-34, 36-42, 44, 45, 47-50, 53, 54, 56, 60, 701-744</td>
<td>61480</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léngké</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepan</td>
<td>11-13, 51, 52, 65</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemaq</td>
<td>26, 57, 58</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbawar</td>
<td>43, 61</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanun</td>
<td>05-08, 46</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai-Golo Leboq</td>
<td>19, 35, 64, 748-751, 804</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golo Lizun</td>
<td>745-747</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>14, 15, 28-31, 55</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rembong</td>
<td></td>
<td>81362</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigit</td>
<td>62, 63</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanamai</td>
<td>752-755</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolo Mézéq</td>
<td>756-764</td>
<td>4043</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bou-Munting</td>
<td>765-768</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riqa(-Nintar)</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Térong(-Mawong)</td>
<td>770-777</td>
<td>7040</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wué</td>
<td>778, 779</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangka</td>
<td>780-803</td>
<td>9926</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>110631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Year of recording the texts in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Numbering of text in the corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>23-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>01-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>05-19, 21-27, 35, 44-50, 53, 54, 56, 58-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>20, 28-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>32-34, 36-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>42, 43, 51, 52, 65, 748-803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>701-722, 737-742, 745-746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>743-744.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>744.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No year</td>
<td>55, 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Field work

\textsuperscript{17} Verheijen (1978a) mentions some other names of lects, i.e. Faté/Waté, which probably should be included in Riqa (it is in desa Ria II), Nampé(q), which should be included with Wolo Mézéq or Lanamai, Teding, which is in Riqa (II) or Lanamai, Téong which is in Lanamai, and Waru-Klá, which is in Wolo Mézéq.

\textsuperscript{18} Words (tokens) here mean text units separated by white space.

\textsuperscript{19} Includes texts from Lémpang Paji, Lédâq, Liur, Tégéq and Tengga.
During the field work, my main language consultant was Bapak Ignatius Egi Dadu from Lémpang Paji, former assistant of Pater Verheijen and author of several texts in the corpus. The two other language consultants were Bapak Bensol, *Dor*\textsuperscript{20} in Lémpang Paji and Bapak Paulus Runtung, *Dor* in Kai.

4.3 Analysis of data

The search opportunities found in FLEx, especially the concordance, were used to determine the distribution and frequencies of the investigated elements. The number of occurrences for the different lects was determined if deemed relevant. After that, the functions of the elements in the different positions where they are found was determined. To help the interpretations, the field data was consulted if needed.

\textsuperscript{20} ‘Lord of the land’, i.e. a ritual head.


5 Results

5.1 Preliminaries

In this section, some features of Rembong-Wangka, which motivate how the language is written and how the glossings of the examples are made, are presented. Discussions of some problems which are of relevance for the investigation of possession are also included.

In 5.1.1, the phonemic system of Rembong-Wangka, including some dialect variations, is presented. In 5.1.2, the orthography for Rembong-Wangka used in this thesis is motivated. In 5.1.3, arguments for which grammatical elements are regarded as enclitics are given. In 5.1.4, the uses of the suffixes are presented. In 5.1.5, the personal and possessive pronominal systems are presented.

5.1.1 Phonology

In Table 7, the phonemes in the Rembong dialect of Rembong-Wangka are given in IPA. The spelling of the phonemes used in this study are given in angle brackets, if different from the IPA notation.

Table 7: Consonant phonemes in Rembong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>/ʔ/</td>
<td>/&lt;q&gt;/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>/&lt;ng&gt;/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these phonemes, the voiceless prenasalized stop series (/mp/, /nt/, /ngk/) series is not found in the Wangka dialect, /ʔ/ is not found in the Térong dialect and /h/ is quite marginal, being mainly found initially in loanwords and interjections. /b/ and /d/, possibly have a different pronunciation in some dialects; in the Wangka texts, Verheijen writes /bh/ and /dh/, supposedly indicating that the voiced stops are implosive, preglottalized or fricative, but Schmidt (2013:98) says that such sounds are not found in Wangka, and that is accepted in this study.

Final consonants are: /t/, /k/, /q/, /n/, /ng/, /s/, /l/, /r/.

In Table 8, the vowel phonemes in Rembong-Wangka are given. /a/ is perhaps not phonemic, at least in some dialects (see 5.1.2).

Table 8: Vowel phonemes in Rembong-Wangka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronunciation of the /-allophones have not been analysed.

Schmidt’s statement is made in opposition to Rosen’s (1977:38) assertion that what is written as /<b>/, /<d>/ and /<gh>/ (Verheijen: /bh/, /dh/, /gh/) in this study “are sharply imploled sounds”. However, Rosen’s writes that the phonetic realization of these phonemes are /ʕb/, /ʕd/ and /ʕg/ respectively, which is very confusing, because it seems to indicate that they are prepharyngealized. Rosen (1977:38) also thinks that what is regarded as vowels followed by glottal stops in this study, and glottalized vowels in Schmidt (2013:94-96,107) are pharyngealized vowels.
5.1.2 Orthography

The spelling of the phonemes follows the orthography in Verheijen’s publications, which follows the conventions of Indonesian orthography, except in three cases: 1. \(<gh>\) (\([\gamma]\)) which is not found in Indonesian, 2. \(<q>\) (\([?]\)) is marginal in Indonesian and is written \(<'>\) there, 3. \([e]\) and \([a]\) are both written \(<e>\) in Indonesian, but are differentiated here as \(<\acute{e}>\) and \(<e>\). If an official orthographic system existed for the language, it would certainly be based on the Indonesian system. Two arguments against using the IPA system in this thesis is that it would make the reading harder for potential Indonesian readers, and that Indonesian-based orthographic systems are generally used in grammars of Austronesian languages spoken in Indonesia, examples are van den Berg (1989:17-21) for Muna, Klamer (1998:10) for Kambera, and Donohue (1999:20-21) for Tukang Besi. However, the use of \(<q>\) for \([?]\), \(<e>\) for \([a]\) and \(<\acute{e}>\) for \([e]\) in this thesis need some comment. The use of \(<q>\) for the glottal stop departs from the principle of using Indonesian spelling and also from the practice in Schmidt (2013:102-107), where the glottal stop is interpreted as glottalization of the preceding vowel and written \(<'>\). The reasons for using \(<q>\) is that it is used by Verheijen and that \(<'>\) is not practical to use in FLEx, because it divides words there. Schmidt (2013:107-108) uses \(<e>\) for \([e]\) and does not write anything for \([a]\), because \([a]\) is non-phonemic in Wangka. If that is the case in other Rembong-Wangka dialects is uncertain, and will not be investigated in this study. In any case, if Schmidt’s orthography is applied, the number of syllables in a word will not be clearly represented, many unusual consonant clusters will be posited and words would get a quite ‘un-Indonesian’ look. For arguments against Schmidt’s orthography, see the discussion in Elias (2018:53-56) for Lio. However, it must be noted that local views sometimes favor the non-writing of \([a]\) (Schmidt 2013:108). The same view was also expressed by a language consultant in Namu concerning the writing of the local language (personal information). A more economical way of writing could be to only mark the difference between \([a]\) and \([e]\) in the penultimate syllable, because \([a]\) is never found in the final syllable. A drawback of this would be that such a spelling convention would differ from that in Manggarai, where \([a]\) is found in final syllables and is phonemic in that position.

5.1.3 Enclitics

In this section, only functional elements which contain no vowels are investigated, because they are written together with the preceding words in the texts and have to be separated from their hosts in the corpus in FLEx and in the examples in this thesis. These elements are the pronominal enclitics and the short forms of the function words, like \(=g\) for \(?a\) ‘already’. One, perhaps apparent, exception from that the investigated elements contain no vowels is the third singular nominative enclitic \(=i\), where the spelling follows the practice of Verheijen. However, it seems clear that it is pronounced \([j]\) after vowels, but it is also found after consonants, where it is not clear how it is pronounced. Some words which are written as free words in the texts are probably clitics also, but no attempt to decide their status will be made in this thesis, and they will be treated as free words.

The Zwicky-Pullum criteria for distinguishing clitics and affixes are:

“i Host selectivity: Clitics can exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems.

ii Arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

iii Morphophonological idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

iv Semantic idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

v Lexical integrity: Syntactic rules can affect words, but cannot affect clitic groups.

vi Clitic-affix ordering: Clitics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot”

(Spencer & Luís 2012:108).

Some of these criteria will be considered below.

Criterion (i) above implies that affixes generally will attach to the head of a phrase, while it is more common that clitics can be attached to other words. In Rembong-Wangka, the nominative and genitive enclitics are found attached to words other than the head of a phrase. In example (1), the third person plural nominative enclitic \(=s\) follows directly after the verb, while in example (2), the words \(tau\) and \(?a\) intervene between the verb and the enclitic \(=s\). In example (3), the third person plural genitive
enclitic =s follows directly after the possessed noun kaqo, while in example (4), the qualifier loéq intervenes between the noun and the enclitic.

21.4.3; Nénés Raé Ndaghéng; Tengga (Rembong)

(1) *endéq =n* ngai le *emaq =n* mata =s gaq, …

mother =3SG.GEN and father =3SG.GEN die 3PL.NOM already, …

‘its (the deer’s) mother and its father died, [speared by hunters]’

03.2.2; Tenda ngai Kolang; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)

(2) *Endéq-emaq =s mata taun ga =s*

Mother-father =3PL.GEN dead all already =3PL.NOM

‘Both their parents were already dead’

03.4.12; Tenda ngai Kolang; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)

(3) *Olo damang ziuq kaqo =s le sia*

First try give dog 3PL.GEN by 3PL

‘They first tried to give [it] to their dog’

26.3.2; Pezuk ngai koaq ata taqu zua; Lemaq

(4) *Lapu tana we kaqo loéq =s “…”*

Immediately ask EMPH dog small =3PL.GEN “…”

‘(He) [the sorcerer] immediately asked their puppy, “…”’

With one exception (the demonstrative nes, a plural form of *ena* ‘that’ or *naq* ‘that’) the pronominal enclitics do not change the forms of the words to which they are attached, which is an argument for regarding them as enclitics according to Zwicky-Pullum’s criterion (iii) (see p.16). This makes it likely that the pronominal clitics are enclitics rather than suffixes.

Many words, such as *ghan* ‘eat; food’, can be used both as verbs and nouns without any morphological change. The limitations of this possibility are not investigated in this study. However, when genitive enclitics are used on such words, the interpretation of their hosts as nouns is unambiguous. It is not clear if ‘nominalization’ is the proper term to use in such cases, because it is not known in which cases the enclitic is obligatory, but it is used provisionally here. In example (5), which admittedly seems to be quite heavily influenced by Indonesian, the property word *mézéq* ‘big, great’ is nominalized when =n is added and acquires the meaning ‘bigness, greatness, size’. Similarly, *mengerti* ‘understand’ which is a loanword from Indonesian and has an Indonesian verb prefix, has been nominalized by adding =n. In example (6), the word *rézé*, which generally functions as a verb with the meaning ‘suggest, propose, invite; discuss, confer; promise’ function as a noun with the meaning ‘plan’ without the addition of any enclitic.

39.2.3; Nakit ta mélék tuqun; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)

(5) … *manga azar =ng kudi ba =i mengerti =n*

… exist teach =1SG.GEN how =3SG.NOM understand =3SG:GEN

le anak sekola batuuan *mézéq =n* Muri-Keraéng

by child school meaning great/big =3SG.GEN God

‘… I was teaching (lit. was my teaching) how the pupils [should] understand the meaning of God’s greatness (lit. how the understanding by the pupils [of] God’s greatness).’

---

23 Both ‘big’ and ‘great’ for *mézéq* are given in the glossing, because the point of the story hinges on that the teacher means ‘great’, but a pupil takes the meaning to be ‘big’.
The third person singular genitive enclitic is also used to mark a word as specific. However, it is often difficult to distinguish the genitive and specificity or definite function, so it seems inconvenient to distinguish two different elements here. The context of example (7) is that the dogs of a man searching for honey in a forest has discovered a tree with a bee hive and bark to call the man. The bee hive is not mentioned, but implied by the context.

The enclitic =n can also refer to the object of a sentence as in example (8), where it refers to seeds for planting. In example (9) the object referred to is a whole clause.

The functions of the enclitic =n are, at least superficially, quit similar to those of the Indonesian suffix -nya. As Remong-Wangka =n, Indonesian -nya can be used as a pronominal possessor (Sneddon et al.2010:171), in nominalization (Sneddon et al.2010:311-312), as a specificity marker (Sneddon et al.2010:155), as an object marker (Sneddon et al.2010:170) and as a possessive construction marker in non-pronominal possession (see section 5.2.2.2.5 and Sneddon et al.2010:150). The last is supposed to be a Javanese influence on Indonesian.

The distribution of the enclitics with the word zaqa ‘not want’ is a bit surprising. In the Rembong dialect, the nominative enclitic is used when the experiencer (emoter) is the first person singular, but the genitive enclitic when it is the third person singular, while in at least the Wolo Mézéq, Bou-Munting and Wangka lects, the nominative clitic is used for all persons. In example (10), from a Rembong lect, the genitive third person singular enclitic is used to refer to the experiencer, but in example (11), from Wangka, the nominative clitic is used. In example (12), from Golo Leboq, a northern Rembong lect, the only occurrence of the third person singular nominative enclitic(?), zi is used, referring to the experiencer,

---

24 To what extent it is also a definite marker has not been investigated.

25 No example of zaqa with a second person singular experiencer is found in the corpus.
but in the next sentence the third person genitive singular enclitic \(=n\) is used. This perhaps reflects some instability in use in this area.

02.8.6; Ata Gaqé Bopoq ngai Kutung; Léda-Liur (Rembong)

\[(10) \quad \text{Mak } koaq \quad \text{ena } \quad \text{zaqa } \quad =n \quad \text{togo} \]

But child DEM.DIST not\_want \(=3\)SG.\_GEN(?) go

‘But the child didn’t want to go.’

792.6.6; Bhopo Runés nēqē meka Ndona; Wangka

\[(11) \quad \text{Kali } \quad \text{Zazéq } \quad \text{zaqa } \quad =i \quad \text{lakoq} \]

However Zazéq not\_want \(=3\)SG.NOM go

‘However, Zazéq didn’t want to go’

750.7.15-17; Mekas Mulu niq Bopoq Mbi; Golo Leboq (Rembong)

\[(12) \quad \text{Mak } \quad \text{Mekas } \quad \text{Mulu } \quad \text{nui } \quad \text{suliq } \quad \text{koaq } \quad \text{ena} \]

But Old\_man Mulu order again child DEM.DIST

go togo itaq, kali zaqa zi togo.

to go up, however not\_want 3SG.NOM go

Kia nui suliq, “Togo ētaq ené.” Zaqa \(=n\) togo.

3SG order again “Go up mother.” not\_want 3SG.\_GEN go.

‘But Old Mulu ordered again the child to get up, however, she didn’t want to. He (Mulu) ordered again: “Get up mother.” [But] she didn’t want to get [up].’

The genitive enclitics are also found with several words, which very seldom can be used without the enclitic. These words are given in Table 9.
Table 9: Words which are generally bound with a genitive enclitic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>exceptions</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koqé</td>
<td>‘-self’</td>
<td>no enclitic in 782.2.5, (Wangka)</td>
<td>nggau (3SG.OBL) follows in 755.2.5 and kau (2SG) in 759.3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>léqé</td>
<td>‘-self’</td>
<td>no enclitic in 755.3.5, (Lanamai) and 759.3.17 (Wolo Mézég)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngenéq</td>
<td>‘-self’</td>
<td>no enclitic in 703.13.14, 703.14.4, 703.15.4, 703.16.9, 703.19.16, 703.19.21, 703.53.11, 708.3.2, 708.7.4, 709.2.12, 720.24.6, 722.8.6 (Rembong)</td>
<td>3 cases with and 3 without enclitic, all in Rembong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weki ngenéq</td>
<td>‘-self’</td>
<td>no enclitic in 708.3.2, 709.2.12, 716.2.2 (Rembong)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanéq</td>
<td>‘each other’</td>
<td>no enclitic in 43.20.6, 701.5.2, 703.3.11, 703.38.2, 705.5.4, 706.4.3, 706.13.6, 712.13.2, 720.3.2, 744(1).32.1, 744(1).32.1, 745.3.1, 745.9.7 (Rembong)</td>
<td>The enclitic does not directly follows kanéq in 44.6.2, 720.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ngai, négé, né, niq, agu) mésa</td>
<td>‘self, alone’</td>
<td>no preposition and enclitic in 771.8.9, 771.8.9 (Térong), no preposition in 798.3.6 (Wangka) no enclitic in 799.3.6 (Wangka)</td>
<td>The form of the preposition depends on lect. Found with 1SG, 3SG, 1PL.EXCL and 3PL genitive enclitics. In Térong and Wangka, the form is perhaps mésaq, not mésa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words in Table 9 are almost always followed directly by a genitive enclitic, but example (9) seems to show that kanéq ‘each other’ can be separated from the genitive enclitic m by another word.

Because the final elements attached to the words in Table 9 are the same as those used in pronominal possession mentioned above, they are regarded as genitive enclitics and treated as such.

A special case is /s/ following a demonstrative, marking plural of the main word in the NP. This is regarded as the same =s as in the nominative clitic in this study. However, there are some facts which could speak against such a treatment. One is that some lects of Rembong-Wangka must be regarded to have plural forms of demonstratives, like sindoq=s ‘these’ (Wolo Mézég), sinaq=s ‘those’ (Lanamai, Wolo Mézég, Bou-Munting, Riqa, Wangka), another that the only words in Manggarai which have plural forms are the demonstratives, and finally that the plural ne(=?)s ‘those’ exists, even though there is no *ne ‘that’, which is an argument that /s/ is a suffix according to Zwicky-Pullum’s criterium iii (see p.16). Perhaps the plural demonstratives could be regarded as stable collocations which have lexicalized.

Several elements in the texts are written as separate words, but in some cases should perhaps be regarded as enclitics, or in the case of mai even as a suffix (so Schmidt 2013:148), and have short forms which are written together with the preceding word. These short forms are here regarded as enclitics and are listed in Table 10.
Table 10: Short forms of some function words where the short forms are regarded as enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short form</th>
<th>Full form</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=g</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>‘already’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=m</td>
<td>mai</td>
<td>‘at, on, to’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=m</td>
<td>manga</td>
<td>‘exist’</td>
<td>used only with paéq ‘not’ and baqn ‘not’ (final n omitted when =m is added). Baqm (‘how’+’exist’) should perhaps be regarded as a lexicalized emphatic negation (compare Indonesian mana ada ‘how can there be’). Paéqm can perhaps be regarded as a beginning grammaticalization of a negative existential (Veselinova 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ng</td>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>‘with’</td>
<td>used in comparisons with sama-sama(=ng) ‘same (with)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ng</td>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>‘PCM, of’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One argument against considering the short forms as suffixes, is that no words in Rembong-Wangka can end in g or m. In example (13) the negation is followed by the full word manga ‘exist’, but in example (14), ‘exist’ is expressed by the enclitic =m. In example (15), ena ‘that, then’ is followed by the particle ga ‘already’, but in example (16), ‘already’ is expressed by the enclitic =g. These examples indicate that the short forms and their corresponding full forms behave the same, and the only difference is in phonology.

57.5.11; Kaqé-azéq ta golé ma mopoqs; Lémaq (Rembong)
(13) Laqar waqi =n paéq manga oméq =i
trace foot =3SG.GEN NEG exist be_visible 3SG.NOM
‘His footprints are not seen (lit. His footprint does not exist visible)’

02.11.6; Ata Gaqé Bopoq ngai Kutung; Léda-Liur (Rembong)
(14) Mak s=itaq mbaru paéq =m oméq zi
but here=up house NEG exist be_visible 3SG.NOM
‘But he was not seen (lit. was not existing visible) at home’

48.6.6; Pezuk ngai ata koaq taqu telu; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)
(15) Élé paéq urat pesu mekas ena,
because NEG strongly fart old_man DEM.DIST,
ena ga ngampong le koaq ena =s
DEM.DIST already say by child DEM.DIST 3PL.NOM
‘because the old man did not fart strongly, the children said: …’

43.17.1; Sa Wiru ngai Nggolong; Mbawar (Rembong)
(16) Oméq =g koaq zua ena =s,
be_visible already child two DEM.DIST 3PL.NOM
ena =g ngampong =s ...
DEM.DIST already say 3PL.NOM ...
‘having seen the two children, they said: …’

As proclitics are counted: 1. l= ‘to, at’, which is the weakest allomorph of lo/lélé/le= ‘to, at’ (ex. l=awaq ‘down to’), 2. s= , which is the weak form of séq ‘here’ (ex. s=awaq ‘down here’).

5.1.4 Suffixes
The elements in Table 11 are regarded as suffixes:
Table 11: Suffixes in Rembong-Wangka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-n</td>
<td>forms adverbs from other parts of speech</td>
<td>gokatn ‘in the morning’, gokat ‘morning’; enaqn ‘now’, enaq(q) ‘that, there, then’; tuqun ‘really, truly, tuqu ‘true’</td>
<td>How the words saq ‘one’ and naq ‘that, there, then’, which when followed by endings which are the same as the genitive clitics =n and =s mean approximately ‘only, just’, i.e. an adverbial meaning, should be looked upon has not been decided on yet. In this case, the endings, which are identical to the genitive clitics, on saq and naq, seem to be category-changing and for that reason should be regarded to be suffixes. Zwicky-Pullum’s criterium iv (see p.16) is also an argument for regarding them as suffixes. However, this has the perhaps unsatisfactory consequence that inflexion for number is only found on these two adverbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n</td>
<td>forms ordinal numerals from cardinal numerals</td>
<td>zuan ‘second’ from zua ‘two’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n</td>
<td>forms postposed directionals from preposed directionals</td>
<td>See examples (17)-(20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ng</td>
<td>is placed between the multipliers and puluq ‘ten’ in most multipliers of ten</td>
<td>lima-ng puluq (five-ten) ‘fifty’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schmidt (2013:145) says “A productive use of the -n suffix is in forming directional postpositions from locative prepositions.”. In example (17) lau ‘north, seawards’ functions as a locative preposition, but in example (18), lau as a directional preposition. In example (19) it follows a preposition, and in example (20) it comes after the NP and has the suffix -n attached. The directional meaning seems to be quite similar in examples (18)-(20). Example (19) shows that lau can follow a preposition which prepositions like kolo cannot, and similarly kolo cannot be a postposition with a suffix -n, as in example (20). Thus it seems that words like lau should not be regarded as prepositions, and could possibly form a part-of-speech class of its own, as in Kéo (Baird 2002:136-139), which could be called directionals, as is provisionally done in Table 11.

08.7.7; Emboq ngai Kita-Ata; Kanun (Rembong)

(17) “Tuqun réang ikang lau ena?”
“Really many fish north DEM.DIST?”
“Are there really much fish there [in the] north?”

08.7.7; Emboq ngai Kita-Ata; Kanun (Rembong)

(18) “Mai ga kita toqo lau tasik.”
“Come already 1PL.INCL go north sea
“Come! Let us go to the sea!”

05.4.7; Liong; Kanun (Rembong)

(19) Kia terus luzi kolo lau nozong niq endéq nggia
3SG immediately run to north garden_hut with mother 3SG.OBL
‘He immediately ran to his mother’s garden hut.’
Ata gaqé ena seman taboq giq
Old.man DEM.DIST accordingly bring already.3SG.NOM
kata ena natar laun
green_junglefowl DEM.DIST village_yard north
'So the old man brought the green junglefowl to the settlement.'

In some single words, listed in Table 12, it seems that an enclitic has merged with the word stem.

**Table 12: Single words where enclitics have merged with a word stem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wéqan</td>
<td>‘out’</td>
<td>always has a final n, except when mailm ‘at, on, to’ follows, at least in the Lémpang Paji lect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baqn</td>
<td>‘not’</td>
<td>The -n in baqn ‘not’ is omitted when =m ‘exist’ follows. The word is derived from a grammaticalization of the question word baq ‘where?’ followed by the genitive singular enclitic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murin</td>
<td>‘lord, master, owner’</td>
<td>It seems that what was originally a third singular genitive enclitic on the word muri ‘Lord’ has merged with the base, forming murin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanang</td>
<td>‘propose, ask in marriage’</td>
<td>The enclitic =ng ‘with’ seems to have merged with tana ‘ask’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two prefixes are found, pe-26 and se-/sa- ‘one’.

**5.1.5 The forms of the personal pronouns**

In Table 13 the different forms of the personal pronouns are given.

**Table 13: The personal pronouns, nominative enclitics, oblique pronouns and genitive enclitics in Rembong-Wangka**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>personal pronouns</th>
<th>nominative enclitics27</th>
<th>oblique pronouns</th>
<th>genitive enclitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>aku =k</td>
<td>nggaku =m, =ms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>kau =k</td>
<td>nggau =m, =ms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>kia =i, (=?)zi, =z</td>
<td>nggia =n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>kia =t</td>
<td>nggita =l, (=nt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL</td>
<td>kami =m, =ms</td>
<td>nggami =m, =ms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>miu =m, =ms</td>
<td>mui =m, =ms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>sia, siza =s, =ns</td>
<td>sia, siza =s, =ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table 13:

Siza is found in Térong, Wué and Wangka, and sia in the other lects. Sia also occurs in Térong (1) and Wangka (2) as a personal pronoun.

26 Schmidt (2013:140) says "The pe- prefix is a prefix which can be used to form nouns from verbs or adjectives referring people who are good at the activity or property referenced by the root." For its use with adjectives, Schmidt (2013:141) gives the example pebalong ‘someone with a propensity to be lazy’ from balong ‘lazy’. However, an example like pekaqo ‘hunter with dogs, owner of hunting dogs’ from kaqo ‘dog’ seems not to be covered by Schmidt’s explanations. The exact meaning of the prefix remains to be investigated.

27 Zi is not shown to be an enclitic in section 5.1.3, but is regarded as such here.
The z-enclitic (3SG.NOM) is only found in Kigit.
The zi-enclitic is found in Rembong (>100), Kigit (2), Lanamai (6) and Wolo Mézéq (2)
The ms-enclitics are found in the Kanun (2PL.NOM), Lemaq (1PL.EXCL.NOM, 2SG.GEN), Mbawar (1PL.EXCL.NOM, 2PL.NOM, 2PL.GEN), and Kai-Golo Leboq (1PL.EXCL.GEN, 2PL.NOM, 2PL.GEN) lects of the Rembong dialect. However, the m-enclitics are also found in the mentioned lects.
The ns-enclitics are found in the Rembong lects Lémpang Paji (3PL.NOM) and Golo Lizun (3PL.NOM) and in Wangka (3PL.GEN).
The nt- and ngk-enclitics are not found in the texts, but are found in Wangka, according to Schmidt (2013:110). How these clitics should be pronounced is uncertain, because prenasalized unvoiced stops are said to not exist in Wangka (Schmidt 2013:97).
The wort ngénéq- ‘-self’ can be used with genitive enclitics after personal pronouns or alone to form polite or honorific or polite pronouns. The forms are: 1SG ngénéq=ng, 2SG ngénéq=m, 3SG ngénéq=n, 1PL.INCL ngénéq=t, 1PL.EXCL ngénéq=m, 2PL ngénéq=m, 3SG ngénéq=s.
In (21) an example of the honorific use of ngénéq- is given. No clear example of its use following a personal pronoun in a honorific or polite sense were found in the texts.

Kita can be used as a polite second person singular pronoun, as in (22).

The word kita-ata ‘human being’, of which the first part, kita ‘we (incl.)’, can sometimes be referred to with a 1PL.INCL clitic, as in example (23).

Aku ‘I’ can sometimes be used for ‘we’, In example (24) more precisely ‘[I and] my descendants’.

Imot is said to be a first person polite pronoun in Wangka (Schmidt 2013:172), but in the three examples in the corpus, it seems to denote the second person polite singular (nominative and genitive) in two
cases, and in one case the meaning is unknown (788.4.5). It seems likely that the word is derived from *imo* ‘friend’ and the genitive enclitic /tu/. If the enclitic refers to the first person plural, the meaning of *imot* must be ‘you’, but if it refers politely to the second person singular (see example (22)), the meaning should be ‘I’.
5.2. **Adnominal possessive constructions**

5.2.1. **Preliminaries**

In the examples and the corpus counts, the definition by Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001:961) for prototypicality of possession is adopted. Koptjevskaja-Tamm’s definition is: “the possessor is an individuated human being, the possessee is a specific concrete object and their relation includes legal ownership, as in Peter’s hat, kinship relations (my son) or body-part relations (the boy’s leg).” In this study, with possessees like buildings and land, all the the members of the family which live in the house and use the land are counted as owners of the house and land. Clothing and personal adornment are included as owned. Kodo ‘a skin that can be removed at will and is used for disguise’ is considered to be a kind of clothing. Emboq ‘grandparent, grandchild, old person, (young person)’ is counted as a kinship term, even though ‘real’ kinship is not expressed. Weki ‘body’, nawa ‘soul’ and nai ‘heart, intention’ and body parts of dead persons as possessees are not regarded as body parts. If the same expression occurs more than once in a story, it is only counted as one. Possessive relations which are parts of predicative possession constructions are not counted. Speaking animals are written with upper case initials in the texts and constitute a category of possessors different from animals.

Only constructions for which there are examples of prototypical possession are regarded as possessive constructions. For relationships which reasonably could be considered possessive relations, the expression ‘non-prototypical possessive and possessive-like relations’ (abbreviated non-prot.) is used.

5.2.2 **Encoding of adnominal possession**

In 5.2.2.1 adnominal possessive constructions with a pronominal possessor, and in 5.2.2.2 with a non-pronominal possessor are treated. In 5.2.2.3, a summary and an attempt to explain the distribution of the constructions are made.

5.2.2.1 **Constructions with a pronominal possessor**

The adnominal possessive relation can be expressed mainly in two ways in Rembong-Wangka if the possessor is expressed as a pronoun, with a genitive enclitic or with an oblique pronoun. In example (25), =n is the singular and =s the plural genitive enclitics standing for the possessors Liong and Liong with her mother respectively. In example (26), the possessors of the garden, a father and his two daughters, are indicated by the oblique personal pronoun nggami ‘we (exclusive)’.

```
05.2.2; Liong; Kanun (Rembong)
(25) waliq sa lezoq Liong ngampong ngai endêq =n go
    on one day Liong say with mother =3SG.GEN VOL
ma sakoq naq lozaq =s
    go cut (Job’s tears) in part_of_garden 3PL.GEN
‘one day, Liong said to her mother [that she] wanted to go and cut Job’s tears in the garden’
```

```
10.3.10, Néngon Ngiung ngai Kita-Ata; Liur (Rembong)
(26) “kudi ba kau bêwêq mai séq uma nggami, ...
    “how 2SG night come here garden 1PL.EXCL.OBL.PRON
    “how [can] you come in the night to our garden here”
```

For the forms of the enclitics and the oblique pronouns, see Table 13.

In Table 14, it is shown that genitive clitics are used predominantly with humans, including speaking animals, as possessors, and that the most common possessee is a Kinship term. Especially that Kinship terms as possessees is very common is probably a function of the character of the texts.

---

28 *Called possessive pronoun in Schmidt (2013).*

29 *It can be asked if it is most appropriate to regard the possessors and possessees as words or referents of words. In this study, this problem was disregarded at first, which had the unsatisfactory result, that ‘Kinship term’, which refers to a word, was used for the designation of one possessee and one possessor, but referents of words to designate the other possessors and possessees. This could have been remedied.*
Table 14: The use of genitive enclitics with possessors and possessees (tokens) in the first 11 texts in Verheijen (1977b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>Human+ Speaking</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Body part</th>
<th>Material Inanimate</th>
<th>non-Material Inanimate</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship term</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other part</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and ornaments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Inanimate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Material Inanimate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:

Kinship terms do not take genitive enclitics or oblique pronouns in the following cases:

a. When used in address, e.g. “O, kaqé, …” “Oh, elder brother. …”.

b. When referring to the person one is speaking to (‘you’).

c. When children are speaking about their mother.

d. In compounds, which include terms which are relational to each other, e.g. kaqé-azéq (older_sibling-younger_sibling) ‘siblings’.

e. When used with saq ‘one’ functioning as an article.

Body part terms do not take genitive enclitics or oblique pronouns in the following cases:

a. When they are used in comparisons of size.

b. Sometimes with body parts of dead persons. Ex. muru ‘meat’ (07.5.1)

c. Sometimes when a demonstrative follows. Ex. wuk ena (hair_of_head DEM.DIST) ‘the hair’ (15.6.5).

d. Sometimes in proverbs.

In addition to their use as pronominal possessors, the oblique pronouns are also used after the prepositions élé/élè ‘by’ and beti ‘by’. Schmidt (2013:191) notes that they are found after the prepositions lé ‘by’, baténg ‘by’, zung ‘for’, azang ‘for’, paléng ‘because’ and sarang (marks manner) in Wangka. This is interesting, because, as will be seen in section 5.3.1, PAN *ni could be used both as a possessive marker and a marker of non-subject agency.

The frequencies of use of the genitive enclitics compared with the oblique pronouns are quite different for the different persons, which is shown in Table 15.³⁰

Table 15: The frequencies of use of genitive enclitics and oblique pronouns for the different persons in texts no.1-11 in Verheijen (1977b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>1PL.INCL</th>
<th>1PL.EXCL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive enclitics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique pronouns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third person possessor enclitics, especially 3SG, are much more common than the oblique third person pronouns. For the first and second persons, the difference in frequency between possessor enclitics and oblique pronouns is much less. The reason for this is probably that the first and second person possessors are used almost only in direct speech and often express an emphatic assertion which is generally not the case with the third person possessors. Also, kin terms and body parts are almost obligatorily possessed, mostly with the third person singular genitive enclitic, and that use is almost

³⁰ Examples of oblique pronouns after prepositions are not included.

by exchanging ‘Kinship term’ with ‘Relative’, but it seems more appropriate to regard the possessors and possessees as words, as in Dixon (2013(vol.2):272). In that case, all the names of the possessors and possessees would have to be changed, which has not been done.
never emphatic. The conclusion is that possession expressed with oblique pronouns are more emphatic than possession expressed with genitive enclitics.

A special case is when the possessee is a Kinship term. As will be shown in 5.2.2.2.4 a Possessive Construction Marker (PCM) \(=\)ng is used if the possessee is a Kinship term and the possessor a person. This \(=\)ng can sometimes be used after Kinship terms if the possessor is expressed by an oblique pronoun. If the pronoun is the second plural oblique \(miu\), \(=\)ng seems obligatory, except after \(anak\) ‘child’ in Rembong, example (27). However, the same word, as the variant \(ana\) is found with \(=\)ng in the Wolo Mézéq and Riqa dialects. An example from Wolo Mézéq is found in example (28). Except before \(miu\), the PCM \(=\)ng seems to be found with pronominal possessors only in non-Rembong lects. When the possessor is the first or second person singular, there could be some doubt whether \(=\)ng is the PCM or a first or second genitive pronoun, especially if it is followed by a personal pronoun, as in example (29). In example (30) it is followed by an oblique pronoun, and there \(=\)ng is probably a PCM on the strength of a comparison with example (31) from the same dialect, where \(=\)ng certainly is a PCM. This construction is found in the Wolo Mézéq, Bou-Munting and Wangka dialects.

\[
\begin{align*}
751.7.4; & \text{Tara mangan woza niq pangin; Golo Leboq (Rembong)} \\
(27) & \text{‘Ena giq anak miu.’} \\
& \text{‘DEM.DIST already.3SG.NOM child 2PL.’} \\
& \text{‘That [is] your child.’} \\
756.10.15; & \text{Ngiung lau lolong; Wolo Mézéq} \\
(28) & \text{..., aku paeq ana =ng miu} \\
& \text{..., 1SG NEG child =PCM 2PL} \\
& \text{‘..., I am not your child’} \\
753-8-10; & \text{Néngé Tawu Mas; Lanamai} \\
(29) & \text{‘Dikuq miu mbelé lé kaqé =ng aku.’} \\
& \text{‘Later 2PL kill by elder_brother =PCM/1SG.GEN (?) 1SG.’} \\
& \text{‘‘Later you [will] be killed by my elder brother.’’} \\
768.3.2; & \text{Lanur néqé Kembo; Bou-Munting} \\
(30) & \text{Kau lakoq ala ghan aléq iné-emaq =ng nggaku.} \\
& \text{You go bring food west mother-father =PCM/1SG.GEN (?) 1SG.OBL.} \\
& \text{‘Go to my parents and bring food.’} \\
768.3.5; & \text{Lanur néqé Kembo; Bou-Munting} \\
(31) & \text{Ko taun Lanur lokoq aléq iné-emaq =ng nggia.} \\
& \text{Finally Lanur go west mother-father PCM 3SG.OBL.} \\
& \text{‘Finally, Lanur went to her parents.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In two cases the PCM nggé, which is normally used in non-pronominal possession (see 5.2.2.2.2), is found in pronominal possession followed by the personal pronoun kia. Probably this is because otherwise the relative clause which follows would refer to the possessee, the head of the phrase. One of the examples is given in example (32).

\[
\begin{align*}
705.7.12; & \text{Napaq Zat; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)} \\
(32) & \text{... bating ghaé nggé kia ta kedak olon naq ...} \\
& \text{... by friend PCM 3SG REL spear first DEM.DIST} \\
& \text{‘... by the friends of him who had speared [the animal] first …’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

An example with sia preceded by nggé and followed by a relative clause is also found (745.2.1), but the interpretation of the sentence is uncertain.
5.2.2.2 Constructions with non-pronominal possessors

If the possessor is a non-pronominal NP, there is either a juxtaposition of possessee and possessor, or a construction marker between the possessee and the possessor. Juxtaposition is treated in 5.2.2.2.1 and possessive constructions with possessive construction markers (PCM) in 5.2.2.2.2.

5.2.2.2.1 Juxtaposition

Juxtaposition is a common method to express possession in western Indonesia. It can also be used for attribution, and it is difficult to draw a line of demarcation between possession and attribution. Because of this, it seems best to begin with investigating prototypical possessive constructions. Only the 11 first texts in the material (only about 5400 words) in the Rembong dialect were investigated. There are 7 cases of prototypical Ownership, 2 cases of Body parts and perhaps 1 example of Kinship. Examples of Ownership (33), Body parts (34) and Kinship (35) are given below.

01.2.11, Landang ngai Lanur; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)

(33) nozong emboq =m
garden_hut grandmother =2SG.GEN
‘your grandmother’s garden hut’

05.4.5, Liong; Kanun (Rembong)

(34) wulu berambang ata gaqé mekas ena
body_hair breast person old old_man DEM.DIST
‘the breast hairs of that old man’

02.3.1, Ata Gaqé Bopoq ngai Kutung; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)

(35) anak Raza
child King
‘child of a king’

The possessees in the Ownership relation are buildings and land. The examples for Body parts, and especially Kinship are not optimal. In example (34), the old man is not a real human, but a ngiung, a human-like creature. In the other example (not given), it is talked about a dead person’s bones, which are spread around. However, wuk endég ‘mother’s hair’ (15.6.4) is a prototypical example. Example (35) should probably be considered as a compound with the meaning ‘princess’. Other Kinship terms which are possessees have a PCM between the possessee and the possessor, so the conclusion could probably be drawn that juxtaposition could not be used for a possessive construction which have a Kinship term as a possessee.

Among non-prot. relations between nouns, the following can be mentioned:


c. Part of body part: tuka mozoq (stomach hand) ‘palm of hand’


e. Material: liang watu (cave stone) ‘stone cave’, wazég kunut (rope palm_fiber) ‘rope of palm fiber’


g. Product of animals: kako manuk (crow rooster) ‘crow of the rooster’, teloq manuk (egg hen) ‘hen’s egg’

the garden hut’, *wazég zarán* (rope horse) ‘rope for binding a horse’, *wongkoq rana* (village man) ‘the man’s village’, *nuu kutung* (hole porcupine) ‘hole of a porcupine’.

The conclusion is that, although juxtaposition can be used for Ownership and Body part relations, it is mostly used for other, various, non-prot. relations.\(^{31}\)

### 5.2.2.2 Construction with the marker *nggé/nggé*

An example of *ngge* as a PCM is given in example (36).

\[
\begin{align*}
01.4.7; \text{Landang ngai Lanur; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)} \\
(36) \quad \ldots, \quad \text{zengég ga élé endéq-emaq ngge Landang \ldots} \\
\quad \ldots, \quad \text{hear already by parents PCM Landang \ldots} \\
\quad \ldots, \quad \text{‘..., Landang’s parents heard …’}
\end{align*}
\]

The distribution of *nggé* and *ngge* in the sources seems to indicate that there has been a normalization to *nggé* in Verheijen (1988), which is shown in Table 16.

#### Table 16: The distribution of *nggé* and *ngge* in Verheijen (1977b) and Verheijen (1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>nggé</em></th>
<th><em>ngge</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verheijen (1977b)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verheijen (1988)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verheijen (1977b) can be used for investigating if there is a difference in the use of *ngge* and *nggé*, and that is done in Table 17. One example with *ngge* seems impossible to regard as a possessive construction, namely *menurut ngge taéqng-turuk* (according *ngge* story-story) ‘according to the story’, and is not included in Tables 17 and 18 and is disregarded in the following discussion.

#### Table 17: Distribution of *ngge* and *nggé* with types of possessors in Verheijen (1977b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>Proper name</th>
<th>Kinship term</th>
<th>Other humans Speaking animals</th>
<th>Inanimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nggé</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ngge</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if it seems that Proper names and Speaking animals as possessors prefer the PCM *ngge*, there is too little material to draw any firm conclusions, so in Table 18, where the distribution of possessors and possessees are shown, *nggé* and *ngge* are combined.

#### Table 18: Distribution of *ngge/nggé* with different types of possessors and possessees in Verheijen (1977b) (non-M: non-Material)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessees</th>
<th>Proper name</th>
<th>Kinship term</th>
<th>Other humans</th>
<th>Speaking Animals</th>
<th>non-Material Inanimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship term</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Inanimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-M Inanimate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, 25\(^{32}\) of the 37 constructions express prototypical possession, which is quite high, and contrasts markedly with what was the case with juxtaposition. However, in the texts 701-722, by Ignatius Egy Dadu, there are 9 prototypical and 23 non-prototypical examples of use of *nggé/nggé*. *Nggé/nggé* is

---

\(^{31}\) Perhaps a-c can be considered to be non-prototypical possessive relations and d-h possession-like relations. There are some other noun-noun relations which have not been included here, namely (near) synonym compounds and apposition.

\(^{32}\) Namely those with a possessive which is a Relative, Body part or Material Inanimate.
found as a PCM only once in a non-Rembong dialect, in a non-prototypical possessive construction (wongkoq nggé Zumaq ‘Zumaq’s settlement’, 768.6.9, Wolo Mézéq).

It seems that nggé and ngge are derived from the third singular oblique pronoun nggia, which functions as a PCM in an example from Bou-Munting, which is given in example (37).

768.17.1; Lanur négqé Kembo; Bou-Munting
(37) Lanur né kaqé-azéq nggia Lanur
‘Lanur and Lanur’s brothers’

The origin of this construction seems to be that the possessor was in apposition with the oblique pronoun, instead of the more common possessee + oblique pronoun as in example (38).

771.18.16; Amé Zongkéng né Nggézang Kolong; Térong
(38) Sa kæo nggia Tamba Løløng ma =iq
Then dog 3SG.OBL Tamba Løløng go =3SG.NOM
‘Then his dog, Tamba Løløng, went away’

5.2.2.3 Construction with construction marker ngai/ngé/nge

Below are examples of ngai (39), ngé (40) and nge (41) as possessive construction markers.

12.3.8; Néngon Kokaq Kolong ngai Wéqan; Kepan (Rembong)
(39) wina ngai Kolong
wife PCM(with) Turtledove
‘Turtledove’s wife.’

09.3.6; Mekas Pako ngai Ambé Ara; Liur (Rembong)
(40) ngis ngé Ambé Ara
tooth PCM(with) Ambé Ara
‘the teeth of Ambé Ara’

(04.5.2; Watu Lokoq; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)
(41) kodo nge Watu Lokoq
skin_for_disguise PCM(with) Round Stone
‘Watu Lokoq’s skin for disguise’

The examples found in the material so far are quite few and are listed in Table 19.

**Table 19: Examples of ngai, ngé and nge used as possessive construction markers in Verheijen (1977b)**
(abbreviations: B: body part, Kin: kinship term, A: animal, M: inanimate material object, non-M: inanimate non-material object)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>possessor</th>
<th>possessee</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>N (mekas Pako ‘old Pako’)</td>
<td>Kin (wina ‘wife’)</td>
<td>09.2.3</td>
<td>prototypical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>N (Kolong ‘Turtledove’)</td>
<td>Kin (wina ‘wife’)</td>
<td>12.3.8</td>
<td>prototypical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngai</td>
<td>A (kokaq reman ‘wild pig’)</td>
<td>B (tolak ‘throat’)</td>
<td>34.3.5</td>
<td>non-prot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngé</td>
<td>N (Ambé Ara)</td>
<td>B (ngis ‘tooth’)</td>
<td>09.3.6</td>
<td>prototypical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nge</td>
<td>N (Watu Lokoq ‘Round Stone’)</td>
<td>M (kodo ‘skin for disguise’)</td>
<td>04.5.2</td>
<td>prototypical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nge</td>
<td>N (Nggot)</td>
<td>B (mozaq ‘hand, arm’)</td>
<td>22.4.4</td>
<td>prototypical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If ngai were not found as a possessive construction marker, it would be quite plausible to consider that ngé and nge were weakened grammaticalized forms of the third person oblique personal pronoun nggia. However, ngai, which has several meanings, among others ‘with, and; to; while; have, possess’ (Verheijen 1997a:104), seems to be relatively securely attested as a PCM, so it seems more likely that ngé and nge are weakened forms of ngai. Moreover, ngai and nge can both be used before the
experiencer when the predicate is *tana* ‘ask’. In example (42) *ngai* ‘with’ is used, and in example (43) *nge* is used in exactly the same function.

\[ \text{54.2.3; Rogoq ngai Pakéq; Tengga (Rembong)} \]
\[ (42) \text{ sa tana le Rogoq ngai Pakéq ena} \]
\[ \text{then ask by River Crab with Frog DEM.DIST} \]
\[ \text{‘then River Crab asked the Frog’} \]

\[ \text{64.3.3; Nggot II; Kai (Rembong)} \]
\[ (43) \text{ tana ga le mekas ena nge bopoq =n} \]
\[ \text{ask already by old_man ena with old_woman =3SG.GEN} \]
\[ \text{‘the old man asked his old woman (=wife)’} \]

### 5.2.2.4 Constructions with construction marker *=ng*

As is noted by Schmidt (2013:141), an element ‘*ng*’ is often inserted after a possessee which is a Kinship term if the possessor is a person, i.e. a human, sometimes even a pronoun (see examples (27)-(31) in section 5.2.2.1). Schmidt calls it an interfix, but it is regarded as an enclitic here (see Table 10). An example with a Kinship term as possessee and a human possessor is found in example (44).

\[ \text{04.2.6: Watu Lokoq; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)} \]
\[ (44) \text{ endéq =ng ata wina ena} \]
\[ \text{mother =PCM person female DEM.DIST} \]
\[ \text{‘the mother of that woman’} \]

In example (45), from Bou-Munting, the possessee is *wongkoq* ‘settlement’, an inanimate. No examples of this in the Rembong dialect is found.

\[ \text{768.16.3; Lanur néqé Kembo; Bou-Munting} \]
\[ (45) \text{ Wenang naq Lanur lakoq wongkoq =ng Kemboq aléqn …} \]
\[ \text{After DEM.DIST Lanur go settlement =PCM Kemboq west …} \]
\[ \text{‘Thereafter Lanur went to Kemboq’s settlement.’} \]

As can be seen from Table 18, *=ng* does not occur on the Kinship term in a construction with the PCM *nggélngge* even if the possessee is a kinship term and the possessor a human.

### 5.2.2.5 Constructions with the construction marker *=n*

In a few cases the third person singular possessive pronoun is used as a PCM in a non-pronominal possessive construction. An example is given in example (46).

\[ \text{33.3.6; Mangan Watu Ngandong; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)} \]
\[ (46) \text{ ikoq =n kaqo ena} \]
\[ \text{tail =3SG.GEN dog DET.DIST} \]
\[ \text{‘the tail of that dog’} \]

The four examples, two from Rembong and two from Térong, found thus far are listed in Table 20.

| Table 20: Examples of =n as a PCM in non-pronominal possession |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| **possessee** | **possessor** | **source** | **status** |
| *tara bonéq* ‘place of hiding’ | *kodo nggau* ‘your skin for disguise’ | 08.6.6 | non-prot. |
| *ikoq* ‘tail’ | *kaqo ena* ‘that dog’ | 33.3.6 | non-prot. |
| *anak* ‘child’ | *bopo kénang* ‘that old woman’ | 771.14.2 | prototypical |
| *anak* ‘kid’ | *rusa* ‘deer’ | 775.8.2 | non-prot. |

The use of =n as a PCM in non-pronominal possession constructions seems to be quite marginal. Its use as a PCM is perhaps influenced by the use of -nya as a PCM in Indonesian, which in its turn is regarded
as a Javanese influence (Sneddon et al. 2010:150). Perhaps it could also be regarded as a marker of definiteness or specificity (see pp.16-17).

5.2.2.6 Other, rare, construction markers

Heine (1997:144) lists source schemas for adnominal possessive constructions. They are Location, Source, Goal, Companion and Topic.

Examples for companion (ngail/ngé/ngge) are found in examples (38)-(40). Another example of companion (47) and examples of source (48) and location (49) are given below. Niq in example (47) is the equivalent of Rembong ngai in the Kanun lect.

(47)  05.4.7; Liong; Kanun (Rembong)
      nozong  niq  emboq  Nggia
      garden_hut  PCM(with)  grandmother  3SG.OBL
‘her grandmother’s garden hut’

(48)  720.5.6; Wina-wai Rana-laki séq Rembong; Lémpang Paji (Rembong)
      ata  gaqé  maing  ata  rana  =n
      person  old  PCM(from)  person  male  =3SG.GEN
‘the parents (old persons) of the man’

(49)  Verheijen (1977a:98)
      uma  naq  Liong
      garden  PCM(there/for/at/to)  Liong
‘Liong’s garden’

Based on the limited material analysed up till now, the PCMs in examples (48) and (49) are very rare, and possibly ad hoc-constructions which are hardly grammaticalized. The use of maing ‘from’ as a PCM might be influenced by Indonesian dari (Sneddon et al.2010:150).

5.2.2.3 Explanations for when juxtaposition and when PCMs are used

The more regular patterns of possessive constructions are:

1. Juxtaposition
   a. Possessee and possessor in unchanged form: Mainly non-prot. relations, Ownership of land and buildings and Parts-and-Whole relations, but rarely Body parts.
   b. Possessor has a special form: Pronouns.
2. PCM ngail/ngé/ngge: Body parts and Kinship terms as possessees and Personal names as possessors. One example of an animate (animal) as possessor.
3. PCM =ng: Possessee a Kinship term and possessor human. An example of an inanimate possessee is found in an eastern dialect.
4. PCM nggial/nggélngge: Used almost only with human (including speaking animals) possessors in the folktale type of texts in Verheijen (1977b), but used very often with non-material possessees in diverse possession-like relations in the texts 701-722 by Ignatius Egy Dadu and hardly at all in non-Rembong dialects.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this is:

1. Pronominal possessors are treated differently from non-pronominal possessors.
2. Parts-and-Whole relations where the whole is inanimate are generally treated differently than when the whole is human.
3. Kinship terms and Body parts as possessees are generally treated similarly, but there are two differences: a. Kinship terms cannot be juxtaposed, b. Only a Kinship term can be a possessee with the PCM =ng.
4. Juxtaposition is mainly used for non-prot. relations and Ownership.
All PCMs show that the possessor is human, or at least animate, with the partial exception of nggialngél̥nge. The use of ngailngél̥nge seem to more closely show the character of the possessor (Personal name), and the use of -ng the character of the possessee (Kinship term). Because of the limited material investigated, the conclusions are not very certain, but a preliminary conclusion is that nggialngél̥nge is the less marked PCM, and the other PCMs show the character of the possessee (=ng) or the possessor (ngailngél̥nge) more clearly.

Figure 1 shows a hierarchy which shows the possessees most likely to be a part of a construction with juxtaposition to the left and those with a PCM to the right.

**Occurrences in juxtaposed construction**

- Parts-of-whole
- Inanimate objects
- Body parts
- Kinship terms

**Occurrences in a construction with PCM**

- Pronouns
- Humans
- Animals (?)

Figure 1: Construction choice for possessee in Rembong-Wangka

For possessors the hierarchy will be as in Figure 2:

**Occurrences in juxtaposed construction**

- Inanimate objects
- Pronouns
- Kin terms

**Occurrences in a construction with koʔo**

- Body parts
- Other nominal entities
- Kin terms

Figure 2: Construction choice for possessor in Rembong-Wangka

The main dividing line here is between Humans and the others. Pronouns and Animals occur only exceptionally with PCMs (see example (31) and Table 19). Even Inanimate objects can occur with a PCM in some dialects (see example (44)).

This can be compared with the corresponding hierarchies made by Baird (2007:208) for possessees (Figure 3) and possessors (Figure 4) in Kéo.

**Occurrences in juxtaposed construction**

- Parts-of-whole
- Body parts
- Kin terms

**Occurrences in koʔo construction**

- Inanimate objects
- Pronouns
- Kin terms

Figure 3: Construction choice for possessee in Kéo (after Baird 2002:208)

**Occurrences in juxtaposed construction**

- Animals
- Pronouns
- Proper names

Figure 4: Construction choice for possessor in Kéo (after Baird 2002:208)

One question is if the possessive construction with PCMs are head-marked or dependent-marked. Ngai has many meanings, but one of the more prominent is ‘with, and’, so it could probably be regarded as a preposition, which means that the constructions with PCM ngailngél̥nge can be regarded as dependent-marked, which makes it natural that the character of the possessor should be more influenced by the marker. In its shortest form, =ng, the PMC is connected phonomically with the head, which possibly could explain why the possessee is more restricted in this case. The PMC ngialngél̥nge is derived from the third person singular possessive pronoun, followed by the non-pronominal possessor in apposition, which means that the construction is head-marked. That this PMC is almost only found in the Rembong dialect and that its use is not stable in different kinds of discourse seems to indicate that it has developed quite recently. However, it is found in a text from 1938.

Baird (2002:207) makes the generalisation for possessive constructions in Kéo: “Inalienable relationships are expressed by the juxtaposed construction, unless the possessor is a kin term, proper name or animate noun. Other possessive relationships are expressed by the koʔo construction.” That inalienable relationships generally are expressed by more ‘compact’ expressions is not disputed, and can be explained either by iconic or economic (Haspelmath 2017:193) reasons. However, the quite important exception “unless the possessor is a kin term, proper name or animate noun” is not explained.

It seems that a proposal by Lander (n.d.) can be helpful here, but it seems that his final hypothesis on
p.[9] has to be combined with his preliminary hypothesis on p.[3]. In the formulation of the hypothesis below, the parts added from the formulation on p.[3] have been added in square brackets:

“The distribution of the unmarked (juxtaposition) and marked possessive [(prepositional or clitic)] constructions depends on the type of the possessor [:if the latter is type-restricting, juxtaposition is chosen; otherwise, the marked possessive construction is used.:] if the ambiguity between type-restricting and token-restricting possessive function arises, juxtaposition is chosen for type-restricting possessor, while the marked construction is chosen for token-restricting possessor.”

Lander (n.d.:[3,9])

Thus, constructions with token-restricting possessors, like personal names or kinship terms are predicted to include a PCM. Animate nouns are also often token-restricting.
5.3 Comparison and etymology of the forms

In 5.3.1, the pronominal genitive enclitics and the oblique pronouns are treated together with the PCM =ŋ and yai, because the etymological discussion touches on both the oblique pronouns and the PCMs. In 5.3.2 the etymology of the PCM *gial/*gel *gə is treated, and its possible connection with the Central Flores PCM go/koʔolko discussed.

5.3.1 The pronominal genitive enclitics and the PCMs =ŋ and yai

In Table 21 the nominative enclitic(s) is/are given before the slash and the genitive enclitics after the slash for Komodo, the Kempo subdialect of the Western Manggarai dialect, the Central Manggarai dialect and Rembong-Wangka, separately. The sources are: Verheijen (1982:31) for Komodo, Semiun (1993:17-18) and Burger (1946:79) for the Western Manggarai subdialect Kempo, Burger (1946:40,47) for Central Manggarai and Schmidt (2013:138) and the Corpus for Rembong-Wangka.

Table 21: Nominative and genitive personal enclitics in Komodo, the Kempo, Central Manggarai and Rembong-Wangka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Komodo</th>
<th>Kempo</th>
<th>Central Manggarai</th>
<th>Rembong-Wangka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>hu / ŋu, ŋu?</td>
<td>/ k, ku</td>
<td>k / g</td>
<td>k / ŋ, ŋk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>o / m, mu</td>
<td>me, mo / m, mo</td>
<td>h / m</td>
<td>k / m, ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>i, e / n, ne</td>
<td>e / n, na</td>
<td>i, j / n</td>
<td>i, j, zi, z / n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>t, te / t, te</td>
<td>t / d</td>
<td>t / t, nt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL</td>
<td>? / mi</td>
<td>cm / gm</td>
<td>m, ms / m, ms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>m, mu / mu</td>
<td>se / s, so</td>
<td>m / s</td>
<td>m, ms / m, ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>s, si / de</td>
<td>si / r, ra</td>
<td>s / d</td>
<td>s, ns / s, ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ngad’a has no enclitics.

There is full syncretism, with the possible exception of the first person inclusive in some lects, between the nominative and genitive enclitics in the plural. In Manggarai, there is no syncretism at all, and in Komodo only in some forms.

The genitive markers which Blust (2015:442) reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian (PAN) are *ni ‘genitive of singular personal names’, *na ‘genitive of plural personal names’ and *nu ‘genitive of common nouns’, Rembong 3SG.GEN =ŋ can be an reflex of PAN *na or *ni. Rembong 3PL.GEN =s can hardly be original, so it is hypothesized that it derives from the 3PL personal pronoun siza/sia or the nominative enclitic was taken over to create a complete syncretism in the plural.

In Table 22, the forms of what is here called oblique pronouns, and in Schmidt (2013:138) and Semiun (1993:9) possessive pronouns, are listed for Rembong-Wangka, two Manggarai dialects and Ngad’a. The Western Manggarai forms are those of the Kempo subdialect (Semiun 1993:18), but if the forms in Kolang (Burger 1946:79) are different, they are given in parentheses. The sources for Central Manggarai is Burger (1946:47) and for Ngad’a Djawanai (1983:159). There are no recorded oblique pronouns in Komodo.

---

33 In this section, IPA is used when citing forms from all languages. When Central Flores languages are mentioned, Palu’s is excluded, because it seems to be less closely related to the other languages in the group than they are to each other (Elias 2018:75).

34 Kempo also have subject enclitics 1SG: =k, =ek, =eku, 2SG: =m, =em, =emo, 3SG: =n, =en, =ena, 2PL: =s, =es, =eso, 3PL: =r, =er, =ero, used for progressive aspect (Semiun 1993:18-19). The genitive enclitics in Kempo are: 1SG =gu, 2SG =mo, 3SG =na, 2PL =so, 3PL =da, =ra according to Burger (1946:79).
Table 22: The oblique or possessive pronouns in Rembong-Wangka, the Western Manggarai dialect, the Central Manggarai dialect and Ngad’a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rembong-Wangka</th>
<th>Western Manggarai</th>
<th>Central Manggarai</th>
<th>Ngad’a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>ŋgaku</td>
<td>gaku</td>
<td>daku</td>
<td>ŋaño</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ŋgau</td>
<td>gau</td>
<td>dɔ hau</td>
<td>gao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>ŋgia</td>
<td>dia (Ko gia)</td>
<td>diha</td>
<td>gazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>ŋgita</td>
<td>dite</td>
<td>dite</td>
<td>gita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL</td>
<td>ŋgami</td>
<td>gami</td>
<td>disi</td>
<td>hoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>miu</td>
<td>gemi</td>
<td>dɔ meu</td>
<td>siza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>sia, siza</td>
<td>dise (Ko dihe)</td>
<td>dise</td>
<td>siza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The ‘plural’ forms in Ngad’a are in fact defferential/distant forms (Djawainai 1963:159). Oblique forms of the pronouns are only found in the southern dialects of Ngad’a (Djawainai 1963:160).

In Central Manggarai, there are also pronouns beginning with /g/ for 1SG: gaku ‘to/at me’, 3SG: giha ‘to/at him’ and 3PL: gise ‘to/at them’. (Burger 1946:40,46). According to Burger, the /g/ comes from the shortened form of agu ‘with, and’, ɡə. He thinks that these forms are different from the Western Manggarai forms beginning in /ŋ/ in Table 22, because their different function, although he thinks it likely that they have the same origin (agu>ɡə) (Burger 1946:79).

Schmidt (2013:142) assumes that the oblique pronouns in Wangka are formed by prefixing an [ŋ] to the personal pronouns, and, further, that the irregularity in the first person singular, where the personal pronoun is aku and the oblique pronoun ʾgaku, depends on analogy with the other oblique pronouns. This seems to be confirmed by the Ngad’a first person singular oblique pronoun ŋaʔo where the nasal is prefixed to a word with an initial vowel, and therefore not lost.35 However, a problem here is that the first singular personal pronoun in Ngad’a is ɗjaʔo or zaʔo, with an initial consonant, which either has to have disappeared after [ŋ], or to have arisen after the oblique form had been formed. That the initial consonant is relatively late is indicated by the reconstruction of *aku ‘1SG’ for Proto-Central Flores (Elias 2018:117), so the second alternative seems most likely. On the other hand, the form of the first person singular oblique pronoun in Western Manggarai perhaps shows the possibility that the oblique pronoun in Rembong-Wangka could have been formed by prefixing [ŋ] to a form which already had an initial [g]. However, because the oblique forms of the Rembong-Wangka oblique pronouns seem to show greater similarities with the Ngad’a than the Manggarai oblique pronouns generally, Schmidt’s analogy hypothesis seems to be the most likely explanation.

A second question is the origin of the ‘ŋ’ element in the oblique pronouns. Schmidt (2013:142) connects this element with the ‘interfix’36 found between the digits in numerals. In that case, it should be linked with the PMP ‘linker for multiples of ten’, *ŋa (Blust & Trussel 2016; see also Blust 2012), but that element was only used with numerals. One could consider PAN *ni ‘genitive case marker for singular personal names and pronouns; marker of possession, part-of-whole relationships, and agency of a non-actor voice verb’ or PAN *na ‘linker marking emphatic attribution’ (Blust & Trussel 2016) as the source. In that case, [ŋ] was assimilated to [ŋ] after the loss of the vowel. The derivation from *ni seems especially attractive because it was used both as a genitive marker and ‘agency of a non-actor voice verb’, and the oblique pronouns in Rembong-Wangka is used after prepositions indicating the agent in passive sentences. Schmidt (2013:141-142) considers the PCM -ŋ used with kinship terms as possessesssesees (see 5.2.2.1) to have the same source, i.e the ‘interfix’. In Wangka, =ŋ can also be used before words like muri ‘lord’ and imo ‘friend’ (Schmidt 2013:142). Possibly the same element is found in demonstratives beginning with /k/, which are not found in the western dialect and take an ŋ- prefix after some time nouns, like béwéq ‘night’, lezoq ‘day’ and lekar ‘year’ in Wangka (Schmidt 2013:143).

The most likely etymology of PCM =ŋ is as weakened form of ŋai. Dãi in example (39) and =ŋ in example (44) are used in equivalent possessive constructions (see also the examples in Verheijen 1977c:36). It can be hypothesized that because ŋai is more often used as a conjunction, a more

35 Ngad’a has no prenasalised stops.
36 ‘Ligature’ would probably be a more appropriate term.
grammaticalized, shortened form, i.e. =ŋ, developed in the context of a kinship term as possesse. Coming back to the oblique pronouns, the possibility that their prenasalised initial consonants go back to ŋai is perhaps strengthened somewhat by the fact that the functions of Manggarai agu, which was supposed to be the source of the Western Manggarai oblique pronouns by Burger, is fulfilled by ŋai in the Rembong and Lanamaí dialects. This would make the sources of the oblique pronouns functionally equivalent in Western Manggarai and the Rembong dialects. A complication is that ŋai corresponds to other forms in many lects of Rembong-Wangka. In at least the Kai and Kanun lects in desa Golo Leboq and in desa Golo Lizun where the Rembong dialect is spoken the form is ni?, in Riqa the form is niʔ? or ne, in Wolo Mëzëq neʔe, ne or ŋai, in Bou-Munting, Wuë and Wangka neʔe or ne and in Tërong ne. Of less importance is that in the Kigit and Ladar-Kaong dialects, agu is used as in Manggarai. In Ngad’a the corresponding word is neʔe, which among other meanings has the meanings ‘and, with; be; get, have’ (Arndt 1961:350). Ne and ŋai are recorded in the same meanings, and neʔe with the meanings ‘and, with; have’ in Rembong-Wangka lects. Either have the eastern lects of Rembong-Wangka borrowed the word from Ngad’a, or neʔe is derived from ŋai through reciprocal assimilation of the vowels and [ŋ]>[n]. In the first alternative, ŋai and neʔe have to be regarded as words of different origin, but with surprisingly similar semantics. Because of the semantics, neʔe is supposed to derive from ŋai here. As an example of [aɪ]>ɛʔe there is the word for ‘water’ (PAN *waSiR), which is wai in Kambera and weʔe in Wewewa on Sumba. For [ŋ]>[n] no example comes to mind, but the sound change seems plausible. This derivation also associates ŋai with the word for ‘and, with’ in the other Central Flores languages, which is neʔe in all Central Flores lects, except Lio where it is noʔo. (Elias 2018:132). Elias (2018:132) reconstructs the Proto-Central Flores form as *noʔo, because Palu’c has noʔo. This makes some difficulties for the derivation above, but possibly the Palu’c form has been influenced by the form in Lio. If *noʔo was the Proto-Central Flores form and there is an etymological connection between Rembong ŋai and and Central Flores neʔe and noʔo, then the backing of the vowels must be assigned to Proto-Central Flores, and a fronting of the vowels must have occurred in the other Central Flores lects. However, this seems quite unlikely.

As was already noted above, ŋai and nelneʔe can have several meanings, but it can be made likely that the meaning as a sociatal preposition ‘with’ is primary by looking at the predicative possessive construction with maña ŋailneʔelne ‘exist with, possess’ with a genitive enclitic on the possesse, exemplified in example (50).

777.2.1; Néngé Telo Kaba; Térong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(50)</th>
<th>Maya</th>
<th>sa-yata</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>røba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>one-CLF(persons)</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta</td>
<td>maña</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ine-ema</td>
<td>=n37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>exist</td>
<td>with/possess</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>=3SG.GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘There was a youth who had his parents (living)’

It can be supposed that, as a further grammaticalization of the predicative possessive construction, the existential verb maña was lost and ŋailneʔelne acquired a verbal meaning ‘have, possess’. In example(51), the meaning of ŋai seems to be ‘have’, even though a translation with ‘with’ would perhaps be possible. The uncertainty in the interpretation of soroʔ does not influence the interpretational possibilities. In example (52), neʔe means ‘have’, even though there is no genitive enclitic on moraʔ, which can be seen as a further grammaticalization. An example from Kéo, which is equivalent with example (52), is given in example (53).

65.7.3; Nangéq Rembong Mbong; Kepan (Rembong)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(51)</th>
<th>Soroʔ</th>
<th>kau</th>
<th>ŋai</th>
<th>waʔi</th>
<th>=m,</th>
<th>omo</th>
<th>wi</th>
<th>sapak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think(?)</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>leg</td>
<td>=2SG.GEN</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>cut_off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Do you think you [will] (or: you will not(?)) have legs if [you] cut [them] off”

37 In the text, it is written iné-éman, but it is probably a mistake for iné-eman.
756.12.4; Ngiung lau lolong; Wolo Mézéq

(52)  \textit{\textbf{In,} aku ne\textit{\textbf{e}} m\textit{\textbf{e}}ra?}

Yes, 1SG have ear-rings

‘Yes, I have ear-rings.’

Kéo (Baird 2002:219)

(53)  \textit{\textbf{Kami ne\textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{\textbf{e}} ae}}

1PL.EXCL have water

‘We have water.’

5.3.2 The Possessive Construction Marker (PCM) ə\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{i}}\textit{\textbf{a}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{e}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{o}}

Because ə\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{i}}\textit{\textbf{a}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{e}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{o}} can perhaps be regarded as the unmarked PCM in Rembong-Wangka, it would seem to be of some interest to investigate if it has any correspondences in other closely related languages, and if there are any etymological connection between them.

In Manggarai, ə\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{i}}\textit{\textbf{a}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{e}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{o}} corresponds to ə\textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{\textbf{o}}, which is used as a PCM between a possessee and a possessor, and is also used in pronominal possession, with deletion of the ə\textit{\textbf{s}}/ before pronouns beginning with vowels, forming a kind of correspondence with the oblique pronouns in Rembong-Wangka. Manggarai also has genitive enclitic pronouns, corresponding to those in Rembong-Wangka. It seems likely that ə\textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{\textbf{o}} derives from PAN ə\textit{\textbf{d}}i ‘locative case marker (probably for plural personal names)’ or ə\textit{\textbf{d}}a ‘locative case marker (probably for singular personal names)’ (Blust & Trussel 2016). In Tambunam Dusun [kzt], ə\textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{\textbf{i}} is used as a PCM (Omar 1983:238). Omar (1974:391) further says:

“There is sufficient evidence from the six Western Austronesian languages under consideration (i.e., Malay, Iban, Javanese, Sundanese, Achehnese, and Kadazan) to support Lyons' hypothesis that the possessive construction is in deep structure a locative adverb and is closely related to existentiality (Lyons, 1968:388-397)”

(Omar 1974:391),

which suits well with the derivation of ə\textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{\textbf{e}} from PAN ə\textit{\textbf{d}}i or ə\textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{\textbf{a}}.

The Rembong-Wangka PCM ə\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{i}}\textit{\textbf{a}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{e}}/\textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{\textbf{o}} thus seems to have no etymological connection with the corresponding Manggarai PCM. Because the Manggarai PCM is a reflex of a PAN form, the form in Rembong-Wangka is probably an innovation. In that connection, it seems relevant to make a comparison with the languages most closely related to the Manggaralic languages, the Central Flores languages. If a correspondence between the Central Flores PCM and a Rembong-Wangka function word could be established, that could be of relevance for grammaticalization paths and areal influence, although perhaps not for genealogical questions.

In the Central Flores languages, there are two ways to express adnominal possession, juxtaposition and with a PCM between the possessee and the possessor, except in Lio, where only juxtaposition is found (Elias 2018:131). In Ngad’a the form of the PCM is ə\textit{\textbf{g}}o and in the other Central Flores languages, except in Lio, the form is ə\textit{\textbf{k}}o and/or ə\textit{\textbf{k}}\textit{\textbf{o}} (Elias 2018:74-75). Except as a PCM, ə\textit{\textbf{g}}o/ə\textit{\textbf{k}}o/ə\textit{\textbf{k}}\textit{\textbf{o}} has other functions, which are listed in Table 23. Because of the relative paucity of sources, it is expected that the different functions are certainly found in more Central Flores languages than those listed in the table.
### Table 23: Uses of the PCM marker in the Central Flores languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>All Central Flores lects, except Lio</td>
<td>Elias (2018:74-75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominaliser</td>
<td>Ngad’a</td>
<td>Djawanai (1983:144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic mood marker</td>
<td>Kéo</td>
<td>Baird (2002:323-326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic marker</td>
<td>Rongga</td>
<td>Arka (2016:139-140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object marker (mostly optional)</td>
<td>Rongga</td>
<td>Arka (2016:140-141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In pronominal possession, the pronominal possessor has the same form as independent pronouns in Kéo (Baird 2002:108) and Ende (McDonnell 2008:3), and supposedly in the other Central Flores languages, except some dialects of Ngad’a (Djawanai 1983:160). However, at least Ende also has pronominal ‘adnominal ligatures’ in the singular ‘which references a nominal phrase and always comes after a noun’ (McDonnell 2008:4).

There are several more or less possible etymologies of the PCM in the Central Flores languages:

1. Burger (1946:79) supposes that the Ngad’a PCM go is connected etymologically with the weakened form of Manggarai agu ‘with, and’, go.

2. An etymological connection with Rembong-Wangka ʔgo<ŋe<ŋia seems semantically preferable but phonetically equally likely as Burger’s proposal, because prenasalization is lost in most Ngad’a dialects. This, as also Burger’s proposal, would explain the consonant part of the Ngad’a PCM, go, because some dialects of Ngad’a, but as far as known no other Central Flores lect, have oblique pronouns beginning with /ŋ/ or prenasalization. However, a direct etymological connection between the Rembong-Wangka PCM ʔgo<ŋe<ŋia seems unlikely, because in Central Flores lects, except Ngad’a, the PCM marker begins with /k/, and the PCM seems to be relatively recent in Rembong-Wangka. In Palu’e, the PCM is heʔe (Danerek 2019:101), where /h/ plausibly can be a reflex of /k/. What is suggested here is that the PCM in Rembong-Wangka and the closely related Central Flores languages have grammaticalized from similar grammatical elements, i.e. from the oblique third person singular oblique pronoun in Rembong-Wangka, and from the third person personal pronoun in the Central Flores languages, where personal pronouns fulfil the same functions as the oblique pronouns in Rembong-Wangka. The third person singular pronoun is kia in Rembong-Wangka, gazi in Ngad’a and So’a, kai in Rongga, kai in Lio and Ende and ia in Palu’ė (other Central Flores lects have innovative forms) (Elias 2018:131). Elias (2018:131) reconstructs the Proto-Central Flores form as *ka(d,dʒ)i. If the Central Flores forms instead go back to *kia, a vowel metathesis in Proto-Central Flores has to be assumed, perhaps including an approximant or a fricative which separated the vowels. In that case, the original form should be *kia, rather than *kai, because the form is probably connected with PAN *ia ‘3sg. personal pronoun’, and Palu’ė, which is more distantly related to the other Central Flores languages than they are to each other, has the form ia. The closely related Manggarai has hia and Riung ia and nia (Schmidt 2013:72). In the hypothetical grammaticalization process of the PCM in Proto-Central Flores-Palu’ė, the approximant or fricative was lost and an assimilation of /l/ and /d/ to each other took place and they were separated by a glottal stop, producing [eʔe]. Finally, it was a backing of the vowels in Proto-Central Flores (perhaps excluding Lio).

3. A phonetically more satisfactory etymology could be a connection with Rembong-Wangka koe ‘self’, but the semantics seem to be quite difficult.

---

*That at least some of them once had it seems to be indicated by the alternative forms for the first person singular dʒao and ʔao in Kéo, while which form is used depend on dialect in Ende (Baird 2002:111).*
4. The deontic mood use seems much similar to voluntative-future use of Rembong go, Wangka ko. Baird (2002:324) thinks that it is “conceivable” that the deontic function developed from the possessive in Kéo, in conformity with a suggestion by Heine (1997). In this case, it seems likely that the borrowing was from the Central Flores languages to Rembong-Wangka.

There seem to be important problems with all the four derivations of the Central Flores PCM, so no conclusion of which derivation is correct is drawn here. Thus, no solutions for the problems of grammaticalization and areal influence can be solved, some material for a more in-depth research of these problems has been presented.

6 Discussion

6.1 General discussion

The conclusions in this study are in many cases preliminary, and the analyses not final and conclusive. The study’s usefulness generally lies in indicating what is not known and where further information and deeper analyses are needed. In section 6.4, some of the directions in which further research is needed will be indicated. However, some conclusions about adnominal possession can be regarded as quite certain. Examples are the origin of the PCM nggé/ngge from the third person singular oblique pronoun nggia.

It is important to distinguish the description of a single language and how the morphological elements are classified for comparative purposes. A good example of this is the enclitic =n. It is the third singular genitive enclitic, but it does also function as a specificity marker and definite article and to form abstract substantives from semantic adjectives. There seems to be no reason to consider =n to be different elements in these different functions. Moreover, it seems impossible to decide if the function is that of a genitive enclitic or a specificity marker in many cases. This means that, e.g., that the typological question if the language has obligatory possession of kinship terms or body parts could be impossible to answer, because they probably are always specific when they have a genitive clitic attached, but the language specific question if kinship terms and body parts take an obligatory =n enclitic if they are not possessed by a non-third person singular subject can be answered.

6.2 Discussion of method

Normally, modern descriptions of living languages are based on spoken language. In this case the description is based almost only on written documents with mainly two quite different types of material. Verheijen (1977a) and the second half of Verheijen (1988) contain stories, ‘folktales’ or traditional history, of more or less the same type, while the first half of Verheijen (1988) contains a description of life and celebrations in Rembong, written/spoken in the first person by Verheijen’s main assistant, Ignatius Egi Dadu. The reason for relying mainly on written material is that I could only stay for one month in Lémpang Paji, where the language is spoken, and most of that time was taken up with explaining the written texts, so in this investigation almost only the written material was analyzed. Information from the fieldwork was included only if it adds to the information from the texts. A possible advantage is that a description of the language in the written documents will provide a point of comparison to estimate if the language spoken today has begun to change because of disturbed transmission. It could, for example, be possible to calculate the proportion of loanwords from Indonesian at different times. However, that study was not pursued in this study. Because the texts are from different lects, it is also possible to investigate internal variation in the language, which is done to a quite limited extent, and because the texts were entered into FLEX, it is possible to investigate frequencies, which was done.

Some of the weaknesses of the chosen method would also be found in all analysis of documentary corpus material if elicitation is not included. One thing is that it is impossible to know what uses or constructions

39 Some ritual texts are also included.
are regarded as incorrect, because they are probably not found in the corpus, or if found, it is impossible to know that they are not generally accepted. If a construction turns up once or twice, like the PCMs *maing* or *naq* (see section 5.2.2.6), it is not possible to know if they are ad hoc constructions, perhaps not accepted by most speakers, or are regularly used in certain contexts. It seems also that, even in a quite big corpus, many rare forms will not turn up. An example is the demonstratives (not investigated in this study), of which Schmidt (2013:179) cite 19 forms in Wangka, only a small part of which is found in the corpus.

In the etymological discussions, the conclusions should be based on established sound laws of the concerned languages and when discussing grammaticalized elements, which do not always follow the usual sound laws, with parallels from the concerned languages, other languages or general tendencies. This has not always been followed in the etymological discussions in this study because of lack of time and knowledge. Thus, much of the etymological discussion should be regarded as a preliminary collecting of material and constructing of hypotheses on which a deeper investigation of the material in the context of a comparative study of grammatical elements in the Flores Barat languages could build.

6.3 Ethics discussion

Most of the information in this study comes from printed publications or internet sites, and when the information is used, the sources have always been acknowledged. Some information comes from manuscript sources, written by Pater Verheijen, Ignatius Egy Dadu and Nao-Cosme Rémon. In the case of Pater Verheijen, a permission to use and publish the manuscript materials was given by the SVD Provincial superior Netherlands-Belgium Province and a written permission to use the materials written by Ignatius Egy Dadu was obtained from Ignatius Egy Dadu himself. I have asked Dr. Rémon for permission to use his vocabulary lists of 11 lec ts from Riung, and he gave a positive answer, provided that the source is recognized.

Permission to use the information obtained during the field studies and publish the names of the providers of the information was obtained orally during the field studies.

6.4 Suggestions for further research

Several of the small languages in the Manggaraiic group, notably Kepo’, Rajong and Kolor, have hardly been investigated at all, and fieldworks to do that should be made. Most desireable would of course be full grammars of these languages, including Rembong-Wangka, but sketch grammars would also be useful. As a preliminary work, the manuscript material about these languages found in the Verheijen collection in the archives in Leiden University could be scanned and glossed in FLEx.

A survey of at least the northern parts of the kabupaten Manggarai Timur, Ngada and possibly Boawae should be made and to attempt to decide what languages are there and the borders between them.

A focused investigation of the different lects of Rembong-Wangka and Riung should be made to ascertain if they constitute one language or two, and what is the status of the different lects.

No part-of-speech analysis has been made in the present study, and when parts-of-speech are mentioned, it is in a conventional meaning, depending on their seemingly main function. Two problems which should be investigated are to what extent unmarked property words, in Croft’s (2001:88) sense, should be regarded as verbs, and the common occurrence of words which can function both as nouns and as verbs without any morphological modification.

An investigation of the two multifunctional words ngai and wai in a Flores Barat comparative perspective could be quite interesting.

To find Indonesian loanwords in local Indonesian languages, like Rembong-Wangka, is generally easy. As was seen in section 5.1.3, the functions of the Rembong-Wangka enclitic =n and the Indonesian suffix -nya are very similar. In questions about morphosyntax like this, it seems much harder to distinguish an Indonesian influence from an inherited pattern. To develop methods to distinguish between the two possibilities would be very useful.
7 Conclusion

In this chapter, results in the form of answers to the three research questions which concern information about the Manggaraic languages, especially Rembong-Wangka, adnominal possession and etymology of some key morphemes used in adnominal possession are given.

1. Information about where Rembong-Wangka and other small Manggaraic languages are spoken, the number of speakers, and dialects of Rembong-Wangka and its relation to other neighbouring languages, should be presented.

Information about the smaller Manggaraic languages, as where they are spoken, which is not available in the literature, was presented.

An attempt to assess the relationships between the neighbouring lects was made by using lexicostatistics on partly rather unsatisfactory material. The material indicated that the division between the Rembong-Wangka and Riung languages was not so certain and should be further investigated. One result of the collected information, in this case Rémon (n.d.), was that Glottolog in its latest version (4.1) for the first time lists Namut-Nginamanu as a language of its own. Some other lects which hardly can be included as dialects of languages in the investigated area, but could possibly have closer relationships with languages spoken further east, were indicated.

An attempt to estimate the number of speakers of Rembong-Wangka was made, and the conclusion was that it was at most 20,000.

A hypothesis about the dialects of Rembong-Wangka were made. The main dialects were the ones proposed by Verheijen (1977a; Map 2) with the addition of Ladar-Kaong. A subdivision of the main dialect, Rembong-Riung Barat was made and includes among others Kigit and as a very uncertain dialect, Mbazang-Damu.

An attempt to decide in which kampungs Rembong-Wangka is spoken and to map them was made.

2. The adnominal possessive constructions should be investigated.

An attempt to differentiate between enclitics and suffixes relevant for the investigation of possession was made. The third person singular genitive enclitic =n has several functions which are all similar or identical with functions fulfilled by the suffix -nya in Indonesian. In addition to expressing a pronominal possessor, it can be used as a marker which shows unambuously that a word should be interpreted nominally, as a specificity or definite marker, as an object marker and marginally as a PCM in non-pronominal possession. One, or more, suffix/suffixes of the form -n is used to form adverbs, postposed directionals and ordinal numbers.

The possessive pronoun enclitics are used very frequently with all kinds of possessees. The oblique pronouns are used for emphasis, which entails that the first and second person oblique pronouns are relatively more common than those in the third person.

Juxtaposition of two NPs is used in many cases with different possession-like semantics. However, it seems not to be used with possessors which are kinship terms.

The most common of the PCM in non-pronominal possession is nggé/ngge which is used almost only with human possessors in mostly prototypical possessive constructions in the folktales in Verheijen (1977b), but is used mostly in non-prototypical and possession-like constructions in the texts by Ignatius Egy Dadu in Verheijen (1988). It is a grammaticalized weakened form of the third person singular oblique pronoun nggia, which is found in a single example as a PCM in non-pronominal possession in an eastern dialect of Rembong-Wangka. Except this example, this PCM is found only in the Rembong dialect.

The enclitic =ng is obligatory if the possessee is a kinship term and the possessor a person.

Isolated examples of the source schemas ‘origin’ and ‘location’ are found. More, but not very numerous, examples of ‘companion’ are found.
The use of the enclitic =n in non-pronominal possession seems to be very marginal, and could perhaps depend on Indonesian influence.

3. The etymologies of the key morphological elements used in adnominal possession and differences with other dialects should be noted and a comparison with closely related languages be made.

It was concluded that the =ŋ used as a PCM was derived from ŋai ‘with, and; have, possess’. Four alternatives for the origin of the prenasalization in the oblique pronouns were discussed: 1. The PAN ligature *ŋa found between the digits in numerals, 2. PAN *ni, which was a genitive and agent marker, 3. PAN *na ‘linker marking emphatic attribution’ and 4. ŋai. No decision between these were made, but 2. and 4. were deemed especially interesting.

Different possible etymologies of the PCM in the Central Flores Languages were discussed in the light of morphological elements in Rembong-Wangka, but because phonetical and/or semantic problems, none was deemed to be convincing.

The the results under research question 1 could be of use as preliminary information useful for the planning of a linguist who would like to make a more ambitious survey of the language situation in kabupaten Manggarai Timur and northern kabupaten Ngada. The results of questions 2 and 3 could be of some use for grammaticalization studies and the comparative studies of Austronesian languages in eastern Indonesia.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1

**Table 24: Kampungs where Rembong-Wangka is or was formerly spoken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kabupaten</th>
<th>Kecamatan</th>
<th>Desa/Kelurahan (k)</th>
<th>Kampungs</th>
<th>Abandoned kampungs</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai Timur</td>
<td>Sambi</td>
<td>Rampas</td>
<td>Nampar Sepang</td>
<td>Sepang, Jemali</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rawuk, Tamping, Tompong, Kampungténga, Nasarét, Waéri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai Timur</td>
<td>Elar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Golo Lijun + Legur Lai</td>
<td>Kembo, Nanga Lok, Marobola</td>
<td>2053 + 832 = 2885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai Timur</td>
<td>Elar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Golo Leboq + Kazu Wangi</td>
<td>Kai, Kanun, Waér, Kazu Ata, Kowong</td>
<td>1337 + 900 = 2237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai Timur</td>
<td>Elar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Golo Munde</td>
<td>Ladar, Kaong</td>
<td>(937)(^{41})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai Timur</td>
<td>Elar Selatan</td>
<td>Lempang Paji (k)</td>
<td>Lédaq, Liur, Menuéq, Ngandong, Randing Mata, Namut, Noran, Téngga, Lewurmés</td>
<td>Tégéq</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai Timur</td>
<td>Elar Selatan</td>
<td>Sangan Rasan</td>
<td>Kigit, Lawurla</td>
<td></td>
<td>(about 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Benteng Tawa + Benteng Tawa I</td>
<td>Lindi, Damu, Mok, Mbazang</td>
<td>Kos, Terong-Kedong</td>
<td>(1545 + 1248 = 2793)(^{42})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Lanamai + Lanamai 1</td>
<td>Téong, Teding, Waru-Nembu</td>
<td>723 + 1089 = 1812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Wolomeze + Wolomeze I</td>
<td>Maronggélá, Warukia, Poso, Wué, Mungga</td>
<td>811 + 554 = 1365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>Riqa, Kedu, Nitar</td>
<td>Lindang, Rungang</td>
<td>1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Ria 1</td>
<td>Waté</td>
<td></td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Ngara</td>
<td>Munting, Bou</td>
<td></td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Latung</td>
<td>Mbarungkéli</td>
<td></td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung Barat</td>
<td>Wangka</td>
<td>Nukiar, Matalé, Wewoloe, Dilang-Api</td>
<td></td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{40}\) Sources: Manggarai Timur: personal information, Ngada: Rémon (2012) and Schmidt (2013).

\(^{41}\) If only a part of the number of speakers in a desa speaks Rembong-Wangka, the number is given in parentheses.

\(^{42}\) Perhaps partly Rajong-speakers.

\(^{43}\) Moved to desa Denatana.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngada</th>
<th>Riung</th>
<th>Wangka Selatan</th>
<th>Lewur Betong, Lada, Kulusuan, Lelo Punding, Madar, Nuling, Watu Nekot, Kundurkolong, Butang Nanga, Lekoq Leruk, Tanalain, Nandeng, Maki, Reghas</th>
<th>1383</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung</td>
<td>Rawangkalo</td>
<td>Rakansake, Tajo/Kazuata, Paupungga, Rawangkalo, Kotoq, Namut</td>
<td>(2476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Riung</td>
<td>Taen Terong + Taen Terong 1 + Taen Terong 2</td>
<td>Térong, Rawuk, Maro Lidong</td>
<td>455 + 492 + 326 = 1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngada</td>
<td>Wolomeze</td>
<td>Denatana</td>
<td>Wué</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Table 25: Movements of Rembong-Wangka speakers to new kampungs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Rembong → *Munta Rembong → *Sepang → *Jemali → Ara, Lengko Randang, Tompong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rembong → *Munta Rembong → *Sepang → *Mbung Lodong → Tompong → Mbiaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liur → Lai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leda → Muntê, Lelu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Posoq → Tengga → Logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Posoq → Pandang Mata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wangkung → Pulak → Nele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nalat → Kepan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbawar → Kembo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turêng → Kembo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Longka → Bui, Lumpang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Paqan Watu → Selek, Buntal-Bawé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kongkor → Kowong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemaq → Wuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kanun → Won tong, Tompong, Bawê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Waér → Kazu Ata, Tompong, Nasarêt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Uwu → Kigit, Lewur La</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bar → Kubur Sakaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubur Seka → Maro Lauk, Bawê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ndisar → Bawé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Wolomézé (mountain) by Niki (mountain) → Waté, Rawuk, Térong, Wangka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the outside → Téong, Téding, *Rungang, Kedu, Riqa, Mbarungkéli, Waté, *Poso, Wangka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kos → Lindi, Mok, *Térong-Kedong, Mbazang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sewan → Waru-Nembu, Téong, Teding, Waté, Nampé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mungga → Bou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wué → Wué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dilang-Api → Bou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 An asterisk is put before the names of kampungs which are presently uninhabited. An asterisk is put before the names of kampungs which are presently uninhabited. The sources for East Manggarai is personal information from Ignatius Egi Dadu and for other areas Rémon (2012).