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NIMBORAN KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE

Kevin R. May

IKHTISAR


Perkawinan merupakan jalan untuk mengembangkan marga. Ada bentuk yang wajar bagi perkawinan namun kawin lari juga dikenal sebagai suatu hal yang sah. Setiap perkawinan menuntut mas kawin. Pembayaran mas kawin ini sesuai dengan pemindahan kesehatan mempelai wanita dari marga ayahnya kepada marga mempelai laki-laki. Perkawinan antara saudara sepupu dilarang sekali pun perkawinan dengan keturunan mereka diizinkan sesudah beberapa turunan.

Poligini dipraktekkan dalam masyarakat Nimboran. Sesudah suami meninggal isteri dapat menikah dengan saudara laki-laki suaminya.
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0. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to describe the kinship system and marriage customs of the Nimboran people of Irian Jaya. Aspects of the culture have been described by van Baal (1952) and Kouwenhoven (1956), but to my knowledge no detailed description of kinship and marriage has yet been published. Pouwer (1966) made reference to Nimboran kinship but evidently used his own unpublished notes, and gave no description of the system as such.

1. BACKGROUND

The Nimboran people live in an area centered in Genyem, a town about 80 km west of Jayapura, the capital of the Indonesian province of Irian Jaya. They constitute a rather closely-knit community of some 3,500 people, although a considerable number of Nimboran have moved to the environs of Jayapura since large-scale contact began earlier this century. Kouwenhoven (1956: 43ff) has detailed the history of contact from the first patrol in 1903 to his time as District Officer in Genyem (1951-1955).

The most important unit of Nimboran social structure is the clan, which is a patrilineal, patrilocal, exogamous kinship group averaging about 70 members. The head man of each clan is known as dekening, or ilam, which is an hereditary position passed from the headman to his eldest son. The dekening is only properly called ilam after he has been ceremonially installed at a large feast, the Ilam-be kebi (Kouwenhoven 1956:29ff). The position carries the highest prestige in the culture. Next to the ilam in authority is the tekai, who carries out the instructions of the ilam, and is described by the people as his "left hand".

Whereas formerly each clan would have been located in its own territory and village, present-day villages often contain members of more than one clan, and some clans have members in more than one village (Kouwenhoven 1956:53ff). Each village house is occupied by one nuclear family, often with the addition of a widowed mother, or perhaps close relatives staying temporarily, such as a brother who is in the process of building a new house. Houses of members of one clan tend to be grouped together in a particular section of a village.

2. KINSHIP

The Nimboran kinship system has been described by Pouwer (1956:273) as "Iroquois-Hawaiian" so far as cousin terminology is concerned. Cross-cousins are distinguished from parallel
### 2.1 KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Nearest English equivalent</th>
<th>Scope of application</th>
<th>Affinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td>misklo</td>
<td>ancestor</td>
<td>m or f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>pppate</td>
<td>great-great-grandparent</td>
<td>m or f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>bayom</td>
<td>great-great-grandparent</td>
<td>m or f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>babussi</td>
<td>great-grandparent</td>
<td>m or f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>babu</td>
<td>grandparent</td>
<td>FF, FM, MF, MM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>ngayo</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>F, FB, M2BH, PPBS</td>
<td>M2WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>M, N2, FBM, MBM, PPPBM M2BW, MBMNB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iniewo</td>
<td>mother's brother</td>
<td>Mb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iwm</td>
<td>father's sister</td>
<td>F2, F2H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngusum</td>
<td>parent-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neakingwou</td>
<td>eldest brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neaking</td>
<td>older sibling of same sex</td>
<td>(m speaking) OB,FOB, OMB, WOR, MOZ, MRS</td>
<td>MO2, WO2H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f speaking) OZ, FOBD, OZH, WOB, MO2D, MBD</td>
<td>M2BW, senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to symbols used:
- Coninqueal: cross-cousins, using terms for siblings. Paternal cousins are normally referred to using a separate term. Thus the system does not fit neatly into an Ironoik or an Hawaiian classification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Nearest English equivalent</th>
<th>Scope of application</th>
<th>Affective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nengko</td>
<td>younger sibling of same sex</td>
<td>Consanguineal Affinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(m speaking) YB, FYB, YBM, WYB, WY, WYB, WYMB, WYBM, junior co-wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new</td>
<td>brother (f speaking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nengganbu</td>
<td>sister (m speaking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blu</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nese</td>
<td>brother-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(m speaking) ZH, ZBW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f speaking) BH, BZ, BH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sibai</td>
<td>child's parent-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>general term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Nearest English equivalent</th>
<th>Scope of application</th>
<th>Affective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nemase</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>Consanguineal Affinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nenggeji</td>
<td>daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dunea</td>
<td>brother's child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nemaski</td>
<td>son's wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demungga</td>
<td>daughter's husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 and beyond</td>
<td>demanddo</td>
<td>grandchild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS, SD, DS, DD,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grandchild of any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nesking, nengko,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nengganbu, or new,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes.</td>
<td>Children of father's senior co-wife are all classed as older siblings, and children of a junior co-wife as younger siblings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The appropriate kinship term may be changed as a result of a marriage. In such cases the term resulting from the marriage takes precedence from then on. For example, if a man marries the daughter of a man he has formerly called "brother", he will call him "father" thereafter.
Figure 1: Consanguineal kinship chart
Key: Where two numbers are shown, unbracketed term used by male ego,
bracketed term used by female ego.
Otherwise male and female ego both use the same term.
1. sibling
2. nephew
3. nieghbo
4. brother
5. mother
6. daughter
7. sister
8. niece
9. mother-in-law
10. daughter-in-law
11. child
12. grandchild
13. grandfather
14. grandmother
15. great-grandchild
16. great-grandfather
17. great-grandmother
18. cousin
19. cousin
20. cousin
21. cousin
22. cousin
23. cousin
24. cousin
25. cousin

Figure 2: Affinal kinship chart
Key: 1. sibai
2. nomba
3. manggabu
4. mokingo
5. mokag
6. ki
7. sibai
8. nomba
9. manggabu
10. mokingo
11. demungga
12. nomba
13. hlo
14. mokag
15. mokag
16. mokag
17. mokag
18. mokag
19. mokag
20. mokag
21. mokag
22. mokag
23. mokag
24. mokag
25. mokag
2.2 COUSIN TERMINOLOGY

In common with many Papuan kinship systems, parallel cousins are classified as older or younger, not on the basis of their age relative to ego, but on their parents' relative age. That is, all FOBC children and MOZ children are termed older siblings, and FYB children and MYZ children are younger siblings.

Maternal cross-cousins (MBC) are known by the collective term usunendi, a term which is sometimes compounded with the appropriate sibling term, such as usunendi nesw. All usunendi are regarded as older siblings. Conversely, all paternal cross-cousins (FZC), known collectively as keiteronendi, are regarded as younger siblings. These latter are frequently referred to simply as keiero without the addition of a sibling term. The term usunendi extends to include MBBW children also, but not the rest of MBW father's clan. Similarly the term keiteronendi extends to include FZHE children, but not more distant members of FZ Husband's clan.

2.3 RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER'S BROTHER

A Nimboran person feels a closer relationship with his mother's brother's family than with his father's sister's family. This is shown in the more frequent use of sibling terms for MBC as noted above, a greater restriction on marriage with their lineage (see section 3.2), and the use of the terms ngayo 'father' to address MB and me 'mother' for MBW. There is a tendency to use the Indonesian term oom for MB, but the people recognize this as an innovation in the system.

The mother's brother is an important person, having a guardian role in a child's life. He may receive a gift following the child's birth (see section 3.5), and should anything untoward happen to the child, he will investigate it. If the child is killed, he will demand a payment (Indonesian bayar kepala or 'head payment') from the father's clan. The child must obey him in every respect, as he has authority over the child's life, and may kill him if seriously offended.

2.4 EXTENDED USAGE OF TERMS

In every Nimboran village a person would normally address another by a kinship term. Indeed, he may feel that conversation is impossible until he knows the relationship between himself and the other. In many cases the relationship may be quite distant, dating back several generations to the time when a woman of the other's clan married into his own, or vice versa. Information on these relationships is normally passed on from father to son, so that he knows how to address people in other villages. For example, if a man from one village has been told by his father to call another ngayo 'father', he will tell his son to call that man kei and call his children ngayo 'father' or me 'mother' as appropriate. This will continue until such time as another marriage takes place, when there may need to be some revision of the terminology.

This is an illustration of the closeness felt between all Nimboran people. A person for whom one has no kinship term is considered a potential enemy. This closeness does not necessarily extend to the carrying out of normal kin obligations, however. Whereas a man going outside the Nimboran area, for example to Jayapura, may expect hospitality from his brother or sister who lives there, if the relationship is more distant than the close relatives and affines, he could not expect the same.

3. MARRIAGE

3.1 PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE

The main purpose in marriage is to produce children for the building up of the clan. If the family can be built up sufficiently to form a clan of their own, then they will be entitled to their own ilam, with all the associated prestige that is implied.

Additional purposes for marriage are seen in the provision of food, and provision for sexual needs. As women are brought into the home in marriage, they add to the workforce, increase the possible level of production, and give
an excess that can be shared with relatives and others, with
the resulting increase in prestige. Women plant and care for
the garden, they bear a large part of the load of processing
sago, and they tend the livestock (pigs, chickens, and goats).
Men will clear the trees for a new garden site, cut down the
sago palms, and will help with pounding the sago. At home the
man expects his wife and daughters to cook and serve his food,
while he is responsible for building, repairing, and extending
the house.

3.2 PERMITTED AND PROHIBITED RELATIONSHIPS IN MARRIAGE

A man may marry a woman from any clan except his own, his
mother's, and his paternal grandmother's. He may not marry
his keiteronendi (FZC), nor his mother's sister's children,
who are described as siblings. It is considered proper to wait
for at least three generations to pass before marriage between
descendants of an earlier marriage, but even four generations
if the descendants are ego's usunendi (MBC). Thus a man's
children may marry children of his keiteronendi, although not
his usunendi, for whom another generation should pass. This
situation is parallel to that of the neighboring Kemtuik
people. (See van der Wilden (1976:12)).

Other than these restrictions, there is no limit placed on
the choice of clan. (Kouwenhoven 1956:22). There is a tendency
to marry from clans in nearby territory, for the sake of
convenience, but this is by no means universal. A survey of 23
married people in Sarmai Atas shows in their parenthood the in-
volve ment of 18 clans, the people themselves representing eight
clans, four of whom are resident in the village.

Figure 3: Marriage restrictions. Ego, who is a member of
Mallo clan, cannot marry Sem or Hawase, but can marry Napo
or Giai.

Previously it was customary for a woman to marry outside
her own village, as well as outside of her clan. The former
pattern of only one clan in a village is changing, so that
now it is possible to marry within the village, as there may
be two, three, or four clans represented in present-day
villages. In the above survey, six of the eleven women had
married within the village. This must be understood with
respect to the fact that four clans are represented there.

Sister exchange is a possible method of selection of a
spouse, although it seems to be the exception rather than the
rule. When it happens, the payment of brideprice is greatly
reduced, there being only a small exchange in each direction.
An example of a "wrong" marriage can be seen in the case of a boy and girl who grew up together in the village. They wanted to marry, but their relationship was considered by the old men of their clans to be too close. The boy was related to the girl as FFMBSS, i.e. she was his father's usunendi's grandchild, which is not a prohibited relationship, but he was also her MFBS, classified as her MBS, which is too close. When their elders discovered that they had been having sexual relations, the young man received 25 strokes of the cane, and was fined Rs.20,000 and the young woman was also caned. However, under threat of sorcery by the young man against the young woman, she was given to him. No brideprice was paid in this case, which has left resentment among her brothers who would have received the payment in normal circumstances.

3.3 FACTORS IN THE CHOICE OF A SPOUSE

Apart from the matter of prohibited relationships, there are other factors which must also be considered in the choice of a spouse. One is the question of age. A husband is not sought for a bride until she has passed puberty, and is proficient in the skills of gardening and cooking. Generally speaking the bridgroom will be several years older, giving him time to gather together the required brideprice, the crucial factor in his marriage. If the brideprice is not available, no wife can be obtained for him. Another factor is that it is considered wrong for a younger sibling of the same sex to marry before the elder.

In recent times the agreement of the parties to the marriage is sought before arrangements are made, although earlier this was not so. Previously both sons and daughters were expected to obey the wishes of their parents with respect to marriage, as in other matters. The marriage would be arranged between the parents. Although this may still be done, both bride and groom are expected to signify their agreement to the proposal. In the absence of such agreement, another match is usually sought, rather than force the issue.

Social status of the parties must also be considered. The son or daughter of an ilam would not be expected to marry a "commoner", but a spouse of equivalent status is sought. The brideprice is correspondingly higher, and only the relatively wealthy family of another ilam would be able to pay it.

3.4 MARITAL CUSTOMS
3.4.1 MARRIAGE BY ARRANGEMENT

The following describes the events of a normal arranged marriage. The case of elopement is treated below (section 3.4.2).

Often it is the girl's parents who look around for a husband for their daughter. It may be that in the course of daily contacts they hear that someone has a brideprice ready, so the girl's father will go to see if it is satisfactory. If so, a ceremony of agreement is arranged. This involves the future bride and groom, their respective parents, and the people of the groom's village as witnesses. The contract of marriage is sealed in the sharing of a cigar of native tobacco, which is smoked in turn by the groom, the bride, and their respective parents. Following this it is declared before the witnesses that the girl is promised to the boy, and that her honour must be guarded. If either party to the marriage should marry someone else, a payment in breach of contract must be made. This would consist of the goods usually exchanged as brideprice, with or without an additional fine in cash.

For the next several months the groom's relatives gather together the necessary goods for the brideprice, and food for the feast. It is usual for the entire clan to contribute, as well as other relatives and friends. Sago can be prepared in advance and stored, and meat may be smoked for preservation. It would be shameful if the food were not in abundance for the feast.

When all is ready, the invitation to the feast is given out, and the bride's parents are advised to be ready. They will also prepare gifts of food for the feast, bringing them with the bride.

On the day before the feast, two or three of the groom's sisters go to the bride's village bearing gifts of clothing. In former times a net bag and flowers for personal adornment
would have been included. They sleep the night in her village. In the morning they dress her in the new clothes, and then lead the procession to the groom's village, taking the bride with them, followed by her relatives.

Meanwhile the groom's family have laid out the brideprice goods for display, and the groom himself has gone off to the forest, to hunt with a few friends. It is not proper for him to be in the village when the bride arrives, and in fact he only returns at evening, and does not sleep in the house until the third day. His attitude ideally is shyness, as he is entering into a new relationship with someone whom he may hardly know. He has been instructed in the "facts of life" by the old men, but supposedly has not previously had sexual relations with a woman.

When the bride and her relatives arrive in the village, the first item after the exchange of greetings is the examination of the brideprice goods. This may take several hours, as the items are looked over carefully, and any unsatisfactory items are replaced. The method and timing of making good any shortage must be agreed upon and then the feast may begin. Subsequently the more distant relatives may return home, but the bride's parents and brothers remain in the groom's village for the next day or two. On the second day there is more feasting, and then, or perhaps on the third day, the ceremony is ended.

The bride prepares food for her husband and his parents, and her relatives. The groom's sisters invite him to come up into the house, as until now he has slept outside in a nearby shelter. The bride's brothers' wives eat first, as the brideprice goods are distributed to her brothers and parents. Then all eat together. The bride's brothers then give their advice to the bride, telling her to work well in the garden and home, provide food properly, and stay with her husband. They have now received their share of the brideprice, so she now belongs to her husband's clan. They then bid her farewell, and return home. From this time on, provided that enough of the brideprice has been paid, she remains with her husband's clan, and all her children belong to that clan as well. This is not to say that she loses contact with her relatives; in fact contact continues throughout her lifetime, and she is free to visit them often.

3.4.2 ELOPEMENT

Elopement is a recognised method of getting married, though it is considered inferior because it is not accompanied by the feasting of a proper wedding. Should a man and woman form an attraction for each other and decide to elope, they will employ a trusted go-between to set up a secret rendezvous in the garden or forest. When the time comes for the elopement, the man sends a message telling the woman to meet him in a stated place. She gathers her possessions, perhaps hiding them in a bundle of rubbish to throw out, and leaves her parents' home ostensibly to take out the rubbish. She meets the man, and they go straight to his village.

As soon as her father finds out where she has gone, he goes to examine the brideprice. If a satisfactory quantity is available, and the relationship is not prohibited, the marriage will be accepted. If not, the woman will be taken home and punished. In such a case it is likely that she will be given in marriage to a man from an area far from her home, maybe outside the Nimboran area altogether, to prevent further contact with her disappointed lover. It is important therefore for a man to have the brideprice ready, or be able to raise it from his clan brothers, before he finalizes the elopement.

3.4.3 THE BRIDEPRIICE

Kouwenhoven wrote that attitudes towards brideprice had changed, and it had been "brought into disrepute" (1956:24). However, today the custom of paying brideprice is still very much followed. Van Baal (1952:9) reported that money had replaced the traditional goods as the customary medium, and indeed these items were supposed to have been destroyed. However, the use of the traditional goods is still very common, although the exchange usually includes money in addition. Brideprice payment for a wife from outside the Nimboran area may consist entirely of money, if the bride's parents do not value the traditional goods.

The custom of paying brideprice is viewed as an
unalterable tradition handed down from time immemorial. No doubt the differences in attitude recorded by van Baal and Kouwenhoven were due to the presence of the mission during their time. Since then the local church has become independent, there is no longer a mission presence, and the people's underlying attitude has come into the open again.

The payment is viewed as a kind of "head payment" (see section 2.3) for the bride, who is leaving her clan permanently. In a sense, she dies to her former clan. In addition there is a sense that her clan should be repaid for the progeny she will bring to her husband's clan. It is believed that if the brideprice is not paid, she and her children will die.

The severance from her father's clan is further exemplified by the fact that, should she be widowed and remarried into a different clan, her first husband's clan will receive a brideprice payment. (See section 3.7)

The major articles used for brideprice are:
undo - stone axeheads of varying sizes, the longer and better-polished, the more valuable. They range in length from about 15 - 30 cm, and may be of black or greenish stone. As with other goods, undo may be bought and sold for money, the values at present ranging from approximately Rp. 5,000 to Rp. 35,000. Although these are no longer used as axes, having been replaced by steel tools, they have remained an essential component in the brideprice payment. The Nimboran people no longer know their origin, saying variously that they were given to a man in a dream long ago, or that they have existed since the world began, or that they were made in a place somewhere to the south of their territory, from where they are no longer obtainable. Most probably they came from the highlands to the south by way of trade, long ago.
tekam - a general term for beads, of which several types are in circulation. Their origin is no longer known either, though they were most likely traded from the coast to the north.
tekam lemak - a dark blue glass bead, spherical in shape, about 1.3 cm in diameter. This is the most valued type of bead, and is an obligatory part of the brideprice. Cash value about Rp. 5,000.
tekam tawo - a light-green glass bead of the same size and shape as tekam lemak. Cash value about Rp. 2,500.
tekam yawong - a yellow opaque bead of unknown composition, but vitreous appearance. These are cylindrical in shape, about 1.5 cm in diameter x 1.2 cm long. Cash value about Rp. 2,000.
tekam natu - a white bead.

Cash sums may be added to the goods exchanged, to make up the balance of the agreed amount. The actual total appears to vary, depending on the status of the parties to the marriage and on their ability to pay. Total cash values between Rp. 200,000 and Rp. 300,000 have been paid in recent times.

The brideprice is contributed largely by the groom himself, with his father, brothers, and friends adding their contributions. It is paid to the bride's father and brothers, with the father receiving the largest portion. Brothers each receive a portion, and cousins may receive a lesser amount, adjusted to reciprocate for the amount of contribution they may have made for a previous marriage in their own clan.

It is not uncommon for a part of the brideprice to remain unpaid until some time later. In one case a man deferred the debt until the woman's daughter was married, indicating a delay of some 20 years. More often, the outstanding balance is paid on the birth of a son and heir. At this time the woman has proved her ability to produce male children, and a full settlement should be made. Until this balance is paid, the woman may not feel constrained to live in her husband's village permanently. In one case observed recently, the woman spent alternate weeks with her husband, until their second child, a son, was born. Then the balance was paid, and she moved permanently to her husband's village, bringing the first child, a daughter.

3.5 CHILDREN

All children born of the union belong to their father's clan. Nevertheless the woman's brothers take an active interest in the welfare of her children. Although it is not obligatory, a gift is often given to the brothers by the child's father as a sign of proper respect and goodwill towards them. This may be done up to three years after the birth, when the child has
survived the uncertainties of infancy. There is a high rate of infant mortality in the area.

It is common for children to feed at the breast for two to three years, and during this time the husband refrains from intercourse with his wife. Since a woman stops breast-feeding her child when she becomes pregnant, adherence to the postpartum taboo is felt to safeguard the child’s chances of survival.

The taboo against intercourse with the mother extends from the time that the wife’s pregnancy is apparent, until the child can stand alone and has begun talking. Intercourse before birth contaminates the mother with the father’s blood which would cause still-birth or abortion. After the child is born, it receives its soul by means of the mother’s milk, but if the mother is contaminated with the father’s blood the child’s soul is cut off and it will sicken and die.

It is the father’s responsibility to teach his sons the necessary skills for living, such as hunting, housebuilding, and the use of tools and weapons. Mothers teach their daughters how to plant gardens and prepare food. The father’s role in his daughters’ education is limited to advising them on good behaviour and diligence.

3.6 POLYGyny

It is not uncommon for a man to have more than one wife. In the past it was expected that the ilam would have at least two if not three wives. There was no traditional limit on the numbers, but for practical reasons and for the sake of domestic peace the number was restricted. An additional wife would increase the capacity for the production of foodstuffs, enabling a man to be more generous in giving, thereby gaining in prestige. There would also be the possibility of having a larger family. Weighing against these considerations is the need to provide a second brideprice (unless marrying a brother’s widow), and the high risk of domestic disorder and tension. The tensions in such a household often result in one wife returning home, or living separately in a different place. Many men therefore prefer to marry only one wife at a time.
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Sororal polygyny, i.e. marriage with a younger sister, is a recognized possibility if the first wife did not produce children. In such a case, it would be necessary for the elder sister to approach the younger, and they would have to agree to live together harmoniously. Then if all parties agreed, the second marriage could take place. The concept of marriage with two sisters is rooted in Nimboran mythology. There are several myths in which the hero marries two sisters, for example the story of Waliklem, which Kouwenhoven summarizes (1956: 33ff).

3.7 LEVIRATE AND SORORATE MARRIAGE

It is normal for a widow to marry her deceased husband’s brother, usually a younger brother. As she has married into the clan, it is expected that she will remain with that clan for life. The second husband need not necessarily be an actual sibling of the deceased, but should be a closely related man who called him “brother”. However, a brother who declines to take her renounces in that act the right to any brideprice payment that would be due if she were to marry subsequently outside of the clan. The sons of the deceased would then receive the payment, or it would be held for them by the clan leader’s assistant known as hum, who is keeper of the clan’s valuables.

In widow remarriage, the wishes of both the deceased husband’s brother and the widow are respected. He may agree or decline, and she may indicate which of the eligible brothers she wishes to marry. She may indicate her wishes by sending a cigar to the brother, and then a gift of food. In such a case the brother takes her to live with him without further ado. No brideprice is necessary.

On the other hand, she may marry outside of the clan. If she has young children with her, she may take them to her new home while they need her care, but they remain members of their late father’s clan. Unaccompanied children become the wards of the deceased’s brother, whom they already call “father”. Any subsequent children the woman may have will belong to the clan of her new husband, although retaining their relationship as siblings of the children from the first marriage.
The custom of sororate marriage is also recognised in the culture, although no data is yet available on its frequency of occurrence. At least one case is known to the author. If a man's wife dies, he may marry her younger sister, with payment of a reduced brideprice. Her family must be agreeable to the marriage, but if he has been a good son-in-law they are likely to agree. However, if the younger sister marries someone else, the deceased wife's sons can go and demand a payment as compensation for her not marrying their father.

3.8 DIVORCE

Recognised grounds for divorce include:
1. Failure to have children;
2. Fighting with a co-wife, or with the husband;
3. Refusal to have sexual intercourse;
4. Laziness or very unsatisfactory work in the garden and the home.

If a divorce occurs within the first few weeks or months of marriage, the brideprice should be repaid, or at least a part of it, except when the husband is to blame. If a longer period has elapsed, the husband cannot expect to recover anything. Their reasoning is that the goods will have been redistributed in connection with other marriages, and will no longer be available.

When a wife is sent home, her father and brothers will enquire into the reason for it. If she has just been lazy or belligerent, she is likely to be beaten by them and taken back. However, if the husband has been unreasonable, social pressure may be brought to bear on him, or else she may be kept from him and married to someone else. For further discussion see Kouwenhoven (1956:19).

If a wife has no children and her husband takes another wife, the rights of the first remain. She becomes the senior wife, with authority over the junior. However, if trouble develops between them, she is liable to be divorced, and will not be sent back to the husband. It is more likely, though, that the barren first wife will be divorced before the husband remarries.

In any case, a divorced wife retains the right to the produce of any trees and plants she has planted in her section of the garden. She may return to the garden at any time to make use of her right. However, there is no guarantee that the second wife will take kindly to her coming, especially if there is enmity between them. In one case already observed, the divorced wife was too afraid to venture into the village to claim the produce to which she was entitled.

In any divorce, the husband has the right to retain the children. But if he feels disposed to do so, he may give them into the wife's custody. They would then cease to be his, and would be reckoned with the wife's father's grandchildren as members of his clan.

4. CONCLUSIONS

It has been shown that Nimboran people distinguish between cross-cousins, and differentiate them from siblings, although sibling terminology is also applicable to them. The mother's brother is considered a close relative, having the same kinship term as father, and has an important role in a person's life. The father's sister seems to be less close, having a separate kinship term and different restrictions on marriage with her descendants.

Great importance is given to marriage as the means of building up the clan. There is a proper form for marriage, but elopement is recognised as a valid but inferior form. Regardless of how the marriage takes place, every proper marriage requires payment of brideprice. This payment is related to the transfer of all the bride's allegiance from her father's to her husband's clan. Nevertheless her relationship with her relationship with her brothers remains close.

Marriage restrictions exclude marriage with all cousins, although marriage with their descendants is permissible after a suitable interval. Polygyny is practised, and the levirate is the norm. There is also evidence for a sororate in the culture.
Notes:

1. Information for this paper was gathered while I have been residing in the village of Sarmai Atas, commencing October 1978, under the auspices of the UNCEN - SIL Project. I acknowledge gratefully the help of Lambert and Thomas Mallo, father and son, who gave much of the information personally, and the cooperation of the people of Sarmai Atas. This paper was written during an anthropology workshop at Danau Bira led by Dr. Daniel Shaw, whose helpful criticisms and encouragement have materially assisted in its production.

2. I have recorded 46 clan names in current use, but not all represent separate, independent clans. Some are growing branches which may become independent of the parent clan in the future. Some others have few surviving members and are reckoned in affiliation with another.

3. Differences in the spelling of Nimboran words, compared with that used by van Baal and Kouwenhoven, are due to the lack of a written form of the language. The phonology has been studied by Anceaux (1965), and a fresh study by the present author, with a proposed orthography, has recently been published (Irian, Vol. IX).

4. In practice, if the bride goes back to her family, her unmarried brothers are likely to beat her and send her back, lest they lose their share in the brideprice, which they must keep on hand for their own future wedding.

5. Van Baal wrote that elopement was a rare occurrence. My impression is that it is not infrequent. There is scope for further statistical research on this point.

6. In discussing these items, the speaker invariably indicates the length along his left hand, by pointing with his right hand on his left wrist where the end would be if the tip was at his fingertips.

7. I have been told of this bead, but have not yet seen one personally. Kouwenhoven (1956,23) also refers to tekam salam, which I have not yet encountered.
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APPENDIX: ALTERNATIVE TERMS AND MORPHOLOGY

There are some terms that have alternatives with the same meaning, and some take a different form when used with the second person possessive pronoun kombe 'your'. In the list below, (a) indicates a term of address, (r) indicates a term of reference, with a number indicating the appropriate person or persons where there is a limitation. e.g. (2r) means a term of reference used only with the second person possessive pronoun.

Given term
babu 'grandfather' (a,r)
ngayo 'father' (a, r)
me 'mother' (a, r)

Alternative
nemande (3r)
belemande (2r)
babuhlu (r) 'grandfather'
babuki (r) 'grandmother'

intie (3r)
namia (3r)
indio (3r)
ON COHESION IN A MALAY WRITTEN TEXT

Daniel C. Ajamiseba

IKHTISAR

Makalah ini adalah suatu analisa mengenai suatu naskah yang ditulis dalam bahasa Melayu dalam hubungannya dengan perpaduan suasan kata-kata yang terada di dalamnya. Paduan seperti yang didefinisikan oleh Halliday dan Hasan adalah kumpulan kemungkinan-kemungkinan yang ada dalam bahasa yang menyebabkan naskah itu berpautan.

Paduan adalah suatu hal yang semantik dan oleh karena itu tidak dibatasi oleh batasan-batasan kalimat. Sebagian dijelaskan melalui gramatika (paduan gramatikal) dan sebagian melalui perhendaharaan kata (paduan leksikal). Lima tipe paduan untuk bahasa Inggeris yang dibicarakan oleh Halliday dan Hasan: referensi, substitusi, pembuahan kata-kata, hubungan dan paduan leksikal juga ditemukan dalam bahasa Melayu yang menyarankan kemungkinan paduan universal pada tingkat karaana.

0. Introduction
1. Text and Analysis
2. Generalisations and Universals
  2.1 Conclusion and Implications
  2.2 Backward Nature of Cohesion
  3.3 Levels of Operation of Cohesion

0. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a preliminary attempt to discuss cohesion in a Malay written text. It is preliminary, since not much, if anything at all, has been done on this subject yet in Malay.

Most of the discussion will be centered around a sample text, a fable about a tiger and a mouse. The text is narrative in nature and was translated by J. Laneijn with the assistance of Oesman.

Cohesion, as defined by Halliday and Hasan, is "the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together: the potential that the speaker or writer has at his disposal". In the same source they state also that cohesion is part of the text forming component in the linguistic system. It is the means whereby elements that are structurally unrelated to one another are linked together through the dependence of one on the other for its interpretation.
Another point they make is that cohesion is not a structural relation, but a semantic relation; hence it is unrestricted by sentence boundaries. Cohesion, according to them, is expressed partly through the grammar (grammatical cohesion) and partly through the vocabulary (lexical cohesion). When they talk about cohesion as being "grammatical" or "lexical", they add, it is not a purely formal relation, with no meaning behind it. It is a semantic relation which, in the course of its realization in the linguistic system, is channeled partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary. They subdivide grammatical cohesion of spoken and written English into:

1. Reference
2. Substitution
3. Ellipsis

Besides these, the other two types they mention are:

4. Conjunction

which is a borderline type of cohesive relation and is mainly grammatical, but with a lexical component in it, and

5. Lexical Cohesion (Lexical Repetition)

Since we are dealing with a written text in this paper, it is good to know what is meant by Text. Halliday and Hasan, in the same source as quoted above, state that Text is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that forms a unified whole. It is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit like a clause or sentence, and it is not defined by its size. It is not something that is like a sentence, only bigger, it is different from a sentence in kind. It is best regarded as a semantic unit: a unit not of form but of meaning. It is related to a sentence not by size, but by realization (coding), i.e., a text does not consist of sentences; it is realized by or encoded in sentences.

Furthermore, according to them, "a text may be spoken or written, prose or verse, dialogue or monologue. It may be anything from a single proverb to a whole play, from a momentary cry for help to an all-day discussion on a committee." They also state that a text is a passage of discourse which is coherent in two regards: it is coherent with respect to the context of situation (i.e., it is consistent in register) and it is coherent with respect to itself (i.e., it displays cohesion).

Register is defined by them as "the set of meanings or semantic patterns, that are typically drawn upon under the specified conditions, along with the words and structures that are used in the realization of meanings." 4

1. TEXT AND ANALYSIS

The text to be analyzed is presented below in an interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme translation (wherever possible) accompanied by a free translation. The analysis of the text will mainly focus on cohesive devices which operate on levels higher than the clause.

Harimau dengan Tikus
Tiger with mouse

The Tiger and the Mouse

A. I 1. Apa --kah nama binatang jang ter - lukis ini?
What-QM name animal which pref1- paint this
What's the name of the animal pictured here?

II 2. Kamu kenal semua - nja.
You pl.recognized all - def. art.
All of you know (him).

III 3. Harimau, bukan?
Tiger no
It's a tiger, right?

IV 4. Harimau itu binatang jang besar dan amat kuat.
Tiger that animal which big and very strong
The tiger is a large and very strong animal.

5. Manusia takut akan dia.
Man afraid of him
People are afraid of him.
6. Se-kuat-kuat orang mudah sadja dapat di-bunuh
   int.-strong-strong person easy just can pref3-kill
   -nja.
   -him
   No matter how strong a man is, he can easily be
   killed by him (the tiger).

V 7. Djahat-nja pula, tabi'at - nja tjulas.
   Evil -he also behavior-his mean
   He is also evil, his behavior is mean.

   sometimes he pref3-try pref3-kill water buffalo
   Sometimes he tries to kill water buffalo.

9. Tetapi kalau kerbau itu tahu harimau itu datang,
   But if water buffalo that know tiger that come
   kerap kali ia me-lawan.
   often time he pref3-oppose
   However, if the water buffalo knows the tiger is
   coming, often times he will go against the tiger.

10. Dalam hal itu ter- djadi - lah per- kelahi-an yang
    In case that pref1-become-f.m. nom3-fight which
    very violent
    In that case a violent fight will take place.

11. Se-kali-kali ada djuga kerbau yang menang,
    Once in while exist also water buffalo which win
    tetapi atjap kali-lah ia kalah,
    but often - f.m. he lose
    Once in a while there is a water buffalo who wins,
    but often he is defeated.

B VII 12. Apa pula nama-nja binatang jang ketjil pada gambar
   What also name-his animal which small at picture
   jang di-bawah ini?
   which at-below this
   What's the name of the small animal in the picture
   below?

VIII 13. Ia, betul.
   Yes, right
   Right!

   That mouse
   It's a mouse.

15. Tikus diam-nja dalam liang.
   Mouse live-he in hole
   The mouse lives in a hole. (Mice live in holes.)

16. Kalau ia me-lihat orang, lari-lah ia se-tjepat-
    If he pref3-see person run-f.m. he int.-fast-
    tjepat-nya.
    fast -he
    If he sees a person, he will run away as fast as he
    can.

17. Ia terlalu liar dan pe-nakut.
   He very wild and nom3-afraid
   He's very wild and a coward.

C IX 18. Pada suatu hari ada-lah se-ekor harimau tidur dalam
   On one day exist-f.m. a-class1 tiger sleep in
   hutan di-bawah se-batang kaju.
   forest at-under a-class2 wood
   One day there was a tiger sleeping in the forest
   beneath the trunk of a fallen tree.

19. Dekat tempat-nja tidur itu ada liang se-ekor tikus.
   near place-he sleep that exist hole a-class1 mouse
   Near that place there was a mouse hole.

20. Ketika itu tikus itu hendak ke-luar men-tjahari
    moment that mouse that want to-out pref3-look for
    ekam-an.
    eat-nom3
    At that time the mouse wanted to come out to look
    for food.
X 21. Mula-mula di-ke-luar-kan-nja dahulu kepala-nja, lalu first pref₂-to-out-caus-he first head-his then me-lihat ke-kiri dan ke-kanan. pref₃-look-to-left and to-right
First, he poked out his head, then looked to the left and to the right.

22. Tak ada apa-apa di-lihat-nja. Not exist anything pref₂-see-he
He did not see anything: (There wasn't anything (that) he saw.)

23. Manusia-pun tidak ada (ke)-lihat-(an).² man-even not exist see
There wasn't even a person in sight.

24. Sudah itu baharu-lah ia berani ke-luar. After that then-f.m. he dare to-out
After that, he dared to come out.

25. Ia ber-djalan ke-sana ke-mari men-tjahari makan-an He pref₄-walk to-there to-come pref₃-look for eat-nom₃
-his
He walked here and there looking for food.

XI 26. Tiba-tiba di-lihat-nja harimau yang sedang tidur suddenly pref₂-see-he tiger which prog. sleep itu. that
Suddenly he saw the sleeping tiger.

27. "Apa-kah ini gerangan?" pikir tikus itu dengan What-QM this emphatic think mouse that with heran-nja. amazement-his
"What in the world is this?" the mouse thought with amazement.

28. Ia ber-djalan me-niti kaki harimau itu sampai He pref₄-walk pref₃-cross leg tiger that as far as ke-belakang-nja. to-back-his
He walked between the tiger's legs to his back.

29. Itu-pun belum djuga semang hati-nja. that-even not yet also happy liver-he
That did not satisfy him.

30. Di-terus-kan-nja me-meriksā sampai ke-kepala pref₂-continue-caus-he pref₃-examine as far as to-head harimau itu. tiger that
He continued to examine the tiger all the way to his head.

31. Tetapi harimau itu ter-kedjut, lalu djaga, karena But tiger that pref₁-startled, then wake up,because ada rasa-nja yang ber-jalan di-kepala-nja. exist feel-he which pref₄-walk on-head-his
But the tiger started, then he woke up, because he felt something walking on his head.

32. Di-gerak-kan-nja kepala-nja dan tikus itu-pun pref₂-move-caus-he head-his and mouse that-then ter-djatu. pref₁-fall
He moved his head and the mouse fell.

33. Kuku harimau jang amat tadjam itu me-nekan badan claw tiger which very sharp that pref₃-press on body tikus itu. mouse that
The tiger's claws which were very sharp pressed on the mouse's body.

34. Tikus itu-pun ber-teriak. mouse that-then pref₄-yell
The mouse yelled.

35. "Aduh! Aduh!" kata-nja. Ouch ouch say-he
"Ouch! Ouch!" he said.
Forgive, sir-my. Forgive Loose-cause lease servant
"Have mercy, my lord! Have mercy! Release me, your
servant!"

XII 37. "Engkau ku-makan!" sahat harimau itu.
You I-eat answer tiger that
"I'll eat you!" snarled the tiger.

XIII 38. "Minta njawa, tuan-ku," kata tikus itu dengan tangis
ask soul, sir-my, say mouse that with weep
-nja.
-his
"You ask for my life, my lord," said the mouse
weeping.

39. "Badan patik terlalu ketjil, tiada akan men-ngenjang
body servant too small, not will pref3-satisfy
-kan tuan-ku."
-caus. lord-my
"My body is too small, it will not satisfy my lord."

XIV 40. Men-dengar itu harimau itu-pun kash-an.
pref3-hear that tiger that-then take pity
Hearing that, the tiger took pity on him.

41. "Betul kata-mu itu.
correct word you that
"You're right.

42. Aku biasa me-makan binatang jang besar besar.
I usually pref3-eat animal which big big
I usually eat much bigger animals.

43. Engkau ini tiada-kan men-tjukup-1," kata-nja, sambil
You this not-will pref3-enough-tr., say-he, while
me-lepas-kan tikus itu.
pref3-loose-caus. mouse that
You won't be enough," he said while releasing the
mouse.

XV 44. "Terima kasih banjak-banjak, tuan-ku," kata tikus
receive love much much lord-my, say mouse
itu, sambil ber-lari se-tjepat-tjepat-nja.
that, while pref4-run int.-fast-fast-he
"Thank you very much, my lord," said the mouse while
running away as fast as he could.

D XVI 45. Tiada lama se-sudah itu harimau itu kena djaring.
Not long after that tiger that hit net
Not long after that the tiger got caught in a net.

46. Talli djaring itu amat kukuh.
cord net that very strong
The cords of the net were very strong.

47. Bagai-mana-pun kuat-nja di-tarik oleh harimau itu,
how even strong-he pref2-pull by tiger that
tiada djuga putus.
not also break
However forcefully the tiger pulled, he could not
break it.

XVII 48. Sebab marah-nja dan sakit-nja, ia-pun me - raung
because angry-he and pain-his, he-then pref3-roar
se-kuat kuat-nja.
int.-strong strong-he
Because of his anger and pain, he roared as loudly as
he could.

49. Se-kali-an binatang dalam hutan itu lari
All animal in forest that run
(ke)-takut-(an), tiada tentu ke-mana tudju-nja.
afraid, not sure to where aim-their
All the animals in the forest were terrified and
ran aimlessly about.

XVIII 50. Tikus itu-pun ter-kedjut djuga men-dengar raung
mouse that-even pref1-startle also pref3-hear roar
harimau itu.
tiger that
Even the mouse was startled hearing the roar of the
tiger.
51. Ia ingin hendak me-nge-tahu-i hal harimau jang
He desire want pref3-know-tr.plight tiger which
me-lepas-kan njawa-nja itu.
 pref3-loose-cause. soul-his that
He wanted very much to know the plight of the tiger
who had spared his life.

52. Sebah itu ber-lari-lari-lah ia me-nudju tempat
Because that pref4-run-run-f.m. he pref3-towards place
harimau itu.
tiger that
Therefore, he ran towards the place where the tiger
was.

53. Se-telah di-lihat-nja hal radja binatang itu,i-a-pun
After pref2-see-he plight king animal that,he-then
ber-kata: "Dijangg-lah tuan-ku me-raung lagi!"
 pref4-say: Do not f.m. sir-my pref3-roar again
After seeing the plight of the king of the beasts, he
said: "Don't roar any longer, my lord.

will come man to-here pref3-kill sir-my
A man will come here to kill you, my lord.

55. Mudah-mudah an dapat djuga tuan-ku patik lepas-kan."
Hopefully can also sir-my servant loose-caus.
Hopefully I can release you, my lord."

56. Sementara ber-kata itu, di-mula-i-nja-lah
while pref4-say that, pref2-began-tr.-he-f.m.
me-ngerat tali djaring itu.
 pref3-cut cord net that
While saying this he began to cut the cord of the net.

57. Harimau itu-pun diam-lah.6
Tiger that-then quiet-f.m.
The tiger became quiet.

58. Karena tikus itu sangat ketjil, lama-lah baharu
Because mouse that very small, long-f.m. before
tali djaring itu putus dan harimau itu ter-lepas.
cord net that break and tiger that pref1-loose

Because the mouse was very small, it was a long time
before the cord of the net was cut and the tiger was freed.

59. "Pergi-lah tuan-ku djauh djauh dari sini!" udjar
go-please sir-my far far from here say
 tikus itu.
mouse that
"Please, go far away from here," said the mouse.

60. "Terima kasih banjak banjak," kata harimau itu, sambil
Receive love much much, say tiger that, while
ber-lari masuk ke-dalam hutan.
 pref4-run enter to in forest
"Thank you very much," said the tiger while running
into the forest.

61. Demikian-lah tikus itu dapat mem-balas ke-baik-an
Thus - f.m. mouse that can pref3-repay nom3-good
harimau itu, me-lepas-kan dia dari bahaja maut.
tiger that, pref3-loose-cause he from danger death
Thus, the mouse was able to repay the kindness of the
tiger, saving him from the danger of death.

NOTES TO THE TEXT
2. Roman numerals stand for Paragraphs.
3. Dashes represent morpheme boundaries.
4. Nom1 = per ... an nominalizer, deriving nouns from
   reciprocal verbs.
5. Nom2 = pe- nominalizer, usually formed with adjectives and
   a) pe + Adj. refers to the person who has the charac-
      teristic described by the adjective.
   b) pe + Verb refers to the agent of the verb.
6. Nom3 = -an nominalizer, deriving non-abstract nouns from non-reciprocal verbs.

7. Nom4 = ke... an nominalizer, deriving nouns from adjectives making them qualifying nouns, i.e., nouns modifying other nouns.

8. pref1 or ter- prefix is used to form deverbal adjectives in which the agent is usually unimportant, non-existent, or so general as to be virtually non-existent (cf. Macdonald & Soenjono, 1967, p. 96).

9. pref2 or di- prefix is used to focus on the action or the object of the action rather than the actor or the agent (Ibid. p. 81).

10. pref3 or meN- prefix is used to form verbs, which may be either transitive or intransitive (Ibid. p. 80).

11. pref4 or ber- prefix is used to form intransitive verbs.

12. f.m. = focus marker -lah, used to foreground the element to which it is attached.

The text consists of two major parts: a) Narrator's Monologue (Sentences 1 - 17) which is an introduction and a description of the main characters in the text, b) Narrative Proper (Sentences 18 - 61). The NP binatang jang terlukis ini 'the animal which is pictured here' in Sentence 1 refers to something non-verbal but still forms a part of the text, i.e. the picture of the tiger. This kind of reference, in Halliday and Hasan's terms, might be called cataphora, i.e., something that is pointing to another thing that is following in the text. Somehow this case is slightly different from their examples because it points to a picture in the text, whereas what Halliday and Hasan are dealing with is a verbal cataphora. Following is their example: "This is how to get the best results. You let the berries dry in the sun, till all the moisture has gone out of them. Then you gather them up and chop them very fine", where this points forward to both the sentences following the sentence in which it occurs.

In this first sentence the narrator wants his reader to read the sentence first before looking at the picture. But in reality the reader would likely look at the picture first, then read the sentence and then look again at the picture. Now, what do you call this kind of a situation? There is a pragmatic interference here. (Probably the term "interference" is not appropriate here since this process is done naturally by the reader.) This process doesn't occur in the verbal cataphora case. One can't imagine the reader reading, "You let berries dry in the sun till all the moisture has gone out. Then you gather them up" and then going back to "This is how to get the best results" and then proceeding to the second and the third sentences for the second time. Supposedly, the presupposed element, the picture, has to follow the presupposing one binatang yang terlukis ini "the animal that is pictured". The reason why there is some "interference" is partly because of the fact that the picture is put on the left side of the text. It should have been put on the right of the text to fit the term cataphora, since in Malay one reads from left to right, just as in English.

The information jang terlukis "which is pictured" could have been omitted although it is more directly related to the non-verbal element "picture" lukisan. Ini "this" (=here) together with binatang without jang terlukis refers to the picture of the tiger. This all works out to a style that seems
to characterize the pragmatics of adult to child or an overly pedantic story teller. Ini doesn't literally mean "pointing with your finger to something near to you as speaker ", but rather it means "on the left side of this page". It has more of a sense of location than of a literal pointing.

In the second sentence there isn't anything explicitly referring to an element preceding or following. However, from the verb kenal "recognize", which is transitive, we conclude that the object is deleted on the surface. The object would lexicalize as binatang ini "this animal", if the sentence were made explicit. The result would be Kamsa sempunya kenal binatang ini. Thus the implied binatang ini would be the presupposed element and the lexical item binatang in S1 would be the presupposing element. Hence, in terms of the surface structure, the cohesive relation between the implied binatang ini in S2 and binatang in S1 is an elliptical one, but in terms of the deep or implied structure the cohesive relation between these two items is a lexical one, i.e., it takes a lexical repetition.

The lexical item harimau "tiger" of S3 is an answer to the question which constitutes S1. Specifically, it has a cohesive relation with the phrase nama binatang...ini in S1. S3, in its full form, would be Nama binatang ini harimau,bukan? "The name of this animal is tiger, isn't it?" Hence, nama binatang ini is repeated implicitly in S3. Thus the cohesion is established through the repetition of the lexical phrase nama binatang itu. Surface-structurally the cohesive tie is an elliptical one, i.e., Harimau, bukan is an ellipsis of the implied structure Nama binatang ini harimau, bukan?

In S4 harimau and binatang are old or given information, whereas the rest of the sentence is new. The former is a lexical repetition of harimau in S3 and the latter is another lexical repetition of binatang in S1. The cohesive relation of both these items with their presupposing items is established through lexical cohesion. Itu "the" (literally "that") of harimau itu is a neutral demonstrative anaphoric reference; it marks the fact that the lexical item preceding it is old information. It is anaphoric because it refers back to harimau in S3.

Dha "hlm" in S5 is a pronoun which has an anaphoric cohesive relation with its target item harimau itu in S4. It signals "identity of reference" with the latter. In other words, the cohesive relation is expressed through identity of reference (or coreferentiality) signalled by the personal pronoun dia.

The description of nya "hlm" in S5 is almost identical with that given above for dia in S5, despite its difference in form. It is a clitic in Sentence 6, while in S5 it is a free form. S5 and S6 are in a cohesive relation because of the relation of manusia "people" and orang "person"; the former is a generic term for the latter. The type of cohesion involved here is a lexical one with a generic-specific relation between manusia and orang. S5 and S6 have a reversed causal cohesive relation; the former is the result and the latter is the reason. The conjunction relating these two sentences is not overtly marked; if it were, S5 would have to be modified by the adding of karena "because" initially.

In S7 nya "he" of djabhatnya is an "identity of reference" which points back to harimau itu in S4 and pula "also" is a conjunction which signals a cohesive relationship of the additive type between the evil of the tiger in S7 and his strength described in S6.

There is a cohesive chain of third person pronouns with different functions in S's 5,6,7 and 8 which refers to its substantial element harimau itu "the tiger" in S4. Cohesive chains, according to Halliday and Hasan', are "sequences in which it (in this case dia or -nya), for example, refers back not to the immediately preceding sentence but to another it and it is necessary to go back three, four or more sentences, stepping across a whole sequence of its, before finding the substantial element".

The description of ia "he" in S8 is almost identical to nya of djabhatnya in S7, except for the fact that ia is non-clitic and agentive, while -nya is clitic and non-agentive. Furthermore, bunuh of mem-bunuh "kill", surface-structurally speaking, has a lexical cohesive relationship with bunuh of dibunuhnya in S5. In terms of deep structure, membunuh of S5 has a cohesive tie which is conjunctive with di-bunuh of S6.
despite the fact the conjunction is not overtly expressed in $S_8$. The type of conjunctive cohesion implied here is the additive one. Thus, overtly marked with the additive conjunction, $S_8$ might be something like *Kadang-kadang ia mentjoba pula membunuh kerbau* "sometimes he also tries to kill a buffalo".

In $S_9$ kerbau itu establishes a cohesive relation lexically (by repetition) with kerbau in $S_8$. Harimau itu establishes lexically a minimal cohesive chain with harimau itu in $S_4$. Their presupposing item is harimau in $S_3$. Itu doesn't need to be accounted for since its description has been presented in the description of harimau itu in $S_4$.

Tetapi "however" is a conjunction which signals a cohesive relationship of the adversative type between the information of $S_9$ and of $S_8$. The basic meaning of the adversative relation according to Halliday and Hasan is "contrary to expectation".

Dalam hal itu "in such an event" again is another conjunction which signals a cohesive relationship between $S_{10}$ and $S_9$. The kind of cohesion established here is conditional. It might be an emphatic one, not just a simple one. Furthermore, part of the conjunction, i.e., hal "event", is anaphoric; this is signalled by itu "that" (=such). It points back to the possibility of the buffalo fighting the tiger. If the implied part is made explicit we would have the following: Dalam hal kerbau melawan harimau... "In the event of the buffalo fighting the tiger". Besides the conjunctive relation, perkelahian, "fight" in $S_{10}$ is lexically and semantically related to melawan "oppose" in $S_8$. Thus these two items establish a lexical cohesion between $S_9$ and $S_{10}$.

In $S_{11}$ menang "win" and kalah "lose" are semantically related to perkelahian "fight" in $S_{10}$ and melawan "oppose" in $S_9$, i.e., the latter two items presuppose the former two items. So there is a lexical cohesion between these items which is causal.

In $S_{12}$, pula "also", the additive conjunction discussed in $S_2$, relates $S_{12}$ with $S_1$ by modifying namanya binatang "the name of the animal" which establishes a lexical cohesion with nama binatang in $S_1$. Gambar "picture" also establishes the same type of cohesion with ter-lukis "picted" in $S_1$. Notice the distance of cohesive relation between these two sentences. This shows that this relation occurs on the episode level and not only on the sentence or paragraph level.

Cambar jang dibawah ini "the picture below" is cataphorically related to the picture of the mouse in the text.

In $S_{13}$ is a confirmation of something that is implied in the text, i.e., the imagination of the narrator of the reader's response: Tikus "mouse". Thus $S_{13}$ is in an elliptical cohesive relation with the understood item Tikus.

In $S_{14}$ and $S_{15}$ tikus "mouse" is the lexical repetition of the item implied in the response of $S_{13}$.

In $S_{16}$ and $S_{17}$ the pronoun ia "he" refers to tikus in $S_{14}$.

In $S_{18}$ forms the start of the narrative proper. However, due to the narrator's monologue which contains the description of the main characters, the tiger and the mouse, we sense that there is somehow a relationship between the specific harimau in $S_{18}$ and the generic harimau described in the narrator's monologue. This relationship is textual and cohesive despite the fact that harimau is modified by the indefinite article sektor "a". The use of such an indefinite article is characteristic of the beginning of every narrative. The kind of cohesive relationship between the specific harimau of $S_{18}$ and the generic one described in $S_{1-10}$ is a lexical one.

In $S_{19}$ tempat-nya tidur itu "his sleeping place" substitutes dalam hutan dibawah sebatang kayu "underneath the trunk of a fallen tree" in $S_{18}$. The device which makes $S_{18}$ and $S_{19}$ cohesive is substitution. (Its nature is anaphoric in this instance. In English, anaphoric substitutions are the unmarked case, whereas the cataphoric ones are the marked ones.) Notice that the substituting element is nominal, whereas the substituted one is adverbial.

-nya of tempatnya is a personal or pronominal reference which refers back to harimau in $S_{1}$. Tidur functioning as a noun modifier in $S_{19}$ is a lexical repetition of tidur as verb in $S_{18}$. Itu marks the fact that tempatnya tidur is old
information and refers to the new information dalam hutang dibawah sebatang kaju in S16. The type of cohesive relation established between these two items is an anaphoric reference signalled by the neutral demonstrative itu.

In S20 ketika itu "at that time" and tiki tus itu "the mouse", both as old information, point back respectively to pada suatu hari "one day" in S18 and seekor tikus "a mouse" in S19, both as new information. The cohesive relation between the former pair, i.e. ketika itu and pada suatu hari, is established through substitution, whereas the relation between the latter is done through lexical cohesion (repetition).

In S21 the personal pronoun -nja following dikeluarkan and kepala refers to tikus itu in S20. The first nja is agentive and the second one is possessive. The cohesive relation between S21 and S20 is established by these two items, i.e., by -nja and tikus itu; this type of cohesion is called pronominal or personal reference.

In S22 the passive form dilihat is a lexical repetition of the active form me-lihat in S21, and the agentive nja refers to tikus itu in S20. These situations create respectively a lexical cohesion between S22 and S21, and a pronominal or personal reference one between S22 and S20.

-pun "even" in S22 is a conjunction that relates manusia "person" with apa-apa "anything", the direct object of S22. This form of the clause manadia-tidak ada of S23, a comparative construction: S22: "There wasn't anything that he saw." S23: "There wasn't even a person in sight." The meaning of the cohesive relation of these two items, signalled by pun, is additive with the submeaning "beyond expectation/in favor of (favorative?)". Besides this, tidak ada in S23 is a lexical repetition of tak ada in S22. Notice that tidak is the emphatic form of tak, due to the fact that S23 is a comparative form of S22 as has been pointed out above. Notice also that kelihat in S22 is basically a lexical repetition of dilihat in S20, and me-lihat in S21; thus they form a lexical cohesive chain. Surface-structurally kelihat don’t take an agent, whereas dilihat does. The agent of kelihat is optional whereas the agent of dilihat is obligatory. The reason why kelihat optionally takes an agent which is deleted in this case is due to the fact that the agent is already present surface-structurally in S22. Besides this, S23 is conjoined to S22 by pun, hence, the agentive nja in S22 has the potential to take charge as agent over S23.

Mekhat in S21 simply doesn't take an agent since the clause in which it occurs is conjoined by bali with the preceding one where the agentive subject -nja follows dikeluarkan.

Sudah itu baru-lah is a conjunction which is part of a chain of sequential temporal conjunctions. This cluster starts out with mula mula "first" and lalu "then" in S21 and ends with sudah itu baru-lah "after that". This cluster of conjunctions makes three actions hang together: a) the poking out of the head in the first clause of S21; b) the looking to check the safety of the surroundings in the second clause of S21; and c) the coming out of the hole in S24.

Notice that semantically the second clause of S21 forms a unit with S22 and S23, but not with the first clause of S21. Notice also that the second clause of S21 focusses on the direction of looking and sentences 22 and 23 focus on the objects of the looking.

The definite article itu refers anaphorically first to action a) and then to action b) as mentioned above.

The type of cohesion established in these sentences is accomplished through a chain of sequential temporal conjunctions.

Keluar "come out" (old information) in S24 is a lexical repetition of keluar (new information) in S20. Their occurrence creates a lexical cohesion between these two sentences.

Mentjahari makanan "look for food" in S25 and S20 is an identical case with keluar in S24 and S20.

Berdjalan kesana kemari "walk here and there" in S25 is possible only after the action keluar "come out" in S24. In other words, keluar is a prerequisite for berdjalan kesana kemari. So there is some kind of cohesive relation between these two sentences, because of the relation between these two items.
Tiba-tiba dilihatnya harimau in S_{26} is an opposite or a contrary-to-expectation situation to the one described in S_{22} and S_{23}. These two situations are implicitly related by some conjunction, i.e., walaupun (or biarpun) "although" plus a clause repeating what was mentioned in S_{22}. Thus, the implied conjunctive clause might read as follows: "Walaupun beberapa saat jang lalu tak ada apa-apa dilihatnya tiba-tiba..." "Although he didn’t see anything a while ago, suddenly..." (This conjunctive clause must be implied, otherwise tiba-tiba "suddenly" wouldn’t have any impact at all on the reader.) Thus, these two situations are made cohesive by an implied adversative conjunction (or conjunctive clause). Another interpretation, which is perhaps more likely, is one which interprets these two situations as cohesively related implicitly by the adversative conjunction tetapi "but", which can be explicitly attached in the initial position of S_{26}.

Harimau jang sedang tidur itu in S_{26} is again a lexical repetition, with some modification, of seekor harimau tidur in S_{18}. The former is an NP (old information, marked by itu), whereas the latter is a clause (new information, marked by seekor). The cohesion between these two items is a lexical one.

Notice that from S_{26} way back to S_{24}, except S_{23}, there is a cohesive chain of the 3rd person singular pronoun, either in the form of -nja or ia, pointing back to the substantial element tiku itu in S_{20}.

In S_{24} ini "this" refers back to harimau jang sedang tidur itu "the sleeping tiger" in S_{26}. The cohesion established here is the reference type marked by a demonstrative. Tikus itu in S_{27} is another substantial element after the cohesive chain of ia and nja referring back to the first tiku itu in S_{20} (i.e., the first after the introductory indefinite tiku in S_{19}). If we represent this situation as a wave contour, we have the following diagram:

seekor tikus tikus itu -nja -nja ia ia -nja tikus itu

The big waves represent some kind of foregrounding. Now why foregrounding? In S_{27} the foregrounding is necessary to contrast tikus itu with the foregrounded harimau in S_{26}.

Suppose S_{27} has instead of tikus itu the personal pronoun ia "he". The reader who reads this text would think that ia refers to harimau just because of the fact that harimau was just mentioned in S_{26}. So, the substantial element tikus itu is repeated here to avoid confusion on the part of the reader and to ease and smooth his reading for enjoyment.

Starting with S_{28} and through S_{30} we have the cohesive chain of ia, -nja and -nja pointing back to tikus itu in S_{27}.

In S_{28}, S_{29}, S_{30}, and S_{31} the NP harimau itu occurs in a cohesive chain. It is foregrounded here because tikus, in the background (which is why it is represented by a cohesive chain of 3rd person pronouns from S_{28} - S_{30}), is exploring the thing that he suddenly sees.

In S_{29} itu "that" refers to the information in S_{28} - pun "even" here is a conjunction which relates the two sentences.

S_{30} and S_{29} hang together, because the latter forms the reason why the action expressed in S_{30} is taking place. The two sentences are conjoined by some implicit conjunction, i.e., makanja or oleh sebab itu both of which mean "that is why". These conjunctions can be explicitly placed preceding S_{30}.

Diteruskanja memeriksa "he continued to examine" in S_{30} presupposes that the mouse has been examining the tiger up to that point. The presupposing item is expressed in S_{28}. The presupposing item is memeriksa. The cohesion between these two sentences is established through nominal substitution, because memeriksa here fills the object slot in the sentence.

Tetapi "but" in S_{31} conjoins S_{31} with S_{28}, S_{29} and S_{30}. It is a conjunction which expresses contrary-to-expectation, in this case contrary to the expectation of the mouse. Kepala "head" in S_{31} is a lexical repetition of kepala in S_{30}. Thus S_{31} is a) conjunctively cohesive with S_{28}, S_{29} and S_{30}, and b) lexically cohesive with S_{30}.

-nja "he" and -nja "his" in S_{32} refer back to harimau itu "the tiger" in S_{21}. Kepala "head" in S_{32} is a lexical repetition of kepala in S_{31}, thus the three of them form another cohesive chain.
S₃₃ is made cohesive with the others gone before by the lexical repetition of harimau and tikus.

-pun is in S₃₄ conjoins S₃₃ with the preceding sentence. In this context it is a conjunction which marks a cohesive relation of reason and result between these two sentences, S₃₃ being the reason and S₃₄ being the result: and the verbs expressing this relation are respectively menekan "press on" and berteriak "yell".

Berteriak "yell" in S₃₄ refers cataphorically to what is expressed in S₃₅ and S₃₆. Furthermore, kata "say" in S₃₅ is some kind of lexical repetition of berteriak in S₃₄ (despite their difference in form).

S₃₄ is the tiger's response to the mouse's plea to be released in S₃₆. It is a speech act which means

Saja tak akan lepas-kan engkau
I not will loose-caus. you
I'm not going to release you

Notice that in this implied meaning, lepas-kan is a lexical repetition of lepaskan in S₃₆. Through these items a lexical cohesion is established between these two sentences.

Another interpretation takes saja tak akan lepaskan engkau as a sentence which is deleted preceding lepaskan kumakan.

Minta niuwa "you ask for my life" in S₃₈ is another way of saying Aku hendak tuan makan "you want to eat me up". From this implied meaning we see that makan is a lexical repetition of the same word in S₃₇. This then creates a lexical cohesive relation between S₃₆ and S₃₇.

In S₃₉ the speaking up 1st person pronoun patik "I" refers to tikus in S₃₈ and mengenjangkan "satisfy", is semantically related to makan "eat", in S₃₇, i.e., "satisfaction" is a result of the action of "eating" (although the act of eating is not carried out in this context). Moreover, S₃₉ is cohesively related to S₃₈ by an implicit conjunction tetapi "but" which expresses a meaning relation of contrary-to-expectation between these two sentences. This conjunction occurs initially in S₃₉.

In S₄₀ the demonstrative itu "that" is anaphorically related to what is stated in S₃₈ and S₃₉. Moreover, -pun is a conjunction expressing a causal relationship between S₄₀ as the result, and S₃₈ and S₃₉ as the reason.

S₄₁ is the tiger's confirmation of (or agreeing with) what the mouse said in S₃₉, and katamu itu "what you said" is the clausal substitution of S₃₉.

Binatang jang besar-besar "much bigger animals" in S₄₂ refers back to and is the opposite of badan patik terlalu "my body is too small" in S₃₉. Moreover, since S₄₁, as has been said, is a clausal substitution of S₃₉, S₄₂ is therefore in a cohesive relation with S₄₁ as well.

Tiada alasan mencukupi "won't be enough" in S₃₉ refers back to and is the tiger's paraphrase of the mouse's tiada akan mengenjangkan "will not satisfy" in S₃₉.

Terima kasih banjak banjak "thank you very much" in S₄₄ is a response to the tiger's action melepaskan "release" in S₄₃.

Tiadalama sesudah itu "not long after that" in S₄₅ is a temporal conjunction which conjoins the incident that happens in the same sentence, and which is developed throughout the rest of the story, and the incident that has taken place in the preceding episode, i.e., from S₃₈ up to S₃₆. Itu refers back to the things happening in the first episode. Thus, sesudah itu is a conjunction that works on the episode level, and itu is a demonstrative that points back to things on the episode level.

S₄₆ is in a cohesive relation with S₄₅ because of the repetition of the lexical item dijarai "net".

Tiada digunakan putus "did not get severed" in S₄₇ is a confirming information on the quality of the net described in S₄₆, i.e., amat kaku "very strong". The meaning relation between these two items is causal, i.e., the former is the result and the latter is the reason. As a matter of fact, the whole S₄₆ is the reason for the information given in S₄₇ as the result. S₄₇ does not have any explicit direct object. It does not have to because this information has already been supplied by S₄₆. One might try to repeat it in S₄₇, the result of which would be: Bagaimanapun kuatnya tali dijarai jang amat kaku itu ditariik oleh harimau itu, tiada digunakan putus. However, stylistically this is bad in relation with S₄₆, because the information load
is too light and this makes the sentence sound unnatural in this context. Thus $S_{47}$ and $S_{46}$ are made cohesive through a causal meaning relation and a nominal ellipsis.

Marahnya dan sakitnya "his anger and pain" in $S_{48}$ is the result of the unsuccessful effort the tiger made as mentioned in $S_{47}$.

The action of lari ketakutan "ran terrified" is the result of mereang se-kuat kuantja "roared as forcefully as he could", which forms the reason in $S_{48}$.

The subject of $S_{50}$ was predicated by terkeduh djuuga "was also startled". Juga indicates that ketakutan "terrified" in $S_{49}$ is semantically related to terkeduh, i.e., the former implies the latter, but not necessarily the other way around (in this context). -pun "even" conjoins the two sentences with the meaning relation of contrary-to-expectation. The NP raung harimau itu "roar of the tiger" ($S_{50}$) points back to the proposition ia meraung "he roared" ($S_{48}$).

$S_{51}$ is cohesively related to $S_{50}$ by ja "he" as a pronominal reference to tikus itu "the mouse". The modifier harimau jang melepasukan njawanja itu "the tiger who had saved his soul" in $S_{51}$ points back to sambil melepasukan tikus itu "while releasing the mouse" in $S_{49}$. There are two types of cohesion operating here to relate these two sentences: a) the lexical type by repeating melepasukan and b) the substitution type through njawanja itu replacing tikus itu. Although the mouse doesn't know the situation of the tiger, hal "plight" here refers back to kena djari ngot "caught in a net" in $S_{45}$. The type of cohesion established here is that of nominal substitution.

Sedab itu "therefore" in $S_{52}$ is a conjunction which relates $S_{52}$, the result, with $S_{51}$, the reason. Itu "that" of sedab itu refers to the whole information conveyed in $S_{51}$. Thus $S_{52}$ could be omitted and $S_{52}$ would read as follows: Sedab itu ia ingin hendak mengetahui hal harimau jang melepasukan njawanja itu beriari-larilah ia menujui tempat harimau itu "Because he wanted very much to know the plight of the tiger who had freed his life, he ran towards the place where the tiger was".

The subordinate clause of $S_{53}$ presupposes that the mouse had reached the place where the tiger was and causes $S_{52}$, therefore, to be cohesively related to this sentence. Thus, by presupposition, tempat "place" and harimau "tiger" are lexically repeated in $S_{52}$. Hal "plight" is a lexical repetition of hal in $S_{51}$. Radja binatang itu "king of animals" is a substitution of harimau itu "the tiger" in $S_{52}$.

$S_{54}$ is an elliptical conditional sentence. The if-clause is left unsaid. If it were said, $S_{54}$ would be:

Kalau tuan-ku me-raung, nanti....
If sir-my pref-3-roar
If my lord do

Part of the unsaid part is a repetition of tuanku meraung in $S_{53}$. Thus, through this clausal ellipsis a cohesive relation is established between $S_{54}$ and $S_{53}$.

In $S_{55}$ tuanku "my lord" is a lexical repetition of tuanku in $S_{54}$ which in turn is a lexical repetition of tuanku in $S_{53}$. Djuuga "also" which modifies tuanku patik lepaskan "I release my lord" indicates that an act of releasing has taken place before, i.e., the tiger releasing the mouse as mentioned in $S_{53}$. Djuuga is, therefore, an additive conjunction which conjoins $S_{54}$ with $S_{43}$, and lepaskan "release" is a lexical repetition of lepaskan in $S_{43}$. Through these two items, $S_{55}$ and $S_{43}$ made to hang together.

In $S_{56}$ berkata "say" is lexical repetition of berkata in $S_{43}$. Itu "that" (*-thra) is a substitution for all that is asserted in $S_{53}$, $S_{43}$ and $S_{54}$.

-pun "then" (meaning "therefore") in $S_{57}$ is a causal conjunction which ties $S_{54}$, as the reason, with $S_{57}$ as the result.

$S_{58}$ is cohesively tied to $S_{52}$ because of the lexical repetition of tali djaring "the cord of the net" and the reason-result meaning relation between mengerat "cut" ($S_{56}$) and putus "break" ($S_{58}$). Terlepas "freed" is the result of the breaking of the net which in turn is the result of the cutting of the net in $S_{56}$. So here is a cohesive chain of reason-result relations in which one result becomes the reason giving another result.

$S_{59}$ has a meaning relation of reason-result with $S_{54}$. The former is the result and the latter is the reason. As a matter
of fact, $S_{54}$ can be considered as the unsaid part of $S_{59}$ and has to follow $S_{59}$ as a negative conditional sentence. Thus, $S_{59}$ put explicitly, potentially has the following form: *Kalau tidak, nanti datang manusia kemari membunuh tuanku "If you don’t, a man will come and kill you".* With this interpretation, $S_{59}$ is cohesively tied to $S_{54}$ through a negative if-clause as the conjoining element.

The asserted part of $S_{60}$ is a response of the tiger to what the mouse has done to help him get released, as expressed in $S_{56}$ and $S_{58}$.

$S_{61}$ is the conclusion of the whole story (which starts at $S_{18}$). *Demikianlah "thus" is the conclusion marker; it conjoins the concluding sentence with the whole story. Keibaikan harimau itu "the kindness of the tiger" specifically refers to what the tiger did for the mouse and is explicitly expressed in $S_{43}$: Tikus itu dapat membalas kebaikan harimau itu "the mouse was able to repay the kindness of the tiger" refers cataphorically to melepaskan dia dari bahaya maut "saving him from the danger of death" and both these last two items summarize what the mouse, out of thankfulness, did for the tiger, which has been specifically made clear in $S_{56}$ and $S_{58}$.

2. GENERALISATIONS AND UNIVERSALS

2.1. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The five types of cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan for English text analysis can also be used as devices in Malay text analysis. Following is a summary of the cohesive devices that are used in the text.

1. Reference
   a. Personal or pronominal reference, for instance the agentive enclitic -nia "he" in $S_{22}$ which refers to tikus itu "the mouse" in $S_{26}$, dia "he" in $S_{3}$ which refers to harimau itu "the tiger" in $S_{4}$.
   b. Demonstrative reference, for example ini "this" in $S_{2}$ which refers to harimau yang sedang tidur itu "the sleeping tiger" in $S_{26}$, the first itu "that" in $S_{40}$ which refers to $S_{38}$ and $S_{39}$.

2. Ellipsis
   a. Nominal ellipsis, for example the deleted object binatang ini "this animal" (or gambar binatang ini "the picture of this animal") in $S_{2}$.
   b. Clausal ellipsis (see the discussion of $S_{54}$ on page 51).

3. Lexical Cohesion, e.g., kerbau in $S_{9}$ which is a repetition of kerbau in $S_{8}$.

4. Conjunction
   a. Additive, e.g., pula "also" in $S_{7}$ which conjoins the evil of the tiger with his strength in $S_{6}$.
   b. Adversative, e.g., tetapi "but" in $S_{9}$ which conjoins the same sentence with $S_{8}$.
   c. Temporal
      c.1. Interrupted, e.g., tiada lama sesudah itu "not long after that" in $S_{45}$ which conjoins the incident that happens in the same sentence, developed throughout the rest of the story, with the incident that has taken place in the first episode, i.e., from $S_{18}$ - $S_{44}$.
      c.2. Sequential, e.g., mula-mula......lahu......sudah itu in $S_{21}$ and $S_{24}$ (Cf. the discussion of *sudah itu baharulah*, page 45, 3rd paragraph).
   d. Reason-result, e.g., sebab itu "therefore" in $S_{52}$ which relates the same sentence, the result, with $S_{51}$, the reason.
   e. Conclusive, e.g., demikianlah "thus" in $S_{1}$ which conjoins the same sentence with the rest of the story.

5. Substitution
   a. Nominal, e.g., radja binatang "king of animals" in $S_{53}$ substitutes for harimau "tiger" in $S_{52}$.
   b. Clausal, e.g., katamu itu "what you said" in $S_{41}$ replaces what is expressed in $S_{39}$ (cf. p.49).
Besides the five types discussed by Halliday and Hasan, there is another type of cohesion in Malay—covert logical cohesion—which may exist between two sentences. This relationship is not manifested overtly.

Following are the subtypes of this kind of cohesion (as found in the text).

a. Oppositional, e.g., binatang jang besar besar "much bigger animals", in S\textsubscript{42} versus badan patik terlalu ketjil "my body is too small" in S\textsubscript{39}.

b. Paraphrase, e.g., the direct quote of S\textsubscript{43} is a paraphrase of S\textsubscript{39}.

c. Reason-result, e.g., the main clause of S\textsubscript{48} is the reason for what is related in S\textsubscript{49}.

Every language uses certain elements which are logically redundant but which are used anyway. In English, for example, gender, tense and number are often redundant.

Thus, the English constructions

(1) five books
(2) he ran away yesterday
(3) Ann did not go to school because she was sick

if translated into Malay would be simply

(1') *five book
(2') *He ran away yesterday
(3') *Ann didn't go to school because 3rd person (unmarked for gender) was sick.

This is due to the fact that

(a) five entails plurality
(b) yesterday entails past tense
(c) Ann entails feminine gender

In this text there are certain elements which, according
to the logic of a speaker of English, are redundant. Whether they are redundant in the sense that they can be left out without creating ungrammatical sentences, as is the case with the English examples shown above, is an unsolved problem for me right now. In other words, at this stage I am not sure whether they are typical Malay properties or not. (The reason for this uncertainty is due to the fact that this story is a translation of an international story. This I found out after finishing the first draft of the paper. To answer this question, I would have to study several original Malay texts—which I was not able to do in writing this paper.)

At any rate, on the one hand, these elements seem to contribute to the cohesive power of the text, and on the other hand, they lighten the information load of the sentence in which they occur. These elements are as follows:

1. -nia "he" in S\textsubscript{15} which is in coreference with tikus "mouse" in the same sentence.
2. -nia "he" and tidur "sleep" in S\textsubscript{19} which respectively refer to harimau and tidur in S\textsubscript{18}.
3. dahulu "first" in S\textsubscript{21} due to the presence of mula-mula "first" at the beginning of the same sentence or the other way around.
4. -nia "his" in S\textsubscript{26} which is in coreference with ia "he" in the same sentence.
5. -nia "his" in S\textsubscript{28} which is in coreference with tikus itu "the mouse" in the same sentence.
6. -nia "he" in S\textsubscript{47} which is in coreference with harimau itu "the tiger" in the same sentence.
7. the first, second and third -nia in S\textsubscript{48} which are in coreference with ia "he" in the same sentence.
8. -nia "he" in S\textsubscript{53} which is in coreference with ia "he" in the same sentence.

Suppose these elements are taken off these sentences, we would then have the following results:

15' ?? Tikus itu diam dalam liang.
2.2 BACKWARD NATURE OF COHESION

Throughout the analysis of the text in this paper we have seen that Cohesion in Malay normally works backwards, or anaphorically i.e., the interpretation of a certain element in the text depends on another element that has gone before. On the other hand, in the analysis of S34 we have a case where an element, i.e., berteriak "yell" points forward to what is expressed in S35 and S36. This is one of the few cases where cohesion works forward in the text (see also the discussion of S61 for another pointing-forward case). Hence, a conclusion can be drawn that backward cohesion (anaphora) is the unmarked case in Malay texts. This implies that, except for the occasional instance of cataphora, one cannot predict what is to come in a Malay text. Now, why is the backward nature of cohesion in Malay more normal than the forward one? Is this due to the fact that one tends to build up things through experience, i.e., through what has gone before? Is this phenomenon a universal of human behavior? If it is, then the backward nature of cohesion might be a universal linguistic phenomenon.

2.3 LEVELS OF OPERATION OF COHESION

Cohesion in this text works on five different levels.

1. Clause level
2. Sentence level
3. Paragraph level
4. Episode level
5. Text level

The first case is not dealt with in this paper. On the sentence level, Cohesion can be seen for example in the analysis of -nya of tempatnya in S19 (p.43); dilihat in S22 (p.44); sebab itu in S52 (p.50), etc.

On the paragraph level, cohesion is seen in the discussion of itu in S40 (see p.48), raung harimau itu in S50 (p.50), and berkata in S56 (p.51).
Cohesion on the episode level can be seen in the discussion of tiada lama sesudah itu in S43 (p.49).

Cohesion on the text level is seen in the discussion of demikianlah in S61 (p.52).

Besides these levels, cohesion also operates in sentence clusters within a paragraph. See, for example, tuanku discussed in S55 (p.51), tetapi in the analysis of S31 (p.47), sesudah itu barulah, as part of a cluster of conjunctions, discussed in S21 (p.45).

At this stage my analysis is not comprehensive enough to be adequately predictive, simple because the scope of this paper is very limited. I realize that there is a lot of things that need to be revised once more Malay texts are studied. However, I feel that I have a legitimate reason for presenting these suggestions at this point in order to begin to pioneer this area of research an to stir up interest in exploring language universals in the area of cohesion on the text level, especially as more "Eastern" texts are analysed.

Notes:

* My special appreciation to Professor K.L. Pike, Professor Kenneth Gregerson, Marit Kana and Christine Ajamiseba for their valuable comments and editorial assistance.
1 taken from Lamelijn and Oesman, 1949, pp. 33 - 36.
3 Ibid. Chapter I, p. 1.
4 Ibid. Chapter I, p. 31.
5 ke...an has a passive sense; it is used to foreground the recipient of the action.
6 -lah in this context forms a unit with -pun, and functions as a conjunction expressing a causal meaning relation of reason-result with the sentence or clause that precedes the pun...lah construction: the pun...lah being the result and the preceding clause or sentence being the reason.
7 I'm not sure whether they discuss this non-verbal case in their book. I did not have time to check in detail their chapter on Reference.

8 Verbal is a self-explanatory modifier I have to attach to make my point clear.
10 This is my own insertion.
12 As a matter of fact, it refers more specifically to dinawah sebatang kaju "beneath the trunk of a fallen tree" as a specific location; dalam hutan "in the forest" is a generic location.
13 Semantically dilihat is identical to kelihatan: di- and ke--an are grammatical devices used to foreground the direct object.
14 Thus with the optional agent S23 will be as follows: manusiapun tidak ada kelihatan oleh-nja.
15 by-him
16 In different contexts both of them may mean different things although semantically they share some features in common.
17 jang "which" makes the predicate amat kukuh a NP modifier. That is why itu follows amat kukuh.
18 That is, the mouse, knowing the tiger, shouldn't be startled, but he was because the roar was too loud.
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Apakah nama binatang yang terlukiš ini?
Kamu kenal semuannya.
Harimau, bukan?
Harimau itu binatang yang besar dan amat kuat. Manusia takut akan dia. Sekuat-kuat orang mudah sadja dapat dibunuhnya.

LAMIEJN DAN DORAAN, MATAURI TARTIT, II.

Djahatnja pula, tabi'atnja tjulas.
Kadang-kadang ia mentjoba membunuh kerbau. Tetapi kalau kerbau itu tahu harimau itu datang, kerap kali ia melawan. Dalam hal itu tercjadilah perkelahan jang amat hebat. Sekali-sekali ada djuga kerbau jang menang, tetapi atjap kalih la ia kalah.

Apa pula namanja binatang jang ketjil pada gambar jang dibawah ini?
Pada suatu hari adakah seekor harimau tidur dalam hutan dibawah sebatang tuju. Dekat tempatnja tidur itu ada liang seekor tikus. Ketika itu tikus itu hendak keluar mentjahari markan.


Tetapi harimau itu terkedjut, lalu djaga, karena

„Minta njaw, tuanku,” kata tikus itu dengan tangisnya. „Badan patik terlalu ketij, tiada akan mengengkangkan tuanku.”

Mendengar itu harimau itu pun kasihan. „Betul katanja itu. Aku biasa memakan binatang jang besar-besaran. Engkau ini tiadakan mengikutupi,” katanja, sambil melepaskan tikus itu.

„Terima kasih banjak-banjak, tuangku,” kata tikus itu, sambil berlari setjepat-tjepatnja.

Tiada lama sesudah itu harimau itu kena djaring. Tali djaring itu amat kuku. Begaimanapun kuantja ditarik oleh harimau itu, tiada djuga putus.

Sebab marahnja dan sakitnja, iapun meraung sekutu-kuatnja. Sekalian binatang dalam hutan itu lari ketakutan, tiada tentu kemana tudjunja.

Tikus itu pun terkedjut djuga mendengar raung harimau itu. Ia ingin hendak mengetahui hal harimau jang telah melepaskan njawanja itu. Sebab itu berlarilah ia menjadju tempat harimau itu.

Setelah dilihatnja hal radja binatang itu, iapun berkata: „Djanganal tuanku meraung lagi! Nanti datang manusia kemari membunuh tuanku. Mudah-mudahan dapat djuga tuanku patik lepasan.”

Sementara berkata itu, dirumalainalah mengerat tali djaring itu. Harimau itu pun diamlah.

Karena tikus itu sangat ketij, lamalah baharu tali djaring itu putus dan harimau itu terlepas.

„Pergilah tuanku djauh-djauh dari sini!” udjar tikus itu.

„Terima kasih banjak-banjak,” kata harimau itu, sambil berlari masuk kedalam hutan.

Demikanlah tikus itu dapat membalas kebaikan harimau itu, melepaskan dia dari bahaya maut.
A PRAGMATIC ACCOUNT OF ISIRAWA NARRATIONS

Carol J. Erickson

IKHTISAR

Dalam makalah ini wacana naratif suku Isirawa digambarkan dalam hubungannya dengan konteks pragmatik sebagai pokok titik permulaan analisis dan matriks dalam mana wacana diciptakan. Dua tipe utama dari cerita-cerita Isirawa, khayalan (rarara fofoera) dan kenyataan (rarara), dan subtipe-subtipenya yang beraneka ragam dibicarakan dalam makalah ini, mulai dari orang yang menceriterakannya dan pendengarannya sebagai mana dilihat dari pandangan penduduk asli. Komponen-komponen lain dari konteks pragmatik terdiri dari: waktu, tempat, kegunaan, perkiraan-perkiraan, sikap, pernyataan dan interpretasi, ekspresi dan tanggapan.
analytical starting point and the matrix in which discourse is born. This approach to the study of language begins with the storyteller (narrator) and his audience as viewed through the eyes of a native speaker. Gregerson's (1976) revised model of the components and relations in a Communication Act (see Figure 1) may be used to sort out the relevant facts of Isirawa narrative discourse.

Figure 1. COMMUNICATION ACT

COMMUNICATION ACT

COMMUNICATION SOURCE (OS) COMMUNICATION MEANS (OM) COMMUNICATION GOAL (OG)

It has only been relatively recently that linguists have begun focusing serious attention on units of grammar higher than the sentence. They began by studying paragraph and discourse structure, gaining many insights into lower units of grammar, such as the sentence, by understanding how they are part of a larger whole. (Longacre, 1968) In the seventies linguists increasingly began to ask themselves whether discourse itself must not in turn be interpreted in terms of something broader. Can we fully explain and analyse discourse just by the units it contains? Can we identify discourse genre by grammatical means only, or do we also need the emic insight that a native speaker of the language under analysis can give us?

The purpose of this paper is to answer the above questions for Isirawa narrative discourse by focusing on the total speech act (the pragmatic context) as the ultimate
Gregerson explains this model as follows (personal communication):

"The above diagram of the Communication Act is intended to convey the notion that communication fundamentally consists of a complex pair of linked 'devices' identified as a communicative source (CS), for example, a human speaker, and a communicative goal (CG), for example, a human hearer. The CS may be said to determine (DET) in some sense, by his communicational initiative, the internal state of the CG. Both the CS and the CG are constituted of the triplex of internal functions, volition/purpose (VOL), emotion/attitude (ATT), and presupposition/belief (PRSP). Thus, what a particular speaker (x) communicates has been filtered through his will, feelings, and beliefs. Likewise, what a specific addressee (y) understands from the same communication is the product of a similar filtering process via his own will, feelings and beliefs.

In order to accomplish his communicative purposes the CS asserts (ASRT) or 'predicates', in Searle's (1969) terms, the information to be transmitted. This transmission must take some overt expression (EXPRS) form as linguistic, kinesic, etc. stuff.

On the other side of the communicative process the CG perceives (PRCV) the formal structure of the overt signal transmitted by CS. From this superficial message form the CG constructs a more abstract interpretation (INTRP) of its information content.

Finally, each of the functions in which speaker x and addressee y participate as part of the communication process are rooted in space/location (L) and time (T). While the L of the Communication Act is often, for all practical purposes, the same for CS and CG, it is essential to distinguish the two in theory in order to handle communication at a distance (e.g. telephone calls, etc.). Likewise T must in principle be distinguished for CS and CG."

1. AN OVERVIEW

In this section I want to summarize some general aspects of Isirawa discourse from a pragmatic perspective, including the speech act context and the types and structure of the narrative pieces.

1.1 ASPECTS OF NARRATION

Applying the pragmatic aspects mentioned in Section 0, the following questions may be raised for each of the narratives:

Speaker/Audience: Who is able to tell a story and who can listen to it?

Time: Are there significant or conventional time dimensions? Perhaps the most important thing to note is when during the 24-hour period, or on what occasion is the narrative usually related since in a language group where there are no TV's, tape recorders, or books, the time of the telling is the same time as that of the hearing.

Location: Are there typical places where the narratives are recited?

Purpose: What is the speaker's purpose in telling the story? Why have the hearers (audience) come? What are the particular choices throughout the text that reflect the goal of the speaker vis-à-vis the hearers?

Presuppositions: What knowledge do the speaker and the audience share which at various points in the narration becomes relevant? What is believed to be fact and what is believed to be fiction?

Attitudes: What is the attitude of the speaker and the audience toward the story (that is being told) and the total situation that encompasses the event? What emotions underly the speaker's words and what feelings are aroused in those who hear him?

Assertion and Interpretation: What is the speaker really trying to convey by the overt expressions he produces? Is the hearer's intended interpretation clear?

Expression and Perception: What instances of linguistic or kinesic forms expressed by the speaker or perceived by the hearer are noteworthy or ambiguous as symbols of the underlying message being asserted?
1.2 NARRATIVES TYPES

The Isirawa distinguish two basic types of narratives, which may be glossed as 'fact' vs. 'fiction'. Further sub-types of the factual narrative may be defined in terms of their form and function. (See Figure 2.)

NARRATIVES

Fictional (rararafofoera) Factual (rarara)

Folktales (nomirarara) Ethnography Morality Tale Current Events

Figure 2. Isirawa Narrative Types

1.21 FICTIONAL NARRATIVES

The FOLKTALE is the only fictional narrative type. The Isirawa term for folktale is nomirarara (as differentiated from rarara 'talk'). The folktale is formally distinctive because of its special vocabulary used to refer to people and things. The named folktale characters are special too, for they are usually spirits (cin< Indonesian jin 'spirit').

1.22 FACTUAL NARRATIVES

ETHNOHISTORY narratives recount non-witnessed events which are believed to be real. They are mostly origin myths. The characters are named and are understood to be real people as distinct, for example, from the spirits that inhabit the folktale. For some of these stories there are restrictions as to who can hear them and who can tell them. The Isirawa ethnography narrator is a specialist and he never tells folktales.

MORALITY TALES are generally witnessed events, that is, witnessed by someone like a grandfather and then passed on. An event that has just happened can also be made into a morality tale. The idea is that these are experiences of real people and we can learn from them. For example, in the tale called "Being Swallowed", a man finds a dead cassowary and eats it. Later, however, he is swallowed by a snake because a tree spirit had killed the bird. The moral of the story is that people shouldn't eat dead animals they find.

CURRENT EVENTS are happenings which are current in the broadest sense. News and gossip also fall into the Current Events category.

1.3 CONSTITUENTS OF NARRATIVES

Isirawa narratives have been described as occurring within a total pragmatic matrix created by a speaker and an audience with all their internal aspects at a certain time and place. This communication process defines for Isirawa the set of narrative types enumerated above. The account is not
complete, however, without saying something concerning the grammar of narratives. Discourse, like sentences, may be segmented into their relevant constituents. For Isirawa the following composite string may be suggested:

\[
\text{NARR} = \text{(Aperture)} \text{ Stage} \text{ Body} \text{ (Closure)} \text{ (Finis)}
\]

Constrains on occurrence of each of these constituents in each narrative type are summarized in the following chart:

**Figure 3. Constituent Occurrence Constraints of Narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FICTION</th>
<th>FACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOLKTALE</strong></td>
<td>ETHNOHISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aperture</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finis</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = used
0 = not used
+/0 = optional

2. **AN ANALYSIS**

In this section I will discuss each narrative type in terms of the pragmatic and discourse grammar aspects of narrations in Isirawa.

2.1 **FICTION**

2.11 **THE FOLKTALE**

The folktale Chart in Figure 4 identifies some of the pragmatic aspects that are involved in the act of telling a folktale.
The above chart is self explanatory in most aspects. In regard to PURPOSE and PRESUPPOSITIONS, folktales are not always told before a pig hunt, but hunters believe that it is helpful. Although it is not the main purpose of a folktale, some do teach a kind of lesson. In one story, Semtrove, a youth has his nose ornament stolen from him. The story tells of his search and adventures to get it back, for it was not really his own but his older brother's wife's heirloom. The moral or lesson is that one should not lose his sister-in-law's things.

The EXPRESSIONAL ASPECTS convey what the speaker is asserting. A good Isirawa storyteller is remarkably similar to a good American storyteller. He uses voice inflections, sometimes giving various characters different voices, sometimes stretching out a word (oooh!) or repeating something several times (i.e. he waited, and waited, and waited and waited). He uses eye contact with his audience (even in a dark smoke-filled room), using hand motions to indicate size—or to reach out and twist an ear. All this keeps the speaker and audience in close contact throughout the story.

Other expressional features are found in the words of the text itself. Dialogue in the story moves it along quickly and can add humor as the storyteller puts in the appropriate voice inflections, such as the exclamations people make in the story Momomoara when they get their ears twisted off. Most storytellers maintain close contact with their audience by comparing people in the story to some of those who are listening. Instead of repeating the word mirii for 'youth', he may substitute Ayupe rariye, which means 'like Ayub' (one of the audience), for the subject of a sentence, e.g. "The Ayub-like one took up his arrows."

A unique feature of the folktale is its specialized vocabulary consisting of names of characters and places found only in folktales. The people have stylized personalities and characteristics. In fact, sometimes people in the village of Amsira may refer to someone by one of these names, thereby indicating what kind of personality he has. The following is a list of the special vocabulary found only in folktales.

**people**
- Kaara 'old man'
- sumerwave 'old woman'
- mirii 'youth'
- mastitaanaa 'maiden'
- Piisaaurico 'older sister...
careful personality'
- Fafataka 'younger sister...
does everything fast'
- Tiparire 'cannibal leader'
- Truiye 'cannibal, second in command'
- Sasaporeri
- Kiriywe 'other cannibals'
- Nuwaeraorana
- Aifo 'cannibal woman'
- Ititota 'cannibal woman'

In four out of the five folktales studied, place names, if named, are also fictitious. One folktale that has Air Mati origins has the names of real Air Mati locations in it.

**places**
- Paawari 'body of water, generally a river.'
  In real life this is the name for the general classification of water spirits, and it also is sometimes used as the local name for the Apawar River.
- Ciri 'body of water, or river.' This word is more often used by the western group of Isirawa speakers where the above is used by the eastern group. The Namberamo River is sometimes referred to as Ciri.

**GRAMMAR OF THE FOLKTALE**

The structure of a well-formed Isirawa folktale (see Figure 3) typically has a formulaic APERTURE and FINISH. The APERTURE has two variations:

1. E me Naakaarii ve rarii. I this name Obj. talk 'I'm going to talk about Naakaarii.'
2. E mai Kemaare ve rive fririivaii. I this name Obj. begin start 'I'm now beginning (to talk) about Kemaare.'
This APERTURE then introduces the main character. The FINIS consists of only two words which constitute the formulaic ending of all types of discourse:

Tokrima ceso.
until here
'Up to here.'

The margins in many narrative discourses are STAGE and CLOSURE. The STAGE introduces background information regarding location and/or time (usually far past incomplete aspect), and introduces the characters that begin the action of the story. CLOSURE, which in myths, for example, ties the story to the present, is totally missing in the folktale. This is probably because there is no logical or moral conclusion in a folktale and that is one of the main functions of the CLOSURE constituent.

The BODY of the discourse is the main constituent of the narrative discourse. It is made up of units tentatively called Sentence Clusters. (This unit may be a reversal of the typical "clause chain" found in New Guinea languages (Longacre, 1972).) These units are made up of a far past completed aspect form of the verb beginning a unit, followed by several other verbs marked by incomplete aspect or no marking at all. It is interesting that the first action verb of the text in eighty percent of the folktales is the verb 'to go'.

The folktale seems to be a tension type discourse (Forster 1977). Thus, in the first part of the BODY an event occurs which ultimately must be resolved. This first part may involve one event, as in the story Semtrowe in which a girl steals the hero's nose-ornament, or several related events, as in Momomooara in which the hero goes around cutting off people's ears. Such events are followed by one or more episodes which serve to resolve the tension. In the final episode the tension is resolved and everyone 'lives happily ever after'.

2.2 NON-FICTION

As noted in Section 1.2, non-fiction or factual narratives are further divided into three main sub-types: Ethnohistory, Morality Tale and Current Events.

2.2.1 ETHNOHISTORY

Ethnohistory is subdivided by content, purpose and restrictions on the audience. The Creation Myths can be heard only by married Isirawa men. I have labeled them EXCLUSIVE. All other myths can be heard by men, women and children, so I have labeled them INCLUSIVE. The INCLUSIVE type myths can be further subdivided into those heard by all Isirawa people, and those heard only by those in a certain clan. Because this is the only major difference between the two, for the purpose of this paper I have left the INCLUSIVE ETHNOHISTORY as one unit.

EXCLUSIVE ETHNOHISTORY, THE CREATION MYTHS

Figure 5, EXCLUSIVE ETHNOHISTORY, graphs what is entailed in this speech event.
### Figure 5. EXCLUSIVE ETHNOHISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION SOURCE</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAKER:</strong> The ethnobiologist (warara maskawimawa 'one who tells old tales') is usually a respected older man.</td>
<td><strong>AUDIENCE:</strong> Married men, usually of the speaker's clan, and who have two or more sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME:</strong> The ethnobiographies are usually told at night, whenever they are requested by two or three men.</td>
<td><strong>PURPOSE:</strong> 1. To explain the origin of the world and specific things in it. 2. To pass on the tradition name of God for magical purposes such as healing or helping crops to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION:</strong> Usually a private place, either a house at night or in the jungle during the day.</td>
<td><strong>PURPOSE:</strong> 1. To learn how the world originated. 2. To learn God's name so they can use it magically to heal sick people or bring about a good harvest quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESUPPOSITIONS:</strong> 1. The story is factual. 2. The traditional personal name of God is powerful.</td>
<td><strong>PRESUPPOSITIONS:</strong> 1. The story is factual. 2. The traditional personal name of God is powerful. If women or children should accidentally hear his name, misfortune will fall on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDE:</strong> Usually brave, self-confident and serious.</td>
<td><strong>ATTITUDE:</strong> Usually fearful if they hear the traditional personal name of God, but not fearful if generic terms are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSERTIONAL ASPECTS:</strong> &quot;This is how the world came to be.&quot;</td>
<td><strong>PERCEPTION AND INTERPRETATION:</strong> All grammatical and other structural features must be interpreted by the audience. (For a specific example, see Section 2.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPRESSIONAL ASPECTS:** ORAL AND VISUAL: See Folktales Chart, Figure 4.

**TEXTUAL:**
1. Story is stylized; there is little room for variation in telling it.
2. Explains background of present customs and gives basis for natural phenomena.
3. The generic terms for the creator of the ocean (Pupuwarli) and the creator of everything else (Marac) are generally used. Each clan has its own personal name for God which they share with no one else.
4. The constituents of the discourse occur in the pattern summarized in 1.3 above.

As opposed to the Folktale, both the speaker and the audience of the Exclusive Ethnohistory are restricted. All women know the generic names of the two creators and the gist of the stories. It is legal for them to hear the stories in theory, but in practice it is not usually allowed because of the fear that the traditional personal name of God could somehow slip out during the narration, causing potential harm to the women. There is one group of women who are allowed to hear the traditional personal name of God, and those are the ones who are barren.

The personal name of God is considered powerful magic in traditional belief. His name is whispered and blown into leaves which are rubbed on sick people or women having a difficult labor. His name is spoken when sago trees (sago is the Istrawa staple food) are planted, to assure quick growth and perhaps even a harvest within seven years. The particular misfortune which may befall a person who hears the name of one of the creator depends on which creator's name he hears. If he has heard the name of the creator of the ocean (Pupuwarli), his canoe may turn over, or a large wave may wash him into the sea and drown him. If a young man should hear Marace's real name, his wives will have only daughters. For either men or women who hear Marace's name, a tree may fall and crush them to death or they may fall to their death from a tall tree.

The overall attitude of both the speaker and audience is much more serious during the narration of a myth than during a folktale, since what is being asserted is considered to be true.

**EXPRESSIONAL FACTORS**

Apart from the text itself, the way a narrator of Ethnohistories puts himself across to the audience is important. He uses voice inflection, sometimes singing a short part—when the character himself is singing—using the language which that particular character uses, which is often the Kwerba (Air Mati) language.
Unlike the Folktale, this being a factual story cannot be added to, so the history has the same form regardless of who tells it.

GRAMMAR OF ETHNOHISTORY

I am aware of only two creators and two creation myths in Isirawa, both of which begin immediately with the STAGE. Following introduction of the main characters, background information, such as location or state of the world at that time, is given. The Marace story begins as follows:

**Takii pemii. Marace afofo ve varusaami.**
father is god girl Obj. gave birth
The Father exists. God gave birth to a girl.

**Pevase taataoofe wariisaami. U maarinaii tona.**
then boy gave birth earth this stomach
Then he gave birth to a boy. On the face of this earth

**mavase warare paii. Pina tona ninisiniivaa cecero**
this tree no ocean stomach to see like there were no trees. It was like looking at the ocean.

**piimarinaii. U tokriima so warare paii.**
which is earth up to at tree no
Even way over there, there were no trees.

The BODY is composed of episodes leading up to the creation of the ocean (in the Pupuwarai myth) and creation of trees, night and day and the institution of marriage in Marace. The episodes are in chronological order.

Continuing on in the Marace story, the episodes are as follows:

1. The children look for food but have no leaves to wrap the food in.
2. They continually hunt for food and rest very little, for there is no night.
3. God makes night so they will get some rest.
4. The children sleep.
5. God gives the son tobacco to smoke.
6. God makes morning.
7. God makes plants, especially trees.
8. God tells the boy to consider the girl his wife.

A CLOSURE follows in which the events of the story are offered as the explanation for patterns of life today, thus

"Mankind was a result of that first marriage. They must have used the exchange system for getting a bride because we do the same now."

or

"When you see big waves you know that Pupuwarai is here whipping them up."

The Ethnohistory ends with the traditional closure,

**Tokriima ceso.**
until here
'Up to here'
In this type of myth, the speaker is typically a man, rarely a woman. The most important credential for an ethnohistory narrator is that he be well versed in the traditional tales. A slip-up in narration could lead to embarrassment, the most devastating of experiences for an Isirawa.

One of the purposes of this type of myth is to teach proper behavior. The teaching is not explicit but must be deduced by the audience. Often the behavior of one of the main characters in the narrative is the opposite of what is expected in Isirawa culture. For example, in the story Tri, Tri is caught having sexual relations with a younger sister of his two wives. He is highly embarrassed and the story shows how he tries to hide because of his embarrassment. Thus the lesson in the story is,

"We shouldn't have sexual relations with our wife's younger sister."

According to the Isirawa, some of the lessons learned in other myths are:

In the story Came: "It tells us why a certain bird tells us when people are going to die."

and in the story Arimo: "If our dog kills another man's dog, we have to kill our dog or a war might start."

Many of the songs that are sung and danced at traditional dances were, according to the Isirawa, composed by Came. (Oosterwal 1961 notes that Came is a common character found in stories among the various language groups of the Sarmi area.) According to tradition, she composed most of the dance songs while people were trying to kill her. Therefore her story is told at dances and young people are told, "This is the part of the story where she made up this song."

Although the fear of being killed if one hears another
clan's history is nowadays beginning to disappear, at least fifty percent of the clan history narrators, including some young men in their twenties and thirties, are still very careful about relating their clan histories in the presence of non-clan members.

EXPRESSITIONAL ASPECTS

The Inclusive Ethnohistories all take place in the far past tense. Near the end, that is, in the CLOSURE, the tense may change to yesterday or today past as the speaker ties in these past events to the situation of today.

The characters in these histories all have personal names except for one clan history, in which kinship terms are used instead of names. The names of places are actual places within Isirawa territory or the surrounding area.

The skillful history narrator is also a good teacher. He knows just how much his audience knows about the background of the story and tries to tie them personally into the story. For instance, the story Tri was told to me after I had climbed a mountain to observe rock formations called 'Tri's pigs'. 'Tri's sago' and three small red stones called 'Tri's wives'. In the story Tri climbs up to heaven, leaving some of his possessions behind. At that point in the narrative the narrator interjected,

"These things were pointed out to Carol today. Carol was able to see his two pigs. He left them behind and told them, 'You stay here like this.'"

GRAMMAR OF THE INCLUSIVE ETHNOHISTORY

As in the Folktale, the Inclusive Ethnohistory has the margins APERTURE and FINIS. The APERTURE is apparently not obligatory, for it appears in only three out of seven texts.

The APERTURE is a statement of the story's title and sometimes includes the narrator's name and a reference to his audience.

E Kiiimapa. E Came ve rare, tfira viikanise.
I Cleopas  I Came Obj. talk child to
"I am Cleopas. I am talking about Came to the children."

The FINIS is the same one that is used in the previously discussed narratives.

The STAGE follows the APERTURE or begins the story if there is no APERTURE. The main characters are introduced, the location in which the story begins, and sometimes something more about the condition or state of the main character are also mentioned. This seems to be the first sentence cluster after the APERTURE.

Came mali, efoare pees maamai. Umenasaca
Came this she then being earth/father-in-law
When came was living, she had a father-in-law, (who was
naace. Efaa wiwe Oterave. Came mali Oterave se maamai.
had his name Oterave Came this Oterave at being
the earth). His name was Oterave. Came was living at Oterave.

The BODY of this narrative, several sentence clusters long, consists of a series of episodes in which the main character acts or is acted upon. The first episode following the Stage introduces some minor characters if they are important immediately in the story. Minor characters can be brought in and dropped anytime during the narration. Once a main character is introduced, his name is dropped and only the third person pronoun efoara is used to refer to him. This pronoun usually appears only once in a sentence cluster. If another person becomes the main character of an episode, then he takes the third person pronoun (once he has been mentioned by name) until that episode is finished. When the first main character re-enters, he is mentioned by
name again before the pronoun is used for him. A change of location in the story often indicates that a new episode has begun. One episode may be expounded by one or more sentence clusters. These units are shortest when the action moves the fastest.

The CLOSURE may be several sentence clusters long, or it may be only a few statements. Approximately the last third of both the Tri and the Cama histories are devoted to tying the past in with the present. For example, the following is from the Cama story:

"The Air Mati people took Cama's head when her body was divided up. That's why they know all the songs. We only know a few. The place where her body was left on a burial rack is still there. It's always swept clean of leaves, but who sweeps it?"

One of the clan INCLUSIVE myths has no explicit CLOSURE enunciating the moral, but accomplishes the same thing by closing with the main character bemoaning the death of his relative who had disobeyed him.

2.22 MORALITY TALE

Figure 7. gives us an overview of the morality tale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKER: Usually a parent of the child or one of his close relatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME: Usually immediately after a child has done something wrong. The story specifically deals with the thing he has done wrong. If his friends have done a wrong deed, then after supper at night his parents may tell the story to show what will happen to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION: In the home or wherever the wrong doing took place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE: 1. To teach the child proper behavior. 2. To show the child the consequences of wrong behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESUPPOSITIONS: 1. The story is factual. 2. The child, or his friends, have done something wrong. 3. Hearing the story will change the child's behavior. 4. A law of cause-and-effect operates in the universe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE: General attitude of fear and concern for the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENTAL ASPECTS: &quot;If you do what this person did, the same thing will happen to you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESSIONAL ASPECTS: ORAL: More intense voice quality, otherwise same as in folktale (Figure 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINESIC: The parent may shake his finger at the child and emphasize with his hands the size of the punishment that can come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTUAL: 1. The characters are real people such as uncles, grandfathers and great-grandfathers of the hearer. 2. An implicit moral is present in the form of repeated references to the suffering which results from bad behavior. 3. The constituents of the discourse occur in the pattern summarized in 1.3 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUDIENCE: Primarily children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE: 1. To willingly or unwillingly learn. 2. To be entertained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESUPPOSITIONS: 1. The story is factual. 2. The parents know what is best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE: General attitude of fear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEPTION AND INTERPRETATION: The grammatical structures and tone of voice may cause the surface interpretation of &quot;If I continue to do what I did, something bad might happen to me.&quot; On the other hand, another child might say &quot;That was a good story, but that won't happen to me,&quot; indicating the speaker has failed in his intent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SPEAKER in a morality tale differs from other narrative type speakers in that he is generally a parental figure, while the AUDIENCE, which may consist of only one hearer, is primarily children.

Unlike other factual narrations, the morality tale is told almost anytime that warrants it. The location can vary as well.

Here the speaker's PURPOSE is to teach the child by pointing out the punishment other people received when they did something that the child has just done. The child has no option as to whether he wants to hear the story or not.

One other PRESUPPOSITION is that the child will understand what the implicit moral to the story is. The timing of the story to immediately follow the misbehavior may clue the child in to the intended moral, as may the repeated references to the suffering of the story's characters.

EXPRESSIONAL ASPECTS

The oral and kinesic aspects are basically the same as in other narrations, except here the tone of voice may be more intense and gestures may portray the size of the punishment which is to come.

The actual text contains characters who are real, and are relatives of the child. The places are real and known to both the speaker and audience. In one tale even the main character's dogs are named, thus enhancing the tale's reality. There is no overt referral to the child's wrongdoing in the story, nor is there any explicit statement of the moral. Instead, the point is emphasized by other people in the story that a catastrophe happened to one of the characters because of his previous wrong action. In one tale a man is swallowed by a snake after he ate dead game found in the jungle. The fact that he was swallowed because he ate that animal is repeated several times by different characters in the story. Therefore, the implied moral is "don't eat dead animals found in the jungle".

GRAMMAR OF THE MORALITY TALE

The morality tale has no APERTURE, but begins with the STAGE, giving the name and some background information about the main character.

Ivise pese maamai, ef wiye Tikave. Ef nanye warofa. Man big then being his name Tikave his dog many. There was a big man, his name was Tikave. He had many dogs.

The BODY consists of three basic episodes: What was done (a man ate an animal found dead in the jungle), what was the result of the action (a snake pursued him and swallowed him whole), and why the result occurred (he was swallowed by the snake because he ate a dead cassowary). Sometimes the moral is implied by emphasizing how the character suffered for his action.

It closes with the typical narrative discourse FINIS marker:

Tokrima ceo.
until here
'Up to here'.

2.23 CURRENT EVENTS

These include any story one might tell about himself or someone else. Told in a general way or in detail, they are often embedded in everyday conversations. All witnessed history is included in this type so that 'current' might mean in one's grandfather's day as well as yesterday.
The SPEAKER and AUDIENCE are unrestricted in this type of narration, which sets it apart from all other non-fiction types.

Like the Morality Tale, the TIME and LOCATION can be anytime and anywhere. Stories relating adventures may be told immediately after the event as, for example, when one of the villagers came running to us informing us that she had barely escaped being caught by a crocodile. They may be recounted later in the evenings when it is too dark to do anything else but sit around a fire.

The PURPOSE of current event narrations is different from all other type narrations in that they are not told to cause a change in behavior, or teach history (although tales of the 'old days' may in a sense be teaching history). Instead, it is told merely to pass on information or to elicit a response. If the PURPOSE is to elicit a response from the hearer, then it is generally told immediately after the event occurs. So if someone comes with a message that someone is sick, lost, or taken by a crocodile, the response is everyone running to visit and help the sick, search for the lost, or search for the body. If the PURPOSE of the narration is just to pass on information, then there is no immediate response, but the audience and speaker may later change roles, with the audience becoming the speaker and passing on that same information to someone else.

The ASSERTION that the event occurred is explicit, but that the hearer is supposed to respond is implicit. Once some men came to me saying "Daniel is sick!" They didn't say "come and see him" but expected me to interpret it as a request to go and see him. It also could have been interpreted that someone had bewitched him, so his relatives must find out who did it.

**EXPRESSATIONAL ASPECTS**

Oral features vary with the urgency of the message and the time elapse between the event and the telling. If it
was a scary event the sentences tumble out fast, intonation dropping as a person catches his breath. For most current event narrations, though, the oral and kinesic features are similar to all other narrations.

**GRAMMAR OF THE CURRENT EVENT NARRATION**

The Current Event text contains no APERTURE (as seen in Section 1.3), but rather begins with the STAGE or Introduction. Here the main characters are introduced, and some background information is given such as, "Sunday Daniel and Bastapa went up to Puare". The time of the event is set by the tense on the verbs. All other narrations primarily take place in the far past tense, but Current Event narrations can take any of four tenses:

- **-mi** 2 or more days ago or distant history
- **-mo** yesterday or recent history
- **-aai** early this morning
- **-a** just now

Although **-mo** is normally used with the meaning of "yesterday" it is also used with time in a general sense, or to indicate the more recent of two events. "What I promised (**-mo**) you is what my father also promised (**-mi**) you."

The BODY of a Current Event Narrative differs from all other narratives in that it may have as few as one episode. Others, like an account of the last Isirawa war, relate several episodes on the cause of the war, how they fought, and who won or lost each battle.

Only the stories from the older days and some of those that are third person oriented have a CLOSURE, which ties the speaker with the audience. For example, the war story ends,

"We who are alive now do not know war. We don't know how to shoot each other. We shoot—but not each other. You asked me to tell this story and now it is finished. The end!"

**Notes:**

1. Isirawa (also known as Saberi) is the name of a group of about 2,000 people located on the north coast of Irian Jaya, between the sub-district town of Sarmi and the Apawar River. C.L. Vorhoeve (1975) tentatively classifies Isirawa as a sub-family isolate in the Dani-Kwerba Stock of the Trans-New Guinea Phylum. Isirawa phonemes are represented as follows: a, aa, e, i, ii, o, oo, u, p, t, k, f, h, c, m, n, s, r, v, w, and y. (See Oguri and Erickson, 1975)

Data used in preparing this paper was gathered through intermittent stays in Amsira between October 1973 and May 1979. I wish to acknowledge the assistance of my many friends in Amsira who have helped me learn their language, and especially Filipus Mamawiso who has helped more than anyone else. I also want to thank Kenneth Gregerson and Marit Kana for their valuable suggestions and comments in the drafting of this paper.

2. "Air Mati", one of the dialects of the Kwerba language, is the name given to the entire Kwerba group by the Isirawa people. The Air Mati people live along the southern boundary of Isirawa territory. They share many cultural similarities with the Isirawa and there is some intermarriage between the two groups. The languages are distantly related, both being in the same stock.

3. These clusters of sentences, from two to ten verbs long and nearly each verb carrying sentence intonation, often begin with a change of location or with the introduction of another character. They do not necessarily coincide with semantic paragraphs, although they often do. Therefore, until more research is done, I hesitate to label them paragraphs.

4. Came is the Isirawa equivalent of Oosterwal's Djeame. The Isirawa have no voiced alveopalatal affricates.
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