

Endangered Languages of Austronesia

edited by
MARGARET FLOREY

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS



OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Editorial matter and organization: Margaret Florey 2010
© The chapters: their various authors 2010

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published by Oxford University Press 2010

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham, Wiltshire

ISBN 978-0-19-954454-7

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Contents

<i>List of Plates</i>	vii
<i>List of Maps, Figures, and Tables</i>	viii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	x
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiii

PART I OVERVIEW

1 Introduction	3
<i>Margaret Florey</i>	
2 Language Documentation in the West Austronesian World and Vanuatu: An Overview	12
<i>Alexander K. Adelaar</i>	

PART II LINGUISTIC VITALITY: THEORY, ASSESSMENTS, AND CHALLENGES

3 Language Endangerment Scenarios: A Case Study from Northern Central Sulawesi	45
<i>Nikolaus P. Himmelmann</i>	
4 Digging for the Roots of Language Death in Eastern Indonesia: The Cases of Kayeli and Hukumina	73
<i>Charles E. Grimes</i>	
5 Maintaining <i>Vera</i> in Rongga: Struggles over Culture, Tradition, and Language in Modern Manggarai, Flores, Indonesia	90
<i>I Wayan Arka</i>	
6 Why the Philippine Negrito Languages are Endangered	110
<i>Thomas N. Headland</i>	

PART III CAPACITY BUILDING AND REVITALIZATION INITIATIVES

7 New Directions in Field Linguistics: Training Strategies for Language Documentation in Indonesia	121
<i>Margaret Florey and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann</i>	

3

Language Endangerment Scenarios: A Case Study from Northern Central Sulawesi

Nikolaus P. Himmelmann

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to exemplify an approach to language endangerment in which endangerment is not defined with respect to a list of more or less disparate criteria such as number and age of speakers, homogeneity of the speech community, etc. Instead, language endangerment is seen as the possible outcome of an *endangerment scenario*, i.e. a specific and complex constellation of varied factors, some of which may be conducive to language shift, others to language maintenance. This concept is illustrated by an attempt to assess the viability of the Tomini-Tolitoli languages, a group of eleven languages/major dialects spoken by some 145,000 people in northern Central Sulawesi, Indonesia.

Section 3.2 introduces a distinction between the symptoms of language endangerment and its causes and then further defines and explains the notion of a language endangerment scenario. Section 3.3 provides background information on the Tomini-Tolitoli languages and language area, including some essential notes on its sociology

This chapter was first presented at the *International Workshop on South-East Asian Studies No. 11: The study of endangered languages and literatures of South-East Asia* in Leiden in December 1996. I wish to thank the members of the committee on endangered languages (AGBS) of the German Linguistic Society (DGfS) and John Wolff for many helpful discussions which have deeply influenced my understanding of the phenomenon of language endangerment. Some of the general views expressed here are also found in the brochure on endangered languages produced by the AGBS (*Arbeitsgruppe Bedrohte Sprachen*, 1995, *Informationsbroschüre zur Dokumentation von bedrohten Sprachen*, Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft). The *emigration scenario* discussed in section 3.4.1 emerged in conversation with John Wolff. Many thanks to Chuck Grimes, Andrew Pawley, Phil Quick, Hein Steinhauer and Chikao Yoshimura for comments on various versions of this chapter, and Margaret Florey for a very thorough and most helpful final editing.

The fieldwork on which this chapter is based was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and carried out under the auspices of the Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (LIPI) and in cooperation with the Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Jakarta. I am very grateful for all the support received from these agencies and the large number of individuals (more than one hundred) who contributed to this project. Full acknowledgments may be found in Himmelmann (2001).

and history. Section 3.4 describes the two basic endangerment scenarios found in Tomini-Tolitoli language communities and then illustrates their possible outcomes by assessing the viability of each Tomini-Tolitoli language and major dialect. Section 3.5 concludes.

The chapter draws on those aspects in work on language shift and language death that are relevant to minority groups in a developing nation such as Indonesia, including Dorian (1989); Sasse (1992); Mühlhäusler (1992, 1996); Landry and Allard (1994); Grenoble and Whaley (1998a); Hagège (2000); and Bradley and Bradley (2002). The only in-depth discussion of language shift in Indonesia to date remains Florey (1990). See Florey (2005a) for a brief overview of the overall endangerment situation in insular Southeast Asia.

3.2 Language Endangerment: Factors vs. Scenarios

In many discussions of language endangerment it is common to operate with extensive and fairly heterogeneous lists of presumed 'reasons' or 'causes' of language endangerment (cf., for example, Dressler 1987; Wurm 1996; Crystal 2000). Often the fact that children do not acquire the language any longer is singled out as the most important 'factor' contributing to language death. In the present contribution, the discussion of language endangerment is based on the following two assumptions:

- It is useful to make a fairly strict distinction between directly observable symptoms (indications) of language endangerment and their often not so clearly discernible causes.
- It is rarely the case that one or two or three causes or factors lead to language endangerment. Instead, language endangerment results from the specific and complex constellation of a variety of such factors. A constellation of this kind is called an *endangerment scenario* in this chapter. Thus, *scenario* is used here as a technical term and not in the much looser, non-technical sense widely attested in the literature on endangered languages (e.g. Wurm 1996:2).

In the remainder of this section, these two assumptions are further elaborated. Excluded from the discussion is one possible scenario for language death, i.e. the complete physical elimination of speech communities through violence, natural disaster, or disease. This scenario differs radically from the other scenarios to be discussed below, all of which involve language shift, a phenomenon absent from, or irrelevant to, the physical elimination scenario.

There is, it seems to me, basically one essential symptom for the vitality of a language, i.e. the number and quality of the domains in which it is used. With *quality* I refer to the importance of a given domain within the overall language ecology in a given speech community, based on the breadth and variety of linguistic behaviour found in that domain. For example, the use of a language in a working environment

which consists basically of short commands and acknowledgments could be seen as less relevant to the vitality of the language than its use in informal conversations between family members which touches on a broad variety of topics and involves the use of many different linguistic routines. The number of domains is important because different domains often involve different registers. Some linguistic routines may occur only in a given register.

Given this view of language vitality, language endangerment may be defined as a rapid decline in the number and quality of domains in which a given language is used.

One very important domain is, of course, the interaction between parents (and other caregivers) and children. Note, however, that here the fact that children do not acquire a language any more is viewed as a *symptom*, and not a *cause*, of language endangerment. Given the anthropomorphic metaphor of *language death* it seems admittedly correct to say that a language is going to die *because* the intergenerational transmission is interrupted. However, when this presumed cause of language endangerment is compared with other presumed causes such as the small number of speakers, forced migration and dispersal of the speech community, the presence of another dominant language in the area, etc., it becomes obvious that the 'cause' *interrupted intergenerational transmission* is of a different nature than the other causes in this list. That is, it is at least one step further down in the causation chain. That children don't acquire the language any more is not some spontaneous, unpredictable event in the history of a speech community. Instead, it is caused by a variety of factors which may cause other reductions in the usage domains of a given language as well (for example, the use of a new or different language in the educational domain or for trading purposes). A change of language usage in the interaction with children clearly has more dramatic consequences than a change of language in trading interactions. Still, the nature of these changes is similar and they pertain to the same level in the chain of events leading to language shift. This level is called here the level of *symptoms* of language endangerment and it is strictly distinguished from the level of the causes or *factors* that play a role in language endangerment scenarios.

The assessment of factors leading to language endangerment is much more difficult than the assessment of its symptoms. To my knowledge, there is no factor that can be shown with certainty to cause a language shift. Take, for example, the migration of whole speech communities or individuals. Migration is often seen as playing a major role in language shift, and there are many actual examples where it seems undeniable that this factor is involved (the two scenarios to be discussed below for Tomini-Tolitoli languages, the *immigration* and the *emigration scenarios*, are cases in point). However, there is also a substantial number of examples of both individuals and groups where migration does not lead to language shift. In the Tomini-Tolitoli area, for example, there are various settlements populated by Javanese or Balinese (trans-)migrants. Even in the older settlements of this kind (thirty years and older), there is no evidence for a drastic decrease in the vitality of the native languages, Balinese and Javanese,

respectively.¹ On the individual level, one finds in practically every Tomini-Tolitoli village a Chinese trader family. Some of these families have been living in the area for two generations and longer. Despite the fact that they often are the only Chinese speaking people in a given location, many of them are bilingual in Indonesian and Chinese, having only a rudimentary knowledge of the local languages.

These examples should make it clear that the potential which any single factor might have for inducing language shift is only realized in a specific and complex constellation of factors, some of which may be conducive to language shift, others to language maintenance. As noted above, the term *endangerment scenario* is used here to refer to such a constellation of factors which may be observed in a speech community presently undergoing language shift. Connected to this notion is the hypothesis that given a detailed description of a broad variety of endangerment scenarios from all major regions of the world, it will be possible to come up with a typology of endangerment scenarios. Such a typology, in turn, will allow for a better understanding of language endangerment (and its possible 'cures') than the list approach, i.e. the attempt to compute degrees of endangerment on the basis of lists of values for presumed endangerment factors.²

3.3 Tomini-Tolitoli Languages and Language Area³

The part of the northern Sulawesi peninsula inhabited by the Tomini-Tolitoli people is located roughly between the equator and 1° north latitude and around 120° east longitude. The peninsula is quite narrow in this part, with a chain of steep mountains running south to north, later turning west to east. This chain of mountains divides the area into two coastlines, the west coast being bordered by the Makassar Straits, and the east coast by the Tomini Bay.

Table 3.1 lists the eleven major languages belonging to the Tomini-Tolitoli group, arranged in a rough geographical order (beginning in the southwest). The names in parentheses are alternate names used in the literature. The figures indicate the approximate number of speakers for each of the languages.⁴

Neighbouring languages are, in the northeast, Buol (west coast) and Gorontalo (east coast), and in the south, Kaili, a network of closely related dialects which are spoken around the Palu Bay and adjoining areas, including Parigi, a town located on the east coast. The major dialects of this network found on the borders and within the Tomini-Tolitoli area are Tawaili, Ledo, Rai, and Tara. Apart from Buol, which has

Table 3.1 Tomini-Tolitoli languages and major dialects

West coast		East coast	
Balaesang	ca. 3,200	Taje (Petapa)	ca. 350
Pendau (Ndau)	ca. 3,200	Ampibabo-Lauje	ca. 6,000
Dampelas	ca. 10,300	Tajio (Kasimbar)	ca. 12,000
Dondo	ca. 13,000	Lauje (Tinombo)	ca. 38,000
Totoli (Tolitoli)	ca. 25,000	Tialo (Tomini)	ca. 30,000
		Boano (Bolano)	ca. 2,700
Total: ca. 143,750			

some 65,000 speakers, the other two languages have a substantially higher number of speakers than the Tomini-Tolitoli language group as a whole, Kaili some 300,000 and Gorontalo some 400,000.

In terms of present day administrative units, the Tomini-Tolitoli languages are spoken in three districts (*Kabupaten*) of the province of Central Sulawesi: Donggala, Tolitoli and Parigi-Moutong.⁵ The government of Donggala is located in Palu which is also the seat of the provincial government and today the single most dominating centre in all of Central Sulawesi. The government of Tolitoli is located in the town of Tolitoli, ca. 250 km north of Palu on the west coast.⁶ The government of Parigi-Moutong is found in Parigi, the major town on the east coast. The districts are further divided into subdistricts (*kecamatan*). Most of the speakers of Tomini-Tolitoli languages are found in thirteen *kecamatan*, nine on the west coast and four on the east coast.

For the ensuing exposition of endangerment scenarios in the Tomini-Tolitoli area, it will be important to take note of the fact that the English word *village* is used here in reference to a typically Indonesian administrative unit (*desa*). A *desa* usually consists of a number of clusters of dwellings, which in turn may vary considerably in size (less than a dozen houses to 100 or more), and in addition includes substantial amounts of cultivated or uncultivated land. It is thus a much more extensive and much less tightly integrated unit than a traditional European village. See Barbara Dix Grimes (2006) for a more comprehensive explication and an investigation of how the modern administrative village structure deviates from the traditional 'mental' map of a given area.

Following T. Li (1991), the Tomini-Tolitoli area may be divided into the following three distinct agro-ecological zones based on both bio-physical as well as social components:⁷

⁵ *Kabupaten* Tolitoli was formed only in 1999 by splitting up the former *Kabupaten* Buol-Tolitoli. *Kabupaten* Parigi-Moutong is an even more recent creation which became fully operational only in 2003. Formerly, the five *kecamatan* forming this new *Kabupaten* were part of *Kabupaten* Donggala.

⁶ Travelling along the coastline, the distance between Palu and Tolitoli is 438 km.

⁷ Li's study pertains to the Tinombo region which is predominantly populated by Lauje, but her results may be applied to the Tomini-Tolitoli area as a whole with a few modifications (cf. Himmelmann 2001:49f.).

¹ For an in-depth study of Balinese migrations to Central Sulawesi see G. Davis 1976.

² Perhaps the most extreme example of this approach is the *Language documentation urgency list* (LDUL) proposed by D. Zaefferer in Munich (email address: ldul@lmu.de).

³ This section contains a brief synopsis of the background chapter in my sourcebook on Tomini-Tolitoli languages (Chapter 2 in Himmelmann 2001). In that chapter, the demographic, geographical, social, and historical aspects mentioned here are discussed in much greater detail. The sourcebook also features a number of maps where all the locations mentioned here can be found.

⁴ For reasons discussed in Himmelmann (2001:17f.,37), these figures are far from reliable.

- the *coastal zone* is characterized by seasonal rainfall, the vegetation consisting of mangroves, grass, bushes, and light secondary forest. The most conspicuous crops are coconuts and wet rice, but the coastal population often also own gardens in the middle hills. Other sources of income include wage work (hired farm labor and government jobs such as teachers) and fishing. 99 per cent of the coastal population is Islamic, a large majority of them actively taking part in the religious, social, and political life of the village.
- the *middle hills* are characterized by frequent rainfalls and a mixture of secondary and primary forest. Middle hill people live at some distance from the coast, often in fact at the foot of the hills or on an inland plain, in village or hamlet-like settlements; they cultivate dry rice, corn and cash crops (shallots, cashews, cocoa, etc.); they are at least nominally Islamic and share the basic values of the coastal population; they are to a large extent integrated in the governmental control- and benefit-system.
- the *inner hills* are characterized by very frequent rainfalls and deep secondary and primary forest. Inner hill people live close to the forest frontier in small groups of 2–3 households, plant taro and cassava as their main staple food, eat pigs, do not adapt their values, lifestyle and dressing to coastal standards, and are affiliated with either an indigenous religion or Christianity.

While inner and middle hill people, to date, seem to form socially and economically fairly homogeneous groups, the coastal population is divided into economic/occupational classes.⁸ The majority of the population call themselves farmers. They gain their livelihood through wage work (for the owners of large coconut plantations, *sawah* (wet-rice fields) or cash crop gardens), petty trade, and gardening and/or fishing. The professional fishermen form a homogeneously distinct group, who usually do not own their own equipment (and thus have to share the catch with the equipment owner) and who more often than not live in their own hamlet on the shore, the village centre usually being located up to 1 km inland. Another class is formed by the political and educational elite who control the local government and educational institutions, and a substantial part of the fertile coastal land. Finally, there is the very small, but economically the most powerful, class of traders who buy the local cash crops (copra, chocolate, garlic, etc.), finance rattan expeditions and fishing equipment, run minibus services to Palu and own stores well-stocked with household items, dry goods, hardware, etc. Most traders are Chinese or Buginese.

As for the history of the Tomini-Tolitoli area, there are only very few records directly concerned with it up to the most recent times (ca. 1970). This lack of historical records is just one of a number of indications for the fact that the area has been, and continues to be, a peripheral one. It has never been a power centre dominating adjoining areas

⁸ As Li repeatedly points out, this state of affairs is presently undergoing rapid change through the increased cultivation of cash crops in the hill regions. Since access to fertile land is not evenly distributed, one may see in the near future class distinctions in inner and middle hill areas similar to those on the coast.

but, instead, has always been at the very fringes of the various powers which have sought to control parts or all of Sulawesi.⁹ In the current context of exemplifying the notion of an *endangerment scenario*, the following fairly well-established historical facts¹⁰ are of major relevance.

In the early eighteenth century, powerful Bugis and Mandar kingdoms in South Sulawesi took over the control of the Tomini-Tolitoli coast lines, in cooperation with their Kaili allies who had been subjugated by them earlier on. Their primary goal was to use the largely 'empty' coastal planes of the Tomini-Tolitoli area for coconut plantations. To this end, marriages were arranged between male members of the Bugis, Mandar, or Kaili nobility and female members of the Tomini-Tolitoli nobility. The task of the Tomini-Tolitoli nobility was to persuade (or force) their people to move with them from the mountains to the coastal planes and work on the plantations. In several areas this led to a split between the members of a Tomini-Tolitoli tribe, with part of the population remaining in the mountains (the ancestors of the present day inner and middle hill people) and the other part following their nobility down to the coast (the ancestors of the present day coastal population).¹¹

From a sociolinguistic point of view, it is important to note that only a few outsiders (Bugis, Mandar, or Kaili) were directly involved in this enterprise. These outsiders settled in the area and learned the language. The pact between the two nobilities was continually renewed through intermarriages according to the same pattern (male Bugis/Mandar/Kaili and female Tomini-Tolitoli). This seems to have happened fairly consistently until about the 1950s as shown by the fact that most members of the present day political elite of the Tomini-Tolitoli coastal population (i.e. the descendants of the former nobility) claim to have at least one continuous chain of Bugis, Mandar or Kaili males in their ancestry.¹² Nevertheless, in the older generation it is the rule rather than the exception that the members of this elite are fluent and competent speakers of a Tomini-Tolitoli language which is generally their first (their mother's) language (they also know Kaili and/or Bugis and Indonesian).

This interactional pattern between South Sulawesi and Tomini-Tolitoli changed radically around 1900 (or 1930?) when substantial numbers of poor (common) South Sulawesi people began to migrate to the supposedly still largely empty but fertile¹³ land of the Tomini-Tolitoli area. These migrants generally settled in, or close to, the established coastal villages and opened up new locations for their own plantations. They usually arrived with little more than the capital and tools necessary to stake out claims, to clear the forest and buy a first set of seedlings. They achieved an

⁹ See Henley (1989) for a short, but comprehensive outline of the history of Sulawesi.

¹⁰ Compare Adriani and Krut (1912:117–166, 297–360), Davis (1976:94–105), Masyhuda (1977:9–52), and Nourse (1989:1–101).

¹¹ Cf. Nourse (1989:4–11, 69–101) for the Lauje version of these events.

¹² It is thus not surprising that many of them have typically South Sulawesi names such as *Amerang Hji. Dg. Palipa, Abrahman Dg. Mallawa*, etc.

¹³ Compared to the very fertile volcanic soil found in Java, Bali, or Minahasa, the alluvial soil found in Central Sulawesi is rather poor. Thus, 'fertile' here means something like 'land amenable to agriculture'.

economic position similar to the native Tomini-Tolitoli within a generation or so, often even being economically more successful than the average Tomini-Tolitoli family in a given village. Moreover, they started almost immediately to interact socially with the Tomini-Tolitoli (the nobility probably functioning as an intermediary). The major focus of this migration was the west coast. It happened in various waves and actually continues to the present day, albeit on a much smaller scale. As will be discussed in detail in Section 3.4.2, this migration had a considerable impact on language use in the affected areas.

A similar impact can be observed for the rapid change (modernization) engineered by the Indonesian government which has occurred in the region since about 1970. In some areas (in particular in the town of Tolitoli and its vicinity), this change occurred extremely fast because of the economically very successful introduction of new cash crops such as cloves (for which there was a boom in the 1970s but the value has since dropped considerably). The first and major innovation was the establishment of an extensive network of primary schools (all villages and most settlement projects today have at least one primary school, referred to as SD in Indonesian), followed by health centres, sealed roads, electricity, and television. That is, at least the coastal zones have become fully integrated parts of modern Indonesia. The power centre, of course, continues to be in Palu and the provincial government is dominated by Kaili (and people from South Sulawesi) but a number of Tomini-Tolitoli participate in the local government on the district and subdistrict levels, especially in the newly created districts Tolitoli and Parigi-Moutong.

As for the middle and inner hill regions, considerable efforts have been made by the Indonesian government, missionaries and foreign aid development projects to integrate their population in the modernization process. Resettlement projects, which have the task of bringing the inner hill people closer to the coastal village centres, have been established for nearly all inner hill people. The exception are the inner hill Lauje in the Tinombo and Tomini subdistricts, as further elaborated at the end of Section 3.4.2.3.¹⁴

3.4 Endangerment Scenarios in the Tomini-Tolitoli Area

3.4.1 Basic scenarios

Leaving aside the specific features distinguishing individual speech communities in the Tomini-Tolitoli area, two basic scenarios for language endangerment may be discerned:

- the *immigration scenario* in which members of another speech community from outside the area 'take over' a Tomini-Tolitoli speech community.

¹⁴ Some of the inner hill Lauje are 'taken care of'—so at least it is perceived by the district and provincial administrations—by New Tribes Missionaries who have been operating in the mountains above Tinombo since the 1970s.

- the *emigration scenario* in which there is a substantial, though temporary migration of members of a Tomini-Tolitoli speech community to educational and/or occupational centers in- and outside the Tomini-Tolitoli area.

Before commenting in more detail on these two basic scenarios it is important to notice the following: the names as well as the brief characterizations of these two scenarios make reference to *one* factor (immigration and emigration, respectively). This is *not* to be interpreted as claiming that these are single, isolable factors causing the presently observable language endangerment in the area. Instead, as already discussed in Section 3.2, the scenarios consist of a complex constellation of a variety of factors, of which the two factors chosen for naming and characterizing the two scenarios are arguably the most conspicuous ones.

The following discussion explores the sociostructural factors relevant to the two basic scenarios. It will come as no surprise to learn that they share many factors since they both involve migrations. An effort is made in any given instance to point out examples where the factor under discussion has not induced language shift, thus providing empirical support for the present approach which holds that it is never a lone factor that induces language shift.

The two scenarios are based on participant observation and informal conversations. I travelled the whole area during two longer field trips (1988 and 1993), and one shorter trip in 2002. Altogether 12 months were spent on location, the time allocated for the visit of a given settlement or village varying between one day and six weeks. In all the locations mentioned below, I spent at least two weeks (exceptions to this rule are explicitly indicated).

3.4.1.1 IMMIGRATION SCENARIO The first point to note with respect to the *immigration scenario* is that the migrants actually have to occupy settlements and farmland which were inhabited and used before exclusively by the Tomini-Tolitoli speech community. That is, there are both past and present examples of migrations into the area which have not affected the viability of Tomini-Tolitoli speech communities. In the past, Bajau have settled in various places on the east and west coasts (e.g. Pomolulu in *Kecamatan* Balaesang, Simatang in *Kecamatan* Dampal Utara, Bajo in *Kecamatan* Moutong). These settlements are usually located either directly on the coast line or on smaller off-shore islands, i.e. locations not inhabited by Tomini-Tolitoli people. The interaction between Bajau and Tomini-Tolitoli seems to have been confined largely to trade, with the Bajau providing fish and the Tomini-Tolitoli produce (there is one example of closer social interaction, including quite a few intermarriages, which will be discussed in Section 3.4.2.3).

Examples of modern migrations which (so far) have not affected the viability of Tomini-Tolitoli speech communities are the various large transmigration projects found throughout the area, generally populated by Javanese and/or Balinese migrants (e.g. Budi and Karya Mukti in *Kecamatan* Dampelas, Kota Raya in *Kecamatan* Tomini). The projects are located in extensive inland plains which were 'empty' before in the

sense that there were no permanent Tomini-Tolitoli settlements or extensive clusters of garden locations in these plains.¹⁵ At present, the interaction between Tomini-Tolitoli and transmigrants is confined to small scale trade (mostly produce sold by the transmigrants to the Tomini-Tolitoli).

A second point to note with respect to the *immigration scenario* is that a certain proportion of migrants is necessary in order for there to be an impact on language usage in the community. It is difficult to specify this number with any degree of precision. Perhaps most important in this regard is the fact that in Tomini-Tolitoli speech communities it does not take a large number of speakers of another language in order to change language usage. According to my observations, the following interrelated phenomena are found today in most villages with a population of about 20 per cent (or more) non-Tomini-Tolitoli:

- the migrants do not even have a rudimentary knowledge of the Tomini-Tolitoli language;
- whenever a non-Tomini-Tolitoli is present in a communicative situation either Indonesian or some other mutually available language (Bugis or Kaili) is used;
- the language of the public domain (meetings, political discussions, much of the everyday talk that can be overheard in the streets) is Indonesian.

This observation is to be contrasted with the following two. First, if there are only a few 'outsiders' in a village, one or two Chinese or Bugis trader families, for example, then these 'outsiders' will understand enough of the local Tomini-Tolitoli language to follow everyday conversations. They will also have a fair command of some basic formulae and patterns of this language (but rarely be fluent speakers). Second, in villages where migrants form a majority, the Tomini-Tolitoli will be fluent in the majority language, usually Kaili or Bugis. In villages with a more varied population there is a strong tendency for Indonesian to be the general public domain language. However, given that Bugis form a strong minority in the overall population (say 30 per cent) then Buginese will also be used in the public domain.

The preceding remarks pertain only to the interaction between Tomini-Tolitoli and out-of-area migrants. If speakers of two different Tomini-Tolitoli languages settle in the same village, it is always the case that the 'newcomers' have a complete command of the local language. It is, however, extremely rare that a substantial number of Tomini-Tolitoli migrates to an established Tomini-Tolitoli settlement (the major example is the migration of Lauje to Dondo and Tialo settlements in *Kecamatan Dondo* and Tomini).¹⁶

¹⁵ It is highly likely, however, that these plains were used to some extent by Tomini-Tolitoli middle and inner hill people. This is suggested by the fact that one finds various resettlement projects scattered around most transmigration areas.

¹⁶ Lauje is very similar, and closely related, to Dondo and Tialo. Dondo and Tialo are even more closely related to each other and could be considered dialects of a single language (cf. Himmelmann 2001:20).

A somewhat special case in this regard appears to be the village of Lakuan located at the border between Totoli and Buol speaking areas (forming the northeastern-most boundary of the Tomini-Tolitoli area). Here Totoli is clearly the dominant language despite the fact that a large part of the population claims to have Buol or Dondo ancestry.

A third point to note with respect to the *immigration scenario* is that the occupational or class background of migrants does not seem to be of particular importance for their impact on the usage of the Tomini-Tolitoli language. Migrants fall in two broad classes with respect to socioeconomic status and power. On the one hand, there are government officials (administrators, police, teachers) and traders, who usually own some land and/or capital, the former also having considerable political influence and high social prestige. On the other hand, there are poor South Sulawesi farmers who are looking for unclaimed patches of farmable land.

For both classes of migrants, the impact they have on patterns of language use seems to depend essentially on their relative numbers (see above). As far as any differences in their impact may be discerned, these pertain to more circumstantial aspects such as the likelihood of a given location to attract one or the other class of migrants in substantial numbers. A substantial number of government officials and traders is found only in administrative centres (most of the subdistrict capitals belong in this category). In these centres there is, in general, no space for migrant farmers. Thus, migrant farmers are found in 'normal' villages. A second difference pertains to the fact that migrant farmers usually come in larger groups (and therefore quite generally make a noticeable impact on linguistic usage in the village they settle) while the number of traders and government officials in 'normal' villages is very small (but there is practically no village without at least one trader and one or two teachers who are not natives of the village).

A fourth aspect of the *immigration scenario* is the degree to which the original population and more recently arrived migrants intermingle. Upon arrival, the newcomers usually have to settle at the periphery of a village.¹⁷ Hence it is not surprising that in many villages some quarters (*dusun*) are heavily (or exclusively) populated by speakers of a Tomini-Tolitoli language, while others are mostly populated by speakers of an out-of-area language. While in administrative centres this pattern can be maintained over generations, in the villages it may change as fast as within one or two generations. The most important factor in this change is intermarriage, for which the most common pattern is to have a migrant man proposing to a Tomini-Tolitoli woman (a pattern already followed by the nobles in former centuries (see Section 3.3 above)).

The relevance of this change for patterns of language use is this: as long as the population of a *dusun* is fairly homogeneous, the common everyday language in the *dusun* will be the native language of its inhabitants (i.e. a Tomini-Tolitoli language in a Tomini-Tolitoli *dusun*, Buginese in a Bugis *dusun*, etc.). As soon as a *dusun* becomes

¹⁷ Possible exceptions to this general 'rule' are instances where a sizeable fraction of the original village population has died at once (through violence, natural catastrophes, or disease), thus allowing the new arrivals to move into locations in the village centre.

more heterogeneous with respect to linguistic affiliations, either Indonesian or, if it was originally inhabited mainly by migrants, the migrants' native language becomes the medium of everyday conversation. I have not come across an instance where a Tomini-Tolitoli language dominates in a quarter shared by Tomini-Tolitoli and a substantial minority group of out-of-area migrants.

Note that the sociolinguistic impact of intermingling on the *dusun* level is much more pervasive than the impact of intermingling on the village level. On the village level, this impact is generally restricted to the public domain, often only to the more formal interactions in the public domain (such as school, village meeting, paying an official visit to the village head, etc.). On the *dusun* level it potentially encompasses all linguistic domains. Minimally, it influences all linguistic interactions from which the next door neighbours are not to be excluded. Given that the yard surrounding a house and the 'living room' (i.e. the space in a house designated for entertaining guests) are semi-public spaces in which the neighbours have a 'right' to know what's going on, the domains not directly influenced by the linguistic norms holding at the *dusun*-level are the kind of linguistic interactions that take place in the kitchen and the space allocated to eating (sometimes part of the kitchen) and sleeping. In the case of intermarriages, a non-Tomini-Tolitoli language will be used in these spaces as well.

Exempt from the general 'rule' stated in the preceding paragraph are older speakers (70 and above). These speakers tend to use their native language when conversing among themselves as well as when conversing with younger people (provided these know the language). In both instances it is considered socially acceptable that some of the people present in the communicative situation are excluded from the conversation in the sense that they are unable to fully understand what is being said. One major reason for this exception seems to be the fact that older speakers often only have a poor command of the 'new' everyday language. In other words, in those instances where older speakers are fluent in the dominant non-Tomini-Tolitoli language they will also use this language in everyday interaction.

As briefly mentioned above, the three major candidates for being the everyday language in a *dusun* with mixed population are Indonesian, Bugis, and Kaili. Kaili is often well known by older speakers of a Tomini-Tolitoli language because it seems to have been a lingua franca in the area for quite some time (200–300 years?). Hence it is least likely to find older speakers regularly using a Tomini-Tolitoli language in a *dusun* (or village) where Kaili has become the everyday language. Similar observations hold for some parts of the west coast where Bugis has been a dominant language for at least 100 years (in particular, northern Dampelas-Sojol, Dampal Selatan, and Dampal Utara). Overall, it holds true that of the said three languages, Indonesian is least known among the older generation of Tomini-Tolitoli speakers. Note, however, that there is a substantial minority of older speakers who are fluent and competent speakers of Indonesian.

A fifth aspect of the *immigration scenario* pertains to the location of the farmed land with respect to the village centre. Wet-rice fields (*sawah*) and coconut plantations are

generally found in the environs of the village. Hence it is possible to work these sites from the home in the village. Garden locations, on the other hand, can be located at a considerable distance from the village centre. Working there means commuting between the village home and a temporary lodging in the garden.

The time spent in the garden is essentially determined by economic factors. If the garden is the major source of a family's income it is not unusual for such a family to spend most of its time in the garden, paying only occasional visits to the village centre (on market days, for example). A major conflict arises when a family has children of school age. Since the school is always located in the village centre, this means that the family is either split between village home and garden location or that the children only sporadically attend school. The latter is the clearly disfavoured option chosen only if the garden requires the work of all family members at a time. Well-to-do families hire labour for doing most of the work in the garden, paying only occasional visits to the garden location. Those who have a job in the village centre (teachers, for example) work their gardens irregularly.

The relevance of this factor is to be seen in relation to the preceding one: the garden locations are generally inhabited only by the nuclear family (parents and unmarried children), the next neighbour being relatively far away (at least 100 metres). Thus, language usage in the garden is solely determined by the family members. If husband and wife are native speakers of a Tomini-Tolitoli language, the family will use this Tomini-Tolitoli language for everyday conversation. The more time spent in the garden the less the linguistic usage within the nuclear family is influenced by the linguistic norms on the *dusun* and village levels.

To conclude this discussion of the *immigration scenario*, note that none of the factors mentioned necessarily leads to language shift. Although the arrival of a substantial number of migrants in a given area certainly has some impact on language usage everywhere in the world, none of the factors mentioned above excludes the possibility that a situation of stable bilingualism arises in the wake of the migration. As far as I could ascertain, it is not the case that the migrants violently entered Tomini-Tolitoli territory and subjugated the native population, forcing their linguistic and cultural practices on them. Instead, the Tomini-Tolitoli seem to adjust themselves readily to the migrants. This is particularly obvious in those instances where a relatively small minority of migrants (20–30 per cent of the overall population) has a considerable impact on linguistic usage. I will return briefly to this issue in section 3.4.1.3 after discussing the *emigration scenario*, for which the same observation holds.

3.4.1.2 EMIGRATION SCENARIO The *emigration scenario* is characterized by the following cluster of interrelated factors: apart from farming, all other work opportunities open to Tomini-Tolitoli people require them to live outside their native village for an extended period of time. At present, there is actually just one such alternative work opportunity, i.e. to work for the government. There is hardly any industry in the whole province of Central Sulawesi, and the few fishery and logging companies that exist are

financed by foreign capital and bring their own labour. The trading networks are firmly controlled by Bugis and Chinese traders and generally do not involve Tomini-Tolitoli people (apart from a few people who function as the local representative of a larger company at the village level).

Government employees work either in the extensive administrative network established by the Indonesian government since 1965 (the basic layout of the national administration is copied at the provincial, district and subdistricts levels) or in the educational sector (most teachers are government employees¹⁸). With the exception of primary school teachers, they rarely work in, or close to, their native villages, at least not early in their careers. That is, they live and work in an environment where Indonesian is the everyday language.

Of some importance in this regard is the fact that there are special housing programmes for government employees, a factor contributing to their relative isolation from the surrounding community. A fairly typical example is a high school (or more precisely: upper secondary school, usually referred to as SMA in Indonesia), of which there are quite a few in the larger villages throughout Central Sulawesi. The teachers in such a school usually come from a variety of linguistic backgrounds, including the native languages of North, Central, and South Sulawesi, and Balinese. The teachers' houses are built on the school ground. They converse in Indonesian among themselves and interact only minimally with the community in which the school is located.

The relevance of this scenario for usage patterns consists of the fact that Indonesian is also the language commonly used at home even if husband and wife share the same native language. Most importantly, their children acquire Indonesian as their native language and hardly acquire much knowledge about any other language (depending on the degree of contact and interaction with grandparents and other relatives, which will be commented on shortly). Note that this phenomenon is not restricted to the families of Tomini-Tolitoli speakers but pertains to all families of government employees irrespective of their linguistic background (at least in the parts of Central Sulawesi I have visited). It also includes, for example, Bugis¹⁹ who otherwise are known to display a particularly strong allegiance to their native language. Moreover, this is not a recent phenomenon. Several government officials I met—who were in their thirties and forties and whose parents were also government employees—claimed to have grown up learning only Indonesian and knowing only bits and pieces of native Sulawesi languages.

So far, the exposition of the *emigration scenario* has been concerned with the nuclear family. However, the impact of this scenario is not confined to the nuclear family but may also affect language usage in the native village of such families. This is so because the 'migrant' family remains closely linked to the village by a bundle of personal and

¹⁸ There are a number of private schools in the area sponsored by Islamic organizations. Their number has increased constantly during the 1990s and in late 2002 there was such a school in almost every village.

¹⁹ The Bugis in the area typically work in the administrative sector (including the judicial system) rather than as teachers.

economic ties. Economically, such a family often will own some land in the native village which, though not worked by themselves but by hired labour, provides a highly welcome additional income. In fact, the cash income earned through the government position often allows more senior employees to extend their property in the native village.²⁰ The existence of such property ensures that government employees return regularly to their native village. It is also a strong incentive to seek appointments close to the native village during the later stages of one's career²¹ and to return for good to the village on retirement (the regular retirement age is 55).

The impact such government employed families may have on language usage in their native village is very similar to that of the out-of-area migrants discussed above with respect to the *immigration scenario*. As in the *immigration scenario*, these families have a noticeable impact on usage patterns only if a certain number of them is present in a given *dusun*. They then will form a network of people who consistently use Indonesian when talking among themselves. They are used to speaking Indonesian at home and their children do not know the native language of the village. Their relatives and neighbours will tend to assimilate to this state of affairs and also use Indonesian in most interactions with these families.

Apart from this direct influence the families of government employees have through their actual linguistic practices, there is also a more subtle and indirect influence. In general, such families will enjoy a relatively high social prestige because of their education and their economic power. Their good command of Indonesian is seen as one major factor in their success. Hence, all families aspiring to similar achievements will tend to emphasize the use of Indonesian in their linguistic interactions. Some families actually adopt an Indonesian-only policy in conversing with their children even if their economic resources are fairly limited (and hence the prospect of a higher education for their children rather dim).

The major 'prerequisite' for the *emigration scenario*, then, is that a number of families are present in one village and generation with the economic means to afford a higher education for (some of) their children. Becoming a government employee is a lengthy and expensive process because one has to pass middle school ('lower secondary school' or SMP) and high school (SMA) and do some basic course work at university. Since SMPs and SMAs are not found in every village, the students have to leave their families and live as boarders in larger villages or administrative centres. To receive a university education they have to move to the provincial capital, Palu, or even further away to Makassar (formerly Ujung Pandang) in South Sulawesi, or to Surabaya in Java.

²⁰ It is very difficult to acquire land for gardens close to the location of an employee's work because most of the land in the vicinity will be already in somebody's possession. This holds in particular of the cities (Palu and Tolitoli) but is also true for all subdistrict capitals. Furthermore, for many employees it would not make much sense to acquire land close to their work location because they are very often shifted between various work locations, in particular in the wake of promotions.

²¹ New government employees are expected to take on inconvenient assignments as a sign of their gratitude for having been accepted into government service. They also lack the contacts and experience necessary for influencing one's appointments.

Given that the extensive network of primary schools presently found in the area has only been built up since the early 1970s, it should not come as a surprise that up to that date very few Tomini-Tolitoli families were aware of the possibilities of education. Thus, one finds only a few Tomini-Tolitoli teachers who are fifty years old or older, and even fewer Tomini-Tolitoli in the same age bracket in other government positions (the positions are generally on the subdistrict level and never exceed the district level). These older Tomini-Tolitoli government employees are usually part of the traditional elite whose economic power rests on their extensive coconut plantations and the relations with their Kaili and South Sulawesi kin, established and continually renewed by intermarriage for at least 200 years (cf. Section 3.3 above).

The 1970s not only brought more accessible primary schools but also a first boom in cash crops other than coconuts, which allowed many of the poorer relatives of the old elite to pursue careers in the rapidly expanding government agencies. That is, within the generation of the thirty and forty year olds there are several areas within the Tomini-Tolitoli region where the effects of the *emigration scenario* are clearly visible (details in Section 3.4.2.2). Note that, at present, the overall impact of this scenario is still relatively minor since there are not many villages where enough people have the economic power to pursue careers outside the village. In the not too distant future, however, it may well turn out to be the major scenario for a quickly progressing language shift in those areas which to date have remained relatively unaffected by the *immigration scenario* (but see the qualifications in Section 3.4.2.3).

3.4.1.3 COMMONALITIES AND 'DEEPER CAUSES' In concluding this section, note that the two scenarios are partially in complementary distribution: only areas where extensive stretches of land have been cultivated for some time have the economic potential for the *emigration scenario*. Extensive cultivation precludes one instantiation of the *immigration scenario*, i.e. the one involving farming migrants, since there is no land left for newcomers to cultivate. Conversely, areas with lots of 'empty' space inviting newcomers to settle permanently lack the economic potential for temporary migrations in pursuit of higher education.

Furthermore, both scenarios also share some more or less circumstantial factors which potentially contribute to the ongoing language shift. These include the following three:

- the extensive network of primary schools throughout the area which was already mentioned above. This is correlated with the fact that in all villages there is at least one linguistic domain in which Indonesian is the dominant language. The decentralization policy setting in Indonesia after the fall of the Suharto government in 1998 has brought more autonomy to regional and local government agencies, including the educational sector (compare, for example, *Indonesian Government Regulation No. 25/2000* on educational decentralization and *Law No 20/2003* on the National Education System). Primary schools now have the option to include

classes in the local vernacular in their curriculum, but to date (i.e. 2007) little use has been made of this option.²²

- the rapid introduction of television which began in the late 1980s. In 1993 at least one or two television sets were found in practically every village. The social consequences of the introduction of television are quite noticeable, because watching television has become almost immediately the most favoured evening entertainment. The programmes are nowadays almost all in Indonesian or have at least Indonesian subtitles (in the early days of Indonesian television, many English language series and movies were shown, often with few or no subtitles).
- the much improved transportation system—better roads providing for faster, cheaper and more regular transportation—which allows a higher degree of general mobility. This is particularly relevant for the *emigration scenario* since it gives the employees in the administrative centers the possibility to spend weekends and short holidays in their native villages. This used to be impossible at times when most journeys took a minimum of 8–10 hours and were highly unpredictable because of constantly changing road conditions.

More importantly perhaps, both scenarios as outlined here are similar in that they pertain to the somewhat shallow or superficial level of the outwardly observable. That is, one could easily argue that they do not get to the 'real' or 'deeper' causes of language shift. Thus, for example, it is obvious that the migratory movements which play an essential role in both scenarios are not spontaneous happenings which are not amenable to further explanation or motivation. Instead, they most certainly have their deeper causes in economic motives and forces. The farmers migrating to the Tomini-Tolitoli area all come from heavily overpopulated areas (South Sulawesi, Java, Bali) where it is hardly possible to get access to enough land to support oneself and a family by farming. Young members of Tomini-Tolitoli speech communities want to get a better education in order to be able to get better paid and relatively secure jobs. While there can be no doubt about the relevance of such deeper economic forces, I would hold that the kind of more 'superficial' scenario sketched here still is an important facet in a coherent and comprehensive theory of language endangerment. We will return to this point in the conclusion (Section 3.5).

Another aspect of both scenarios that demands explanation on a deeper level pertains to the fact that in both scenarios it is possible for a minority to influence the linguistic usage patterns of a majority of native Tomini-Tolitoli in the direction of a reduction in the usage domains of the Tomini-Tolitoli language. Most importantly, in both scenarios it is not at all obvious why the changes induced by the arrival of out-of-area migrants or a substantial number of native government employees do not lead to relatively stable bi- or multilingual settings. This is particularly surprising

²² See Mochtar (2005) for a first investigation of the impact of the new policy options on curriculum development and language maintenance in the area, focusing on Totoli.

because multilingualism seems to have been the norm in the area for centuries. And bilingualism is the norm for many of the out-of-state migrants, such as the Bugis, Chinese, and Bajau, many of whom are bilingual in Indonesian and their native languages.

It seems to me that none of the sociostructural factors discussed so far can account for this essential aspect. It is also not obvious whether and how the individual decisions leading to mono- rather than multilingualism could be conditioned by economic factors or considerations (other than in a trivializing Marxist view that all social cognition and behaviour is rooted in economic power relations). Instead, it seems necessary to turn to factors related to social psychology and their sociohistorical sources in order to address this question in a fruitful manner. This is a topic well beyond the scope of this chapter and the expertise of its author. Two relatively superficial aspects of relevance for such a study, however, are fairly clear.

First, the Tomini-Tolitoli area has been, and continues to be, at the outer periphery of a power and dominance network whose main centre is in Makassar (controlled by Bugis and Makasar) and whose intermediary centre today is in Palu (controlled by Kaili and migrants from South Sulawesi). This has been the case for at least two hundred, probably three hundred years. One small piece of evidence for this power network is the fact that the predecessors of the present university in Palu, Universitas Tadulako, were two out-of-state branches of higher education institutions in Makassar, i.e. Universitas Hasanuddin and IKIP (teachers college) Ujung Pandang. These two branches were integrated into the new Universitas Tadulako in 1981. The majority of the staff of the present Universitas Tadulako continues to be from South Sulawesi.

Second, many Tomini-Tolitoli speakers admit that they feel ashamed (Indonesian *malu*) to use their native language in the presence of native speakers of out-of-area languages such as Kaili, Bugis or Gorontalo (but not Balinese or Chinese!). Several times I met people who tried to hide their linguistic affiliations, claiming to be native speakers of Buginese.

3.4.2 The present state of the Tomini-Tolitoli languages

From the preceding discussion one prognosis clearly emerges: if the Tomini-Tolitoli languages have a future at all, it will be as part of a complex language ecology which involves at least one non-Tomini-Tolitoli language, dominating the linguistic interactions in the political, administrative and educational domains, i.e. Indonesian. This is not a totally new scenario since individual and societal bi- and multilingualism have been a common phenomenon in the area for quite a long time. What is threatened, however, is the relative stability of the former bi- and multilingual settings and the role the Tomini-Tolitoli languages had to play in these settings.

The ongoing sociocultural changes will affect the usage of the Tomini-Tolitoli languages, generally in the direction of a reduction in their use. Inasmuch as all Tomini-Tolitoli languages face (further) reductions in their usage domains, it can be claimed that they are all endangered. Such an assessment, however, is of fairly

limited value since it obfuscates the quite substantial differences that exist between the various speech communities with respect to their potential of (re-)developing a stable multilingual setting which includes a Tomini-Tolitoli language. Taking this potential as the major parameter, a fairly broad distinction between three kinds of Tomini-Tolitoli speech communities can be made:

- those where the prerequisites for a stable multilingual setting including a Tomini-Tolitoli language no longer seem to exist. The Tomini-Tolitoli languages in these communities may be characterized as moribund.
- those where it is unlikely that a stable multilingual setting including a Tomini-Tolitoli language will re-emerge. Here one could distinguish various degrees of likelihood ('from highly unlikely' to 'not very likely'). The Tomini-Tolitoli languages in these communities may be characterized as endangered.
- those where there is, in principle, a potential for a prominent role of the Tomini-Tolitoli language in the emerging new language ecology, provided that the process of language shift currently in its incipient stages is brought to a halt. The Tomini-Tolitoli languages in these communities may be characterized as vital, but long-term endangered.

The following review of the present state of the Tomini-Tolitoli languages is organized in accordance with these three broad classes.

3.4.2.1 MORIBUND LANGUAGES Moribund languages are here defined as languages whose domains of use are already extremely limited and, in particular, do not include any longer regular verbal interactions with children. Typically, speakers still having a relatively full command of the language are in their fifties or older. There are two such languages in the area, i.e. Taje and Dampal. In both cases the present state is a consequence of the *immigration scenario*.

The Dampal were the original settlers in the area between Ogoamas (northern tip of Sojol) and Bangkir (Dampal Selatan). Today, there are only very few, not more than 300, native Dampal left. Most of them are intermarried with Bugis and do not speak Dampal any more. Bugis and Mandar have been migrating to the area since about 1920 and dominate it today (95 per cent of the present population, i.e. ca. 20,000 people, are Bugis or Mandar). Reportedly, a disastrous smallpox epidemic occurred among the Dampal in 1919, when 800 families (ca. 3,500 people?) died within three months. That is, the area seems to have been largely depopulated in the very early stages of the migration of South Sulawesi farmers to the Tomini-Tolitoli region.

Dampal probably was a dialect of Dampelas, a language spoken some 100 kilometres to the south of the present-day location of the Dampal. The two populations must have been separated for quite some time since they hardly know of each other. I stayed for about 3 weeks in the Dampal area and managed to unearth only tiny fragments of information about the Dampal and their language (in the more vital communities about ten times as much information was gathered in the same amount

of time). Most of the few rememberers that I met—none of them younger than fifty—had problems in providing basic lexical information (the Swadesh 200 word list). Only two speakers seemed to have achieved some fluency in their childhood and were able to provide a short text and a few elicited clauses. Both of them have died since.

The Taje are the original settlers of Petapa, a village located at the southernmost end of Tomini-Tolitoli area on the east coast, close to Parigi. The distance to the next location of a group of Tomini-Tolitoli speakers (i.e. Sidole) is ca. 50 km. Petapa's population of 1568 (1992 census) consists of two Kaili groups, Tara and Rai, and Taje. Today, the Tara are the dominant group in terms of numbers of speakers (more than 50 per cent of the village population), economically and linguistically.

Truly native Taje, i.e. both parents being Taje, are few. Estimates varied around 15 per cent of the village population (ca. 200 people). There are, however, considerably more people who know some Taje because one parent was Taje. That these people know some Taje at all is probably due to the fact that most of the Taje live in one *dusun* (Kamonji) which is separated by a few rice fields from the other parts of the village.

Most Taje claimed that they didn't know the language very well and pointed to one older man as the one person who really knew the language (and the one to ask questions about the language). In eliciting lexical items, the four contributors I worked with made an effort to find words that are different from Rai or Tara (which did not always produce satisfactory results). In eliciting and recording clauses, however, many Tara and Rai items surfaced, bearing witness to the fact that Taje in Petapa is heavily influenced by these languages.

There are two more groups of Taje who live in resettlement projects further north. One project is located in Sidole (50 km north of Petapa) where about 150 Taje live together with as many Ampibabo-Lauje. The other project is located in Sienjo (another 30 km further up the coast) where about 30 Taje settle together with about twice as many Tajio. Both projects were established in 1982. Before that time the inhabitants of the two projects were middle or inner hill people. The interaction between the members of the two Tomini-Tolitoli groups in these projects remains to be investigated. At present, no informed prognosis as to the future pattern of language usage in these settlements are possible.²³ Note, however, that the vicinity of Sidole is dominated by Ampibabo-Lauje and Rai, and the vicinity of Sienjo by Tajio and Ledo/Rai.

In concluding this section it may be well to remember two points: first, language death in the kinds of setting just mentioned is a very slow and gradual process. Second, the assessment proposed here is not based on a detailed long-term study of the communities. Hence, in particular in the case of Taje, it is very well possible that important domains of language usage involving Taje have been missed. Both points

²³ This presupposes that the projects develop into permanent settlements. About one third of the resettlement projects in the Tomini-Tolitoli area resolved after the government sponsorship came to an end. Note that I visited the Sienjo settlement only very briefly (one day) and stayed close to the Sidole settlement for about one week.

are nicely illustrated by the fact that Taje was already declared to be nearly extinct by Adriani, who made a voyage along the Tomini coast in 1902 (cf. Noorduyn 1991:71)!

3.4.2.2 ENDANGERED LANGUAGES As noted in the introduction to this section, endangered languages are here defined as languages whose usage domains are presently undergoing a rapid reduction. This reduction manifests itself, inter alia, in the fact that the linguistic competence of speakers under twenty is extremely varied, ranging from highly fluent speakers who use the language every day to speakers with a primarily passive competence. For the latter ones, linguistic interactions involving the native language are restricted to conversations with their grandparents. In such interactions, the grandparents would often use the Tomini-Tolitoli language while the grandchildren would respond in Indonesian.

For all Tomini-Tolitoli languages there are some speech communities where the Tomini-Tolitoli language may be considered endangered in this sense. This holds in particular for most major administrative and commercial centres, such as Sabang (Dampelas), Tolitoli (Totoli), Ampibabo (Ampibabo-Lauje), Kasimbar (Tajio), and Moutong (Tialo).²⁴ In these centres, language usage is influenced by both the *emigration scenario* and the *immigration scenario*.

In Tolitoli, for example, a town of more than 30,000 inhabitants, less than half of the population belong to the original settlers of the area, i.e. the Totoli. The remainder of the population consists mostly of people from outside the Tomini-Tolitoli area, including Buol, Bajau, Bugis, Mandar, Gorontalo, Javanese, Balinese, Chinese and Arabs, who have come to this town because of its extensive administrative body (Tolitoli city is the capital of the district (*Kabupaten*) Tolitoli), its educational facilities or for trading purposes. Of the four (administrative) villages which together form the town of Tolitoli, there is only one, Nalu, where the Totoli are in the majority. And it is this village where Totoli is still used as an everyday language in some quarters.

However, even in Nalu Totoli is on the wane, not so much because of the substantial number of migrants that live there, but because it is a very prosperous area. Many of Nalu's inhabitants made a (small) fortune during the clove boom in the 1970s. This enabled them to send (some of) their children to university in Palu or Makassar. Many of these children were able to secure government jobs. The consequences have been described above in the *emigration scenario*: the young government employees live for extended times outside Nalu, speak only Indonesian with their family, but return regularly to Nalu and have a non-negligible influence on linguistic usage there. The same holds to an even larger degree for the other villages which form a part of Tolitoli city. In these villages it is rare to find a fluent speaker below the age of fifty.

This scenario, however, is not confined to administrative centres. There are, for example, six other villages in the Tolitoli plain where Totoli used to be the everyday language. Here, as in the town of Tolitoli, the *immigration scenario* and the *emigration scenario* mutually reinforce each other: the Totoli permanently living in the

²⁴ The exception is the subdistrict capital Tinombo which will be discussed in the next section.

village are now a minority because of out-of-area migrants and because a substantial minority of the younger generation studies or works outside the native village. Under the influence of the 'outsiders', the permanent residents shift towards Indonesian as their everyday language.

Another example are the five villages on the west coast (in *Kecamatan Sojol*) where Lauje used to be the everyday language (many more Lauje live on the east coast and in the inner hills between the two coastal locations; cf. Section 3.4.2.3). Buginese and Kaili migrants have come to these five villages (Siboang, Siwalempu, Balukang, Bou, and Pesik) in substantial numbers, and they continue to increase rapidly to this day. A particularly drastic example is the village of Bou. When I stayed there in 1988, the Kaili and a few Bugis settled on the fringes of the village centre, separated from the Lauje *dusun* by a coconut grove. In 1993, the area occupied by Bugis was about ten times the size it had in 1988, extending right into the Lauje *dusun* and reversing centre and periphery: the Lauje are now on the fringes of a Bugis/Kaili village.

The languages mentioned so far in this section are also spoken in other communities where their status does not seem to be in imminent danger (see the following section). There are, however, two languages, Dampelas and Balaesang, which seem to be endangered in all the communities in which they are still part of the linguistic ecology. In both cases the *emigration scenario* plays an important role.

Dampelas speakers are found in eight villages in *Kecamatan Dampelas*. In seven of these villages, there are strong migrant communities and the everyday language in the public domain is exclusively Indonesian (the *immigration scenario*). The population of the remaining village, Talaga, is 99 per cent Dampelas. Talaga is considered to be the original settlement place of the Dampelas and the place where the 'best' Dampelas is spoken. It is located on the shores of a beautiful small lake. Lake and village are encircled by a small hill chain which sets them off both from the sea (to the west) and a very large plain which extends south, east, and north of Talaga. This natural geographic boundary is probably the reason why Talaga has not become a place to settle for the many migrants who have been attracted to the large plain.

The hill slopes surrounding Talaga are relatively fertile, in particular for cash crops (other than coconuts). Since the 1960s the village has witnessed a continuous economic growth which has provided at least one third of the families with the means to have some of their children go to Palu for better schooling and university. Note that sending their children off to school in Palu means considerable hardship for the members of the family staying in the village. That is, although these families are relatively well off in the sense that they do not have to worry about their daily subsistence, the higher education for their children comes at considerable personal expense. Among other things, it involves tight restrictions on the expenditures for food items not produced by themselves (buying fish, for example) or other items that could alleviate the hardships of farming (such as buying a motorbike for commuting the 3–15 km between garden and village home). In families with 4–6 children (which

is still the rule in the older generation), it is rare that more than one or two of the children get a chance to go on studying beyond primary school.

Nevertheless, there has been a substantial increase of extramural educational careers since the mid 1980s. On the weekends and during school holidays these students return to the village to help their families with the gardens and rice fields which provide the major source of the family income. When conversing among themselves, they tend to use Indonesian (as they are used to when in Palu). The children of the politically leading families have only a very poor command of Dampelas, bearing witness to the fact that they grew up in an environment where Indonesian was the most commonly used language. In those families who aspire to higher education for their children it is common to use Indonesian when conversing with them. Of those students who had finished their university education by 1993, only very few had returned to the village for good, the others working in Palu or in subdistrict capitals. In short, we find all the characteristics of the *emigration scenario* in progress. If the present trends are not reversed, it is highly probable that the state of Dampelas will resemble that of its close kin Dampal (Section 3.4.2.1) before too long.

The situation for the three villages where Balaesang is spoken seems to be similar to the one just described for Talaga. All of these villages are almost exclusively populated by Balaesang. In Rano, the only village I actually visited, I observed the following: almost everybody in this small village (827 inhabitants according to the 1991 census) was speaking Balaesang. This was fairly easy to observe since a large part of the population crowded at night around the village's two television sets. On first sight, Rano gives the impression of a very vital Balaesang speech community (much more so than Talaga). However, there was a conspicuous hole in the population present at the television meetings, pertaining to the 15–30 years age bracket. Upon inquiry, it turned out that almost every family was said to have some children studying in Palu (or Makassar). Thus, although the symptoms of the *emigration scenario* are not yet as noticeable in Rano as they are in the town of Tolitoli or in Talaga, it seems likely that the further development proceeds along the lines characteristic of the *emigration scenario*.

It was claimed that the situation in the other two Balaesang villages is similar to the one in Rano but that would have to be checked further before making an informed prognosis for the future of the Balaesang language.²⁵

3.4.2.3 VITAL, BUT LONG-TERM ENDANGERED LANGUAGES In 1993, eight of the eleven Tomini-Tolitoli languages/major dialects were spoken in apparently vital speech communities. Five of these languages, i.e. Totoli,²⁶ Ampibabo-Lauje, Tajio,

²⁵ Rano differs from the other two villages, Kamonji and Ketong, in that it is not located on the coast but right in the middle of the Balaesang peninsula, on the shores of a small beautiful lake (similar to Talaga). Since ca. 1990 (when the roads became better), the lake provides a new source of income because its fresh water fish can be sold for a good price in Palu markets.

²⁶ These Totoli live in four somewhat isolated villages ca. 80 km further east of the Totoli discussed above in the section on endangered languages.

Boano and Tialo, are spoken by exclusively coastal populations (Boano in only one village). Most of their villages are 'full' in the sense that there is no space for new migrants to settle in the immediate neighbourhood of the Tomini-Tolitoli. Hence, it is unlikely that these communities will be affected by the *immigration scenario* as outlined above.

However, in the case of the Ampibabo-Lauje and the Tajio, the larger area where these speech communities are found is heavily populated by Rai and Ledo, with the Tomini-Tolitoli villages being surrounded by Ledo/Rai villages. In the case of the Tialo, there are very large transmigration projects right 'at the back' of many Tialo villages, the transmigrants clearly outnumbering the Tialo. In the past, such settlement patterns did not affect language usage very much since the different communities did not interact very closely. It is not clear whether this will continue to be the case in the future when improved transportation and the introduction of telecommunication (begun in the early 1990s) will provide for new interactional patterns on the subdistrict level, a possibility eagerly awaited by the subdistrict administrations. A first example of such new patterns are the regular subdistrict-wide soccer tournaments that have been organized in those subdistricts where the roads are good enough for regular and cheap transportation.

The economic development in all of these villages is in the direction of the *emigration scenario*. This development will, however, be somewhat slower than in the economically stronger villages due to less fertile grounds and overproduction crises (the latter have started to occur since a few years caused by the fact that everyone plants the same cash crop(s), i.e. the ones currently sponsored by a government programme). There is also a limit to careers in administration and education. That is, if no new opportunities for wage work emerge—an item that tops the agenda of the provincial government—the possibilities for temporarily residing outside the village, which forms the core of the *emigration scenario*, will be rather limited. Still, the aspirations of the population in these villages seem to be very similar to those in the economically more advanced villages in which the symptoms of the *emigration scenario* are easily detectable. It is thus very likely that a large scale language shift will occur in those villages with vital Tomini-Tolitoli speech communities as well, if opportunities for (temporary) wage work outside the community arise.²⁷

The assessment of the viability of the remaining three languages is complicated by the fact that they are not spoken exclusively by coastal populations but by middle and inner hill people as well. In fact, one language, i.e. Pendau, is spoken only by middle hill people. Today, most of these people live in resettlement projects or small hamlets close to coastal villages (the Pendau language area spreads very far along the west coast (more than 150 km) which is quite surprising given the fairly small

²⁷ One possibility I have heard being pondered in various of these villages is the possibility to seek wage work abroad, in particular in Malaysia. At least one person of the Tolitoli area is known to work as a teacher in Malaysia.

number of speakers (ca. 3.200)). Although the Pendau seem to have been in contact with the coastal population for a very long time, they have entered into closer social relationships with speakers of another group only in a few instances.²⁸ Otherwise they seem to keep pretty much to themselves even if their settlements are located only a few hundred meters away from a coastal village centre.

In their settlements, Pendau is very much the everyday language. I witnessed only three kinds of occasions in which Pendau use Indonesian. One concerns occasional visits paid to the nearby village (for example, on market days) and the (very infrequent) visits by other people from the village (mostly in official missions). Another situation concerns religious services administered by Menadonese Protestant missionaries who have been active among the Pendau in Dampelas. And, thirdly, most of the Pendau children today attend primary school where Indonesian is the language of instruction.

In the future, the pressure on the Pendau to integrate more fully into the coastal village life will increase. Since the coastal population is socially dominant (and looks down on the Pendau as supposedly 'uncivilized mountain people'), it is unlikely that the Pendau language will play a role in the linguistic ecology of the integrated communities. Note also that the traditional contact pattern between Tomini-Tolitoli groups has been for the later arrivals to learn the language of the established community. It is unclear, however, to what extent the Pendau will give way to the pressure towards further integration.

Turning now to the remaining two languages, Dondo and Lauje, the comments on Dondo can be very brief. Dondo is spoken by both a coastal and a middle hill population. The situation of the coastal population is similar to the one sketched above for the Ampibabo-Lauje and Tajio coastal populations. The situation of the middle hill people—all of whom live in resettlement projects and small hamlets—is similar to the one just described for the Pendau. For both populations, there is, however, one perhaps crucial difference: most of the middle hill Dondo interact with a coastal population which is also Dondo. This set-up may lead to a reinforcement of their use of the Dondo language in a broad variety of domains.

Such a reinforcement is presently observable in the Lauje area around Tinombo, an area almost exclusively populated by some 30,000 Lauje who live in all three agro-ecological zones (coastal, middle and inner hills). Most of the coastal villages are overcrowded and relatively poor due to the fact that in this area steep mountains project very close to the coast line, leaving only little land for rice fields and gardens. Hence, major components of both the *emigration scenario* and the *immigration scenario*

²⁸ One example is the island of Simatang which reportedly is populated mostly by Bajau, some of whom are intermarried with Pendau. I did not visit the island myself but obtained these reports from various government officials in *Kecamatan Dampal Utara* and from the people I interviewed in Bambapula, the mainland village close to Simatang. Furthermore, some Pendau seem to have intermarried with Sangirese on the Balaesang peninsula (Phil Quick, pc). See Quick (2008) for more in-depth information on the Pendau and their language.

do not apply. Even in Tinombo, the subdistrict capital, where only about 60 per cent of the population are Lauje and strong Kaili and Gorontalo communities exist, the tendency towards language shift is not as pronounced as in other subdistrict capitals. One of the reasons for this seems to be the fact that many coastal Lauje have relatives among the middle hill Lauje and interact fairly regularly with them for personal and economic reasons. On these occasions, only Lauje is spoken since the command of Indonesian among the middle hill people is generally poor.

As for the inner hill Lauje, there is simply no space for resettlement projects close to the coastal locations in the area. Attempts by the government to resettle them further south have not been successful so far.

In short, the prospects for Lauje are probably the best among the Tomini-Tolitoli languages because of the demographic, geographic, and economic factors just mentioned. This, however, does not mean that they are immune to language shift. It is almost certain that all Lauje will become bilingual in Lauje and Indonesian in the near future (this is already the case for coastal Lauje). What is not so clear is whether this bilingual setting will be stable or just represents an intermediate stage in a complete shift towards Indonesian.

3.5 Conclusion

The preceding sections develop and illustrate an approach to the problem of language endangerment in terms of endangerment scenarios. This approach presupposes a rather strict distinction between the symptoms of language endangerment and its causes. The notion *endangerment scenario*, as understood here, only applies to the potential causes of language endangerment. It is based on the assumption that there is no single factor which could be claimed to cause language endangerment. Instead, language endangerment is seen as the outcome of a complex constellation of factors which have to co-occur in order to have an impact on patterns of language use.

Approaching language endangerment in terms of scenarios does not mean that no generalizations are possible with regard to its causes. However, this approach rests on the assumption that useful generalizations would not simply consist of a list of possible causes. Instead, what is required is a typology of endangerment scenarios which provides a systematization of typical constellations leading to large scale language shift in a given community.

The scenario approach is also supported in Chapter 4 by Charles E. Grimes in this volume, which discusses endangerment scenarios on Buru, an island east of Sulawesi. Here as well, (forced) migrations of local populations play a major role in the loss of two languages. However, as in the case of the Tomini-Tolitoli languages, it would be misleading to claim that migration necessarily leads to language shift, as shown by the fact the some other varieties on Buru survived the forced migrations under Dutch colonial rule.

Comparison with the Buru cases nicely illustrates the need for detailed and finely-grained descriptions of endangerment scenarios in order to arrive at a useful and comprehensive typology of such scenarios. While many details in the overall scenarios in northern Central Sulawesi and on Buru are strikingly similar, others diverge quite clearly. To mention just two examples of divergence, some of the Buru cases involve the migrations of whole speech communities rather than subgroups or individuals, and the migrations in Buru were forcibly brought about by a colonial power rather than by individual economic aspirations and motivations.

From the point of view of a typology of endangerment scenarios, the question involved in such comparisons is which differences actually matter and which don't. Thus, one may well question whether the distinction between forced and so-called voluntary migrations is relevant in this regard. Migrations which are organized and enforced by government agencies are often put in opposition to 'voluntary' migrations which seem to be initiated by the migrants themselves and do not involve the visible application of force. However, more often than not such 'voluntary' migrations are caused by difficult living conditions and they are in some sense also 'forced' by these conditions. Although there may be different kinds of forces at work here, I do not think that a distinction between forced and 'voluntary' migrations along these lines is an important or useful one in researching language endangerment.²⁹

Instead, comparison of the Sulawesi and Buru scenarios clearly shows the crucial importance of other factors interacting with the migratory movements in bringing about language shift in a specific situation. Thus, for example, in the Buru cases one important factor contributing to language death is the fact that the original homeland of a given group is no longer populated by a segment of the displaced speech community. And, as detailed in section 3.4.1 above, in the Tomini-Tolitoli migration scenarios, settlement patterns on the *dusun* level are important in providing a 'fertile' environment for changing traditional usage patterns.

This brings us back to the issue of 'deeper' causes of language endangerment already raised at the end of section 3.4.1.3. Continuing the argument from the preceding paragraph, one could easily argue that so-called 'forced' migrations are of course also based on economic motives and power constellations (the forced displacement of speech communities on Buru was part of the Dutch strategy to win full control of the area in order to be able to exploit its natural resources, in particular its famous spices). Hence, one could claim that at the root of all migrations and any other similarly 'superficial' factors influencing language use in a given community are economic interests and power constellations.

While the basic role of economic forces clearly is of central importance, they are not sufficient to account for the manifold and highly varied configurations of language

²⁹ A different kind of migration may be involved in imperialist expansions, a topic beyond the scope of the present contribution.

shift occurring throughout the world's speech communities. In order to understand how economic forces influence and shape linguistic usage patterns, one has to look at a largish collection of factors, including demography, settlement patterns, marriage preferences, etc, and their interaction. Only some constellations of these factors lead to community-wide language shift, others not. And it is this aspect of language endangerment that the notion of an *endangerment scenario* is intended to capture and represent.

4

Digging for the Roots of Language Death in Eastern Indonesia: The Cases of Kayeli and Hukumina

Charles E. Grimes

4.1 Introduction

In the Indonesian province of Maluku where the population is roughly 50 per cent Muslim and 50 per cent Christian, people often make distinctions along religious lines in explaining their view of language ecology. In Christian communities, they assert, people no longer speak their vernacular languages and have shifted to Ambonese Malay.¹ In Muslim communities, on the other hand, they assert that people have retained their vernacular languages and speak Ambonese Malay as a second language. While this largely characterizes villages around the provincial capital on the small island of Ambon, religious affiliation per se has not been the determining factor in language maintenance or shift in central Maluku. One has only to look at the nearby island of Buru to find the opposite dynamics—there some Muslim communities have shifted to Malay, while traditional and Christian communities continue to use the vernacular language vigorously (See also Florey 2005c, Florey and Ewing in press: 5–6, Musgrave and Ewing 2006).

In this chapter I focus on two relatively recent cases of language shift and death among Muslim communities on the island of Buru, looking at a variety of relevant historical, cultural and social factors. On the basis of the understanding gained from these Buru cases, I then discuss several other endangered languages and cases of

¹ Ambonese Malay is a regional variety distinct from the standard Malay known as Indonesian (see Collins 1980, C. Grimes 1985, 1996, B. D. C. Grimes 1991, van Minde 1997). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 69th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Organized session: Field reports/Endangered languages, organized by Ken Hale and Tony Woodbury, New Orleans, 5–8 January 1995, and then archived as C. Grimes (1995b). I am indebted to Barbara Dix Grimes for her comments.