UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The body and its parts in Tidore, a Papuan language of Eastern Indonesia

van Staden, M.

DOI

[10.1016/j.langsci.2005.11.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2005.11.013)

Publication date

2006

Published in

Language Sciences

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Staden, M. (2006). The body and its parts in Tidore, a Papuan language of Eastern Indonesia. *Language Sciences*, 28(2-3), 323-343.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2005.11.013>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

The body and its parts in Tidore, a Papuan language of Eastern Indonesia

Miriam van Staden

ACLCL, University of Amsterdam, General Linguistics, Spuistraat 210, 1012 VT Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

This paper discusses properties of body part nomenclature in Tidore. As well as a number of simplex terms that refer to parts of the body, Tidore also has a considerable number of complex terms. Some problems relating to the identification of terms as ‘simplex’ are discussed and it is shown that at least one named part of the body, *yohu* ‘leg/foot’, does not correspond to a perceptually ‘given’, natural part of the body since it does not include the upper part of the thigh. Inherent possessor terms allow for a lexicalisation-based hierarchy of the human body. It is uncertain, however, whether this partonomy also reflects the conceptualisation of the body and its parts in Tidore. Elicitation of data that do not directly rely on the lexicalisation of partonomic relations may reveal an additional partonomy.

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Tidore; Papuan languages; Body part terms; Partonomy; Meronymy; Semantic fields; (Inherent) Possession

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to shed some light on how the segmentation of the human body is encoded in the lexical semantics of Tidore. Terms for parts of the body in Tidore are interesting for several reasons. First, it is often assumed that labels for parts of the body neatly map onto perceptually distinct, i.e., visually ‘given’ parts, but there is at least one

Abbreviations: EXC, exclusive; F, feminine; INAL, inalienable; N, neutral (between masculine and feminine); NEG, negator; NH, non-human; NOM, nominalisation; PL, plural; POS, possessor; RED, reduplication; SG, singular; SU, subject.

E-mail address: m.vanstaden@uva.nl

term in Tidore, *yohu* ‘leg’ that shows that this is not always the case, because its extension does not include the upper part of the thigh. Second, it appears that a number of words for parts of the body are derived from verbs that express the actions usually performed with that part of the body. Third, a number of terms that used to refer to parts of the body also refer to parts of boats, houses, and kinship relations. A question is then whether they are basically body part terms, or have an origin in one of these other semantic fields, or even whether the terms are simply semantically general. A fourth point of interest is the problematic nature of the notion of a partonomy of body parts in Tidore. It is argued that this follows from the particular way in which part–whole relations in Tidore are expressed, combined with the existence of a number of ‘inherent possessor’ terms, that is, terms for parts of the body that must be expressed in a possessive construction with the superordinate part as possessor. The resulting difficulty in setting up a ‘conceptual’ partonomy of parts of the body on the basis of linguistic elicitation is weighed against the interesting possibility of constructing a ‘linguistic’ partonomy as reflected by the inherent possessor terms.

2. The language and its speakers

The Tidore language is spoken mainly on the island Tidore, and on some adjacent islands, in the North Moluccas of Indonesia. It is classified as a Papuan language, but prolonged contact with surrounding Austronesian languages and the local lingua franca ‘North Moluccan Malay’ has left its mark, not only on the lexicon but also on the syntax and morphology. There are at present approximately 40,000 people for whom Tidore may be considered the first language, but all speakers of Tidore are fully conversant in North Moluccan Malay (NMM). In fact, for at least the past 20 years, children begin by speaking NMM and only begin to pick up on Tidore when they are between four and six years old. The language is clearly endangered. The influence from NMM as well as the national language Indonesian is increasing, and Tidore is riddled with NMM and Indonesian loans. In some domains this applies more strongly than others.

In the domain of the body and its parts, we find remarkably few loans (cf. Section 4.3 below). What might be expected in a situation of intense and prolonged language contact is that semantic patterns converge so that the semantics of a NMM term or expression neatly corresponds to an equivalent Tidore term or expression. This is found, for instance, in the domain of spatial deixis where NMM is a perfect copy of Tidore (van Staden, 2000, forthcoming). Yet, in the domain of the body there are some curious mismatches between the terms and their uses in Tidore and NMM. For example, in many Austronesian languages the ‘liver’ is the seat of emotions, and this is also the case in various NMM expressions, for example, those relating to jealousy, happiness, nostalgia, etc. This is also not uncommon in Papuan languages. In Tidore, however, not only the liver but also the heart serves as a seat of emotions. To have a painful heart (*nyinga gola*) means to be jealous, but to have a painful liver (*gate gola*) means to miss someone. In NMM a single expression *hati sakit* ‘sick/painful liver’ covers both.

The North Halmahera family to which Tidore belongs is generally characterised by SOV constituent order, subject and object marking on the verb, and a possessor–possessed order. Of these characteristics, Tidore has retained subject marking on the verb and the order in the possessive construction. Tidore is now an SVO language. Main word classes are nouns, verbs and adjectives; some adverbs are found, but they are typically verbal in

origin; there are few prepositions, and no postpositions. It is a predominantly isolating language with little inflectional or derivational morphology. Highly characteristic of Tidore is the freedom with which words from even closed classes such as numerals or interjections can function as predicators in a clause without morphological derivation. Relevant for this paper is one form of reduplication and a nominalisation strategy involving a ‘nasal prefix’, which usually surfaces as voicing of the first consonant. We return to these in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.

3. Body part nomenclature in Tidore

Data for this article were collected over several periods of fieldwork between 1995 and 2001. Terms for the body were taken from elicited word lists and spontaneous text material (narratives, conversations, poetry, radio broadcasts, etc.) and some additional material was elicited during interviews specifically on the body and its parts. These interviews were conducted as much as possible in the Tidore language. Finally, during my last field work period in 2001, I conducted a pilot study of a ‘colouring in task’ in which I gave consultants a lexical term and asked them to colour in the corresponding part of the body. This was carried out with three consultants and a limited number of terms. The compelling results fed into the development of an experimental ‘Body colouring task’ (van Staden and Majid, [this issue](#)).

The inventory of terms given in this section is not exhaustive, but it will serve as the basis for a discussion of the most important linguistic aspects of body part naming in Tidore. The following topics are covered in later sections: what do the basic terms in Tidore typically refer to (Section 4)? How do terms for body parts function in other domains, and in what sense do they ‘basically’ refer to the human body (Section 4.1)? What is the role of word taboo in this domain, and how do body parts figure in non-every day speech genres (Section 4.2)? In which domains do we find loan words (Section 4.3)? How are body part terms derived (Section 5)? And finally, is it possible to construct a par-tonomy of Tidore parts of the body (Sections 6 and 7)?

The inventory of terms is divided into four groups: (1) terms for the face and its parts; (2) external parts, with the exception of those in the first group, (3) internal parts; (4) other parts. The last group includes terms that refer to products of the body (sweat, hair, urine); to growths, scars and birthmarks; to body configurations (fist); and to a few terms such as ‘umbilical cord’ that are clearly related to the human body, but at least for most of people’s lives not a ‘part’ of it. The focus of this chapter is on the human body, and although most of the terms used here are also used for parts of animals, there are a number of additional terms for animals, but these are not included.

Each of these four groups of terms includes simplex and complex terms. Simplex terms in Tidore are mono-morphemic, non-loans that are in every day use. Some terms that are used only in restricted (linguistic) contexts are presented as ‘rare’. Among complex terms, ‘inherent possessor’ terms are separated and are discussed independently in Section 6. These are always possessed by a fixed, higher order body part term. For each group I briefly indicate what is characteristic of this group, and point out some peculiarities of particular items. In the sections following this overview, I discuss the different categories at more length. The tables are organised as follows: the first column gives the Tidore term; the second gives the common translation; the third column gives the (literal) gloss if the term is morphologically complex. Where necessary a fourth column is reserved for

Table 1
The face and its parts

Term	Translation	Gloss ^a	Grammatical information
Simplex			
<i>aki</i>	‘tongue’		
<i>ane</i>	‘forehead’		
<i>gai</i>	‘face’		
<i>ing</i>	‘tooth’		
<i>lao</i>	‘eye’		
<i>moda</i>	‘mouth’		
<i>ngisi</i>	‘gum’		
<i>ngun</i>	‘nose’		
<i>oko</i>	‘chin’		
<i>wang^b</i>	‘cheek’		
Rare			
<i>gonaga</i>	‘face’		
<i>karabesi</i>	‘beard’		
<i>gubira</i>	‘stubble’	??-rice	root <i>bira</i> ‘rice’; origin of <i>gu</i> is unknown
Complex			
<i>gumi</i>	‘rope; moustache’		
<i>ing ma-ngoli</i>	‘molar’	‘tooth INAL-NOM.bite’ ^c	<i>goli</i> ‘bite’
<i>lao ma-gogo</i>	‘eyebrow’	‘eye INAL-hair’	
<i>lao ma-gomo</i>	‘eyeball’	‘eye INAL-eyeball’	
<i>lao ma-gotu</i>	‘pupil, iris’	‘eye INAL-NOM.black’	<i>kotu</i> ‘black’
<i>lao ma-jobi</i>	‘eyelid (also used occasionally for eye lashes)’	‘eye INAL-NOM.wink’	<i>cobi lao</i> ‘to wink’
<i>moda ma-liso</i>	‘lip’	‘mouth POS-rim’	

^a A gloss is only given when it is different from the translation, e.g. with morphologically complex terms.
^b This term is suspiciously similar to Dutch *wang* ‘cheek’, but unlike other borrowings not recognised as a loan by native speakers. It is tentatively included in the list of ‘simplex’ terms.
^c NB this is not a predicted form of the N-prefix nominalisation. It should in fact give the same form: *ing magoli*. Native speakers, however, insist that the form is derived from *goli* and semantically this is also rather likely.

additional grammatical information, such as particular collocations into which the term (or its root morpheme) enters.

3.1. The face and its parts

Most of the basic terms in the domain of the face refer to the mouth area; most complex terms involve the eye (Table 1). Notable here is the term for ‘eyebrow’, *lao ma-gogo* (lit. ‘eye its-body hair’).¹ Tidore has a number of different underived lexemes to refer to various

¹ The orthography used for Tidore is the same as the one used for Standard Indonesian. It is close to the IPA notation with the following exceptions: *j* is a voiced palatal stop, *y* is a palatal approximant, *ng* is a velar nasal, and *ny* is a palatal nasal. Tidore does not have diphthongs or phonemically long vowels but sequences of vowels, including sequences of identical vowels do occur, and are represented as such.

kinds of human hair: hair on the head (*hutu*), pubic hair (*sogo*), and body hair (*gogo*). These terms occur as free morphemes in relation to the body as a whole, but *gogo* is at the same time also an ‘inherent possessor’ term when it refers to another part of the body. Another example of this is *sako*, which as a free morpheme refers to the neck, and as an inherent possessor term in *gia ma-sako* ‘arm its-neck’ it refers to the wrist.

The term *gai* ‘face’ itself [like the term *dulu* ‘back’] can be used for reference to objects in front of [or behind] a human. The expression *toma mina mi-gai* (at she her-face) is then ambiguous between ‘on her face’ and ‘in front of her’. It is not entirely clear whether the ‘face’ and its part are considered ‘part of the head’. Linguistic evidence appears to indicate that it is not, but non-linguistic evidence suggests that it is. We return to this problem of partonomic relations in Section 7.

3.2. External parts

External parts comprise by far the largest group (Table 2). Most of the complex and inherent possessor terms refer to parts of the arms and legs. As in many other Austronesian and Papuan languages, Tidore has a single term for arm/hand (*gia*) and a single term for leg/foot (*yohu*). One of the questions for many of these languages is whether these terms are semantically general or whether they are ambiguous. If the terms are ambiguous, and if one of the senses of the term includes the entire area from the shoulder to the fingers, the interesting situation arises that one term is used both for the superordinate category and for its constituent part.

So far, no evidence for this possible auto-partonymy, or indeed for clear ambiguity of reference, has been found. It is impossible to talk about **gia ma-gia* (intended reading ‘arm its-hand’) in an attempt to refer to the hand of the arm. Other linguistic tests for ambiguity also failed, e.g. it is impossible to say ‘I have two *gia* (hand) and two *gia* (arm)’. However, it may be that these tests failed because of the contrived nature of the expressions. The colouring in task did give a hint at possible ambiguity. When I asked one informant to colour in *yohu* she first coloured in only the area below the ankle. Then she remarked ‘oh, wait, all of it right?’ and continued to colour in the lower leg, knee and the lower part of the thigh. This suggests that there is a sense of *yohu* that only refers to the foot (because that was the only part that she coloured in initially), and another sense in which the foot is only part of the meaning of *yohu*. Note that neither sense of *yohu* corresponds to English ‘leg’, because its extension never includes the upper part of the thigh. This boundary is related to a cultural taboo on which parts of the body may be exposed. Although Tidore people, both men and women, typically cover their legs at least down to the knees, showing the knees and the lower part of the thigh in public is not indecent. However, the upper part of the thigh is taboo. The boundary on the thigh is then probably not given by common perceptual salience of a boundary, i.e., by the hem of a garment, but by specific knowledge of what can be shown in public.

3.3. Internal parts

The list of terms for internal parts of the body includes both simplex terms and terms derived by reduplication (Table 3). Elicitation of internal parts showed a great deal of disagreement between speakers, leading me to list here only those which occur frequently in every day language and for which there was general agreement among speakers. There are

Table 2
External parts

Term	Translation	Gloss
Simplex		
<i>(y)ako</i>	'penis'	
<i>ahi</i>	'skin'	
<i>dofolo</i>	'head'	
<i>dulu</i>	'back'	
<i>gia</i>	'arm/hand'	
<i>gulu</i>	'armpit'	
<i>gomuru</i>	'waist; side'	
<i>hole</i>	'groin (including the upper part of the thigh)'	
<i>hoso</i>	'testicles'	
<i>hutu</i>	'hair of the head'	
<i>gogo</i>	'body hair, animal hair, feather'	
<i>isu</i>	'breast'	
<i>jubi</i>	'clitoris'	
<i>kefe</i>	'shoulder'	
<i>kolo</i>	'crown of the head'	
<i>ngabo</i>	'nipple'	
<i>ngau</i>	'ear'	
<i>oru</i>	'stomach, belly'	
<i>out</i>	'navel'	
<i>sako</i>	'neck'	
<i>tiro</i>	'vagina'	
<i>ugu</i>	'anus, bottom'	
<i>yohu</i>	'leg/foot'	
Rare		
<i>bateko, bateku</i>	'(upper) arm'	
<i>efa-efa</i>	'arm'	'RED-arm'
Complex		
<i>buku-buku</i>	'elbow, knee'	'RED-corner'
<i>doga-doga</i>	'ankle'	'RED-NOM.break'
<i>fama-fama</i>	'chest'	'RED-chest'
<i>gia ma-buku</i>	'elbow'	'arm/hand INAL-corner'
<i>gia ma-jou</i>	'middle finger'	'arm/hand INAL-lord'
<i>gia ma-jum</i>	'index finger'	'arm/hand INAL-NOM.point'
<i>gia ma-ra-ga ma-jum</i>	'finger nail'	'arm/hand INAL-digit INAL-NOM.point'
<i>gia ma-sako</i>	'wrist'	'arm/hand INAL-neck'
<i>ngau ma-duso</i>	'ear hole'	'ear INAL-NOM.pierce'
<i>nguni-nguni</i>	'shin'	'RED-shin'
<i>pala-pala</i>	'thigh'	'RED-thigh'
<i>sako moti</i>	'nape'	'neck POS.perahu'
<i>ugu ma-ngele</i>	'buttocks'	'bottom INAL-buttocks'
<i>usi-usi</i>	'calf (of the leg)'	'RED-calf'
<i>yohu ma-doga</i>	'ankle'	'leg/foot INAL-NOM.break'
<i>yohu ma-ngoco</i>	'ankle'	'leg/foot INAL-ankle'
<i>yohu ma-ra-ga</i>	'toe'	'leg/foot INAL-digit'
<i>yohu ma-ra-ga ma-jum</i>	'toe nail'	'leg/foot INAL-digit INAL-NOM.point'
<i>yohu ma-uli</i>	'heel of the foot'	'leg/foot INAL-heel, helmsman'
<i>yohu ma-usi</i>	'calf (of the leg)'	'leg/foot INAL-calf'

Table 2 (continued)

Term	Translation	Gloss
Inherent possessor		
<i>gia ma-estinja</i>	'ring finger'	'arm/hand POS-ringfinger'
<i>gia ma-galei</i>	'pinkie finger'	'arm/hand POS-pinkie'
<i>gia ma-ngoda</i>	'thumb'	'arm/hand POS-thumb'
<i>gia ma-raga</i>	'finger'	'arm/hand POS-digit'
<i>gia ma-saha</i>	'palm'	'arm/hand POS-sole/palm'
<i>ngau ma-oso</i>	'earlobe'	'ear POS-earlobe'
<i>yohu ma-saha</i>	'sole'	'leg/foot POS-sole/palm'

Table 3

Internal parts

Term	Translation	Gloss
Simplex		
<i>au</i>	'blood'	
<i>domi</i>	'cervix'	
<i>gate</i>	'liver'	
<i>goka</i>	'bone'	
<i>kaftetu</i>	'muscle'	
<i>nguro</i>	'vein'	
<i>nyinga</i>	'heart'	
Complex		
<i>goba-goba^a</i>	'lung'	'RED-midrib.palm.fronde'
<i>lojo-lojo</i>	'throat'	'RED-throat'
<i>oli-oli</i>	'vocal cords'	'RED-voice'
<i>dau-dau</i>	'muscle'	'RED-cloth'
<i>gale-gale</i>	'intestines'	'RED-wind'
<i>gosi-gosi</i>	'muscle'	'RED-egg'
<i>mali-mali</i>	'gall'	'RED-bitter'
<i>cafi-cafi</i>	'skull'	'RED-coconut shell'
<i>dofolo ma-cafi</i>	'skull'	'head INAL-coconut shell'
<i>kusi-kusi</i>	'uterus'	'RED-banana flower'

^a *Goba-goba* is used to refer to the structure of the house made of midrib palm fronds. Visual analogy might suggest that this term actually refers to the ribcage, but this is not the case, as the following example demonstrates: *goba-goba kala hobo=ge sone ma* 'if your lungs get wet you're dead'.

no nominalisations in this group and there is only one inherent possessor term: *dofolo ma-cafi* 'head INAL-coconut shell', and this has a reduplicated root equivalent *cafi-cafi* 'RED-coconut shell'.

3.4. Other

This final group contains terms that are not easily classified into any of the other three categories. It contains terms for bodily fluids, excrement, scars and blemishes (Table 4).

4. Simplex terms

Simplex terms are mono-morphemic non-loans that are in every day use. This excludes technical terms and loans from other languages, but also terms that are derived from other

Table 4
Other

Term	Translation	Gloss	Grammatical information
<i>boke</i>	‘scar’		
<i>ega</i>	‘snake; umbilical cord’		<i>ngofa ma-ega</i>
<i>fara</i>	‘large mole’		also means ‘scattered’ or ‘separated’
<i>gutae</i>	‘small mole’		
<i>iho</i>	‘defecation’		
<i>dubu</i>	‘fist’	‘NOM.fight’	cf. <i>maku-tubu</i> ‘to fight (each other)’
<i>isi</i>	‘urine’		
<i>nyabo</i>	‘wound’		
<i>ongo</i>	‘tear’		
<i>rehe</i>	‘meat, flesh’		
<i>sogo</i>	‘pubic hair’		

domains in the language. The parts of the body particularly rich in simplex terms are the face and the internal organs, including many terms that do not strictly speaking refer to organs such as ‘blood’, ‘bone’, and ‘umbilical cord’, as well as different words for bodily hair: *hutu* ‘hair on the head’, *sogo* ‘pubic hair’, *gogo* ‘body hair, fur, feather’. When we look at the main divisions of the human body, i.e., the torso, the head, and the limbs, it is notable how few simplex terms refer to these parts. There is no word for ‘body’. The term *rehe* ‘flesh’ cannot be used to refer to the whole of the human body. Instead, either the Indonesian word *badan* ‘body’ is used, or a term referring to ‘person’ or ‘human’, e.g. *mansia*. There is also no word for ‘trunk, torso’, there are no mono-morphemic terms for ‘fingers’ and ‘toes’, no mono-morphemic terms for parts of the arms and legs, and also the joints (knee, shoulder) are not mono-morphemic. There are also no specific terms for ‘hand’ and ‘foot’ distinct from the ‘arm’ and ‘leg’ terms.

4.1. Bodies, boats, families, and houses

If we restrict the notion of simplex terms to include only those mono-morphemic terms that are not derived from other domains in the language, then a term like *gumi* that means ‘rope’ as well as ‘moustache’ is not simplex since its use in relation to the body is derived from its other meaning. Yet, for a number of terms it is not easy to determine whether they are originally used in reference to the body and then applied to other domains, whether they derive from these other domains, or whether they generalise over the different domains. This is the case for a number of terms that apply to the body as well as to parts of boats, families, and houses.

Throughout Eastern Indonesia, both among Austronesian and Papuan speakers, we find a recurrent set of models to express the social ‘whole’ and the constituent ‘parts’. These involve the domains of the human body, the house, the boat, and the family, including the ancestors² (Jansen, 1977; Platenkamp, 1988, 1990). Social and socio-political relations can be expressed in terms of parts of a boat, or in terms of people and their

² Platenkamp also includes a particular numerological system and it may be that this also relevant in Tidore, but more research is needed in this respect.

functions on a boat, as for example in Tobelo, a related Papuan group in North Halmahera. Here, the ceremonial table during a wedding is in the shape of a canoe with the bride-giving group seated ‘ahead’ and the bride-receiving group ‘astern’ (Platenkamp, 1990, p. 20; cf. also Nijland, 1989). The laying of the keel of the boat itself symbolises a ‘wedding’. Similarly, the house may represent the concept of completeness, with male and female sections (cf. Wessels, 1997; on Lisabata, a community on Seram). And the human body is often used to express the hierarchical relation between the whole and its parts, but also to contrast the ‘living’ represented by the perishable parts of the body (the flesh, the organs) to the ‘spirits’ that typically relate to the skull, the jaw bone and the spine of the body.

What is particularly interesting in Eastern Indonesia is that not only do most societies use all these models at once, the models are also mapped onto each other. The body *is* the house *is* the boat *is* the unity of the family, the living and the ancestors. On Tidore, this shows, for example, in particular rituals that are performed in almost identical fashion at weddings, during boat building and house building, such as the *jako se ruko* ritual whereby the bride and the groom, or indeed the newly fashioned boat, or the newly built house, are ‘bathed in water and fire’ and anointed with hibiscus flowers dipped in blessed water. And it shows most markedly also in some of the lexical terms that are used in these domains. In Tobelo (Platenkamp, 1988, especially pp. 51–56) and Lisabata (Wessels, 1997, pp. 91–92), the skeleton of the house is the skeleton of the body; in Sahu, another Papuan group in the North Moluccas, the village temple is a canoe (Visser, 1984). And in Tidore, likewise, we find this reflected in the language, with various words referring to parts of the body, which can equally be applied to houses, boats, and family or ancestral relations. For instance, people, houses and boats can have ‘faces’ (*gai*), ‘middles’ or ‘waists’ (*gumuru*), and ‘backs’ (*dulu*). It is then possible to talk about a location as *toma fola ma-gai* ‘in front of the house’, whereby the ‘front’ is an intrinsic part of the house. But it is not possible to talk about **toma hate ma-gai* to express the notion ‘in front of the tree’. Instead, the absolute frame of reference must be used, e.g. *toma hate isa* ‘landwards from the tree’ (cf. van Staden, 2000, forthcoming). Houses and boats, like humans, also have ‘spines’. In the case of a house this is the ridge of the roof (*fola ma-yora* house INAL-‘spine’), on a boat it is the keel (*oti ma-yora* boat INAL-‘spine’). And *ma-yora* can furthermore be used to refer to one’s parents or ancestors. Another term that occurs in the different domains is *-uli*, which apart from ‘heel of the foot’ (*yohu ma-uli*) also means ‘helmsman’ (*oti ma-uli*).

The question whether there is an abstract set of concepts that is used in these different domains, or whether there is a single source domain, for instance the body, that is used to understand the other, is a difficult one to resolve and more detailed study of the entire complex is necessary. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I have taken the terms to be equally intrinsic to each of the domains, and have included them in the inventory of simplex body part terms.

4.2. Word taboos, literary and archaic language

A number of terms are found only in literary, stylised, and archaic language use, for instance in oral poetry and in ‘remembered’ language, by which I mean terms elicited in interviews from elderly people who recall ‘original, non-polluted’ Tidore. The occurrence of these words in literary and archaic language only, and their abandonment in present-day Tidore may be related to old practices of word taboo. For several related languages

complex practices of word taboo have been reported (e.g. van Baarda, 1895, on Galela, Tobelo, and Loda). This means that it is forbidden to use the names of older in-laws, or any term that resembles them. In these languages, there are numbers of ‘doubles’ for words to facilitate the avoidance of particular terms (cf. Levinson, this issue, for a similar phenomenon in Papuan isolate Yéli Dnye). For instance, both *bateko* and *gia* are used for ‘hand, arm’ in closely related Galela (van Baarda, 1895, p. 10). Tidore does not have this practice. However, some of the terms that in Tidore are found only in literary speech correspond to a ‘double’ in Galela. A case in point is the word *bateku* ‘arm’ which is never used in everyday speech, but which does occur in some old poems, and is given by some speakers as an ‘original’ (*asli*) Tidore word. Some speakers suggest that the forms *gia* and *bateku* are not ‘doubles’ in Tidore: the latter referring to the ‘upper arm’ only. No evidence in use of the terms has been found to support this claim.

The only term I have encountered that has a taboo associated with it is *jubi* ‘clitoris’. This is also the word for ‘arrow’, and men will always use the Malay word *pana* for arrow instead. In an interview I conducted with an elderly man on circumcision rituals on Tidore, the interviewee apologised profusely for having to use this word in order to explain the ritual. However, this kind of taboo is obviously unrelated to the kind of word taboo reported in Galela, Tobelo, and Loda. Interestingly, other terms relating to genitalia are not taboo in this manner, although they may elicit giggles and are used in terms of abuse.

4.3. Loan words

Loan words, although common in almost every domain of the language, are surprisingly sparse in relation to the body. The only loan word that comes up frequently in relation to the human body is *badan* ‘body’ for which Tidore does not have a term. Some other terms are *mayet* or *mayeti* ‘corpse’, *gia ma-sahadad* ‘index finger’, and *gia ma-istinja* ‘ring finger of the left hand’, and a few verbs: *cako tartibi* ‘sit cross-legged (lit. ‘weave orderly’), *napas* ‘breathe’ (for which Tidore also has its own term *iru*), and *sunu* ‘circumcise’. All these terms originate from Arabic and are related to religion (e.g. death, circumcision, marriage). Some terms for parts of the body that in Malay have use outside the domain of the body too are borrowed in Tidore, but only for their non-body part uses. For instance, *kepala* ‘head’, which in Malay can be used to refer to a leader, can in Tidore be used to refer to a leader in ‘Indonesian’ (i.e., non-indigenous) hierarchies, such as government instated village chiefs, government officials, head masters, etc., but it cannot be used for the head of a body. Finally, technical discussions relating to the body, for instance, in relation to illnesses, are often carried out in Malay or in a highly Malayified version of Tidore. Many of the terms for internal organs were encountered only in these types of conversations. They have not been included since they are neither Tidore nor in common use.

5. Complex terms

Terms can be derived by two different morphological processes: reduplication and nominalisation. Sometimes both are involved in the derivation of a term, e.g. *doga-doga* ‘ankle’, which involves nominalisation of the root *toga* ‘break’ to *doga*, which is then reduplicated to give ‘ankle’. There are a few exceptional cases such as *gubira* ‘stubble’ where a root (*bira* ‘rice’) can be identified, but the derivational process is not attested anywhere else

in the language. These exceptions are noted in the tables, but not discussed separately here. Finally, a few terms are related to other domains without any morphological changes. Examples are *ega*, which means ‘snake’ but also ‘umbilical cord’, or *gumi* ‘rope’ also used to refer to ‘moustache’.

5.1. Reduplication

The root is reduplicated and prefixed to the stem:

- (1) *cafi* ‘coconut shell’
cafi-cafi ‘skull’

For most of the forms, the root is a free morpheme used in another semantic domain. The semantics of the source domain is usually outside the human body; it is typically the similarity in form, shape, colour, or texture (e.g. *cafi*, or *kusi-kusi* ‘cervix’ from *kusi* ‘banana flower’) that forms the basis of the derivation. More rarely attested are taste (*mali-mali* ‘gall’ from *mali* ‘bitter’) and function (*oli-oli* ‘vocal cords’ from *-oli* ‘voice, sound’). Not all roots occur as meaningful free morphemes, e.g. *-pala*, *-fama*, *-lojo*, *-nguni*, *-usi*. In the tables these glosses are put between inverted commas. It could be argued that since the apparent root does not occur as a free morpheme, these reduplications should be treated as ‘non-derived’ just like lexemes such as *kumikumi* ‘butterfly’ or *haha* ‘man’s mother in law’. However, a root morpheme can be established, and because they also occur in inherently possessed constructions they are best considered derivations.

The stem of some reduplicated terms is also found as an inherent possessor noun in a possessive construction. So far, four such pairs have been identified:

- (2) *doga-doga* *yohu ma-doga* ‘ankle’ (lit. ‘leg INAL-ankle’)
 (or even: *yohu ma-doga-doga*)
cafi-cafi *dofolo ma-cafi* ‘skull’ (lit. ‘head INAL-coconut shell’)
usi-usi *yohu ma-usi* ‘calf’ (lit. ‘leg its-calf’)
buku-buku *gialyohu ma-buku* ‘elbow’ or ‘knee’ (lit. ‘arm/leg its-corner’)

Note that in the last example, the reduplicated form *buku-buku* can refer to either elbow or knee, while in the possessive construction the possessor noun disambiguates the reference.

5.2. Nominalization

All verbs and some adjectives can be nominalised by means of the ‘nasal prefix’ *N-*. The nasal fuses with the following phoneme so that the place of articulation of the verb initial phoneme is retained, but the features [+Voice] and [+Obstruent] of the nasal consonant are carried over to the stem. Only when the prefix precedes the semi-vowels /w, y/ does it show up as a nasal.³

³ In van Staden (2000, pp. 73–74) this is analysed as the result of historical changes. Synchronically vowel initial roots used to have an initial glottal stop, while the semi-vowel initial roots used to be vowel initial. The initial glottal stop gives the place of articulation (velar), and the nasal prefix gives the voicing, hence the initial /g/ in the nominalisation.

The nominalised form cannot occur as a free morpheme in all cases. It may be that the derived stem must be input to further derivation, for example causative verb formation by means of *so-* prefixation, or initial consonant reduplication deriving nouns from nouns or adjectives (as in the last two examples):

(3)	<i>torine</i> ‘sit’	<i>dorine</i> ‘seat’
	<i>kone</i> ‘to wind’	<i>gone</i> ‘belt’
	<i>fego</i> ‘to close’	<i>bego</i> ‘a cover’
	<i>yofo</i> ‘to smoke’	<i>nyofo</i> ‘smoke’
	<i>uci</i> ‘descend’	- <i>guci</i> (in <i>so-guci</i> ‘make descend’)
	<i>ahu</i> ‘live’	- <i>gahu</i> (in <i>go-gahu</i> ‘customs’)

Adjectives, although in many ways verb-like in Tidore, are not generally input to this nominalisation process, but there are a few exceptions, including colour terms such as *kotu* ‘black’ that is communalised to give *-gotu* ‘pupil’, and the form *konora* ‘middle’ which derives *gonora* ‘waist’.

In the domain of the body a considerable number of terms are derived from the activity that characterises them:

(4)	<i>cobi lao</i> ‘to wink’	<i>lao ma-jobi</i> ‘eyelid’ (lit. ‘eye INAL-NOM.wink’)
	<i>goli</i> ‘bite’	<i>ing ma-ngoli</i> ‘molar’ (lit. ‘tooth INAL-NOM.bite’)
	<i>saha</i> ‘open the hand (palm up)’	<i>gia ma-saha</i> ‘palm of the hand’
		(lit. ‘hand/arm INAL-open’)
		<i>yohu ma-saha</i> ‘sole of the foot’

We may even speculate on the relation between *kia* ‘to marry’ and *gia* ‘hand/arm’ (cf. also van Staden, 2000, p. 127). As pointed out in Section 4.1 family or ancestral relationships are often expressed in terms of the body and its parts, and moreover, the central part of the wedding ceremony consists of a handshake between the father of the bride and the groom.

The nominalised terms that refer to parts of the body typically do not occur as free morphemes, but are either possessed by a fixed superordinate term (cf. Section 6 below), or they are reduplicated first. Three exceptions have been identified: *dubu* ‘fist’ (from *tubu* ‘fight’), *dili* ‘foreskin’, from *tili* ‘pull back/remove the foreskin, and *gonora* ‘waist’ (from *konora* ‘middle’).

6. Parts of the body with inherent possessors

Inherent possessor nouns form a subset of inalienable nouns. In relation to the body, they refer to body parts that are obligatorily possessed by fixed superordinate parts. They occur in the slot of the ‘possessed’ term in a possessive construction, and the superordinate parts occur in the slot of the possessor. The Tidore possessive construction is a superficially simple construction⁴ involving a possessor noun phrase preceding the possessed noun, and a possessive prefix cross-referencing the possessor on the possessed noun:

⁴ But see van Staden (2000) for a more elaborate analysis of the possessive construction in Tidore.

- (5) *ngori ri-koi* ‘my bananas’ (lit. ‘1SG.N 1SG.POS-banana’)
mansia na-gam ‘the people’s village’ (lit. ‘people 3PL.POS-village’)
mina mi-hutu ‘her hair’ (lit. ‘3SG.F 3SG.F.POS-hair’)

The possessor noun phrase is typically present, but is optional for all alienable and most inalienable nouns, except for the inherent possessor ones. The possessive prefixes distinguish three persons, singular and plural, inclusive and exclusive, and three genders for the third person, summarised in Table 5.

The possessive construction is used to express direct ownership, as in *ngori ri-koi* ‘my bananas’, but also other senses of ‘belonging’ such as kinship relations, e.g. *mina mi-ngofa* ‘her child’, dwelling places e.g. *mansia na-gam* ‘the people’s village’, and part–whole relations. Furthermore, it is used to express locative relations as in *meja ma-alu* ‘under the table’ (lit. ‘table its-underneath’). Occasionally it is used for the attribution of properties as in example (6), although direct attribution of a property to a first argument is also possible, cf. (7):

- (6) *Mina mi-jang*
 3SG.F 3SG.F.POS-beauty
 ‘Her beauty’ or
 ‘she has beauty.’
- (7) *Mina mo-jang*
 3SG.F 3SG.F.SU-beauty
 ‘She is beautiful.’

The generic morpheme *-due* ‘possession’ also, obligatorily, occurs in this possessive construction:

- (8) *Ngori ri-due ngge sira rai*
 1SG 1SG.POS-‘possession’ 3NH.there disappear already
 ‘Mine (the one(s) that I have) is/are already lost.’
- (9) *Coba ngona hoda yuke=ge dahe ibarat ngge ngona*
 try 2SG see first=there find example 3NH.there 2SG
ni-due
 2SG.POS-‘possession’
 ‘If you are the first to find anything then it is yours.’

This morpheme *-due* does not occur as a free morpheme.

Table 5
 Possessive prefixes

	sg	pl
1 excl	<i>ri-</i>	<i>na-</i>
1 incl	–	<i>ni-</i>
2	<i>na-</i>	<i>ni-</i>
3 masc	<i>i-</i>	<i>na-</i>
3 fem	<i>mi-</i>	
3 non-human	<i>ma-</i>	

There are two alternative constructions to express possessive relations. The first is to express the possessor as the, left-positioned, topic of the clause, as in examples (10) and (11), and the second uses the predicate *sema* ‘to be, to exist’, as in example (12):

(10) *Fola=ge ngora biasa ua*
house=there door normal NEG
‘That house does not
have a normal door.’

(11) *Ngom=ge nyao rewa*
1PL.EXC=there fish no.more
‘We are out of fish.’

(12) *mina sema ngofa raha*
3SG.F exist child four
‘She has four children.’

Both occur typically, though not necessarily, when more than one property of the possessed term is predicated, e.g. possessor and quantity as in (12). They are never frequent. Locative relations are not expressed in these alternative constructions. Inherently possessed terms also do not occur in these constructions.

The inherent possessor terms form a subclass of inalienable nouns. Inalienable nouns never occur without a possessor prefix. This prefix can be *ma-* for all persons and numbers, although it may also agree with the possessor, as it does with alienably possessed nouns. This is summarised in Table 6.

Apart from the human body and its parts, the group of inalienably possessed nouns includes, houses and their parts, boats and their parts, kinship relations, parts of plants and trees, and expressions related to speech such as *ma-ronga* ‘name, to be called’ and *ma-ngale* ‘meaning’. The obligatory presence of a possessor noun phrase further identifies the inherent possessor terms as a separate group. Some examples of inherently possessed body part terms and their possessors are given in (13):

(13) *gia ma-raga* ‘finger’ (lit. ‘arm/hand INAL-digit’)
gia ma-ngoda ‘thumb’ (lit. ‘arm/hand INAL-thumb’)
gia ma-buku ‘elbow’ (lit. ‘arm/hand INAL-hill/corner’)
gia ma-jum ‘index finger’ (lit. ‘arm/hand INAL-NOM.point’)

Table 6
Alienable and inalienable possession

Alienable	Inalienable
<i>namo</i> ‘bird’	<i>*ronga</i> ‘name’
<i>una il*ma-namo</i> ‘his bird’	<i>una ilma-ronga</i> ‘his name’

The relation between the possessor and the possessed is always partonomic in the sense that the inherently possessed part identifies what is conceived of as a subset of the possessor part, both in *gia ma-ra-ga* ‘finger’ where the finger is part of the arm/hand and in *gia ma-ngoda* ‘thumb’, where the ‘thumb’ is part of the arm/hand. The construction cannot be used to express taxonomic relations between parts or to name individual parts, evidenced by the ungrammaticality of for instance **gia ma-ra-ga ma-ngoda* (‘arm/hand its-finger its-thumb’). These constructions are morphologically complex ways to refer to parts of the body, but sometimes the roots can nevertheless be considered simplex in the sense of Section 4. For example, *-ra-ga* ‘digit’ does not occur as a free morpheme but it is neither semantically nor morphologically derived.

Most terms for parts of the body do not have inherent possessors, which means that the possessor noun phrase is neither fixed nor obligatory. It is not fixed in the sense that one term may have different possessors, and it is not obligatory in the sense that we frequently find body part terms without a possessor noun phrase. This is exemplified in (14), where *ma-ra-ga* is ruled out because the inherent possessor noun phrase is missing, but *dofolo*, which is not an inherently possessed body part, can occur without a possessor noun phrase.

- (14) **ma-ra-ga* (lit. ‘INAL-digit’) *ma-dofolo* ‘the head’ (lit. ‘INAL-head’)

As inalienable nouns they always have a possessive prefix, which may always be *ma-*.

- (15) *mina milma-moda* ‘her mouth’ (lit. ‘3SG.F 3SG.F.POS/INAL-mouth’)
ngori rilma-dofolo ‘my head’ (lit. ‘1SG.N 1SG.POS/INAL-head’)
ngofa ma-ega ‘the child’s umbilical cord’ (lit. ‘child INAL-snake’)

But there are restrictions on the kinds of possessors that these terms can have. When used within the domain of the human body, the possessor can only be a term that refers to a person, e.g. *mansia* ‘person, people’, *ngofa* ‘child’, or a personal pronoun. By contrast, inherent possessor terms cannot be directly possessed by a human denoting term. If there is a further, higher, possessor the possessives must be nested:

- (16) **mina mi-ra-ga* (intended reading ‘her finger’)
mina mi-gia ma-ra-ga ‘her finger’ (lit. ‘she her-arm/hand INAL-digit’)

The terms for the nails of fingers and toes likewise involve obligatory nesting since the nail term has as its inherent possessor the finger or toe term, which in turn have inherent possessors:

- (17) *gia ma-ra-ga ma-jum* ‘finger nail’ (lit. ‘arm/hand INAL-digit INAL-NOM.point’)
yohu ma-ra-ga ma-ngoda ‘big toe’ (lit. ‘leg/foot INAL-digit INAL-thumb’)

7. A partonomy of the body in Tidore

When we seek to establish a partonomy of the human body and its parts, it must from the outset be clear what the partonomy is based on. Is it based on native concepts

or is it based on the linguistic facts? In their critique of Brown (1976), Palmer and Nicodemus (1985) point out that one of the most important weaknesses in his approach to language universals in body part nomenclature is that it is based partly on the language, and partly on (the researcher's?) intuitions concerning the classification of certain body parts, and that Brown is not always clear which classification is based on what type of evidence. Brown's definition of what a 'parton' is already includes this indeterminacy: a parton is 'part of an entity and is described as "possessed by" that entity' (Brown, 1976, p. 401). The first part of this definition concerns the conceptual notion of a 'part of' relation, while the second part stipulates a purely linguistic criterion: can the body part terms enter into particular expression types. Further on, Brown uses yet another criterion which is that the linguistic expression itself may reveal a partonomic relation. In the term *forearm*, for instance, the partonomic relation to *arm* is already encoded. This gives three different principles to establish partonomies. Brown appears to assume that in all languages 'part of' relations will be expressible in possessive constructions, and that possessive constructions will be the primary source for the encoding of partonomic relations. It is not certain whether this is even the case for Tidore. Further, when we say that *X* is 'part of' *Y*, the relation between the two can be at least of two different kinds (cf. Brown, 1976; McClure, 1975). It may be that *X* is a clearly delineated segment of *Y*, or it can be adjacent to it or contained in it. At least in English, both types can be expressed as 'part-whole' relations. McClure (1975, p. 84) notes, for instance, that 'teeth are parts of mouths, mouths are parts of faces, but teeth are not parts of faces' and attributes this to the fact that teeth are not so much 'part of' the mouth as 'contained in' the mouth.

The expression of part-whole relations in Tidore poses a problem, since there does not appear to be a word to refer to a 'part'. The term *-dola* '(-NOM.cut) piece, part' can be used to refer to parts that are the result of the act of cutting, but it is not used to refer to nameable parts of a whole. The parts of a carrot cut in two, for example, may be described as two *-dola*: *ma-dola rimoi lamo*, *ma-dola rimoi kene* 'one part is big, one part is small'. When talking about aspects or parts of rituals, performances, songs, and other 'scripted' events Tidore uses the inalienably possessed lexeme *-ngale* to refer to the parts. This form is glossed as either 'meaning', as in (18), or 'ingredient', as in (19):

- (18) *Fika* *asap* *dan* *fika* *ma-ngale* *rimoi*
 ash/dust/smoke smoke and ash/dust/smoke INAL-meaning one

yali *fika* *abu*
 again ash/smoke ash/dust

'*Fika* (is) smoke and *fika* has another meaning, *fika* (is) ash/dust.'⁵

- (19) *Ma-ngale* *ena* *nange*, *ena* *ma-maya*
 INAL-ingredient areca just areca INAL-flower
 'The (lit. 'its') ingredient now is areca flower.'

⁵ *asap* and *abu* are given as the two Malay translations of *fika*. The conjunction *dan* is a Malay code switch.

It is, however, never used in reference to parts of objects or humans, and using this expression in the elicitation of body part terms was unsuccessful. One example *-ngale* in reference to a body part was found (20), but here it expresses not a partonomic relation, but it is the replacement of a term the speaker seeks to avoid:

- (20) *Ona ni-ngale ngge kini moju*
 3PL 3PL.POS-meaning 3NH.there small still
 ‘Their thingy is still small’ (referring to the foreskin, in a discussion of male circumcision).

To describe parts of objects, Tidore speakers can only use the possessive construction and the two alternative constructions involving topicalisation or the predicate *sema* ‘exist’ described in the previous section. Even the form *-ngale* ‘meaning, ingredient’ must occur as the possessed in a possessive construction. For each body part we must therefore first ask whether it can occur in any of these three constructions. If it cannot occur in these constructions, then it is certainly not partonomically related to a superordinate term. If it can, the relation could be one of partonomy, but this is not necessarily the case since the possessive construction and its two alternatives also express different kinds of relations. Therefore, if we want to establish whether the nose is considered part of the head or part of the face, we must at least be able to say **dofolo ma-ngun* (lit. ‘head INAL-nose’) or **gai ma-ngun* (lit. ‘face INAL-nose’), or alternatively either of the following:

- (21) **?Dofolo* [or: *gai*]=*ge ngun (rimoi)*
 head [face]=there nose (one)
- (22) *Dofolo* [or: *gai*]=*ge sema ngun *(rimoi)*
 head [face]=there exist nose (one)
 ‘The head [or face] has a (one) nose.’

Neither of the two possessive constructions is grammatical, and of the two alternatives only the second is (marginally) possible, especially if a quantifier is involved and the expression is part of a list of enumerating the ‘parts of the head/face’. However, this construction expresses not just partonomic relations, nor even just relations of possession, but is associated with a whole range of meanings. It generically describes that two entities ‘exist’ in relation to each other. Various other relations, especially relations of locative vicinity, can also be expressed in a construction with *sema* but not in a possessive construction:

- (23) *Fola sema gura*
 house exist garden
 ‘There is a garden with the house.’
- (24) **Fola ma-gura*
 house 3NH-garden (intended meaning ‘the garden of the house,
 the garden with the house’)

Fig. 1. A partonomy of Tidore parts of the body.

One possible explanation for the rejection of expressions like *dofolo ma-ngun* 'the head its-nose', could be that it is impossible to talk about relations between parts of bodies in terms of possession. But it may then seem incongruous that a considerable number of body part terms, the inherently possessed terms, actually take the form of a possessive construction. An alternative explanation is that these inherent possessor constructions stand 'in the way' of the productive use of the construction with other body parts. The set of inherent possessor terms is finite, and the collocations they enter into are fixed. All other nouns can, at least within the domain of the human body, only be possessed by 'human denoting entities'⁶. The possessive construction with a superordinate body part as the possessor and a subordinate body part as the possessed is then non-productive and cannot be used to elicit part-whole relations. In other words, *gia ma-raga* 'finger' (lit. 'arm/hand INAL-digit'), or *gia ma-buku* 'elbow' (lit. 'arm/hand INAL-corner') are fixed combinations of terms, and freely expressing other conceivable such relations in these terms is impossible.

Yet, these inherent possessor terms do allow us to establish a hierarchy on the basis of the actual lexemes used to refer to parts of the body. The possessor of an inherent body part term is then the superordinate. This gives the hierarchy in Fig. 1. There is no Tidore lexeme to encode the 'whole' of the human body, and this level is therefore absent. The top level is then formed by all the parts that can only be possessed by a human denoting description, e.g. 'person' or 'human', or indeed a full NP, a pronoun or proper name. Most body part terms are found on this level. There are only two further levels. The terms at level two have the terms at level one as inherent possessors, and in turn inherently possess the terms at level three.

⁶ Outside of the domain of the human body, we find these terms possessed by terms for animals or by terms referring to boats, houses, and kinship terms.

An interesting aspect of this hierarchy is that in Tidore all levels must be lexicalised. Various discussions on partonomies have pointed out that unlike taxonomies, partonomies often lack ‘transitivity’ of relations (cf. especially McClure, 1975; and the introduction to this issue, Enfield, Majid and van Staden). In a taxonomy, even items at the lowest level can always be described as a ‘kind of’ top-level item. But in a partonomy such transitivity is typically lacking: ‘finger nails’ cannot be described as ‘part of the arm’. What we find in Tidore is that regardless of the relation between the parts, it is never possible to find a term at the top level immediately possessing a term at the lowest level and in that sense the transitivity is entirely absent. However, in another sense, the terms are highly transitive, since full partonomy of relations is obligatorily expressed.

On the basis of purely linguistic facts, it is possible to set up a hierarchy of body parts in Tidore. Yet this does not mean that this hierarchy reflects a partonomic conceptualisation of this domain. Evidence from two sources at least suggests that despite the lack of straightforward linguistic expression of partonomic relations between certain body parts, such relations do exist. The first source is the ‘colouring in task’ (van Staden and Majid, [this issue](#)). The pilot study carried out on Tidore showed that there is an overlap when the *dofolo* ‘head’, *gai* ‘face’, and *wang* ‘cheek’ are coloured in, suggesting that the ‘cheek’ is indeed part of the ‘face’ which in turn is part of the ‘head’, if we define the partonomy as representing spatial subsets of wholes. A second source is the relation of the body to the other models of ‘wholeness’ described in Section 4.1. Further study of these models and their mappings may reveal that certain parts of the body are considered to be partonomically related, even when the language does not allow a direct lexicalisation of this relation.

8. Summary

In this paper, I have discussed a number of properties of body part nomenclature in Tidore. The extensional meaning of Tidore body part terms is not necessarily solely determined by (visual) perceptual cues, but can be based also on cultural beliefs. The meaning of *yohu* ‘leg/foot’ includes the foot, but not the upper part of the thigh, i.e., not the part that cannot be shown in public. The upper part of the thigh is included in the term for ‘groin’, *hole*. In Tidore a set of cultural models to express the ‘whole’ and its ‘parts’ is manifest in a set of terms used in the domain of the body and the domains of the house, the boat, and the family. Thus, *yora* refers to the ‘spine’ of the human body, the ‘keel’ of the boat, the ‘ridge’ of the roof of a house, and a person’s ancestors.

When exploring ways to set up partonomies of the human body in Tidore, Brown’s (1976, p. 401) stipulation that parts of the body can be described as ‘possessed by’ other parts runs into problems since there is no straightforward way to phrase this in relation to the body in Tidore. However, on the basis of the lexicalisation of parts of the body it is possible to create a partonomy. Tidore has a number of fixed ‘inherently possessed’ terms that are always expressed in a possessive construction along with their immediate possessor. These expressions reflect a partonomy so that the term *gia ma-raga ma-jum* ‘finger nail’ (lit. ‘arm/hand INAL-digit INAL-NOM.point’) gives three levels of possessive relationships: the arm/hand on level one, the digits on level two and the nail on level three. A partonomy created in this way has only three levels for Tidore, with the only terms on level three being the finger nails and the toe nails. Level two has less than 20 terms, and all other terms are on level one, which means that they can only be ‘possessed by’ terms referring to

human beings, such as personal pronouns, proper names or nouns like *mansia* ‘person’ or *ngofa* ‘child’.

Finally, some progress can be made using two other ways to explore partonomic relations in Tidore, neither relying on direct lexicalisation of partonomic relations. The first uses a non-linguistic ‘colouring in task’ in which speakers are asked to colour in named parts of the body. Overlaps in what is coloured in show whether a part is considered as a spatial subset of another part. The second involves further study of the set of cultural models referred to earlier involving the house, the family and the boat. It is possible that examination of the concepts of ‘wholeness’ and ‘parts’ in relation to other domains than the body will give insights into how the parts of the body are conceptually organised in relation to each other.

Acknowledgements

Research for this project was carried out at the Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication (ACLC), and financed through a grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen. I would like to express my gratitude to Asifa Majid, Nick Enfield, an anonymous reviewer, and my colleagues both in Amsterdam and Nijmegen for their helpful comments and suggestions. Finally, I express my gratitude to my field assistant, Ica, and all my Tidore friends who helped me in my research.

References

- Brown, C.H., 1976. General principles of human anatomical partonomy and speculations on the growth of partonomic nomenclature. *American Ethnologist* 3, 400–424.
- Jansen, H.J., 1977. Indigenous classification systems in the Ambonese Moluccas. In: De Josselin de Jong, P.E. (Ed.), *Structural Anthropology in The Netherlands, A Reader*. Nijhoff, Den Haag, pp. 100–115.
- McClure, E.F., 1975. Ethno-anatomy: the structure of the domain. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17, 78–88.
- Nijland, D.J., 1989. *Schaduwen en werkelijkheid: cultureel bepaald kennen, waarnemen, nonverbaal communiceren en onderzoek daarvan via de terugvertoning van de etnografische film “Tobelo marriage”*. PhD Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Palmer, G.B., Nicodemus, L., 1985. Coeur d’Alene exceptions to proposed universals of anatomical nomenclature. *American Ethnologist* 12, 341–359.
- Platenkamp, J.D.M., 1988. *Tobelo: ideas and values of a North Moluccan society*. PhD Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Platenkamp, J.D.M., 1990. North Halmahera: Non-Austronesian Languages, Austronesian Cultures? Lecture Presented to the Oosters Genootschap in Netherland at Leiden on 23 May.
- van Baarda, M.J., 1895. *Woordenlijst Galelareesch-Hollandsch. Met Ethnologische Aanteekeningen, Op De Woorden, Die Daartoe Aanleiding Gaven*. Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlands Indië, Den Haag.
- van Staden, M., 2000. *Tidore: a linguistic description of a language of the North Moluccas*. PhD Dissertation, Leiden University.
- van Staden, M., forthcoming. Non-contrastive demonstratives in Tidore. In: Meira, S., Dunn, M., *Demonstratives in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*.
- van Staden, M., Majid, A., this issue. Body colouring task. In: Majid, A., Enfield, N.J., van Staden, M., *Parts of the Body: Cross-Linguistic Categorisation (Special Issue)*. *Language Sciences*, doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2005.11.004.
- Visser, L.E., 1984. Who are the Sahu and what do they belong to? In: De Josselin de Jong, P.E. (Ed.), *Unity in Diversity. Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study*. Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 198–215.

Wessels, A., 1997. *Het Gewicht Van De Stilte: Religieuze Tradities En Ontwikkelingen In Lisabata, Een Islamitisch Dorp Op Seram, Midden-Molukken*. Bintang Design & Communicatie, Den Haag.

Further reading

Enfield, N.J., this issue. Elicitation guide on parts of the body. In: Majid, A., Enfield, N.J., van Staden, M., *Parts Of The Body: Cross-Linguistic Categorisation (Special Issue)*. *Language Sciences*, doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2005.11.003.

Levinson, S.C., this issue. Part of the body in Yéli Dnye, the Papuan language of Rossel Island. In: Majid, A., Enfield, N.J., van Staden, M., *Parts Of The Body: Cross-Linguistic Categorisation (Special Issue)*. *Language Sciences*, doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2005.11.007.