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ABSTRACT.—In regard to ethnozoological classification, the Austronesian-speaking area of insular Southeast Asia is one of the least documented parts of the world. Dictionaries of the language of eastern Sumba by Kapita (1982) and Onvlee (1984) include over fifty names for kinds of avifauna with glosses in Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) and Dutch as well as scientific identifications drawn mostly from fieldwork conducted by the naturalist Dammerman in the 1920s. Combining these data with ethnoornithological information collected by the author in the domain of Rindi, the eastern Sumbanese classification of birds is discussed with regard to nomenclature, internal structure, and its relation to a general ethnozoological taxonomy. On the basis of recent ornithological studies of this part of Indonesia, the association of Sumbanese categories with scientific taxa is also reviewed. Finally, the prominence of certain bird categories in the symbolic idioms of ritual speech, myth, and augury is considered as a factor hypothetically linked with eastern Sumbanese ethnoornithological classification.
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RESUMEN.—El área de habla austronesia del sudoeste insular de Asia es una de las partes menos documentadas del mundo en relación a la clasificación etnozoológica. Los diccionarios de la lengua Sumbanesa del Este escritos por Kapita (1982) y Onvlee (1984), incluyen alrededor de cincuenta nombres de clases de aves, con términos en indonesio (de Bahasa Indonesia) y holandés, así como también identificaciones científicas extraídas mayormente del trabajo de campo conducido por el naturalista Dammerman en los años 1920s. Combinando estos datos con la información etnoornitológica recopilada por el autor de este artículo en el área de Rindi, la clasificación de pájaros del sumbanés del este es discutida en relación a la nomenclatura, estructura interna, y su relación a una taxonomía etnozoológica general. Sobre la base de recientes estudios ornitológicos en esta parte de Indonesia, también se discute la asociación de categorías sumbanesas con taxa científica. Finalmente, la prominencia de ciertas categorías de pájaros en los términos simbólicos del habla ritual, el mito, y el augurio, es considerada como un factor hipotéticamente conectado con la clasificación etnoornitológica de Sumba del Este.

en hollandais, ainsi que leurs identifications scientifiques, dont la plupart proviennent des travaux effectués par le naturaliste Dammerman dans les années 1920. À partir de ces données et de l’information ethnoornithologique recueillie par l’auteur dans le domaine du Rindi, la nomenclature, la structure interne, ainsi que relation de la classification des oiseaux du Sumba de l’est avec une taxonomie ethnozoologique générale sont examinées. L’association des catégories sumbanaises et des taxa scientifiques est également revue à la lumière de récentes études ornithologiques effectuées dans cette partie de l’Indonésie. Enfin, l’importance de certaines catégories d’oiseaux dans l’expression symbolique du discours rituel, du myth et de l’augure est considérée comme un facteur hypothétiquement relié à la classification ethnoornithologique du Sumba de l’est.

INTRODUCTION

To date no special study has been conducted into ethnozoological classification on the Indonesian island of Sumba. The several Sumbanese languages belong to the Austronesian family and more specifically to a Central Malayo-Polynesian grouping (Blust 1979). As part of general ethnographic research carried out in the eastern Sumbanese domain of Rindi in 1975 and 1976 (see Map 1), I recorded a number of names for bird kinds. Most of these, and some others besides, appear in dictionaries of the main eastern Sumbanese dialect of Kambera compiled by Oemboe Hina Kapita (1982), the principal Sumbanese expert on the culture and languages of the island, and by the late Louis Onvlee (1984), a linguist and Bible translator and the main Western expert on Sumbanese languages. Onvlee conducted research jointly with Kapita between 1926 and 1955.

The objective of this paper is to review all information recorded so far concerning eastern Sumbanese ethnoornithological classification. In view of the common appearance of birds in symbolic idioms, for example in Sumbanese ritual language and myth, this topic is relevant to rather more than questions of ethnotaxonomy and nomenclature. Since Onvlee wrote in Dutch while Kapita’s work is in Bahasa Indonesia (the Indonesian national language), a particular purpose is to make these data available to a wider ethnozoological, linguistic, and anthropological audience not familiar with these languages.

Another relevant source, also in Dutch, is the writings of the naturalist K.W. Dammerman (1926a, 1926b). On the basis of research conducted on Sumba between 14 March and 26 May 1925 (Monk et al. 1997:882), Dammerman published 32 bird names in eastern Sumbanese (Kambera) and the same number in the western Sumbanese language of Laura (transcribed by Dammerman as ‘Laora’). Dammerman’s work is germane not only because he was the first Western scientist to identify ornithological species present on the island, including two Sumbanese endemics, but also because Onvlee, especially, relies heavily on Dammerman (1926a) in defining eastern Sumbanese categories. Onvlee’s dictionary thus includes just five scientific names that appear to be drawn from (unspecified) sources other than Dammerman. Although both Onvlee and Kapita significantly extend the list of Sumbanese taxa recorded by Dammerman, one unfortunate result of the two lexicographers’ reliance on the early naturalist is that many of the Latin binomials incorporated in their dictionaries are now superseded.
Nevertheless, modern binomials are for the most part readily inferred from a recent comprehensive ornithological study of Sumba and other eastern Indonesian islands by B. Coates and K.D. Bishop (1997).

Another pitfall of the two lexicographers' reliance on Dammerman is of course the possibility that the naturalist was mistaken in associating Sumbanese taxa with particular scientific species and genera. Modern information on bird kinds present on the island, however, supported by information drawn from Onvlee and Kapita, as well as linguistic and ethnographic data compiled by the present author, suggest that Dammerman's identifications, scientific as well as ethnozoological, were largely accurate. In this regard as well, the work of Coates and Bishop (1997) has proven especially useful. In identifying eastern Sumbanese bird taxa I have also been able to draw on information provided by several eastern Sumbanese I questioned in 1999 in Kupang, the provincial capital located in western Timor. With the aid of Coates and Bishop's field guide, the Kupang informants were able to clarify a number of important issues concerning the identity of birds named by Sumbanese terms.

In spite of possible remaining gaps and ambiguities, the data compiled here appear sufficiently complete to analyze eastern Sumbanese bird classification and to establish the general outlines of the system. A point of some relevance in this regard is the comprehensive nature of Onvlee's dictionary. As a student of Sumbanese languages who resided on the island for over 20 years, it cannot easily be assumed that Onvlee would have been unfamiliar with many terms referring to birds, even if he had been unable to identify them scientifically. Also noteworthy is the circumstance that Kapita, although a native Sumbanese and probably better able to draw on a local knowledge of birds, does not record any names that do not also appear in Onvlee's dictionary. In fact, Onvlee's work is slightly more complete. This is not to suggest that further research could not uncover additional names for birds. Indeed, three terms encountered in the course of my own enquiries, in Rindi and among Sumbanese in Kupang (landu witu, mabihi, rawa kawi, see Table 1), are not listed by either Onvlee or Kapita, nor can they obviously be accounted for as local variants of terms the two lexicographers do record. Even so, the total of nearly sixty-odd I discuss below (56 plus as many as ten unnumbered productive binomials, which total however includes a number of synonymous usages) compares favourably with the 66 bird names (or 59, if probable synonyms and terms with non-empirical referents are excluded) recorded for the Nage of Flores (Forth 1996, 1999), and the 54 terms recorded for the Nuauulu of Seram (Ellen 1993b). The figure for Nuauulu should be taken in the context of a total of 195 species recorded for the island of Seram (Ellen 1993b:57). The comparable total for Sumba as a whole is 161 (see Appendix 1; cf. Monk et al. 1997:354, who list 103 breeding species for Sumba). In view of environmental differences between eastern Sumba and the more heavily forested and better watered western part of the island, moreover, it can safely be assumed that the number for eastern Sumba is rather lower than this.

However the results of the present enquiry are judged, one may hope that they will be of sufficient interest to spur others to advance the study of eastern Sumbanese ethnozoological classification. Indeed, publishing information on the
ethnology of Sumbanese birds is at present a matter of some urgency. Owing in part to the advance of the Indonesian national language, knowledge of Sumbanese names for natural kinds is reported to be decreasing, especially among younger people. In addition, as a result of increased hunting (nowadays particularly with air rifles), trapping to supply the export trade in cage-birds, and the destruction of natural habitats caused by human population increase, clearing of forests for agriculture and lumber, and modern development efforts, in some cases the species to which the indigenous names refer are themselves probably in decline (see Monk et al. 1997:821-35; Coates and Bishop 1997:39-40).4

FIGURE 1.—The Lesser Sunda islands showing Sumba and Rindi

BIRDS IN SUMBANESE ETHNOTAXONOMY

The main product of the present exercise is a list of Sumbanese names for birds with provisional identifications. These are set out in Table 1. From linguistic and ethnographic information compiled by the present author in 1975-76, supplemented by Kapita (1982) and Onvlee (1984), it is possible to locate these bird taxa within a broader context of folk taxonomy (see Figure 2). The Sumbanese classification of animal kinds can readily be accommodated to the model of ethnobiological taxonomy developed by Berlin and his associates (see Berlin 1992). Berlin's terms—unique beginner, life-form, intermediate, folk generic, and so on—thus provide a useful means of analyzing local categories and exploring their mutual relationship. The nature of eastern Sumbanese bird nomenclature also lends support to Berlin's approach insofar as it indicates a classification based primarily on observable morphological or behavioural features (including vocal behaviour) rather than on non-perceptual criteria. All the same, the Sumbanese categories are further related in other, non-taxonomic ways, thus participating in a separate, symbolic classification (cf. Forth 1998b:190-91). Non-taxonomic articulations of bird catego-
ries are discussed after a review of nomenclature. In the concluding section I briefly consider the possible influence of symbolic value on the ethnoornithological taxonomy in general.

Whether eastern Sumbanese ethnozoological classification incorporates a term comprehensively designating ‘animal(s)’—thus a named “unique beginner” (Berlin 1992:15)—is somewhat debatable. The main candidate is the expression makayidi-yadaku, ‘things that move,’ which both Onvlee and Kapita further gloss as ‘the whole of creation’ (or ‘all creatures,’ semua makhluk, Kapita 1982 s.v. kayidiku). The phrase is based on the compound yidi-yada, comprising two roughly synonymous terms meaning ‘to move,’ and producing an alliterative sound symbolism comparable to English ‘topsy-turvy’ or ‘twist (and) turn’ and Bahasa Indonesia gerak gerik, which indeed translates the Sumbanese pair. In combination the affixes ka- and -ku lend a repetitive or continuous quality to the basic verbal compound, while ma- (‘that, what, that which’) renders the nominal sense. Although logically makayidi-yadaku could include Homo sapiens, the phrase is not normally applied to human beings and is thus comparable, for example, to the vernacular English use of ‘animal,’ where the word contrasts with ‘man, human.’ The main qualification concerns the collective sense of the Sumbanese phrase, that is, the fact that it appears mostly to be used as a reference to ‘animals’ in general rather than to single individuals. Consistent with this, Kapita does not gloss makayidi-yadaku as binatang (‘animal,’ Bahasa Indonesia), nor does Onvlee translate it with Dutch dier or beest. (Also, the last author gives the phrase as da makayidi-yadaku, thus incorporating the plural article da.) Nevertheless, makayidi-yadaku is a term Sumbanese regularly employ to refer to animals, not an expression constructed in response to lexicographical questioning. That they possess a category of ‘animal’, moreover, is indicated by the numeral classifier ngu (tail), which is used when enumerating animals but not humans or other living things.

Although makayidi-yadaku applies to all non-human animals, its focus appears to be undomesticated kinds. Interestingly, yada, the root of yadaku, can mean ‘wild, untamed, difficult to tame,’ as well as ‘to move, be capable of movement’ (Onvlee, Kapita s.v. yada). Yet this sense—probably involving a metonymy whereby a propensity to movement connotes the opposite of tameness—is not clearly decisive for its incorporation in the longer expression. Domestic animals are collectively called banda. This however is a secondary meaning of a word, the main sense of which is ‘goods, possessions, wealth’ (cf. Bahasa Indonesia benda). As this derivation may suggest, the term moreover refers particularly to large livestock, a principal form of wealth in the Sumbanese traditional economy. Some of my Rindi informants claimed that banda could be understood in the wider sense of ‘animal’ (Bahasa Indonesia binatang), with wild animals then being specified as banda matamba (wild banda); but neither Onvlee nor Kapita record the latter phrase and I suspect that, even at present, it is not a widespread or standard usage. Whatever the case, and regardless of the extent to which makayidi-yadaku and banda may share common referents, the two categories are not obviously related by taxonomic inclusion. By the same token, banda can be characterized as a utilitarian category, referring mostly if not entirely to a class of economic values,
While *makayidi-yyádaku* is a descriptive phrase naming a category of living things distinguished explicitly on behavioural, and implicitly on morphological, grounds.

Since *makayidi-yyádaku* refers to an ability to move, it is significant that the taxon subsumes two major categories both of which are denoted by phrases referring to specific kinds of movement. Both constitute "life-form" taxa, in the sense defined by Brown (1979) and Berlin (1992:15ff). One is *mabei*, 'things that creep, crawl,' a large and internally diverse taxon that can include insects, arachnids, reptiles, amphibians, and even fish. The other is *mahawurungu*, 'things that fly.' Not surprisingly, birds are focal to *mahawurungu*. Contrary to what the name would suggest, not every sort of aerial creature is included in the taxon. For example, the 'Flying dragon' (probably *Draco volans*, cf. Dammerman 1926a:218, in Rindi called *kumbu lai hawurungu*, 'flying lizard') is reckoned not to belong to the *mahawurungu* but rather to the *mabei*, together with other lizards. Some Rindi thought that flying insects—such as houseflies, wasps, and bees—should be counted as *mahawurungu*. However, because they crawl as well, the creatures are also—and probably more usually—classified as *mabei*. It almost goes without saying that bats are classified as *mahawurungu*. Since the term translates exactly as 'flying things' it may be questioned whether Sumbanese, like most folk zoologists, actually classify bats as kinds of 'birds.' That they do so is indicated by the fact that Rindi mentioned bats with birds when listing names of 'flying things,' as well as by a local belief that bats lay eggs.

The derivation of *mahawurungu* requires comment. *Hawurungu* (to fly) comprises a fused prefix, *ha-*, and *wurungu*, evidently a cognate of Malay (or Bahasa Indonesia) *burung* (bird) and, following some authors, a reflex of an Austronesian protoform referring to birds in general (see Dempwolff 1938; Lopez n.d., cited in Wurm and Wilson 1975). The same sources give no indication that *wurungu* reflects protoforms meaning 'to fly,' and it may therefore be supposed that the Sumbanese word derives from a term that once denoted birds but has since, and with the addition of the prefix *ha-*, acquired a verbal sense which, by way of further prefixing, has as it were reverted to its original meaning. There is however an alternative interpretation. Both Kapita and Onvlee indicate a derivation of *hawurungu* (to fly) from *wuru*, denoting the sound produced by the wings of a flying bird, or by an object that is thrown into the air. In that case, the eastern Sumbanese word for 'to fly' may even be based on an onomatopoeia, and its resemblance with *burung* (bird) may be coincidental.

Connected with the opposed modes of locomotion to which the terms refer, *mahawurungu* and *mabei* comprise creatures that typically occupy areas located respectively above and below the human domain. Indeed, it is partly in this regard that one can comprehend the inclusion of fish (*iyangu*) among the *mabei*. For although fish do not actually 'creep' or 'crawl,' living in water they inhabit a region beneath the space inhabited by humans. In addition, fish resemble other *mabei*, particularly reptiles, in several obvious morphological respects, thus suggesting a switch from behavioural criteria as a basis of classification. Although they constitute two major named life-form taxa within the *makayidi-yyádaku* (moving things), *mabei* and *mahawurungu* obviously do not exhaust the Sumbanese category of 'animals.' Most noticeably excluded are mammals, both wild and domesticated.
while *makayidi-yâdaku* is a descriptive phrase naming a category of living things distinguished explicitly on behavioural, and implicitly on morphological, grounds.

Since *makayidi-yâdaku* refers to an ability to move, it is significant that the taxon subsumes two major categories both of which are denoted by phrases referring to specific kinds of movement. Both constitute “life-form” taxa, in the sense defined by Brown (1979) and Berlin (1992:15ff). One is *mabei*, ‘things that creep, crawl,’ a large and internally diverse taxon that can include insects, arachnids, reptiles, amphibians, and even fish. The other is *mahawurungu*, ‘things that fly.’ Not surprisingly, birds are focal to *mahawurungu*. Contrary to what the name would suggest, not every sort of aerial creature is included in the taxon. For example, the ‘Flying dragon’ (probably *Draco volans*, cf. Dammerman 1926a:218, in Rindi called *kumbu lai hawurungu*, ‘flying lizard’) is reckoned not to belong to the *mahawurungu* but rather to the *mabei*, together with other lizards. Some Rindi thought that flying insects—such as houseflies, wasps, and bees—should be counted as *mahawurungu*. However, because they crawl as well, the creatures are also—and probably more usually—classified as *mabei*. It almost goes without saying that bats are classified as *mahawurungu*. Since the term translates exactly as ‘flying things’ it may be questioned whether Sumbanese, like most folk zoologists, actually classify bats as kinds of ‘birds.’ That they do so is indicated by the fact that Rindi mentioned bats with birds when listing names of ‘flying things,’ as well as by a local belief that bats lay eggs.

The derivation of *mahawurungu* requires comment. *Hawurungu* (to fly) comprises a fused prefix, *ha-* and *wurungu*, evidently a cognate of Malay (or Bahasa Indonesia) *burung* (bird) and, following some authors, a reflex of an Austronesian protoform referring to birds in general (see Dempwolff 1938; Lopez n.d., cited in Wurm and Wilson 1975). The same sources give no indication that *wurungu* reflects protoforms meaning ‘to fly,’ and it may therefore be supposed that the Sumbanese word derives from a term that once denoted birds but has since, and with the addition of the prefix *ha-* acquired a verbal sense which, by way of further prefixing, has as it were reverted to its original meaning.7 There is however an alternative interpretation. Both Kapita and Onvlee indicate a derivation of *hawurungu* (to fly) from *wuru*, denoting the sound produced by the wings of a flying bird, or by an object that is thrown into the air. In that case, the eastern Sumbanese word for ‘to fly’ may even be based on an onomatopoeia, and its resemblance with *burung* (bird) may be coincidental.8

Connected with the opposed modes of locomotion to which the terms refer, *mahawurungu* and *mabei* comprise creatures that typically occupy areas located respectively above and below the human domain. Indeed, it is partly in this regard that one can comprehend the inclusion of fish (*iyangu*) among the *mabei*. For although fish do not actually ‘creep’ or ‘crawl,’ living in water they inhabit a region beneath the space inhabited by humans. In addition, fish resemble other *mabei*, particularly reptiles, in several obvious morphological respects, thus suggesting a switch from behavioural criteria as a basis of classification.9 Although they constitute two major named life-form taxa within the *makayidi-yâdaku* (moving things), *mabei* and *mahawurungu* obviously do not exhaust the Sumbanese category of ‘animals.’ Most noticeably excluded are mammals, both wild and domesticated.
These are designated only by individual terms (for example, ruha 'deer;' buti 'monkey;' ringu 'dugong') which in most cases refer to terminal taxa coinciding with scientific species. The only distinction made within these categories concerns wild and domesticated varieties of what are considered single mammalian kinds. Thus, the wild cat and wild swine are called meo rumba and wei rumba (rumba is 'grass, bush') while their domestic counterparts are usually referred to simply as meo (cat) and wei (pig). As can be seen from Table 1, something similar is done when distinguishing wild and domestic kinds of fowls (manu) and ducks (rendi).

FIGURE 2.—Bird taxa in eastern Sumbanese ethnozoological classification
Since Sumbanese are quite clear that all birds are instances of *makayidi-yàdaku*, this category and *mahawurungu* are unambiguously related by taxonomic inclusion (see Figure 2). For the most part, the ‘bird’ taxon immediately includes a series of terminal generic taxa (using “generic” in the sense proposed by Berlin 1992:53-53) that are not further divided into named sub-types or varieties. The resulting structure of three levels is of course quite typical of folk classifications of living things.

At the same time, the names recorded in Table 1 include some 28 binomials, and of these 16 appear to be productive in the sense that the second component specifies the referent as an instance of the class labelled by the first term. Thus, *rawa tana*, for example, specifies a member of the more inclusive category *rawa*. Other binomials are unproductive. Several comprise two words describing a feature of the bird (e.g., *katua wei*, *laleba nggangga*, *landu witu*, *mbera wurungu*). The name *totoru laka* is also descriptive, combining a probable instance of onomatopoeia with a colour term (*laka*, see Table 1). The six names that include *kulu-*, while formally similar to productive binomials, are not actually productive. Despite the probable connection between *kulu-* and words in other Austronesian languages that mean ‘bird’ or a kind of bird (e.g., Nage/central Flores *kolo* ‘dove’ [Forth 1996:106]), the Sumbanese term does not denote any particular class of bird.10 As can be seen from Table 1, the birds thus named are quite various, and indeed, Rindi denied that they were related to one another, or were variants of a single kind. What is more, *kulu-* also occurs as a component of terms designating natural kinds other than birds (see *kulu-kengu*, millipede; *kulu-nderi*, a kind of grass; see also *kulungu*, a small sort of mouse and *kulu*, a kind of breadfruit, *Artocarpus communis* [Onvlee 1984]). In this respect, the morpheme is reminiscent of central Flores (Nage, Ngadha) *kaka*, which similarly forms part of bird names but further occurs in terms for other natural kinds (regarding Nage, see Forth 1996:101; also Verheijen 1963 on the same element in Manggarai).

Most productive binomials form pairs, thus distinguishing just two taxa within the more inclusive kind (e.g., *rendi manu* and *rendi yalangu*). By far the most prominent instance of productive binomials are the six terms denoting kinds of *rawa*, all of which refer to members of the Columbidae (pigeons and doves). Not all members of this family, however, are specified with compounds of *rawa*. Others, particularly it seems smaller members, are named *kulu-ndiha* or *mbàra*, a word that is itself modified to produce terms distinguishing different kinds of dove (see *mbàra manu* and *mbàra nggela*). None of the available evidence indicates that either *mbàra* or *kulu-ndiha* is straightforwardly included within a broader taxon labelled *rawa*. At the same time, some of the referents of *rawa*, applying at the folk generic level, may overlap with those of *mbàra*. Onvlee thus gives *Treron teysmanni* as the referent of both *mbàra* and *rawa ratu*. (Kapita’s gloss, by contrast, links only *Streptopelia chinensis* with *mbàra*, whereas Onvlee, rather surprisingly, connects this species with no Sumbanese term.) Onvlee further equates *rawa kakoruku* with *Geopelia maugei*, while in Rindi this small dove is a probable referent of *mbàra nggela*.

The terms *rawa* and *mbàra* are also comparable insofar as both are used without qualification to refer to particular kinds further named by compounds. For example, *rawa* refers especially to *Ducula aenea* (*rawa kamukumu*), the Imperial
pigeon, a bird that in Rindi at least is further called *rawa manu* and is the largest of the Sumbanese Columbiformes.\(^{11}\) The appearance of *mbàra* in compound expressions denoting creatures that damage ripening rice crops (see Table 2) strongly suggests that this term specifies *Streptopelia* and *Geopelia*, although the cuckoo-dove (*Macropygia ruficeps*) also consumes rice (Coates and Bishop 1997). Larger pigeons, including both the genera *Ducula* and *Treron*, are by contrast fruit-eaters. Hence, it is conceivable that Sumbanese apply *rawa* generally to Columbiformes while reserving *mbàra* for particular instances, distinguished either absolutely or situationally, according to their dietary behaviour—a matter that bears on an obvious utilitarian or practical consideration.

Whatever the exact relation between *rawa* and *mbàra*, the former term can be seen as labelling an “intermediate” grouping, falling between the levels of life-form taxa and folk genera (Berlin 1992:139-160; see Figure 2). On the other hand, this status might more accurately be assigned to a larger, unnamed class of Columbiformes, most of which—but not all—are designated as *rawa* while others are called *mbàra* (or by terms including these) or *kulu-ndiha*. In other words, all Columbiformes may be treated as a single, distinct—though strictly-speaking covert—intermediate category in eastern Sumbanese ethnoornithological taxonomy (cf. Forth 1996). Another candidate for intermediate status is a group comprising most or all of the diurnal raptors. As noted in Table 1, Falconiformes are generally labelled as *ikitu*, although the term’s primary referent appears to be the Brahminy kite, a bird more specifically named as *ikitu marakuku* (‘White necked/throated *ikitu*’). Consistent with this broader use of *ikitu* are three western Sumbanese (Laura) terms for diurnal raptors listed by Dammerman (1926a), all of which include the cognate *wikita*. These are *wikita liza*, *wikita rewa koko*, and *wikita labo*, and correspond respectively to eastern Sumbanese *kapàha*, *ikitu*/*ikitu marakuku*, and *mbaku*/*mbaku tehiku*.

![Figure 3](image-url)
According to the detailed report of a Rindi informant, *ikitu*, understood as a general term for diurnal raptors, comprises two divisions. One includes a single kind, the Brahminy kite (*marakuku*). The second, labelled as *ikitu tolungu* (roughly, ‘meat hawks’), admits other named kinds (*kapâha, mbaku, tariku*; see Table 1), including members of both the Accipitridae and the Falconidae (see Figure 3). The same source specified the following order of size among members of the second division: *mbaku tehiku* (*Haliaeetus leucogaster*, the largest), *mbaku, kapâha, tariku* (the smallest). Unfortunately, I was unable to determine how far this classification of diurnal birds of prey is shared among eastern Sumbanese. Essentially, it separates the Brahminy kite (*Haliastur indus*), the raptor most closely associated with the name *ikitu*, from all other members of the broader taxon identified with the same term. Since *Haliastur indus* also eats flesh, the contrasting term ‘meat hawk’ does not illuminate the basis of the division. It is however possible that the bird’s greater reliance on scavenging rather than killing may be relevant. Also, while the Brahminy kite is often sighted inland—where, like other raptors, it is perceived by Sumbanese as a threat to poultry—it is more commonly found on the coast. This of course is also the preferred haunt of the sea-eagle (*mbaku* or *mbaku tehiku*). But the sea-eagle is nevertheless distinguished from the kite insofar as, according to Rindi at least, the former is the one raptor that does not steal chickens.

As elsewhere in Indonesia, on Sumba large raptors play a prominent role in creation mythology. In parts of Flores, it is the Brahminy kite in particular that is associated with a creator deity (Laubscher 1975; see also Freeman 1960 and Metcalf 1976, regarding the Brahminy kite in Bornean cosmology and augury). In eastern Sumba, by contrast, this part is taken by *Haliaeetus leucogaster*, the White-bellied sea-eagle (see below). Yet Rindi descriptions of the mythical bird sometimes suggested features of the Brahminy kite. Relevant to a possible conflation of the two birds which this suggests is Onvlee’s gloss, which indicates that the large kite may be classified as a kind of *mbaku*, more particularly the ‘White-throated *mbaku*’ (*mbaku bara kuku*, see Table 1), a situation that recalls the sort of classificatory overlap already evidenced with regard to Columbiformes. Effecting an inversion of the relation of inclusion implied by Onvlee, my Rindi informant listed both *mbaku* and *mbaku tehiku* under *ikitu tolungu*. However, his description of members of the first taxon (*mbaku*) did not unambiguously indicate the Brahminy kite, and it may well be that, in Rindi at any rate, this term is applied to a variety of larger eagles and hawks. Regional variation in folk classification may be relevant in resolving these issues. So too may colour phases and environmental contexts of large raptors. For example, *Haliastur indus* (the Brahminy kite) may be classified as a kind of *mbaku* specifically when encountered near the sea (cf. Ellen 1993a).

Another folk taxon represented as comprising a number of distinct types is *manginu*. Like Onvlee (1984), Rindi informants claimed there were numerous ‘kinds’ (Bahasa Indonesia *macam, jenis*) of *manginu*. Mentioned among these were *manginu uhu* (‘rice manginu’), *manginu wataru* (‘maize manginu’), *manginu tana* (‘ground [-dwelling] manginu’), and *manginu kulu-kataitaku*; but there were reckoned to be many more besides, whose names were not known. With the exception of *kulu-kataitaku*, a term used alone to label a generic taxon (see also
manginu kadu, Table 1), these several qualifiers however suggest simple descriptors serving merely to distinguish varieties of a single basic kind. In its most focal sense, manginu denotes Estrildine finches, especially munias (genus Lonchura) and similar small birds that do damage to rice and other cereal crops. Thus, the compound mbàra manginu, 'doves and munias,' is a standard expression for birds that destroy ripening cereals. Yet in a more inclusive application the term further refers to a large variety of generally small passerine birds (or "dicky-birds"; see Figure 2), in which context it suggests an intermediate grouping comparable to ikitu and rawa (cf. the Nage term peti, ana peti, Forth 1996, which is similarly paired with a term for Columbiformes, kolo, to refer to crop pests). At the same time, in its more inclusive sense manginu differs from these insofar as it appears not to be simultaneously identified with a single, undivided folk generic (as exemplified by ikitu marakuku and rawa kamukumu). This broader usage of manginu would moreover account for the apparent absence from the eastern Sumbanese ethnoornithological lexicon of special (that is, folk generic) terms for small birds such as flowerpeckers, flycatchers, honeyeaters, sunbirds, titmice, warblers, white-eyes, and whistlers (see Appendix 1). Apart from the focal finches and other small birds designated by special names, I would estimate that as many as 25 species listed in Appendix 1 could be classified simply as manginu.

Eastern Sumbanese categories include two other candidates for intermediate status. One is an implicit taxon comprising the two black birds named nggangga (Large-billed crow) and laleba nggangga (a drongo, probably the Wallacean drongo). That these form a set is suggested not only by their physical resemblance, particularly in regard to colour, but by the designation of one as the ‘sister’s child’ (laleba) of the other (regarding the use of kin terms as evidence of covert intermediate taxa, see Berlin 1992:145). The other instance of a possible intermediate taxon is panii. Usages recorded by Onvlee indicate that this term serves both to name the Flying fox and as a label for a more inclusive class that also includes much smaller bats (e.g., those called pahomba in Rindi). By contrast, evidence from Rindi suggests that panii may there refer only to Flying foxes (Pteropus spp.) while smaller members of the Cheiroptera may consistently be named with other terms.

NOMENCLATURE

As mentioned above, several names comprising two lexemes refer to empirical or reputed characteristics of the birds so named (e.g., katua wei), as do components of productive binomials (e.g., ikitu marakuku). Where the meaning of a name, or part of a name, is analyzable, this is indicated in Table 1. The six names comprising kulu- all have analyzable second elements. Of these, four refer to visible features (e.g., -kadu, ‘horn, horn-coloured’); one is onomatopoeic (-kawaki); while the other possibly refers to some general quality attributed to the bird (-ndiha, ‘good, attractive’). In contrast, among names constituted of single lexemes, only two—kola and mbaku—possesses an independent meaning that describes a morphological or behavioural feature of its avifaunal referent. Another possibility is nggokaria (heron), insofar as this may be a variant of nggokaru, ‘to stretch, crane the neck,’ which Onvlee further lists as the word for ‘heron’ in the Lewa dialect of eastern Sumba. (Alternatively, nggokaria may comprise two ele-
ments, nggoka and ria, the first of which recalls central Flores gako, 'large heron'; see Nage gako tasi, Forth 1996.) Laleba nggangga indirectly refers to a morphological feature insofar as it alludes to a resemblance with the Large-billed crow, nggangga. By the same token, it is the only name that includes a kin term (laleba, 'sister’s child'). (Ana in ananjâki cannot be construed as 'child' in the sense of a relationship term.) About 17 of the names in Table 1 describe physical features of their referents. Others refer to environmental associations (see landu witu, mbaku tehiku, rawa tana).

Only a minority of names—about seven—are locally recognized as wholly or partly onomatopoeic (koka, kui, kulu-kawâki, nggangga, rawa kamukumu, rawa kakoruku, tutuku). Judging from reported vocalizations, another eight are possible onomatopoeia (see kahuhu, kahiku, kaluki, kutuku, kuu, pipi, pirihi, totoru laka). The large number of avifaunal names beginning with ka-, a fused prefix, reflects a general lexical feature of Sumbanese languages. However, in some cases (notably kamukumu and kakovâku, but see also, e.g., kahiku, kahulu) the prefix specifies something producing a sound denoted by the root (mukumu, koru; see Table 1). In other instances, the fused suffix -ku appears to effect a similar result (see kutuku, tutuku). The resemblance between nggokaria and nggonggali is probably superficial.19

Of the nearly sixty terms listed in Table 1, 33 or about 60 per cent, appear to name single scientific species. A large majority of these are the single representatives of their genera present on Sumba. If Dammerman and the lexicographers are accurate, a further three probably refer to just two members of the same genera (ananjâki, kalewara, powa). Eight names, including three designating taxa of intermediate status, apparently refer to three or more species of the same genera or indeed two or more genera (ikitu, karata, manginu, mbâra, mbera wurungu, nggokaria, pipi, rawa). In the remaining cases, information is insufficient to make a determination.

How far names for folk generic and intermediate taxa are further applied, or "extended" (Ellen 1993b), to species and higher order groupings associated with scientific kinds listed in Table 1 cannot be decided without more research into Sumbanese knowledge of birds. There are, for example, five species of Hirundo (see mbera wurungu) on Sumba, numerous members of the Ardeidae (including Ardea, Egretta, and representatives of six other genera; see nggokaria), and at least eight species of the Scolopacidae (sandpipers, snipes and allies; see pipi, kahulu). Yet one cannot know a priori how many members of these ornithological families and genera Sumbanese would regularly identify with the indigenous terms. It is similarly unclear whether less common Columbiformes (such as the White-throated pigeon, Little cuckoo-dove, Nicobar pigeon, and two species of Ptilinopus, or fruit-doves) would be classified as rawoa or named with other, thus far unrecorded, terms. In accordance with the classification illustrated in Figure 3, it is a reasonable surmise that ikitu can be applied without further qualification to Falconiformes, including five members of the Accipitridae recorded on Sumba but not indicated as possible referents of terms listed in Table 1. In regard to size, these are either comparable to the Brahminy kite (ikitu marakuku) or White-bellied sea-eagle (mbaku tehiku, the largest Sumbanese raptor) or fall somewhere between the two.
These sorts of questions of course turn partly on the completeness of the bird names listed in Table 1, an issue addressed earlier. As suggested, it is probable that a large number of small passerine species are simply classified as manginu. Comparative evidence supports this. For example, Ellen, writing on the Nuauulu of Seram, refers to an “under-differentiation of passerines” that is “quite astonishing” (1993b:79). (A more general “under-differentiation of avifauna”, or classificatory “lumping”, Ellen partly attributes to migration and straggling.) Given that eastern Sumbanese are not a maritime people, one should also not be surprised that seabirds and species inhabiting coastal environments are not particularly well represented in Table 1. Larger passerine birds recorded on Sumba which are not obviously identifiable with known indigenous terms, but which one might expect to be separately named, include bee-eaters, cuckoos, cuckoo-shrikes, and the dollarbird (see Appendix 1). Yet even some of these could conceivably be named by employing already attested categories. Smaller cuckoos, for example, could be classified with the koel (kutuku), as might the larger Channel-billed cuckoo (Scythrops novaehollandiae), while bee-eaters and other larger passerines are arguably not so large that they could not be included in the category manginu. A comparable case are small kingfishers (Alcedinidae), if these are not classified with the significantly larger Halcyonidae as kahiku. (Also not to be ignored is the fact that Sumbanese has a single life-form label—mahavurungu—that can simply be applied to identify any bird not further classifiable.) In marked contrast, the names listed in Table 1 include no fewer than five terms referring to parrots (kaka, kariku, kata/a, pirihu, wowangu). Not only do all of these apparently denote single scientific species, but the five kinds exhaust parrot species occurring on Sumba. Thus, even though they do not compose a distinct intermediate grouping—or at least not one that is named—the Sumbanese Psittacidae are nevertheless taxonomically elaborated to an even greater degree than diurnal raptors (ikitu) and Columbiformes (rawa).

**TABLE 1.—Eastern Sumbanese bird names**

1. **ananjaki** (or ana njaki). One or more species of Anthus (D 12: Anthus ruflllus). Two present on Sumba include A. novaeselandiae (Richard’s pipit) and A. gustavi (Pechora pipit). As in other eastern Indonesian languages ana, ‘child’, can also denote a small version or instance of something (cf. Nage ana go, probably A. novaeselandiae, Forth 1996). Njakı apparently has no independent meaning.

2. **ikitu** Haliastur indus intermedius, Brahminy kite (D 30, Haliastur intermedius). In Rindi the term refers more generally to Falconiformes. Kapita glosses it as Bl elang (‘hawk’) and ‘Palcomidae’ (sic).

**ikitu marakuku.** Also a reference to H.indus. Marakuku means ‘white-neck(ed), throat(ed).’ The bird is also called by this term alone.

3. **kahiku.** Halcyon chloris (D 19). The only other Halcyon kingfisher present on Sumba is H. australasia (C&B). Whether the Sumbanese term might also refer to other kingfishers is not known. In view of one cry of H. chloris reproduced as ‘kick kyew’ (C&B), the name, particularly the root hiku, is probably onomatopoetic.

4. **kahuhu.** A small shorebird, sandpiper. Kapita identifies the bird with the species Dammerman lists for pipi (see below). The word is probably unrelated to huku in the sense of ‘breast, milk’ and is possibly onomatopoetic (see ‘teu-hu-hu’, the call of the Common redshank, Tringa totanus, C&B).
5. *kaka*. *Cacatua sulphurea citrinocristata*, Yellow-crested cockatoo (D 24: *Cacatua citrinocristata*). Onvlee also lists *kaka ratu*, or ‘royal cockatoo’, as a reference to a cockatoo ‘with red eyes’, but this appears not to refer to a separate species.

6. *kalewaru*. *Collocalia* spp. (D 18), swiftlets. Species occurring on Sumba include the Edible-nest swiftlet, *C. fucipltaga*, and the Glossy swiftlet, *C. esculenta*. Nests of the former species are collected for sale and eventual export. The local name *kalewaru* (cf. Manggarai *lawar*, ‘swiftlets and swallows’, Verheijen 1963) is related to BI *kelawar* or *kelelawar*, referring to a small bat. It is therefore of some interest that both swiftlets and bats characteristically roost in caves, often the same caves. Onvlee glosses the almost identical name *kaliwaru* as ‘swallow’ and, referring to Dammerman (D 17), as *Hirundo*. Dammerman in fact gives only *mbera wurungu* (see below) as the eastern Sumbanese name for swallows, though for western Sumba he lists the cognate *kalewara* for both *Hirundo* and *Collocalia*.

7. *kaluki*. *Megapodius reinwardt reinwardt* (D 38: *Megapodius duperreyi*), Reinwardt’s scrubfowl. The name plausibly imitates part of the bird’s call, given by C&B as ‘*kli-au-kau*’ (see wundu, below).

8. *kapaha*. A small falcon, kestrel (D 29: *Cerchneis occidentalis*). Following C & B and the descriptions given by Dammerman (1926a:214, 1926b:22), the term is likely to include *Falco moluccensis*, the Moluccan kestrel or Spotted kestrel. (Another small falcon is *F. longipennis*, the Australian hobby, but this has only once been recorded on Sumba.) Kapita similarly describes the bird as a small Falconiforme with speckled plumage. Whether the name is related to *pahangu* (=*paha* + *-ngu*), meaning ‘to drop (trans.)’, let drop’, is not indicated by the lexicographers.

9. *kapi padangu*. Recorded in Rindi, the term does not appear in either Onvlee or Kapita. *Kapi* means ‘to flicker (of a light or fire)’; *padangu* is ‘plain, pasture.’ In view of *kapi mama*, ‘firefly’, the term possibly refers to an insect rather than a bird.

10. *kapiri*. Described by Onvlee as a “small red bird, a ground thrush” (Dutch *grondlijster*) which lays eggs in “a hole in the ground”. Kapita’s gloss “Pittadae” (sic) indicates a pitta. Although not actually in holes, Pittas in general do nest on or near the ground (C&B). The only pitta recorded on Sumba is *Pitta elegans maria*, the Elegant pitta, which has a red belly and vent and is described as “locally common or moderately common” on Sumba (C&B). Kapita’s further gloss, *kutilang*, an Indonesian (BI) name for a kind of bulbul (none of which are natural to Sumba), can probably be ignored.

11. *karata*. Terns (Laridae, sub-family Sterninae), probably including the Gull-billed tern, *Gelochelidon nilotica*, and one or more species of *Chlidonias* and *Sterna*. Rindi informants stated there were two kinds of *karata* but could not distinguish them by name. A similar account was given by a Kupang informant, who described a ‘pure white’ variety that occurs near inland lakes and paddy fields and another sort, cream-coloured with dark marks on the back of the head, which is found on the coast. Onvlee and Kapita appear mistaken in identifying *karata* with, respectively, gulls (Dutch *zeemeeuw*) and Jaegers (BI *burung camar*). There are no gulls (Larinae) on Sumba.

12. *kàriku*. *Eclectus roratus cornelia* (D 26: *Eclectus cornelia*), the Eclectus parrot. Rindi distinguish red and green varieties (*kàriku rara* and *kàriku muru*). As Dammerman (1926a:213-14) notes, these are actually the female and male of the same species, a fact recognized by Rindi people as well.


14. *katua wei*. The name means ‘companion of the pig.’ Kapita further glosses it as ‘pig spirit’ (BI *roh babi*). Both he and Onvlee identify this as an owl whose call indicates the presence of wild pigs, a notion encountered elsewhere in Indonesia (Forth 1998b). Information is insufficient to determine whether *katua wei* refers to a
particular species of owl or whether this is one of the Strigidae or the Tytonidae (cf. *wangi* below). Among the Strigidae, C&B report just one, unidentified, member of the genus *Otus* on Sumba, as well as *Ninox rudolfi*, the endemic Sumba boobook. Quite possibly, *katua wei* denotes one or more varieties of nocturnal sound, rather than a particular kind of visible owl.

15. *koka*. *Philemon bucuroides neglectus* (D 11; not cited by Onvlee), the Helmeted friarbird, the only *Philemon* species present on Sumba. The name, also rendered contextually as *nggauka*, is described as onomatopoeic.

16. *kola*. A diurnal raptor, listed by Onvlee as ‘*Astur torquatus*’, distinguished by a ‘neck ring of feathers’ (cf. Latin ‘torquatus’, ‘wearing a twisted collar or necklace’). The name probably derives from *kola* in the sense of ‘speckled, flecked.’ Kapita glosses the term as ‘falcon, Peregrine falcon’ (BI *alap-alap*; *Falco peregrinus*).

17. *kuu*. Both Onvlee and Kapita identify this as a kind of kite (Dutch *bastaard-wouw*) and specifically as ‘*Elanus hypoleuocos*’, an apparent reference to the Black-winged kite, *Elanus caeruleus hypoleuocos*. Neither the name nor the bird is listed by Dammerman. As Onvlee notes, the call of this bird, usually heard in the evening, is considered inauspicious. In Rindi, it is more particularly regarded as a manifestation of a witch. Consistent with this association are the partly crepuscular habits of *Elanus caeruleus* (C&B 1997:247), since Sumbanese witches, too, are believed to be especially active at twilight. On the other hand, Rindi described *kuu* as a ‘black’, or dark coloured, bird, as did informants in Kupang. That this does not entirely accord with the plumage of the Black-winged kite may be explained by the bird’s nocturnal associations; indeed on this account Kupang informants claimed never to have clearly seen the bird. Alternatively, *kuu* might refer to another bird altogether. In Umalulu, a domain immediately to the north of Rindi, I was shown a photograph of a dead bird identified as a *kuu* which had been killed because of its inauspicious calling after dark and which, I recall, resembled a female koel (see *kutuku*, below). Kruyt (1922:559), apparently inaccurately, describes *kuu* (transcribed as ‘koeoe’) as another name for the owl otherwise called *wangi* (see below). He also characterizes the name as onomatopoeic, as did one Kupang informant. Noteworthy here is the arguable resemblance of *kuu* to a nocturnal call of the koel (*’ko’e’i or ko-el*, C&B). However, another cry of the bird, rendered by Kupang informants as ‘weep’ or ‘weep’, corresponds with vocalizations reported by C&B for the kite, *Elanus caeruleus*.

18. *kui*. A bird named after its call (Onvlee), but otherwise unidentified. Kapita describes it as having green plumage and feeding on ripe mangoes and other fruits. If this description is accurate, a likely candidate is the glossy green Short-tailed starling, *Aplonis minor*, which is reported as ‘moderately common’ on Sumba (C&B p. 468) and consumes fruit (see also Mason and Jarvis, 1989:47, regarding the papaya-eating habit of Balinese *Aplonis panayensis*). (Contrary to Forth 1981:113, *kui* seems not to be associated with witches. This idea apparently reflects confusion with *kuu* [see above].)

19. *kulu-kadu*. *Saxicola caprata* (D 9: *Pratincola caprata*). Pied bushchat (or Pied Chat, C&B). *Kadu*, ‘horn’, alludes to the largely black plumage of the male. A term mentioned by Kupang informants, *manita watu* (*watu* is stone, cf. BI *batu*), is possibly a dialectal name for the bushchat (cf. BI *kucita batu*).

20. *kulu-kakuta*. *Oriolus chinensis broderipii* (D 14: *Oriolus broderipi*), Black-naped oriole. Meaning ‘resembling betel (*kuta*): *kakuta* seems to refer to the bird’s appearance, although its plumage is predominantly yellow and black.

21. *kulu-kanuhu*. *Terpsiphone paradisi sumbaensis* (D 16: *Terpsiphone sumbaensis*), Asian paradise-flycatcher. *Kanuhu*, which refers to the horse colour called Isabella, may describe the male bird’s predominantly off-white plumage. Onvlee, however, further
glosses the term as ‘rolled combed cotton’, which recalls the bird’s exceptionally long tail feathers. A Rindi myth recounts how these were derived from strands of cotton.

22. kulu-kawākī. A rail. Given by Onvlee as *Rallina fasciata* (Red-legged crake), but this species has not been recorded on Sumba (C&B). In respect of its attributed vocalizations, the bird is possibly *Galirallus philippensis*, the Buff-banded rail, or *Amaurornis phoenicurus*, the White-breasted Waterhen. The second element of the name is onomatopoeic (Kapita). Reputed to be especially vocal just before the onset of the southwest monsoon, the bird is significant in Rindi as an index of seasonal change.

23. kulu-ndīha. A sort of pigeon (Kapita: *Bl merpati, burung dara*, both general terms for ‘pigeon, dove’). The term is at least partly, and perhaps exclusively, applied to domestic pigeons. Onvlee gives as western Sumbanese equivalents *rawa* and *rawa tana* (see below). Dammerman (D 35) gives *kuru ndasi* (cf. *Nage kolo dhasi*, Domestic pigeon, *Forth* 1996:106) for ‘Turtur tigrinus’, or ‘turtle dove’, referring apparently to *Streptopelia chinensis* (*tigrina* is the name of the sub-species of *S. chinensis* found in Wallacea; see *mbara*). The term *kuru ndasi* is not found in either Onvlee or Kapita. The second element of *kulu-ndīha* possibly derives from *ndīha* in the sense of ‘good, attractive’.

24. kulu-taitaku or kulu-kataitaku or manginu kulu-kataitaku. Recorded in Rindi. Not listed by Onvlee or Kapita, though Onvlee gives *manginu taitaku* (see below). Onvlee glosses *taitaku* as ‘to walk, run quickly’ (cf. Kapita who provides the same gloss for *kataitaku*), and describes *manginu taitaku* as a bird that moves by jumping. The most likely referent is *Rhipidura rufifrons sumbensis*, the Rufous fantail. This is supported by Dammerman (1926a:210, 1926b:79), who gives the Laura (western Sumbanese) name for ‘*Rhipidura semieollaris*’ (*semieollaris* is the name now given to the sub-species of *R. rufifrons* that occurs on Flores) as *kela kataga*, ‘dancing bird’, a term evidently cognate with *kulu-kataitaku*.

25. kutuku. *Eudynamys cyanoccephala*, Australian koel (D 21: *Eudynamis everetti*). According to C&B, this is the only member of the genus occurring on Sumba. The Common koel, *E. seolopaeea*, is not listed by these authors, who however note that it may be conspecific with *E. cyanoccephala* (1997:353). A possible application of the term *kuu* to the koel was noted above (see entry no. 17). Since the suffix -ku can indicate reduplication, the name *kutuku* is conceivably explained as a reference to a bird that calls ‘kutu kutu’ (cf. *tutuku*, below).

26. laleba nggangga. Kupang informants identified this bird as a drongo. It is most probably the Wallacea drongo, *Dicrurus densus*. The name literally means ‘sister’s child of the crow (nggangga).’ Accordingly, Rindi describe *laleba nggangga* as like a crow only smaller. Onvlee (s.v. *nggangga*), citing Dammerman, lists the term as a reference to a ‘small black bird’ which he identifies as *Corvus enca*. However, *C. enca* does not occur on Sumba; nor in fact does Dammerman (1926a:208) link this species—which can hardly be called ‘small’—with the Sumbanese name.

27. landu witu. From illustrations, Kupang informants identified this as a species of nightjar, probably *Caprimulgus affinis*. Their descriptions of the bird’s appearance and habits also support this identification. The term is translateable as ‘sign of (from) the long grass’ (see Onvlee, s.v. *landu*, which also means ‘crest’). The name does not appear in either Kapita or Onvlee. According to Kupang informants, the distinctive nocturnal cry of a nightjar, reproduced as ‘cheri-ki-ki-ki’, indicates the presence of a thief, an idea that may illuminate the sense of ‘sign’ (*landu*) in the bird’s name.

28. mabahi. Unidentified. An eastern Sumbanese name reported only by Kupang informants, who gave quite various accounts of the bird’s appearance. The name is not found in Onvlee or Kapita. The variant in the dialect of Mangili is *mabahi*.

29. manginu. Small birds, kinds of Munia (D 13; cf. *Lonchura*). The focus of the Sumbanese category comprises several of the Estrildine finches, especially ones that
do damage to crops (see the Dutch name rijstdiefjes [Dammerman, Onvlee], 'little rice thieves'). C&B record six species on Sumba, including four munias (Lonchura malucca, L. punctulata, L. quinticolor, L. pallida), the Red avadavat (Amandava amandava), and the Zebra finch (Taeniopygia guttata). The names of other small birds classified as manginu are qualified, as follows.

**manginu katu.** A black, horn-coloured manginu 'which however does not eat rice' (Onvlee). Very probably another name for kulu-kadu (see above).

**manginu kani.** Passer montanus, Tree sparrow (Kupang informant; kani, or uhu kani, is the cereal Panicum viride). According to C& B, the species was first recorded on Sumba in the 1940s.

**manginu taitaku** (see kulu-taitaku, above)

30. **manu.** Gallus gallus, Domestic fowl; distinguished from manu tata (below) as manu mopu, 'tame fowl.' Several varieties are distinguished according to colour, size or derivation.

31. **manu tata.** Gallus varius (D 37), Green junglefowl, sometimes simply called tata (cf. Nage kata).

32. **mbaku.** Haliaeetus leucocephalus, White-bellied sea-eagle (D 31: Haliaeetus leucocephalus). Probably further applied to other large eagles and hawks. Mbaku also means 'to float, soar, glide, hover' (Onvlee; see also luku mbaku, 'mbaku river', as the name of the Milky Way).

**mbaku bara kuku.** Described by Onvlee as an eagle with a white neck, smaller than the sea-eagle (mbaku), and otherwise 'orange' in colour. This however describes the Brahminy kite (see above: ikitu, ikitu marakku. Marakku is synonymous with bara kuku).

**mbaku tehiku.** Given by Onvlee as 'large sea-eagle', the designation appears to be merely a more elaborate name for Haliaeetus leucocephalus. On the other hand, it could conceivably include another large coastal raptor, the osprey (Pandion haliaetus), which is intermediate in size between the larger sea-eagle and the Brahminy kite. Tehiku is 'sea.'

33. **mbåra.** A dove. According to Kapita, my own field notes, and identifications provided by Kupang informants, the term denotes Streptopelia chinensis, the Spotted dove, and possibly also Geopelia maugei (but see rawa kakoruku, below). Following Dammerman, Onvlee associates the name with Treron teysmannii (D 32: Osmotheron teysmanni), the endemic Sumba green pigeon. However, partly in view of Onvlee's further identification of the scientific name with rawa ratu, this appears mistaken.

**mbåra manu.** A larger kind of mbåra, the size of a domestic fowl (manu, Onvlee s.v. mbåra). The term was also recorded in Rindi, where it probably specifies Streptopelia chinensis.

**mbåra nggela** In Rindi, a smaller kind of mbåra, possibly Geopelia maugei. Onvlee (s.v. ngguku, nggela) describes mbåra nggela as a dove smaller than a similar kind called ngguku nggela (see below). Both of the latter terms mean 'to move up and down, to nod' and refer to the Columbiforme habit of bobbing the head. Kapita and Onvlee further gloss ngguku as 'to coo.' In Sumbanese songs and narratives, the call of the mbåra is rendered as turu tu tu (Wielenga 1909).

34. **mbéra wuwrungu.** Swallows, Hirundo spp. (D 17). The name translates as 'broken fragment of a pot' (Onvlee, Kapita) and thus is evidently not related to hawuwrungu in the sense of 'to fly.' It is a reasonable surmise that mbéra wuwrungu is further applied to Wood swallows (Artamus leucorynchus) and swifts (Apus spp.; see Appendix 1), but this cannot be known from the available sources.

35. **nggaha.** Domestic goose (recently introduced). From BI angsa (goose).

36. **nggangga.** Corvus macrorhynchos (D 8), Large-billed crow. Like its many cognates in Austronesian languages, the name is locally recognized as onomatopoeic.
37. **nggokaria.** Herons, *Ardea* spp. (D 40). The term probably also refers to Egrets (*Egretta* spp.) and other members of the Ardeidae. Rindi informants stated there were two kinds of *nggokaria* but did not know names for these. A Kupang informant suggested that Australian pelicans (*Pelecanus conspicillatus*), occasional visitors to Sumbanese inland lakes, might be classified as *nggokaria*. Probably relevant here is their watery habitat, as well as the white and black plumage, shape of their heads and—as the informant himself pointed out—large bills.

38. **nggonggali.** *Rhyticeros everetti* (D 20: *Rhytidoceros everetti*), Sumba hornbill. The species is a Sumbanese endemic.

39. **ngguku, ngguku nggela.** Apparently the same bird otherwise designated as *mbàra* or *mbàra nggela* (see above). In Rindi, *ngguku nggela*, which refers to Columbiformes’ habit of head-bobbing, was a war cry uttered periodically by victorious warriors, particularly it seems when returning to their village with enemy heads, and while preparing the heads for ritual use (see Kruyt 1922:561). A Kupang informant from the eastern Sumbanese domain of Lewa reported the name *ngguku kulungu*, which he identified from illustrations in C&B as *Geopelia maugeri* (see *mbàra*).

40. **pipi.** One or more kinds of sandpiper (*Tringa* spp.; D 41: *Tringoides hypoleucus*). Dammerman’s reference particularly suggests *Actitis hypoleucus*, the Common sandpiper, whose call C&B describe as ‘a piping tii-tee-tee’ (C&B). Onvlee and Kapita give the equivalent term in the Mangili dialect of eastern Sumba as *ahu ramuku*, ‘pool dog’ (*ramuku* is ‘pool, pond, wallow’). *Pipi* may be synonymous or overlap with *kahuhu* (see above).

41. **pirihu.** *Trichoglossus haematodus* (D 23), Rainbow lorikeet. The endemic Sumbanese sub-species is *T. h. fortis*. The name bears some resemblance to one of its calls, reproduced by C&B as ‘peaow, peaow, peow’, and so is possibly onomatopoeic.

42. **powa.** *Coturnix* spp., quails (Onvlee). Two species occur on Sumba, *C. ypsilehora pallidior* and *C. chinensis*, the Brown quail and Blue-breasted (or Chinese) quail. Whether the term also applies to buttonquails (Turnicidae), two species of which (including one endemic) occur on Sumba, is not known.

43. **rawa, rawa kamukumu.** *Ducula aenea* (D 33: *Carpophaga aenea*), Green imperial pigeon. Dammerman’s description clearly fits *D. aenea*. The Sumbanese sub-species is *D. a. polia*. As both Onvlee and Kapita note, the bird is also simply denoted by the generic term *rawa*, thus indicating that the species is the focus of the Sumbanese category. *Kamukumu* is onomatopoeic.

44. **rawa kakoruku.** *Geopelia maugeri* (D 36), Barred dove (Onvlee). Kapita associates this term with BI *perkutut*, which McKinnon (1991), referring to Jawa and Bali, identifies as *Geopelia striata*. Rindi claim that if this bird calls at night it presages a death. The second element of the name is onomatopoeic (cf. *koru*, ‘to coo (of a dove)’; *ka- and -ku* are fused affixes).

45. **rawa kawi.** A kind of pigeon, otherwise unidentified. The name was recorded only in Rindi. Informants were unable to explain *kawi*, a word appearing in neither Onvlee nor Kapita, though they described *rawa kawi* as intermediate in size between *rawa manu* (see below)—the largest *rawa*—and *rawa tana*.

46. **rawa manu.** A kind of large pigeon, about the size of a domestic fowl (*manu*). The name was recorded in Rindi, where informants’ descriptions suggested it may be a local designation for the bird otherwise known as *rawa kamukumu* (*Ducula aenea*).

47. **rawa ratu.** *Treron teysmannii*, Sumba green pigeon (following Onvlee, who cites D 32, probably in regard to the western Sumbanese name ‘rawa ratoe’; cf. *mbàra* above). The species is a Sumbanese endemic. *Ratu* refers to a high-ranking ceremonial leader. In view of its use in similar contexts (see e.g. *ularu ratu*, the Reticulated python; also *kaka ratu* under *kaka* above), the term probably alludes to the bird’s colourful plumage.
48. **rawa tana.** *Chalcophaps indica* (D 34), Emerald dove. In Rindi I was told that the bird is so named because it remains on or close to the ground (*tana*, also ‘land, earth, soil’) and never alights in trees. It is also described as silent or rarely vocal, unlike all other *rawa*. (This notion may derive from the circumstance that *C. indica* usually does not call when on the ground; see C&B 1997:316.) Owing to its reputedly quiet nature and iridescent green plumage, in ritual language the bird’s name symbolizes favourable qualities and spiritual beneficence.

49. **rendi.** *Anas* spp. (D 42), ducks. Wild ducks and introduced, domestic varieties are distinguished respectively as *rendi matamba* and *rendi mopu*, ‘tame ducks.’ According to Onvlee, domestic varieties are further distinguished with reference to their origins, as for example *rendi java* and *rendi manila*. The most common domestic species of wild duck, according to Dammerman, is *Anas superciliosa*, the Pacific black duck. According to C&B, the only other species of Anatidae found regularly on Sumba is *Anas gibberifrons*, the Sunda teal. However, a member of the Dendrocygnaeae, *Dendrocygna arcuata*, the Wandering whistling-duck, is also present and locally common.

**rendi manu.** Recorded in Rindi. A kind of wild duck (*manu*, ‘domestic fowl’)

**rendi yalangu.** Recorded in Rindi. A kind of wild duck, smaller than *rendi manu*. Yalangu is evidently a different word from *yalangu*, which Onvlee records as the name of a kind of eucalyptus tree (*Melaleuca leucadendron*).

50. **tarikul.** A kind of falcon or small kite (Onvlee, Kapita); otherwise unidentified. An apparent synonym is *taripeu.*

51. **totoru laka.** *Centropus bengalensis*, Lesser coucal (D 22: *Centropus javanicus*). This is the only coucal that occurs on Sumba. The first part of the name is probably onomatopoetic (cf. ‘toto, totok, totopuk, totopuk’, C&B). *Laka*, denoting a red colour and a tree, the leaves of which are used to produce a red nail varnish, evidently refers to the bird’s rufous wings. *Totoru laka* does not appear in Kapita.

52. **tutukul.** The name of the coucal given by Kupang informants (cf. *totoru laka*), who explained it as deriving from an imitation of its the bird’s call, rendered as ‘tutu tutu.’ The fused suffix -*ku* indicates repetition of the preceding element. *Tutuku*, however, is not listed as the name of a bird by either Onvlee or Kapita. In view of the relatively close relation and similarity of size, form, and colour between coucals and koels (*kutuku*, see above), the phonological and morphological resemblance of the names *tutuku* and *kutuku* is a point of some interest. Another is names for the Lesser coucal in dialects of the Manggarai language of western Flores, where it is called *kotok or totok* (Verheijen 1963).

53. **wángi.** *Tyto alba sumbaensis*, Barn owl (D 28: Dutch *kerkuil, Strix flammea*.) Another Sumbanese species of *Tyto* is *T. longimembris*, the Eastern grass owl. Dammerman states that the bird is considered to manifest a punitive spirit, and that its ‘croaking’ or ‘cawing’ forebodes sickness or death. Rindi people associate *wángi* with witches and particularly with the spiritual essence of a witch, called *wándi*. A connection between this term and *wángi* is however improbable (see Forth 1991:109 n6, 445). A more likely cognate of the bird’s name is *swangi*, a word that in Malay and other western Indonesian languages refers to a maleficent, nocturnal spirit (cf. eastern Indonesian Malay *suangi or suanggi*, ‘witch’). A Kupang informant described *swángi* as designating all owls ‘that are seen’, thus implicitly contrasting the term with *katua weyi* (see above). Even if this is correct, however, the available evidence still points to *Tyto alba* as the focus of *wángi*.

54. **wawangulu.** *Geoffroyus geoffroyi floresianus* (D 25: *Geoffroyus floresianus*), Red-cheeked parrot.

55. **wundu.** A synonym of *kaluki* (see above)
56. yápi. Gallinula spp. (D 39: Gallinula frontata; Onvlee, incorrectly citing Dammerman, gives ‘Gallinula phunicura’). Two species of Gallinula occur on Sumba, G. tenebrosa and G. chloropus, the Dusky moorhen and Common moorhen. For Sumbanese the bird’s most distinctive feature is the bright red bill, which appears in both species. Another red-billed water bird that occurs on the island is Porphyrio porphyrio, the Purple swamp hen. From illustrations, Kupang informants identified both the latter and G. tenebrosa as yápi. Onvlee describes the bird as inhabiting paddy-fields and doing damage to rice and tubers.

ADDENDUM: BATS

pahomba. A small bat (possibly Tylonycteris sp.), about the size of a swallow or large butterfly. The creatures are said to roost in the tops of banana trunks where, Rindi claim, they lay eggs about the size of a dove’s. Apparently referring to the same small bat, Onvlee (s.v. pani=Kapita’s panti) lists the terms pani ru kalu (‘banana leaf bat’) and pani palinju wiki (‘bat that fouls itself’). Sometimes pahomba bats enter houses. In Rindi, they are considered a manifestation of spirits associated with clan shrines, also called pahomba. Being mystically powerful, the creatures are also able to assume human form. panii (pani, Onvlee). Flying fox (Pteropus spp., following Dammerman). The term also means ‘to talk, speak’, and probably alludes to chattering noises made by large fruit-bats. Rindi people reported two kinds which they distinguished only as ‘large’ and ‘small’ (panii bokul, panii kudu). These may correspond to the two species recorded by Dammerman (1926b:22) as ‘Pteropus morio’ (P. alecto morio?), described as almost entirely black, and ‘Pteropus xilus’ (Dobsonia peronii?), which is yellow-brown in colour (see Forth 1998a, regarding two kinds of Flying fox distinguished by the Nage of central Flores). On the other hand, the reference may be to Flying foxes and much smaller bats respectively, especially in view of indications that panii also serves as a general term for bats (see pahomba above).

panyonga makaweda. Recorded in Rindi. A small bat. The name means ‘tricks, fools elderly people.’

KEY:
Bl=Bahasa Indonesia, the Malay-based national language.
C&B=Coates and Bishop 1997.
D=Dammerman 1926a except where otherwise indicated.
Numerals after ‘D’ indicate numbers assigned to species identified by Dammerman (1926a). Latin names given by Dammerman, many of which are now superseded, are not italicized. Where only a number is given with ‘D’, the scientific name provided by Dammerman coincides with the one recognized at present.
‘Kupang informant(s)’ refers to Sumbanese consulted in Kupang, the capital of Nusa Tenggara Timur province, in 1999.
SYMBOLIC ASSOCIATION AND METAPHORICAL PAIRING

Especially the composition of life-form taxa (named with reference to modes of locomotion), and of apparent intermediate taxa, indicate that eastern Sumbanese ethnozoological classification is primarily based on morphological and behavioural criteria. At the same time, several categories of birds are linked in non-taxonomic ways that may generally be called symbolic. Several ethnoornithological categories are paired in the parallelistic idiom of ritual language. For example, the conjoined phrases *pirihu pauli, kaka makangahuru*, 'assembled parrots, collected cockatoos,' refers to any large group of people who unite to expedite a ritual or some other customary undertaking. A number of pairings are listed in Table 2. Together these include 13—thus nearly a quarter—of the categories appearing in Table 1.

Although the list is meant to be illustrative rather than exhaustive, a glance at Table 2 suggests that the three names associated with intermediate taxa (*ikitu, manginu, rawa*) are particularly salient in ritual speech. It may be no coincidence, moreover, that the most prominent of these, *rawa*, a term that pairs with at least four others (including plant and insect categories), is the focus of one of the most elaborate areas of eastern Sumbanese ethnoornithological classification. The most frequently named bird in ritual idioms is in fact the domestic fowl (*manu*). *Manu*, however, is mostly coupled with *wei*, denoting the domestic pig, and the reference is then to the value of both as domesticates, sacrificial victims, and (with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.—Bird names included in ritual speech couplets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>manu</em> // <em>rendi</em>, domestic fowl // duck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manu</em> // <em>wei</em>, domestic fowl // (domestic) pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mbàra</em> // <em>manginu</em>, dove // <em>munia</em> (or 'small seed-eating bird')*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nggangga</em> // <em>ikitu</em>, crow // hawk (or specifically, Brahminy kite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nggauka</em> // <em>rawa</em>, friarbird (=<em>koka</em>) // pigeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pirihu</em> // <em>kaka</em>, lorikeet // cockatoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rawa</em> // <em>moha</em>, pigeon // <em>moha</em> tree (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rawa</em> // <em>ngginggi</em>, pigeon // spider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rawa</em> // <em>ngguku</em>, pigeon (Imperial pigeon) // dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rawa tana</em> // <em>ngginggi rara</em>, Emerald dove // red spider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tariku</em> // <em>ikitu</em>, falcon // hawk (or specifically, Brahminy kite)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a general reference to crop pests, these two terms are simply compounded. In the same context, they are further conjoined with the pair *kulungu kalau*, 'small mice and rats.'
regard to their intestines and livers respectively) as auguries revealing the will of ancestral spirits. The pairing of rawa and nggauka—a ritual language substitute for koka (friarbird)—evidently reflects the association of these two birds in creation mythology (see below), in which context the first term refers specifically to the Imperial pigeon (rawa kamukumu). By contrast, in one pair of phrases linking rawa with ngginggi (spider), the former is specified as rawa tana, the name of the Emerald dove (Chalcophaps indica), which is then more exactly paired with ngginggi rara (red spider), denoting a particular non-poisonous arachnid. In yet another pairing ngginggi is specifically linked with rawa muru, ‘green pigeon,’ which, though not a standard ethnornithological term, probably also refers to the Emerald dove. On the other hand, in the expression pakamu rawangmu, pakameli mohangu, ‘cooing like a pigeon, trembling like leaves of the moha tree’ (a reference to spirits of the dead, Onvlee s.v. rawa), the Columbiforme in question is evidently the Imperial pigeon, since it is specified as making the sound kamu (=kamukumu).

Where Sumbanese ritual speech conjoins two bird categories, the names generally denote kinds that are morphologically or behaviourally similar. For example, Rindi explain the pairing of ‘duck’ and ‘domestic fowl’ (rendi and manu) with reference to their characteristically large broods. In fact, the only obvious exception is the pair rawa and koka. Expressions featuring the couplet ikitu/tariku associate the two Falconiformes with contrasting environments—land and sea, or earth and sky. Yet the metaphorical import of these expressions turns less on the opposing environmental associations than the identical predatory habits of the two raptors. Indeed, since it is tariku rather than ikitu (a term most closely linked with the Brahminy kite) which is linked with the sea, the environmental associations are contrary to ornithological fact. A similar complementarity of dry land and water is also implicit in the ritual speech coupling of domestic fowls and ducks, though in this case of course the environmental contrast is valid.

Most of the ethnornithological terms included in Table 2 designate kinds which are also prominent in Sumbanese myth. Among these are the Imperial pigeon (rawa, rawa kamukumu) and the friarbird (koka), who dispute over the length of day and night and the mortality of mankind (Forth 1992). Especially important in creation mythology is the White-bellied sea-eagle (mbaku). In parallel form named as i Mbongu i Mbaku (mbongu, ‘mist, dew;’ mbaku, ‘to float, glide, hover’), the sea-eagle flaps his great wings causing the waters of the primeval flood to subside and the dry land—specifically the island of Sumba—to appear. Also mentioned in myths of creation are the crow (nggangga), cockatoo (kaka), and fantail (in Rindi called kulu-kataitaku or manginu kulu-taitaku), as well as a spider (ngginggi), a non-ornithological taxon which, interestingly enough, also appears in Table 2. The three bird kinds figure as well in an origin myth of the Rindi clan Kanatangu, which further recounts how various species acquired their characteristic plumage. Other birds appearing in this narrative include the oriole (kulu-kakuta), Asian paradise-flycatcher (kulu-kanuhu), Eclectus parrot (kãriku), and Spotted dove (mbãra). Several narratives recorded by Wielenga (1909)—mostly fables featuring animal kinds—similarly feature three Columbiformes (mbãra, rawa, and a pigeon identified as ‘kuru ndiha,’ cf. kulu-ndiha), three parrots (kaka, kãriku, pirihu), the crow, the friarbird, the junglefowl (manu tata; see also Wielenga
1913), a heron (nggokaria), and ‘small birds’ (manginu). In the mythological genre called analalu—or ‘orphan’ tales—a dove, specified as mbâra, sometimes appears as a messenger who, in a song, reveals the identity and relates the tribulations of an orphaned hero.24 From these several traditions, it can be seen how mythically significant avifauna—including a large raptor, Columbiformes, and small birds classified as manginu—coincide to a significant degree with kinds composing hypothetical intermediate taxa, just as do the bird categories of parallelistic ritual speech. Also noteworthy in this regard are the several parrots and bird kinds whose names include the component kulu- (although, as demonstrated, kulu- does not actually label a divided taxon, nor for that matter a class of any kind).

Another symbolic value attaching to several bird kinds concerns their significance as omens. The augural value of the owl called katua wei, whose cry is thought to reveal the presence of wild pigs (see Table 1), of course pertains to hunting. Vocalizations of the kingfisher (kahiku) heard near a settlement indicate to Rindi that a thief is about. A similar significance is attributed to the distinctive nocturnal cry of the nightjar (landu witu, see Table 1). The cries of two other birds are especially ominous because Sumbanese regard them as manifestations of witches. Variously described as birds ‘ridden by’ witches or as physical forms taken by the malevolent spirit (wàndi) of a witch, these are the Large-billed crow (nggangga) and the bird called kuu (provisionally identified as the Black-winged kite, see Table 1; Forth 1981:113; Kruyt 1922:559). If either of these birds calls near a house where someone is ill, then it is a sign that the illness is caused by a witch, and that the person will likely die. By the same token, a large flock of crows is a more generally negative portent. The owl called wàngi is also considered an embodiment of a witch’s wàndi (see Table 1 regarding the resemblance between these two terms), an idea that possibly illuminates the common belief that if an owl alights on a papaya tree, the tree will die. 25 Because of their association with witches, one should not verbally abuse or throw stones at crows, owls, or the kuu. Nevertheless, it is permitted to kill a kuu if it makes too much noise after dark.

According to Kruyt (1922:558-9), the cries or behaviour of several birds were formerly significant in the context of warfare and headhunting. An outgoing war party would rejoice if they encountered crows (nggangga) cawing. However, if they came across crows perched silently, this was considered an ill omen, and the party should return home. It was similarly inauspicious if either a crow or a bird of prey (ikitu) flew across the path of a group of warriors, as this would portend casualties and defeat. On the other hand, if birds of either kind followed a war party, then they could be confident of success. If a rawa—which from Kruyt’s description appears to refer to an Imperial pigeon (rawa kamukumu)—was heard calling in a village at night, this indicated that an enemy was preparing to attack. Similarly, if a mbâra (glossed by Kruyt as ‘wood pigeon’) called in the evening or early in the morning—something the bird does not usually do—then people should not to leave their homes the following day. Were they to do so, they would suffer some (unspecified) loss. Kruyt adds that nocturnal vocalizations of the mbâra might alternatively indicate the presence of thieves in the vicinity, as might the nocturnal screech of an ikitu (diurnal raptor). In Rindi I encountered a similar belief concerning the Columbiforme identified as rawa kakoruku (see Table 1, nos. 43, 33, s.v. mbâra), whose nocturnal cry can presage a death. Although the interpreta-
tion cannot be fully developed here, it seems there may be a more general connection between Columbiformes—particularly ones designated as ngguku and nggela (see Table 1, s.v. mbìra, ngguku)—and headhunting. Apart from the fact that they commonly fall victim to birds of prey, this could be motivated by their apparently flexible necks, evidenced by their habit of bobbing their heads up and down, and the relative disattachment of head and body which this might suggest.26

Among birds whose cries or behaviour Sumbanese consider ominous, the occurrence of neither owls nor the kingfisher has any particular relevance for their taxonomic status: both are simply called by terms occurring at the level of folk genera. On the other hand, Columbiformes and diurnal raptors, thus birds associated with named intermediate taxa, figure quite prominently in this symbolic domain, as they do in myth and ritual speech idioms. Evidently the most ominous bird of all, the Large-billed crow (nggangga), moreover, participates in a hypothetical intermediate category together with a similarly dark bird, the drongo (laleba nggangga), which, being specified as its ‘sister’s child,’ shares part of its name.

CONCLUSION

Despite the provisional nature of several ornithological identifications of Sumbanese bird taxa given in Table 1, I have argued that the information available here is sufficient to offer a general characterization of their folk classification. Within the entire domain labelled by the term makayidi-yàdaku (animals), the classification isolates two named life-form categories—‘flying things’ and ‘crawling things.’ Members of these two categories are the most strongly contrasted in terms of morphology, behaviour, habitat, and symbolism. Other animals, notably mammals, then figure as a residue of this binary partition. They are, to be sure, makayidi-yàdaku, yet they occupy no separately named or otherwise clearly distinguished grouping within this inclusive class. Relevant here may be the circumstance that there are relatively few mammals, especially large mammals, on Sumba, while those that are present (deer, wild pigs, macaques, several rodents, the palm civet, and a wild cat) are quite various. The most numerous mammalian species are bats, but these of course are classified as—or with—‘birds.’ In other folk systems, ‘fish’ sometimes appear as another named life-form taxon (Brown 1979). But while Sumbanese possesses a general term for ‘fish’ (iyangu), and while they have names for over one hundred kinds (Forth 1981:429, note 28), Rindi classify these and other water creatures as instances of mabei (crawling or creeping things).

Intervening between the life-form taxon mahawurangu (flying things) and the numerous folk generic taxa, eastern Sumbanese bird classification reveals three or more identifiable “intermediate” classes. Two, which partly at least are identified with the names rawa and ikitu, respectively comprise Columbiformes and Falconiformes. A third, labelled mangínu, includes a variety of small passerine birds that have as their focus several species of Estrildine finches. Remarkable in this regard is the overall resemblance between eastern Sumbanese bird classification and the ethnoornithological classification of the Nage people of central Flores (Forth 1996). Largely from evidence provided by free recall lists, I have previously
shown how Nage ethnotaxonomy implicitly entails several intermediate taxa. Most prominent among these, both in terms of the number of named folk generics they include and the priority usually given to them in free recall, are mostly covert categories coinciding with the scientific groupings labelled ‘Falconiformes’ and ‘Columbiformes.’ In addition, the Nage category *ana peti* closely parallels Sumbanese *mangiinu*, being especially associated with the genus *Lonchura* and related birds of very small size but contextually including many other small kinds besides, even to the extent that *ana peti* is sometimes used as a general term for ‘bird.’ (Nage, it should be noted, have no term exactly corresponding to Sumbanese *mahawuringu* which unequivocally includes all birds). Another similarity with Nage concerns the relatively low number of onomatopoeic terms in Sumbanese bird nomenclature, which even including unconfirmed instances amount to no more than 25 per cent of names. For Nage the figure is approximately 30 per cent, which also appears quite low in comparison with some other languages (Forth 1996:103).

Sumbanese treatment of Columbiformes and Falconiformes, especially, bears on another general issue of ethnoornithological classification. Not only are these two groups taxonomically salient; they are equally prominent in the symbolic genres of parallelistic ritual speech, myth, and bird augury. With regard to approaches Berlin (1992:143, 149) calls utilitarian or functionalist, as well as his own observation that intermediate taxa may sometimes be grounded in “cultural” as opposed to morphological or behavioural factors, one needs to consider whether these two facts may be related. Relations between symbolism and taxonomy cannot be treated conclusively here, not least of all because it has not been possible to review all data relevant to the Sumbane se valorization of birds. In closing, however, I would register several points.

First, even where named by terms further associated with hypothetical intermediate taxa (e.g., *rawa*, *ikitu*), most—or perhaps all—symbolically significant birds are actually identifiable with folk generics (e.g., *rawa tana*, *ikitu marakuku*), nearly all of which appear to correspond to single scientific species. It is therefore the most basic categories rather than more inclusive ones that possess distinctive symbolic value; hence it cannot be claimed that this sort of value crucially informs intermediate or higher groupings. The use of general names in symbolic contexts even where more specific designations are available might be ascribed to performative requirements of parallelistic language and traditional narrative, both of which favour single lexemes. A similar consideration could apply to standard admonitions regarding omen birds. That is, where a particular member of a divided class has a negative association, it might be thought prudent to extend this to all, empirically similar, members of the same class. It is just conceivable that distinctions may be made within a class in order to deny an omen contextually or to restrict its range absolutely (cf. Bulmer 1968:637-8, regarding a similar interpretation of New Guinean transformation beliefs). This, however, is merely a hypothetical possibility, and there is no obvious indication that such symbolic motivation of class division has been operative in eastern Sumbanese.

A second consideration is that named intermediates are not only mythically, metaphorically, and augurially significant; they possess more pragmatic—functional or utilitarian—kinds of value as well. This should not be surprising, as both
symbolic and utilitarian values attaching to avifauna typically relate, more or less directly, to perceptible physical properties, including the appearance or behaviour of particular birds. With one exception, all diurnal raptors (*ikitu*) thus prey on domestic fowls. Columbiformes, both *rawa* and *mbâra*, are also common victims of raptors, while at the same time, among wild birds, pigeons and doves are especially valued as food, and so fall prey to human hunters as well. *Mbâra*, or smaller doves, further draw practical attention as crop pests, as do many small birds classified, at the folk generic level, as *manginu* (a label further applying to another hypothetical intermediate taxon).²⁷ It comes as no surprise, therefore, that *ikitu*, *rawa*, and *mbâra* are categories of Sumbanese bird augury, especially in the context of warfare, and thus in relation to human competition and violent aggression.

As the foregoing should suggest, while various sorts of interest in birds may affect the attention given to particular kinds in folk taxonomy, distinctions manifest in Sumbanese symbolic usage, like those pertaining to utilitarian concerns, are consistent with observable morphological and behavioural differences existing independently of those interests. Where natural kinds differ from or resemble one another in regard to symbolic value or practical utility as well as empirical features, therefore, one cannot readily argue that one of the three sorts of factors is more determinant of their linguistic and cultural recognition than the others. Indeed, it is probable that the three interact in complex ways. Nevertheless, in view of their relative ontological independence, morphological and behavioural considerations are, in the long run, likely to prove the most important. Supporting this in the present case is the fact that the majority of Sumbanese birds are not of any practical value, nor are they symbolically significant.

My final point concerns the very terms of the contrast implicit in the issue of symbolism. Contrary to what is often implied in debates over the relative importance of perceptual versus non-perceptual factors in ethnobiological classification, the symbolism of natural kinds is not necessarily more culturally specific or contingent than is the taxonomic recognition (or mental representation) of salient natural features.²⁸ This is indicated, for example, by the fact that 'hawks' and 'doves' form a metaphorical contrast in English-speaking cultures as well as in eastern Sumba, and by the extraordinarily widespread conception of owls and crows as birds of ill omen. Again, this undoubtedly stems from objective physical features of the kinds in question. Yet the fact that their metaphorical value (if not their specific interpretations) is cross-cultural attests as much to universal properties of human cognition as it does to the universal availability of physical avifaunal features for symbolic deployment. These observations tend to suggest that "symbolic value" and "psychological salience" are not as distinct or separate as is often supposed. For this reason alone, the question of whether bird symbolism exercises a decisive influence on aspects of ethnotaxonomy, in eastern Sumba or in general, must remain moot.

NOTES

¹ Hereafter designated as ‘Kupang informants,’ these included Ibu Djukatana, who is a daughter of Oemboe Hina Kapita; her husband, Bapak Drs. Ng. Djukatana (Oemboe Juka Tana); Bapak Minggus Osa and Bapak Thomas Tagudodu, both associated with Nusa Cendana University; Bapak Petrus Yiwa, an Instructor in the Law Faculty at Artha Wacana
University; and several eastern Sumbanese undergraduate students of the latter university. I am most grateful to all of the foregoing for their help, and to Dr. Tom Therik, the Rector of Artha Wacana, who sponsored by visit and kindly assisted me in a variety of ways while in Kupang.

2 Sumbanese terms are transcribed according to the orthography used by Kapita and Onvlee. Single letters mostly represent sounds similar to their English denotata. The /à/ (see ananjåki, Table 1) variously denotes the schwa or a sound like the /u/ in ‘duck.’ The /w/ is often closer to English /v/, especially in medial positions (see rawa). The /b/ and /d/ are implosives phonemically contrasting with /mb/ (see mbaku) and /nd/ (see kulu-ndiha). I follow Kapita in employing ii and uu to indicate vowel lengthening (see panii and kuü), whereas Onvlee places an acute accent above the vowel in question.

3 From lists provided by Verheijen (1963), dialects of the Manggarai language of western Flores would each appear to possess perhaps as many as 100 names for birds, including a fairly large number of productive binomials. The area however is relatively rich in avifauna; Verheijen’s estimate is 180 species, which he claims probably coincide with all those found on Flores island (1963:678). A count of species described in Coates and Bishop (1997) yields a total of 232 for Flores. For the Tobelo of the large Moluccan island of Halmahera, P.M. Taylor (1990) similarly records 111 bird categories, which also include a number of productive binomials.

4 Reporting on his 1925 visit, Dammerman (1926b:24) remarked how cockatoos were already extinct in the vicinity of Waingapu, eastern Sumba’s main port, owing to the large numbers caught for export to Java.

5 In his Dutch-Kambera wordlist, Onvlee (s.v. dier) refers to bohu, a word meaning ‘thievish, voracious,’ and more specifically to mabolu, which he translates as ‘wild animals.’ As I know partly from my own experience in Rindi, however, the phrase refers not to wild animals in general but more specifically to relatively large and dangerous animals. Accordingly, Onvlee exemplifies his initial gloss with ‘wild pig, snake, crocodile,’ while Kapita translates bohu with Bahasa Indonesia buas, a word that means ‘cruel, savage,’ and ‘wild’ only in this restricted sense. Analyzable as ‘what is wild (savage, cruel),’ mabolu thus does not of itself necessarily denote animals. For example, tau bohu denotes a (human) thief.

6 According to Onvlee, yâda more specifically refers to a quick movement. He further glosses the word as ‘to teem, swarm’ and ‘to wriggle, fidget.’ Similarly, he describes yidiku as denoting a movement slower than yidi.

7 An evident borrowing from Malay, mburungu occurs in compound expressions where it refers specifically to bird figures found, for example, on European coins (Onvlee 1984).

8 Worth noting here is the form wururu, which also refers to the sound of bird’s wings or something being thrown, but further denotes a cry uttered at the beginning, or between segments, of ritual song, including mortuary song (cf. Onvlee 1984; Kapita 1982). When performed, the element ru is repeated not just twice but numerous times, thus effecting a sort of whirring sound. Whether this is meant to replicate the sound of a bird in flight, or anything else in particular, I was unable to establish from questioning.
Illustrating uses of *makayidi-yàdaku*, Onvlee (s.v. *yìdi*) records the phrase *makayidi-yàdaku la wai*, “everything that teems in the water”. While evidently including fish, and thus in a sense cross-cutting *mabei*, the expression differs from the two life-form terms by its inclusion of the term for ‘animal(s).’

Fernandez (1996:146) lists the Proto-Flores term for ‘bird’ as *kolon*.

The use of *manu*, ‘domestic fowl,’ to make distinctions within named ethnobiological categories appears to be quite widespread in eastern Indonesian languages, and not only to apply to birds. For example, among the Nage of central Flores, smaller varieties of the Green tree viper and the Monitor lizard are respectively called *hiku manu* and *ghoa manu* (Forth 1995:53, 66 n.4). On Sumba and elsewhere *manu* further appears in the names of plants, but this is mostly explained by resemblance to parts of domestic fowls. For example, *pelu manu*, ‘wattle (of a fowl),’ and *tara manu*, ‘cockspur,’ designate respectively a kind of wild grape and a thorny plant.

Two other raptors listed in Table 1, the *kola* and *kuu*, were not mentioned in this context, but were not explicitly excluded either.

Kupang informants described *kola*, which was not included in this series, as significantly larger than *kapàha* and *tariku* and “almost as large as *mbaku*.” (Although Onvlee and Kapita describe the *kola* as relatively small, their wording suggests that the comparison is with the Brahminy kite or another large hawk.) Also missing from the Rindi comparison is the *kuu*, which Kupang sources described as the smallest diurnal raptor.

Coates and Bishop (1997:247) describe *Haliastur indus* as a scavenger, and with regard to diet mention only “carrion, insects, fish, etc.” MacKinnon (1991:84) says that it feeds on “almost any animal material, dead or alive,” and that it “catches small animals, steals larger prey and scavenges along waterways...delicately picking up floating debris.” Referring to Bali, Mason and Jarvis (1989:45) note that the bird has a “reputation as a stealer of chickens,” but otherwise characterize it as a “general scavenger.” As regards *Haliaeetus leucogaster*, the same authors describe the sea-eagle as snatching fish and sea snakes from the water, occasionally feeding on carrion, and sometimes hunting fruit-bats.

Major settlements in eastern Sumba are mostly located in proximity to rivers, and most are within several kilometres of the coast.

Speaking their own language, eastern Sumbanese use *banjaru*, ‘row, line, group,’ to express the idea of ‘(natural) kind.’ *Ngia*, ‘place, position,’ subserves the same function in some contexts. Thus, *hangia hangia* (*ha-*, ‘one, each’) means ‘all kinds (of things)’ (see further Onvlee, s.v. *ngia*).

Also worth noting is Wielenga’s (1917:33) comparative listing of *mango*, a cognate of *manginu*, as the term for ‘bird’ in the western Sumbanese language of Lamboya. That *manginu* might include more than passerine birds was suggested by a Kupang informant, a young man from Lewa, who identified *kahuhu* (sandpipers) as an instance of the category.

In the report of his expedition, Dammerman (1926b) describes a honeyeater (*Myzomela* sp., p.79), a fantail (p. 79), a whistler (p. 24), and the yellow wagtail (p. 36). Although he
observed the honeyeater and fantail in eastern Sumba, in his shorter article (1926a) Dammerman does not list eastern Sumbanese names for these species, only a western Sumbanese name for the fantail and another for a sunbird (Cinnyris buettikoferi, apparently Nectarinia buettikoferi). The whistler (identified as 'Pachycephala fulviventris') is evidently Pachycephala pectoralis, the Common golden whistler, the only whistler recorded on Sumba. Dammerman describes the bird as very common.

19 Nggonggali probably reflects of Proto-Austronesian *enggang (the initial /e/ represents the schwa; cf. Bahasa Indonesia enggang), ‘hornbill’ (Dempwolff 1938:49; cf. Wurm and Wilson 1975:104). Interpretations of nggokaria (heron) were mentioned earlier.

20 None of categories in Table 1 apply exclusively to seabirds or species found only on the coast. From experience in Flores, I would guess that cormorants and grebes can be classified with ducks as rendi. The classification of birds like plovers and pratincoles (see Appendix 1) with sandpipers (kahulu, pipi) would also not be surprising.

21 In 1975-76 I sometimes observed flocks of bee-eaters (Merops spp.) when travelling between Rindi and the port town of Waingapu, but unfortunately never in the company of informants. A Sumbanese man in Kupang gave kahi as a term for bee-eaters, which he identified from illustrations and descriptions. But this name is probably not distinct from kahiku, a reference to kingfishers, which resemble bee-eaters in appearance, diet, and nesting behaviour. Among the Nage of Flores, who do have a special term for bee-eaters, specimens viewed at a distance, flying high overhead, are sometimes identified with the term for swallows and swifts (Forth 1996:92). Bee-eaters and the dollarbird are both non-breeding migrants on Sumba.

22 The pairing occurs in the expression hibu nggauka, hibu rawa, ‘nest of the friarbird, nest of the pigeon,’ a euphemism for the male genitalia (Onvlee, s.v. nggauka). If the specific referent is the male scrotum and testicles (tilu, also meaning ‘egg’), then evidently the nest of any bird could serve as the metaphoric vehicle. However, the fact that these two kinds in particular are selected can be ascribed to the mythological contrast of koka and rawa, as the two birds that contested over such matters as whether or not humans should die and give birth, in order to replace themselves (see Forth 1992). Their association with reproductive organs in this ritual speech context is thus intelligible with reference to their association in myth.

23 Several popular similes feature yet other birds. Onvlee records the following: paana kalukingu, ‘to have (raise) children like a kaluki;’ pari kalukingu, ‘as strong as a kaluki;’ parara ngandu yâpingu, ‘to have a mouth as red as (the bill of) a yâpi’ (said of youngsters who consume betel and areca); and patutu powangu, ‘to cluster, huddle together like quails.’ The first expression alludes to the fact that Megapodes incubate their eggs under a large pile of debris, and therefore appear not to look after their offspring to the same extent as other birds.

24 More often, songs of this sort are performed by the human characters themselves. In one case (C. Forth 1982: 93-92), the dove effectively takes the place of the hero, assuming his identity in the lyric. In another myth, the human hero is born in the form of a dove (mbâra; Wielenga 1909).
This idea, recorded in Rindi, is also mentioned by Kruyt (1922:559-60). Kruyt describes the owl as the "personification of the witch" and as the Sumbanese "bird of sickness and death." An owl alighting on the roof of a house forebodes certain death for the owner. In the Kambera region, when its nocturnal cry is heard, children sleeping on their backs should be placed on their side. One should also not comment on or respond to the sound, for this could result in death, construed as an indication that the person had "answered the call."

Kruyt (1922:559) says that owls were not considered significant in times of war. However, he also notes that if warriors heard an owl screeching they should go under a tree and make an offering of betel and areca to prevent "the evil associated with this bird" from following them.

The lumping of numerous small birds in the taxon labelled munginu might at first appear to be an instance where utilitarian concerns have a preponderant influence on the emergence of an intermediate taxon. This is contradicted, however, by the inclusion in munginu of ornithological kinds that are known not to infest crops, but which especially in regard to size and form do resemble the crop pests. Also, of course, by no means all avifaunal destroyers of crops are classified as munginu.

A similar argument could be made in regard to the opposition of empirical (or intellectual) and utilitarian values. A more comprehensive, cognate question is whether symbolism is to be understood as an intellectual activity or product or, as Malinowski argued, a kind of utilitarianism.
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