



Semantic Analysis of Rice Terms in Mpur Language

Chrisma Fernando Saragih^{1*} , Boas Yotam Wabia²

^{1,2} Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya, Universitas Papua, Manokwari, Papua Barat 98314, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: 07 Mei 2026	The study focuses on describing the meanings of rice terms in Mpur, an isolated language of West Papuan language group of the Bird's Head of Papua. The data used in the paper were collected from two fluent native speakers of Mpur language by using elicitation technique with an elicitation tool. The tool is designed in the form of a question list to extract the meanings of rice terms from the native speakers' mind. In analyzing the data, componential analysis and lexical semantic analysis supporting by morpho-phonological approach were used. Componential analysis and lexical semantics were used to reveal the meaning of each rice term and the components of meaning they have. Meanwhile, morpho-phonological approach was used to describe how the terms (words) for rice were formed. The result shows that the term is derived Austronesian languages spoken around the Bird's Head area. Historically, Mpur people had a contact with Austronesian groups of people in the past. Morpho-phonologically, the general term for rice in Mpur is constructed through compounding morphological process with epenthesis and elision phonological adaptations. The study also found that there are four types of rice in Mpur. They are <i>kamerkan</i> , <i>jasrik</i> , <i>jakun</i> and <i>waranda</i> . The names for the types undergo three morphological processes of word formation, namely compounding, borrowing, and blending. Semantically, the naming systems are given based on the shape, color, size and feature of the grains. In short, the rice terms in Mpur had undergone some morpho-phonological processes to obtain their meanings as they are now.
Accepted: 24 July 2026	
Published: 06 August 2026	
Keywords: Rice, Mpur Language, Bird's Head Language, Lexical Semantics, Componential Analysis	

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)

Published by CV Wahana Publikasi.

This article is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)

* Corresponding Author: c.saragih@unipa.ac.id

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.5.2.2026.443-455>

1. Introduction

The origin of rice until recently is still a debate among experts. Some postulate that this former perennial swamp species was domesticated in India, while others argue that it was firstly domesticated in China (van Driem, 2002). On the other hand, some suggest that it was domesticated twice (Kovach et. al., 2009) or even three times (Londo et al., 2006). Regarding of its debate, rice has spread out from its original place, from its first domesticators, into whole part of Asian countries including South-east Asia (Falvey, 2010). How rice spread in South-east Asia is also still debatable. Some experts suggest a demic model i.e. rice spread due to the dispersal of its cultivators (Bellwood, 2011; Cobo et al., 2019) as opposed to a cultural model i.e. rice spread due to the incorporation of hunter-gatherers into the populations of rice cultivators (Takamiya, 2007; Barton, 2012). Some, however, assume that both demic and cultural diffusion are possible (Fuller, 2011). Despite of its diffusion model, one of the interesting parts is whenever rice moves, the term for rice moves too. As a result, rice and its vocabularies have historically undergone reconstructed linguistic forms among major language families and subgroups in Southeast Asia (Bellwood, 2011; Sagart, 2011; Crystal & Whittlesey, 2004).

Rice came to Papua for the first time in the Bird's Head area. It is a newer staple food for Papuans. The first contact with rice was approximately 300 years ago. Austronesian people were predictably the first ones who brought rice to the Bird's Head (Reesink, 2002). It is proved by many Austronesian vocabularies which were adopted to Papuan languages in the Bird's Head. According to Miedema and Reesink (2004), words for rice, cloth, loincloth and sin in Papuan languages of Northeast Papua including Mpur, Meyah, Sougb, and Hatam were derived from Biak-Numfor, an Austronesian language. Similar to Kamma (1981) who revealed that it was Numfor People of Doreri who brought rice seeds from people of Halmahera in Moluccas and gave the seeds to Mpur people of Amberbaken. This means that rice was brought to the Bird's Head after Biak (Austronesian) people had settled in Papua and then established contact with westward areas (i.e. Moluccas).

Until nowadays, Mpur tribe is the only tribe who are more successful in planting this plant and passed the seeds for the next generations in the Bird's Head. Note that, this rice is the one planted in a dry field not an irrigated one (rice planted in an irrigated paddy field was just introduced in Papua after Dutch colonial and Indonesian era). As one of the tribes who actively plants rice in the Bird's Head area, Mpur people has also developed lexicons for rice in their language system. However, there is gap of information regarding to the lexicon since until recently there is no research has been conducted to study the lexicon. Therefore, this study aims at investigating rice terms in Mpur, an isolated language of non-Austronesian language spoken in the East Bird's Head of Papua.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theory

As lexical semantic study, the research utilises two approaches to understand the meaning of the rice terms in Mpur Language. The first one is morpho-semantic approach to help revealing the meaning of the words for rice in the language. Morpho-semantics deals with a combination of two forms of linguistic analysis, i.e. morphology, the study of word formation and semantics, the study of word meaning. Morphology, as it is termed, is a linguistic study which focuses on examining the formation and structure of word (Schmid, 2015). One of its features is productive. Morphological productivity relates to "a higher probability of a potential word in the first pattern being accepted in the language" (Aronoff &

Fudeman, 2022). This simply implies that not all patterns of word are able to be accepted in a language. Therefore, morphology is not merely a study about the word formation and its structure generally, but more than that, it inspects the only potential forms and structures of word in a language. Meanwhile, semantics is a linguistic branch which focuses on investigating meaning in language (Saeed, 2022; Crystal & Yu, 2023). The meaning, itself, is divided into two: lexical meaning (lexeme or word meaning) and compositional meaning (i. e. the meaning of larger linguistic units such phrases, clauses, sentences or discourses). This study focuses on the former one. The second approach is componential analysis. It is a semantic analysis used to reveal the meaning of a lexeme or word based on semantic components it has (Riemer, 2010). Therefore, the semantic components of each term of rice which differentiate them in Mpur language will be investigated.

2.2 Brief Description on Mpur Language

Of phylum level, Mpur is classified as an isolated language of the West Papuan of the Bird's Head (Odé, 2002; Holton & Klamer, 2018). It is a tonal West Papuan (non-Austronesian) language spoken in two areas: Kebar and Amberbaken. Today, these two areas are districts of Tambrau regency. According to Odé (2002), the name *Mpur* is unclear and is used only to refer to the language. This, however, seems to change recently. Nowadays, the name *Mpur* can refer to both, people and language and it means "the good manner people or polite people" (Wabia, 2014). Odé (2002) mentions that the total number of native speakers of Mpur is approximately 5000 people. This number probably increases today. However, a recent study providing the up-to-date number for the speakers is not available yet.

The language has two dialects: *Mpur Mae*, spoken around the Kebar Valley and *Mpur Wot* spoken around Amberbaken. In Amberbaken, villages where Mpur is spoken are Imbuan, Sasui, Wefiani, Wasarak, Binasi, Wekari, and Arupi. Meanwhile in Kebar, it is spoken in some villages including Jandorau, Ibuanari, Atai, Akrim, Anjai, Akmuri, Senopi, Asiti and some new villages recently established.

Mpur people, therefore, spread in a quite long area ranging from the coastal areas up to the mountainous areas. Demographically, Mpur borders to some languages: to the east it borders with Meyah language; to the south part, it borders to Moskona language; to the north it borders with Abun language and to the west it borders with Miyakh (Karon Dori), Irires and Maibrat languages.

Culturally, Mpur people are gardeners, fishermen and hunters. Nowadays, many Mpur people also work as civil servants in the regional government including: police, army, nurses, teachers, etc. Taros, sago, cassavas, rice, and sweet potatoes are sources for their carbohydrate requirements. They also hunt wild games such as deer, fish, and pig to fulfill their protein necessity. Today, many outsiders (non-Papuan people) come to and stay in Mpur areas. These migrants build their small stores selling other daily life needs. Mpur people also grow plants such as bananas, vegetables, cacaos, coconuts, and other long-term fruit trees. In term of religion, the majority of them are Protestant. Traditional belief is hardly found to be practiced today. But, some of them still believe in their ancestors' spirit and also taboo places.

Sociolinguistically, Mpur people are multilingual who can speak two or more languages. It is normal for Mpur people to acquire Mpur language, plus one or two neighbouring languages such as, Abun, Irires and Miyakh. The factors that support multilingualism among Mpur people is that they have inter-marriage relations to other language speaking communities such as from Irires or Miyakh and otherwise. The social relations among language speaking communities around the area is intense. They share the same hunting

ground, for instance, so they can anytime meet anywhere in the area and they establish intense communication among each other. Some Mpur people also can speak Abun because the people from Kebar go out with their family and live in Abun. Beside their language, they also communicate with Papuan Malay, as a lingua franca in the area and also with other people from other part of Papua. They use Papuan Malay and Bahasa Indonesia in formal situation such as at schools, churches, and offices.

3. Method

The study is qualitative research with descriptive approach (Nida, 1949; Kroeger, 2005; Crystal, 2010). It focuses more on analyzing and describing objective synchronic data from the form, function, meaning and structure of language that is naturally used by speakers in speech events. No part of a language can be adequately described without reference to all other parts. There is no distinction for population and sample in the research. Since it only focuses on rice and its types, all linguistic terms for rice and its types are used as data in the study.

In collecting the data, two native speakers (50 and 56 years old) who are fluently in speaking the language and know the cultures and folk histories were chosen. Elicitation technique was used to collect the data. This technique aims at extracting data by asking questions with an elicitation tool or instrument to take the data out of the speakers' lexicon entry in their mind (Senft, 2022; Payne, 1997; Bower, 2015). Therefore, an elicitation tool in form of questions was prepared and used to ask the informants to collect the data about rice and its types (Mahsun, 2017).

In analyzing data, lexical semantic analysis approach is used. This analysis focuses on word meaning. It also includes the study of how word structures their meaning. The lexical units which are analysed include words and sub-words (i.e. affixes or bound morphemes). The analysis is also supported by morpho-phonological analysis. Two basic approaches in morphological analysis according to Aronoff and Fudamen (2022) were use. They are analytic and synthetic approach. In analytic approach, we analyzed linguistic structure including forms, functions and meaning of the language data and in synthetic approach, we related the data with available morphological theories by constructing possible structure according to the grammar of the language. Beside the morphological approach, phonological approach proposed by Hayes (2011) is also used. Phonological approach is required to find the phonological rules needed in describing the data. We did this since we found that the data do not only show morphological phenomena, but rather morpho-phonological one.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Etymon and lexicon of rice in the languages of Bird's Head and the surroundings

Before discussing the word for 'rice' in Mpur language, a short note about the term for 'rice' in some languages of the Bird's Head is given. This brief description will help us in understanding how the term for 'rice' is constructed or adopted by languages in the bird's head. Languages in the bird's head, themselves, are classified as West Papuan Languages. They are divided into three language groups, namely: West Bird's Head (WBH), East Bird's Head (EBH), South Bird's Head (SBH) and three isolates (Miedema & Reesink, 2004; Holton & Klammer, 2018).

It is very plausible that the word for 'rice' in the bird's head languages is adopted Austronesian language from South Halmahera West New Guinea (SHWNG) group (Marhita, 2006). The possible proto form for rice in SHWNG group is *fa/*pa. The following table shows

the word for ‘rice’ in some languages of the bird’s head and the surroundings (NAN is an abbreviation for Non-Austronesian; AN is Austronesian).

Table 1. Rice in the Languages of Bird’s Head and the Surroundings

Language	Rice Term
Tehit (NAN)	<i>pasa</i>
Maibrat (NAN)	<i>basa</i>
Iha (NAN)	<i>paha</i>
Irires (NAN)	<i>pasura, menggorafed</i>
Miyakh (NAN)	<i>pasura, pomakan</i>
Moi (NAN)	<i>pasa</i>
Hatam (NAN)	<i>pasa</i>
Sougb (NAN)	<i>pasa</i>
Moskona (NAN)	<i>fas/pas</i>
Meyah (NAN)	<i>mesmei</i>
Irarutu (AN)	<i>pase</i>
Inanwatan (NAN)	<i>pasao</i>
Patipi (AN)	<i>pasa</i>

Table 1 show that the terms for rice are cognate in the languages of the Bird’s Head. The only language which has different linguistic form for rice is Meyah (*mesmei*). The term *mesmei* in Meyah is still unclear. It is probably a compounding word derived from nominalizer *mas* ‘thing’ and *mei* ‘water’. *Masmei* might have two readings: ‘thing water’ referring to rice which is always cooked with water or a plant which is planted in water”. If the latter concept is right, it may suggest that Meyah people came to have the first contact with rice very recently. At the era, paddy irrigated fields were firstly introduced by Dutch government and the first generation of Javanese people who were transmigrated from Java Island. Before those eras, rice was planted in a dry field or garden as what Mpur people do until now.

Other languages tend to have the similar form as *fas* in Biak language. Even, Moskona, an east bird’s head language (see Gravelle, 2011) designates rice as *fas* exactly the same as Biak language (Usmany, 2014). These phenomena suggest that terms for rice in the West Papuan languages of the bird’s head were adopted from the surrounding Austronesian languages such as Biak in the north coast, probably Wamesa (Wandamen) and others like Patipi in the south coast.

Some languages in the bird’s head have their own term for rice. Maibrat distinguishes the term for unhusked and husked rice and cooked rice. *Basa* is used for husked and unhusked rice or *padi* and *beras* in Indonesian, respectively (cf. *basa wo-ju* > *unhusked.rice POSS-1SG* ‘my unhusked rice and *boit wo-ju* > *cooked.rice POSS-1SG* ‘my cooked rice). Meanwhile, *boit* is used to refer to cooked rice or *nasi* in Indonesian. In Irires, rice is called *menggorafed*. This compounding word is etymologically derived from *menggor* “thing” and *afed* “seed”. The same compounding concept is also found in Miyakh (also known as Karon Dori). Dol (2007) includes Karon Dori into one of Maibrat dialects. People in Miyakh call ‘rice’ as *pomakan*. *Po* refers to “thing” and *makan* means “seed” or “grain”. However, Miyakh and Irires also term ‘rice’ as *pasura*, an adopted term derived from Mpur language in Kebar Valley.

4.2 Term of rice in Mpur language

As previously mentioned, Mpur has two regional dialects. These two dialects have two slightly different terms for 'rice'. In Kebar Valley 'rice' is known as *pasubra* [pasubra]. This term refers to unhusked, husked and cooked rice. People in Amberbaken and Kebar also associatively call 'rice' *baja*. It is a term derived from a blending of nominalizer *bar* "thing" and classifier *ja* "seed, stone, grain; small round object". Even though *baja* can be a general term for 'seed', in recent daily conversations, Mpur people have seemingly narrowed its meaning into 'rice'. Thus, in conversation like *Ang-kuan bawan e?* > 2S-cook what Q "What are you cooking?" and *Ing-kuan baja e* > 1S-cook rice PAR "I'm cooking rice.", *baja* is understood as rice not a general seed. The same thing happens to the sentence *In-diet baja* > 1S-eat rice "I eat rice". *Baja*, in the sentence, will be understood as rice, not other seeds. The variant term *pasura* is also used by Miyakh and Irires people living in the west part of Kebar Valley. Culturally, however, people in Kebar do not plant rice in their garden. This indicates that rice is not a socio-cultural commodity for Mpur Mae people of Kebar Valley. As a result, these people have no classification for rice.

Table 2. Rice in Mpur Language

Rice	<i>pasubra/basupra</i>
Alternative name	<i>baja</i>
Metaphorical name	<i>sambwarot</i>
Unhusked rice	<i>pasubra/ basupra</i>
Husked rice	<i>pasubra/basupra</i>
Cooked rice	<i>pasubra/basupra</i>
Broken husked rice	<i>jarik</i>

On the other hand, Mpur Wot people in Amberbaken are more-culturally bound to rice compared to their relatives in Kebar Valley. These people plant rice in their garden and classify the rice based on its types. Slightly different from Mpur people in Kebar, Mpur people in Amberbaken call 'rice' *basupra* [basupra]. Mpur people in Amberbaken refer to husk of the rice as *biek* and *jarik* for 'broken unhusked rice'. They also have a metaphorical term for rice in their language called *sambwarot*. This is a compound word derived from two morphemes: *sam* 'ant', and *bwarot* 'small.egg'. *Sambwarot* is ant's eggs. This is because rice (especially unhusked one) looks like an ant's egg.

The term *basupra*, however, can be used as a general term for rice as in English. This is exemplified by the following data below.

1. *De(r)-batik basupra.*
3PL-harvest rice
"They harvested (husked) rice."
2. *Yeta a-kwarit basupra.*
3SG.M 3SG.M-wash rice
"He washed the (unhusked) rice."
3. *Yeta a-ret basupra.*
3SM 3SM-eat rice
"He ate (cooked) rice."

In Data 1, *basupra* refers to "husked" rice since only husked rice can be harvested. The same thing happens to *basupra* glossed as "rice" in Data 2 and 3. In Data 2, *basupra* means unhusked rice since people only clean unhusked rice (not husked and cooked rice) with water

before cooking it. In Data 3, *basupra* means ‘cooked rice’ since only cooked rice can be eaten. This shows that *basupra* is utilized to designate husked, unhusked, and cooked rice as in Mpur.

4.3 Types of rice in Mpur language

Unlike Mpur Mae in Kebar Valley, Mpur Wot people in Amberbaken know 4 types of rice. Thus, *basupra* is a hypernym with some hyponyms (names of rice type) in Mpur Wot. There are three colours of rice known by Mpur Wot people: black rice (*oryza sativa l. sp.*), red rice (*oryza rufipogon sp.*) and white rice (*oryza sativa*). White rice is categorized as long and short grain.

Even though, here, we try to classify rice according to their colour, the naming system given in Mpur Wot language for the types of rice does not involve colours at all. This suggests that, in Mpur, the taxonomy of rice, is, not classified based on the genetic affiliation, rather it is a more-like folk taxonomy. Indeed, the classification simply relates to socio-cultural concept constructed by the people. The four types of rice in Mpur Wot are *kamerkan* (black-long grain rice, *oryza sativa l. sp.*), *jasrik* (red-long grain rice, *oryza rufipogon sp.*), *waranda* (white-long-grain rice, *oryza sativa sp.*) and *jakun* (white-short-grain rice, *oryza sativa, sp.*).

4.4 Morphological processes for rice terms

In this section, morphological processes in forming rice terms and names for the types of rice in Mpur which have been informed in the earlier sub-sections is discussed. The term ‘rice’ in Mpur as previously mentioned is referred as *pasubra* (Mpur Mae) or *basupra* (Mpur Wot). These two terms were etymologically derived from one donor language. It has been discussed about a short history of how rice enters the Bird’s Head area. This analysis proposes that the term *pasubra* or *basupra* is a compound word borrowed from *fas* ‘rice’ (Biak language) and *bira* another term used in Biak Language which is probably derived from Tidore ‘*bira*’. Biak language is classified as Austronesian and Tidore is a Non-Austronesian.

Herein, a plausible scenario of the loan process is proposed. This begins with borrowing from the donor language, Biak and adopted Tidores lexeme. In the first process, material borrowing is involved. Haspelmath (2009) makes a basic distinction for borrowing: (i) material borrowing (lexemes, stems, affixes or entire phrasal units), and (ii) structural borrowing (copying of syntactic, morphological or semantic pattern such as word orders, case marking, or kinship term). *Fas* and *bira* encounter a phonological adaptation to [pas] or [bas] and [bira] or [pira] in Mpur Mae and Wot, respectively. These two loanwords, later, are morphologically compounded into a single linguistic unit in Mpur language, *pasubra* or *basupra*. The underlying form for [pasubra] or [basupra] is /pasbira/ and /baspira/. Therefore, *pasubra* or *basupra* is a loan-based creation. This term refers to any created word in a (recipient) language whose materials were previously borrowed from a donor language (Haspelmath, 2009).

The surface form [pasubra] or [basupra] experiences two phonological processes: (i) (vowel) epenthesis and (ii) (vowel) elision.

Table 3. Rice Phonological Adaption

/pasbira/ or /baspira/	underlying form
pasubira/basupira	/u/ epenthesis
pasubra/basupra	/i/ elision
[pasubra]/[basupra]	surface form

The reason for inserting and deleting vowel takes place to adapt Mpur phonological features especially consonant clusters in the middle position. Generally, consonant clusters are very rare phenomena in Mpur. Some features of consonant clusters in Mpur are as follows. "Consonant clusters do not occur in syllable-final position and are rare in syllable-initial position, except Consonant + semivowel" (Odé, 2002). Besides, consonant clusters in middle position, as we observed from Mpur data, can occur in Consonant + semivowel (e.g. *dek-wem* "3PL-fall", *an-tik-war* "2SG-bathe-water"), nasal + C, and C + r cluster (*baprek* "bridge", *a-from* "3SG-love"). Other consonant clusters (mostly in morpheme boundaries) will experience consonant elision or vowel insertion.

Therefore, in the analysis, consonant cluster /sb/ or /sp/ in /pasbira/ or /baspira/ respectively, should undergo morpho-phonological process. The first process is inserting vowel [u]. It is proposed that [u] is inserted because [u] is in a harmony with [a] (the vowel in *pasubra*) from the group [a, u, o, ʊ, ɔ]. Another vowel harmony group is [i, ɪ, ε, e, ə]. In order to make vowel harmony, elision is needed. Vowel /i/ in [pasubira] or [basupira], then, is deleted yielding the surface form [pasubra] or [basupra].

Now we will see the morphological processes for the names of rice type in Mpur. As previously mentioned, there are four kinds of rice in Mpur namely, *kamerkan*, *waranda*, *jasrik* and *jakun*. *Kamerkan* is a compound derived from *kamer* "mouse" and *kan* "shit". Thus, *kamerkan* literally means "mouse droppings". This rice has black colour. That's why Mpur people personify it as mouse droppings which is also black and has about the same size with the rice.

The second one is *waranda*. *Waranda* is a borrowing word from Biak (and some other Austronesian languages in the North Papua). *Waranda* means "Dutch" or "white person". In Biak language, the word is borrowed from Makassarese *balanda* with a phonological adaption (note that, the Indonesian word is *belanda* meaning 'Dutch' or 'Holland'). The word, *balanda*, is also used by Yolngu peoples in the north coast of Australia which were in the established a tight trading relationship with Makassarese sea-traders and it is even re-borrowed by the speakers of vernacular English of the Northern Territory (Keith, 2021). One of the language informants said that Mpur people name it that way because the rice has white color just like the skin color of Dutch or white people. In addition, this rice has a long grain which mimics the physical appearance of Dutch people which is higher than Mpur or Papuan people.

The two other types of rice in Mpur are *jasrik* and *jakun*. These two rice types undergo two different morphological processes. *Jasrik* is a compound word comprised of the classifier *ja* meaning 'seed or grain' and *srik* 'line'. *Jasrik* is a type of rice which has red line on its unhusked grain. On the other hand, *jakun* is partly derived from the same *ja* classifier as in *jasrik*. This word is formed through a blending process, *ja* + *kun*. *Kun* is a clipped form from *kunon* meaning "short" in Mpur. Thus, *jakun* is named because of its short size of the grain. *Jakun* is the only short grain rice among the other types.

4.5 Componential analysis for types of rice

In this part, componential analysis is utilised to reveal the different meaning for each rice term. The meaning can be understood through shared and diagnostic (distinctive) features each rice term has. The features deploy the components of each rice term's meaning. Indeed, they help in providing different meaning of each rice term (lexeme/word). The shared feature serves as the common component for all rice terms as semantically related lexemes. Meanwhile, the diagnostic features serve to distinguish the meaning of a rice lexeme (word)

from other rice lexemes. Therefore, the total meaning of a rice term can be seen in terms of a number of distinctive elements or components of meaning.

Table 4. The Components of Rice Terms in Mpur

Rice	land-planted	Long grain	black	red	white
<i>kamerkan</i>	+	+	+	-	-
<i>jasrik</i>	+	+	-	+	-
<i>waranda</i>	+	+	-	-	+
<i>jakun</i>	+	-	-	-	+

Table 4 shows the components of rice term's meaning in Mpur. The shared feature used is land-planted rice. This shows that all rice is the type of rice which is planted in a dry land not in the paddy fields. Whereas, the distinctive features are long grain, blackness, redness and whiteness of the grain.

Data in Table 4 indicates that, the meaning of each rice term is determined by the presence symbolized by (+) and absence (represented by (-) of components. All types are +land planted because all of them are planted in the garden not in a paddy field. Some types share common features for example, *kamerkan*, *jasrik* and *waranda* have the same feature in the shape of the grain, i.e. they are included as long grain rice indicated with (+), while *jakun* does not share this feature. It is -long grain. In this case, -long grain become a distinctive component to distinguish *jakun* from the other three types. *Kamerkan* has +black which is different from the other three which are -black. *Jasrik*, on the other hand, has +red which distinguishes it from other rice types. *Waranda* share the same feature of +white with *jakun*. However, both of them are different in long grain feature. *Jasrik* is +long grain, while *jakun* is -long grain.

Componential analysis in Table 4, therefore, successfully provides the component meanings of each lexeme for rice in Mpur. In addition, it also helps in proving that each name of rice is a different lexeme.

The results show that to understand the meaning of rice terms in Mpur several linguistic analyses should be made. The analyses fall into two approaches: morpho-phonological analysis to analyse how the terms for rice are formed linguistically and semantic analysis, especially componential one which helps in revealing the meaning of each term. In Mpur, the general term for rice '*pasubra* or *basupra*' is shaped by morpho-phonological processes namely morphological borrowing and compounding. After the morphological processes, the term undergoes phonological adaptation through phonological processes namely epenthesis and vowel elision. Beside the general term *pasubra* or *basupra*, Mpur people distinguish the rice into four types: *kamerkan*, *jasrik*, *waranda* and *jakun*. To understand the meaning of the lexeme for each type and the meaning components, morphological analysis and semantic componential analysis are used. Three morphological processes are utilised to describe word formation processes for the names of the rice type. Compounding is used to describe the word formation of *kamerkan* and *jasrik*. While, *waranda* is formed through the borrowing morphological process with a phonological adaptation. *Jakun* somewhat is unique since it undergoes two morphological processes as it etimologically comes from the blending of *ja* 'seed' and *kun* from *kunon* 'short'. However, before the blending process, *kunon* 'short' experiences clipping morphological process in which the last part of the word *on* to yield *kun* is clipped. *Kun* is then mixed into *ja* to form *jakun*. The meanings and meaning components of each name then are analysed through componential analysis. Three distinctive components

are found to be the diagnostic features to differentiate each name's meaning. They are 'long-grain', redness, whiteness, and blackness.

5. Conclusion

So far it has been discussed about morpho-phonological aspect of rice term and the types of rice in Mpur and how the processes end up in constructing lexical meanings for rice terms in Mpur language. It has been proposed that the term rice in Mpur is a loan-based word derived from two donor languages: Biak and Tidore. In the findings, it is claimed that Mpur speakers borrow their term for rice for a donor language and make some morpho-phonological adaptation to construct their own term for rice whose materials are from the borrowed words. Morphological process used to construct the term for rice in Mpur is compounding. And, phonological rules involved are epenthesis and elision.

The paper also has described the types of the rice in Mpur including the existing morphological process and the semantic notion behind the names of rice. Morphologically, the names for types of rice in Mpur underwent compounding, borrowing, and blending process. Semantically, Mpur people name the types of rice based on four things: the shape (e.g. *kamerkan*: black rice which resembles the droppings of the mouse) and the colour (e.g. *waranda*: it's borrowed from Biak, which is borrowed from Makassarese *balanda* meaning 'Dutch' or 'white person'. *Waranda* is named after white skin of Dutch people). Others are naming systems based on the size and the feature of the grain (e.g. *jakun*). It is a type of rice which has short grains and *jasrik*, rice which has line on its grain (especially the husked rice).

The study limits its scopes only to see the word formations of the general rice term and also the names for each rice type. Besides, it also only focuses to reveal the meaning components for each term. Therefore, other discussions regarding language contact and pragmatic used of the terms are left for the further research. This research also only deals with Mpur language. The same patterns of morphological and semantic analysis may be used to research other languages especially languages in the Bird's Head areas as can be seen in 4.1 all terms for rice in the Bird's Head languages are cognates. However, this paper doesn't include the analysis for rice terms in other Bird's Head languages.

Other points we want to highlight here for further research is the study on language contact especially on the issues of loanwords or borrowing and the morpho-phonological adaption occurring in the borrowing process for other linguistic forms in the language or to broader extent the languages in Bird's Head. We have presented the findings for one loanword. Mpur, however, has many loanwords. Therefore, the next study on loanwords in Mpur is highly required to determine the general morpho-phonological adaption for loanwords in the language and for the next further research on the surrounding languages.

Funding

This research received no funding from any external institution, organization, or funding agency.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest related to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Authors' Contribution

Chrisma Fernando Saragih: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.
Boas Yotam Wabia: Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – review & editing

Statement of the Use of AI

The authors used generative AI solely for language editing and clarity improvement. The authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and final content of the manuscript.

References

- Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2022). *What is morphology?* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barton, H. (2012). The reversed fortunes of sago and rice, *Oryza sativa*, in the rainforests of Sarawak, Borneo. *Quaternary International*, 249, 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2011.03.037>
- Bellwood, P. (2011). The checkered prehistory of rice movement southwards as a domesticated cereal—from the Yangzi to the equator. *Rice*, 4, 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12284-011-9068-9>
- Bowern, C. (2015). *Linguistic fieldwork: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137340801>
- Cobo, J. M., Fort, J., & Isern, N. (2019). The spread of domesticated rice in eastern and southeastern Asia was mainly demic. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 101, 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2018.11.007>
- Crystal, D., & Yu, A. C. L. (Eds.). (2023). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, E., & Whittlesey, P. (2004). The role of rice in Southeast Asia. *Education About Asia*, 9(3), 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.65959/ea.622>
- Dol, P. H. (2007). *A grammar of Maybrat: A language of the Bird's Head Peninsula, Papua Province, Indonesia*. Pacific Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.15144/PL-586>
- Falvey, J. L. (2010). History of rice in Southeast Asia and Australia. In S. D. Sharma (Ed.), *Rice: Origin, antiquity and history*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/EBK1578086801>
- Fuller, D. Q. (2011). Pathways to Asian civilizations: Tracing the origins and spread of rice and rice cultures. *Rice*, 4, 78–92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12284-011-9067-x>
- Gravelle, G. J. (2011). *A grammar of Moskona: An East Bird's Head language of West Papua, Indonesia* [Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam].
- Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook* (pp. 35–54). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442>
- Hayes, B. (2011). *Introductory phonology*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Holton, G., & Klammer, M. (2018). The Papuan languages of East Nusantara and the Bird's Head. In B. Palmer (Ed.), *The languages and linguistics of the New Guinea area: A comprehensive guide* (pp. 569–640). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110295252-005>
- Kamma, F. C. (1981). *Ajaib di mata kita: Masalah komunikasi antara Timur dan Barat dilihat dari sudut pengalaman selama seabad pekabaran Injil di Irian Jaya* (Jilid I). BPK Gunung Mulia.

- Keith, E. F. (2021). A Phonological Analysis of Lexical Evidence for Contact between Austronesian and Yolngu Peoples. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 39(2), 151–165. <https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v39i2.193>.
- Kovach, M. J., Calingacion, M., Fitzgerald, M. A., & McCouch, S. R. (2009). The origin and evolution of fragrance in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(34), 14444–14449. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0904077106>
- Kroeger, P. R. (2005). *Analyzing grammar: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801679>
- Londo, J. P., Chiang, Y.-C., Hung, K.-H., Chiang, T.-Y., & Schaal, B. A. (2006). Phylogeography of Asian wild rice, *Oryza rufipogon*, reveals multiple independent domestications of cultivated rice, *Oryza sativa*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 103(25), 9578–9583. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0600929103>
- Mahsun. (2017). *Metode penelitian bahasa: Tahapan, strategi, metode, dan tekniknya* (Edisi ketiga). PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Marhita. (2006). The prehistory of Austronesian dispersal to the southern islands of East Indonesia. In T. Simanjuntak, I. H. E. Pojoh, & M. Hisyam (Eds.), *Austronesian diaspora and the ethnogeneses of people in Indonesian archipelago* (pp. 129–142). LIPI Press.
- Miedema, J., & Reesink, G. (2004). *One head, many faces: New perspectives on the Bird's Head Peninsula of New Guinea*. KITLV Press.
- Nida, E. A. (1949). *Morphology: The descriptive analysis of words* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Odé, C. (2002). “A sketch of Mpur.” In G. P. Reesink (Ed.), *Languages of the Eastern Bird's Head* (pp. 45–107). Pacific Linguistics.
- Payne, T. E. (1997). *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805066>
- Reesink, G. P. (Ed.). (2002). *Languages of the eastern Bird's Head* (Pacific Linguistics 524). Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. <https://doi.org/10.15144/PL-524>
- Riemer, N. (2010). *Introducing semantics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808883>
- Saeed, J. I. (2022). *Semantics* (5th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sagart, L. (2011). How many independent rice vocabularies in Asia? *Rice*, 4, 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12284-011-9077-8>
- Schmid, H.-J. (2015). Morphology. In N. Braber, L. Cummings, & L. Morrish (Eds.), *Exploring language and linguistics* (pp. 77–110). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139548922.005>
- Senft, G. (2022). Elicitation. In J. Verschueren & J.-O. Östman (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics: Manual. Second edition* (pp. 1539–1542). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hop.m2.eli1>
- Takamiya, H. (2007). How did agriculture spread? Case studies from Japan. In M. Komoto (Ed.), *A study on the environmental change and adaptation system in prehistoric Northeast Asia* (pp. 110–118). Kumamoto University.
- Usmany, D. P. (2014). Pelayaran orang Biak Sebelum Abad 19: Suatu Tinjauan Maritim. *Jnana Budaya*, 19(2), 199–216.

- van Driem, G. (2002). Tibeto-Burman phylogeny and prehistory: Languages, material culture and genes. In P. Bellwood & C. Renfrew (Eds.), *Examining the farming/language dispersal hypothesis* (pp. 233–249). McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Wabia, B. Y. (2014). *Reduplication process in Mpur language* [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. Universitas Papua.