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Just a comment about "Kendayan" vs. "Kenayatn":

In various parts of Borneo and Sumatra, there is a widespread development of preploded nasals following phonetically oral vowels and regular nasals following phonetically nasalized vowels. The development of prepllosion generally takes place in word-final position, but in some languages stem-final preploded nasals can be suffixed.

So, in most varieties of Bidayuh and many other languages /knidayan/ is pronounced [kndaya\'nt].

Furthermore, in SW Sarawak and elsewhere voiced obstruents are often lost from a nasal+voiced obstruent cluster. At times the voiced obstruent is nearly lost, but enough of it remains to block the spread of nasality from the nasal onto the following vowel. For example, /knidayan/ > [kndaya\'n] or [kn(d)aya\'n].

In Rara and Salako some voiced obstruents are lost entirely from such clusters, but the vowel continues to be oral and a following nasal is preploded. When questioned, speakers often state that the word does not contain a voiced obstruent. For example, /knidayan/ > [knaya\'n]. Such examples appear to violate the rule that a vowel following a nasal is nasalized and is followed in turn by a regular nasal rather than by a preploded nasal.

However, in other words with such clusters the voiced obstruent is retained, as /knidayan/ > [kndaya\'n]. Hence, a contrast has developed in those languages. Although one could argue that it is more satisfactory to claim that the contrast is between oral and nasalized vowels following nasals, speakers generally seem to perceive the contrast as one between regular nasals and preploded nasals in final position. (Carolyn discusses this “new nasality” in Rara in sec. 6.6, p. 82 et seq., in her chapter on nasality in Rensch, Rensch, Noeb and Ridu.)

So, in the present case the resultant form can be regarded phonologically as /knayatn/. So, what, then, is the status of “kendayan”? This is probably an underlying form, a more abstract representation, which may well occur in other related languages. It may be that this underlying form represents an earlier stage of development. In that case, one could argue either for spelling the language name as “kenayatn” to reflect the phonological form or for spelling it as “kendayan” to reflect a more abstract representation.

Don’t know whether this helps to decide which is the preferable spelling. Very likely the spelling, “Kendayan”, will win out over “Kenayatn” because of tradition, whatever the linguistic considerations of the matter are.

Greetings, Cal