

2.14.2. INLAND GULF, ELEMA "PHYLA"

Karl J. Franklin

Most of the information from this section is from recent materials dealing with the Gulf District (Franklin, ed. 1973). However, we suggest here certain modifications for the more recent broad classifications.

Wurm (1972) outlines a general classification for the area (the Gulf District and adjacent portions of the Western, Southern Highlands, Chimbu, Eastern Highlands, Morobe, and Central Districts) about which we are concerned:

1. The Trans-New Guinea Phylum (McElhanon and Voorhoeve 1970), including:
 - a. Central and South New Guinea Stock (Voorhoeve 1968);
 - b. Gogodala-Suki Stock;
 - c. Trans-Fly Stock;
 - d. Turama-Kikorian Stock;
 - e. Kutubuan Stock;
 - f. East New Guinea Highlands Stock;
 - g. Teberan stock-level Family;
 - h. Pawaiian stock-level Family;
 - i. Angan Stock;
2. Minor Unrelated Phyllic Groups
 - j. Inland Gulf phylum-level Stock;
 - k. Eleman phylum-level Family.

The above classification now needs reconsideration in several respects. First of all, if the relationships of the languages of (a) above are valid, we should also regard as relatively closely related to them those languages which are members of (d) Turama-Kikorian Stock; (e) Kutubuan Stock; (f) East New Guinea Highlands Stock; and (j) Inland Gulf Stock. However, one member of the Kutubuan Stock (Foe) has some affinity eastward

to (g) Teberan stock-level Family and (h) Pawaian stock-level Family, but another member of Kutubuan Stock (Fasu) has affinities westward to (a) Central and South New Guinea Stock, as well as northward to (f) East New Guinea Highlands Stock. As we have shown elsewhere (Franklin and Voorhoeve 1973) the position of the Kutubuan Stock is crucial to the whole classification.¹ I would propose now a separate stock called Trans-Murray (after the mountain and range in the area), consisting of the:

- (1) East Kutubuan Family,
- (2) Teberan Family, and the
- (3) Pawaian Family.

The basis for suggesting that the East Kutubuan Family belongs to this group, rather than to some other individual stock as outlined above is along several lines: (a) cultural factors (see Williams 1940-41 on the Foe of East Kutubuan Family with comparative comments by Wagner 1970 on Daribi, of the Teberan Family); (b) lexicostatistical figures (established in particular between these three areas by MacDonald 1973); and (c) the position of Fasu within the Central and South New Guinea Stock, which despite its obvious proximity and relationship with Foe (Franklin and Voorhoeve 1973) has closer relationships elsewhere. Indeed in the light of these factors the position of Foe and Fasu within the same stock (as outlined in Franklin and Voorhoeve 1973) shows clearly that present linguistic classifications of Papuan languages includes a whole range of relationships.

The second stock that I would question to some extent as having a legitimate position within the Trans-New Guinea Phylum is that of (i), the Angan Stock. Evidence by Lloyd (1973) suggests clearly that the Angan Stock is not closely related to any of the language groups surrounding it. On lexicostatistical grounds involving these languages, the Angan Stock might not safely be considered a member of the Trans-New Guinea Phylum. However, Wurm (personal communication and 2.4.1.5.5.3. in this volume) draws attention to the fact that a sizable number of Angan lexical items tie in well with Trans-New Guinea Phylum cognate chains such as those established by McElhanon and Voorhoeve (1970), and points out that Angan pronouns, and some Angan structural features, are of a type widespread in Trans-New Guinea Phylum languages (see 2.7.4.1. and 2.5.3.3.1.). At the same time, Greenberg (1971) suggests that the Angan Stock may be remotely related to certain languages in Irian Jaya. This possibility is explored in Franklin (1973), but the evidence is very slight. If the relationship is valid, then the Angan Stock must represent a very old remnant of another widely scattered phyllic group.

The further modifications in Wurm's (1972) classification can now be suggested: (1) the inclusion of (j) Inland Gulf Stock as a (sub-phylum-level) stock within the Trans-New Guinea Phylum, showing in particular a relationship with the Turama-Kikorian (sub-phylum-level) Stock, as well as the Central and South New Guinea Stock; (2) broadening the Eleman Family to include the Purari language and Tate, both formerly considered as isolates within the Gulf District (Brown 1973). This can now be called the Eleman-Purarian Stock. Added to this is the strong possibility that Eleman, i.e. the Eleman-Purarian Stock, may have a phylum-level relationship with the East New Guinea Highlands Stock and could be included in the Trans-New Guinea Phylum as a sub-phylic member (see 2.7.8.1. in this volume). The lexical evidence is slight, but oral tradition (as reported in Brown 1973) suggests that the Eleman people, or at least some groups of them, have migrated from the interior. The language which displays the closest set of pronouns with the Eleman-Purarian Stock is Tate (see the section on isolates) however, not Purari (or Koriki as it is also known). But the pronominal evidence is quite conflicting, in that, from pronominal evidence, Eleman also displays some relationships with the Turama-Kikorian Stock.²

Perhaps the answer must now await detailed comparative work. There are, of course, other kinds of comparisons and studies which can be applied to these areas, such as that of Dutton (1973). But Dutton's study of select vocabulary items shows in particular the difficulty in assessing the spread of cultural factors as depicted by the lexicon of any given area.

What is now needed is that Dutton's work be correlated with Wurm's plotting of spacial pronouns (see 2.3.3. in this volume). If both of these factors represent the migration of people, as the authors seem to suggest,³ there should be some correlation in the linguistic groupings also suggested by the authors.

Some linguists have eliminated homophonous doublets or triplets from their lexical evidence. Far more revealing would be some indication of the geographical cum linguistic grouping of such forms. This is yet to be done on any wide or systematic basis.

For the time being then we must be content with allowing the distinction of the Eleman-Purari Stock, the Trans-Murray Stock, the Angan Stock, the Inland Gulf Stock, and the Turama-Kikorian Stock, all within (wholly or partially) the Gulf District. Whether all of these (except perhaps Eleman-Purari) belong to the Trans-New Guinea Phylum (as Wurm 1972 maintains for the languages of the second, third and fifth of these groups, and the author now suggests for the fourth and perhaps for the first (see

above)) can, in the author's opinion, perhaps not be quite positively concluded on a structural basis at this time.

Some notes on the Inland Gulf, and the Eleman-Purari (sub-phylum-level) Stocks have been given in 2.7.7. and 2.7.8. in this volume.

N O T E S

1. Notice, for example that Voorhoeve (1968) included Fasu in his Central and South New Guinea Phylum, but that Wurm (1971) included Foe in an East New Guinea Highlands Phylum. This suggested two things: (1) the relationship of Foe and Fasu were inter-phylic and thus so remote to be of no concern, or (2) the two phyla were more closely related than the taxonomic labels suggest. The latter seems more likely now that Wurm has both the East New Guinea and Central South New Guinea groups as stocks within the new Trans-New Guinea Phylum (see 1.3.4., 2.7.2.1. and 2.5.3.3.2. in this volume).

2. Wurm (1972) in examining the personal pronouns in 450 Papuan languages found that there were basically three sets, two subsets, and one limited set. However, he points out that there is no obvious one-to-one correspondence between such pronominal sets and the established groupings of interrelated languages (see also 2.3.3. in this volume).

3. It is true, of course, that ideas, or even lexicon, can spread in certain directions without people moving uniquely in the same direction. A plotting of other related features such as kinship terms, homophonous forms such as *tree* and *fire* or *grass* and *feather* (see McElhanon 1971 and Laycock 1970 for other terms), temporal notions like *tomorrow* and *yesterday*, basic colours (Berlin and Kay 1969), counting systems, and other semantic domains will show us if there is any distinctly Papuan "world-view".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BERLIN, B. and P. KAY
1969 *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution.*
Berkeley. University of California Press.
- BROWN, H.A.
1973 'The Eleman Language Family'. Franklin, ed. 1973. 279-376.
- DUTTON, T.E.
1973 ''Cultural' Items of Basic Vocabulary in Papua. Part 1:
Foodstuffs and Associated Agricultural Terms'. Franklin,
ed. 1973. 411-538.
- FRANKLIN, K.J., ed.
1973 *The Linguistic Situation in the Gulf District and Adjacent
Areas, Papua New Guinea.* PL, C.26.
- FRANKLIN, K.J.
1973 'The Gulf Area in the light of Greenberg's Indo-Pacific
Hypothesis'. Franklin, ed. 1973. 377-409.
- FRANKLIN, K.J. and C.L. VOORHOEVE
1973 'Languages Near the Intersection of the Gulf, Southern
Highlands, and Western Districts'. Franklin, ed. 1973. 149-
86.
- GREENBERG, J.H.
1971 'The Indo-Pacific Hypothesis'. Sebeok, ed. 1971. 807-71.

LAYCOCK, D.C.

- 1970 'Eliciting Basic Vocabulary in New Guinea'. Wurm, S.A. and D.C. Laycock, eds. *Pacific Studies in Honour of Arthur Capell*. PL, C.13.1126-76.

LLOYD, R.G.

- 1973 'The Angan Language Family'. Franklin, ed. 1973. 31-110.

MacDONALD, G.E.

- 1973 'The Teberan Language Family'. Franklin, ed. 1973. 111-48.

McELHANON, K.A.

- 1971 'Classifying New Guinea Languages'. *Anthropos* 66.120-44.

McELHANON, K.A. and C.L. VOORHOEVE

- 1970 *The Trans-New Guinea Phylum: Explorations in Deep-Level Genetic Relationships*. PL, B.16.

SEBEOK, T.E., ed.

- 1971 *Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol.8: Linguistics in Oceania*. The Hague. Mouton and Co.

VOORHOEVE, C.L.

- 1968 'The Central and South New Guinea Phylum'. PL, A.16.1-17.

WAGNER, R.

- 1970 'Daribi and Foraba Cross-Cousin Terminologies: A Structural Comparison'. *JPS* 79.91-8.

WILLIAMS, F.E.

- 1940-41 *Natives of Lake Kutubu, Papua*. *Oceania Monographs* 6.

WURM, S.A.

- 1971 'The Papuan Linguistic Situation'. Sebeok, ed. 1971. 541-657.

- 1972 'The Classification of Papuan Languages and its Problems'. *Linguistic Communications* 6.118-78.

p. 866 blank