these ceremonies had disappeared. Maori Kiki was accompanied on this visit by Ulli Beier who wished to collect evidence for a book on Hohao sculpture. The following extract, from Kiki’s recently published Autobiography, gives a vivid impression of the ambivalence and confusion of these people about the remaining fragments of their religious and artistic heritage. In his Autobiography, Kiki reveals his deep sympathy for and attachment to the traditional Oroko culture and religion into which he was initiated in his childhood and youth. As a result of several decades of contact with Europeans he felt that ‘the breakdown of our social and religious life in Oroko left a vacuum in people’s minds that caused a great deal of confusion’.

We spent a week that time looking for hohao and trying to get their story. A hohao is an oval-shaped wooden board, carved with the image of a face. In the old days each clan used to have one or more hohaos, which represented important ancestors. They were kept in the erao and in times of danger or before important hunting expeditions they were asked to help. When the eraos were burned most of the hohaos were burned with them, but a few were saved. They then had to be kept in the uvi, the women’s hut. But many people found that the hohao was a powerful magic object and that without the erao they did not know how to handle it. The eraos had been prepared with much magic and they could contain and control the power of the hohaos. Now in the uvi there was nothing to counterbalance the hohao. People became afraid of them, and when frequent deaths occurred in some family they often thought that it was the hohao that was causing them because they no longer knew how to treat it properly. I was very angry to find that Ila Kalaeka, the hohao of the Maori clan, had been thrown out into the yard where it was exposed to rain and sun and it was already much damaged. My people claimed that it was killing their children. They wanted to destroy it but were a little afraid of laying hands on it and as they did not want it in the house any longer they compromised by throwing it into the yard. I argued a long time with them, trying to persuade them to let me take it back to Moeresby with me. ‘We can’t allow you to do that,’ they said, ‘because then it will kill your children.’ There was still a strong faction in the clan that wanted to destroy Ila Kalaeka completely. I had to take a strong stand: ‘If you do that I’ll leave the clan altogether,’ I told them. In the end I managed to save it and an old aunt who lived all by herself agreed to keep it in her house. But even she kept it facing the wall.

I was less lucky with Kivioa, the hohao of my father’s clan. They had already buried it. One of the elders of the clan claimed that he had a dream in which Kivioa appeared and told him: ‘I have helped you in the past, but now times have changed. I can help you no longer. So dress me up in the new fashion and send me back to where I came from, to the earth!’

So they had dressed him up in shorts, a shirt and a tie and had buried him in the cemetery. For three days we talked to them, trying to persuade them to dig Kivioa out again and to let us have him. In the end they promised that they would do it in the night, but next morning they reported that as soon as they started to dig there was thunder and lightning and they took that as a sign that Kivioa was very angry. There was nothing more I could do. One of the most sacred objects of my father’s clan is rotting in the ground. In all the Oroko and Arehava villages combined we found only ten old pieces that had survived. Dozens must have been destroyed and many were doubtless sold to Europeans. I was very sad when I discovered a hohao from Oroko in the Moresby museum. It was a piece I remembered very well because it was carved by my uncle when I was a little boy and I watched him all the way, from the cutting of the tree to the painting. I heard him speak the incantations, I saw him carve the patterns, I helped him grind the colours. And now here it was, nailed on a wall in Moresby, sold by some insensitive relative of ours...

I shall never forget my trip along those lonely creeks. We had to carry water because it was difficult to get fresh water in many of those parts. The sea penetrates the creeks and makes them salty. Once we lost our way and had to sleep in the mangrove scrub. Next morning we discovered that we were quite close to a village called Wowobo. I was amazed to see an erao there, completely intact with hevehe masks not unlike the ones I remember from Oroko in my youth. There was also a collection of skulls, in the erao, all beautifully engraved with patterns. There were some old bullroarers and cassowary bone daggers.

In another village, Mairippea, I found another erao. This had no masks in it, but here I was invited to give my election speech inside the erao. At first I told them: ‘No, I want the women also to hear what I have to say.’ But to my surprise they told me that in their village women were allowed inside the erao. In Ipiko village I saw a very old beautiful hohao. It had clearly been carved with shark’s teeth and cassowary bones rather than with European tools. When the owner saw my great interest in the carving he gave it to me. He told me: ‘This has the power of God. Before you go to a village you must dance with this in the night, letting it face the village. It will make your enemies weak’. I think he gave it to me because, like the people of my own village he felt that he could no longer deal with the ‘power’ that had been accumulated in the ancient object. Being afraid to destroy it, he may have been glad to get rid of it by giving it to me.
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**LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY: DOCUMENTS A29 TO A33**

For a number of decades now linguists have been engaged in inquiries about the identification and classification of the many languages spoken in New Guinea. Their deliberations continue to throw light on the historical identity and origins of these languages. This historical linguistics provides one type
of evidence useful for answering these rather large historical questions about remote ancestors. A second form of inquiry employs the methods of comparative linguistics. When applied to evidence about institutions, ideas and elements of material culture in traditional society this comparative method may assist in answering questions about changes in these institutions and ideas, and about elements borrowed from one culture by another. The use of linguistic evidence is made necessary because the pre-literate communities of New Guinea have left no written records by which we can trace these developments. Both these areas of inquiry are concerned with and based upon traditional indigenous languages. Both may give clues for answering questions about ancestors: whence they came, when they settled in parts of these islands and how they lived and developed certain features of their way of life.

There are also three other ways in which linguistic evidence can assist historical inquiries about more recent events and changes. First, there is the important question about the origin, spread and impact of lingue franche, particularly Pidgin English and Police Motu. Second, and allied to this, are questions about the spread and impact of writing and printing and of literacy in indigenous languages, the lingue franche, German and English. Finally, linguistic evidence can be employed to investigate the ways in which European ideas and values have been communicated in the New Guinea context, both from European to New Guinean and within local communities between Westernised elite groups and the mass of people. In this matter of communication we are at the heart of the process of modernisation in which this country has been involved since the coming of the Europeans. An historical study of this process through the analysis of communication is thus both important and necessary.

In each of these fields linguistic evidence can assist historical inquiry. Investigation about the genetic relationships between New Guinea languages is extensive, but far from complete. Some linguistic probing of social institutions and of the content of material culture has begun. This is the case also with the study of the growth of the lingue franche. But there has been little, if any, specialist study of the impact of literacy and the problem of cross-cultural communication. While each of these questions is an issue of language, each presents the historian with particular difficulties which need to be explored in more detail. Each of these five forms of inquiry will now be discussed in brief.

One of the most fruitful products of the lengthy study of historical linguistics in New Guinea and the Pacific has been more certainty about the relationship between the many New Guinea languages. (Pl. 11) A recent statement by one linguist, S. A. Wurm, puts the picture clearly:

'The New Guinea area, of which the Territory of Papua and New Guinea forms a large part, is one of the most complex regions of the world linguistically. The number of distinct languages is tremendous: estimates of around seven hundred different languages in the entire New Guinea area do not seem exaggerated. Of these, nearly five hundred may be located in the Australian part, much of which is as yet linguistically unknown or only little known...

One fact revealed by recent research has fundamentally affected the linguistic picture of New Guinea: the discovery of some very large groups of more or less closely interrelated languages. It had been believed until recently that the hundreds of languages in New Guinea were either completely unrelated to each other, or that there were only small groups of interrelated languages, each comprising not more than a few languages.1

That statement was published in 1966. By early 1969 the situation was clarified still further:

'The languages of Papua-New Guinea belong to two distinct types: in some coastal and near-coastal areas are located the languages traditionally referred to as Melanesian. These are all inter-related, and belong to the far-flung Austronesian (or Malayo-Polynesian) group of interrelated languages whose territory extends from Madagascar across Indonesia and the Philippine archipelago, and from there across the Pacific to Hawaii, New Zealand and Easter Island. They constitute comparatively recent immigrant languages which are believed to have come to the New Guinea area during the past 5000 years or so.

However, the bulk of the languages in Australian New Guinea are Papuan (or non-Melanesian) languages which are apparently not related to any languages outside the New Guinea area. Until quite recently, it had been believed that most of them were not related to each other either, and only a few groups of interrelated Papuan languages had been established. However, in the past two years, and especially during the past 12 months or so, there has been a quite revolutionary change in the linguistic picture of New Guinea as a result of the intensive linguistic work carried out in the area. It is now known that the majority of the Papuan languages of Australian New Guinea are interrelated and belong to a very widespread language group which occupies close to three-quarters of the New Guinea mainland, and comprises the majority of all the speakers of Papuan languages.2

The process by which this conclusion has been reached, since Thomas Forrest published the first specimen of a New Guinea mainland language almost 200 years ago3 is part of what might be called the linguistic history of this country. Its study throws

much light on the development of Oceanic linguistics as a discipline in European scholarship. More importantly it provides another segment to the complex history of the manner in which Europeans came to know the inhabitants of these islands. For this reason the assumptions, methods and evidence of historical linguistics must be grasped and assessed if this discipline is to contribute to our understanding of New Guinea history.

Since the basic sources for any linguistic inquiry are written records of the vocabulary and grammar of pre-literate peoples, the historian immediately faces major difficulties about the reliability of these sources. G. M. Dening, though referring to the Polynesian situation, indicates the caution necessary in employing this material as historical evidence:

"... The accuracy of any analysis of linguistic relationships in Polynesia will depend ultimately on the accuracy with which we can sift off the historical contacts which changed the original dialects."  

Historians need to be sure that the words being used in these inquiries are 'truly pre-European'. Perhaps a linguist of the stature of Professor Sidney H. Ray of Cambridge University, who did so much to classify these languages in the early decades of this century, was aware of the distortions possible when he engaged in his own field work in New Guinea. But a large part of his work was based upon word lists made by others earlier and upon contemporary work done in the field by missionaries and government officers. He expressed some grave misgivings about the lists collected by native teachers.

"... The outlook for the student is not promising, as most of the mission work among the tribes is that of native teachers, Polynesians or Melanesians, whose native idioms are so very different to the Papuan, that the translations made by them can hardly be depended upon."  

A glance at his findings on the Papuan and Melanesian languages of British New Guinea published in 1907 reveals the wide range and variety of materials he used. In some cases he was well served by men who like W. G. Lawes were considered accomplished linguists by the standards of their times. Before this evidence could be accepted as useful for an historical enquiry, questions would need to be answered about the specific circumstances in which the word list was compiled, the informants used, the language or languages used for communication between the informants and recorder and about both the methods of recording and the assumptions about language brought by the recorder to the task. For instance, the comment made by Dr P. Comrie the surgeon on More'sby's ship HMS Basilisk about some of the languages he recorded in New Guinea, throws much light on the unformed state of linguistic theory in the 1870s in England and places his evidence under some suspicion:

'As regards the language, he thought it strongly bore out the bow-bow and pooh-pooh theory, as the name for a pig was poro-poro, dog bow-bow, axe dim-dim and eating nam-nam, all suggestive of onomatopoeia.'  

All these questions would need satisfactory answers to fulfil precisely the demands Dening makes about the sifting of linguistic evidence. This task may be almost impossible to achieve with the evidence from the early stages of contact. Hence it must be accepted with reservation by historians. More recent linguists give more specific details about the circumstances and methods of their fieldwork.

But if it is necessary to question the gathering of the evidence it is just as necessary to question the models and hypotheses used by the linguists to interpret the historical relationships between languages. The basic assumption they make is that methods can be employed to prove the genetic relationships between groups of languages. These methods have been used for New Guinea languages since 1892 when Ray suggested the division between Papuan and Melanesian types. (A29) More recently lexicostatistics and glottochronology have been applied to this problem as a means of gaining some sense of time depth in their relationships. Lexico-statistics consists of testing the percentage relationships between basic word lists of representative language groups. Glottochronology is based on the hypothesis that over long periods the basic vocabulary of all languages changes at the same overall rate. A brief look at current literature makes quite plain the controversy among linguists about these methods. The conclusions based on these methods, while helpful for giving broad indications about the relative chronology in the linguistic history of New Guinea, must be accepted with some reservations. First, this dating may provide a workable framework within which a historical inquiry about the peopling of New Guinea can develop. However,
a time depth is implied which is usually much greater than that which the historian, using oral and written data, can accept with any sense of certainty. On the other hand, the dating methods of glottochronology are based, according to one of its exponents, Isidore Dyen, on assumptions similar to those employed in the carbon dating of material evidence. Historical linguistics may therefore be used to corroborate the evidence found, and the interpretations proposed, by archaeologists for the pre-history of New Guinea. Second, there is the question about whether linguistic history can finally tell us very much about the history of the people who speak the languages studied. Vansina puts the case with clarity:

While an affinity of language provides insufficient grounds for assuming ethnic affinity, one can, however, sometimes deduce that behind a genetic relationship between several languages lies an ethnic relationship. Thus historical linguistics mainly provides information concerning the history of migrations, and sometimes enables one to arrive at very accurate results.

A rider to this statement is the warning that the evidence and interpretation produced by historical linguistics cannot alone produce any framework of historical explanation that is either satisfying or valid. This is apparent from the limitations already pointed to. This does not mean, however, that linguistic evidence must be rejected. On the contrary: in a situation of such linguistic complexity as New Guinea, there exist many opportunities for meaningful and perhaps fruitful co-operation between linguists and historians. But linguistic evidence must be subjected to the sort of critical analysis that historians would normally apply to evidence from any other source.

Bearing in mind these limitations there are a number of important findings from historical linguistics which can be pointed to.

(i) As more linguistic evidence becomes available it seems clear that overall the languages of New Guinea fall into the two broad groupings suggested above by Wurm: Melanesian languages related to the Austronesian group and Papuan or Non-Austronesian languages which bear no relationship to any group outside New Guinea. The Melanesian languages are distributed geographically in coastal areas of central and south-eastern Papua, the Morobe district and the north coast of New Guinea, as well as through the islands of the Bismarck Archipelago and the south-eastern Papuan region. Historically they suggest relationships out into the Austronesian region of Polynesia and South-East Asia. Whether they predate Polynesian languages or whether Melanesia and New Guinea are one of the early homelands of this language are questions about which there is much controversy. The Papuan or non-Austronesian languages are centred in the Central Highlands of New Guinea and areas bordering on it. The more recent findings suggest wider links within New Guinea with this grouping. But the question about its historical connections with languages outside New Guinea is far from solved. Some Papuan languages in the hinterland regions of the Gulf of Papua, the Sepik and Madang, New Britain, Bougainville and south-east Papua, while belonging to the Papuan type, show no direct relationship to the larger Papuan group centred on the Highlands. (A30)

Moving from this broad canvas to more limited regional patterns a number of interpretations have been proposed about settlements in New Guinea.

(ii) In 1943 Capell proposed a thesis concerning the peopling of south-eastern Papua. He saw this picture as containing three broad population and linguistic movements. These waves came from Borneo, from the Celebes and Philippines, Java and Malaya in that chronological order. While he proposed three points of origin and this chronological sequence, Capell could not suggest any but tentative dates for these three migrations.

(iii) There is some linguistic support for the thesis proposed on the basis of genetics, archaeological and botanical evidence that the Eastern Highlands region has a different and longer history than the Western Highlands region and that there may perhaps have been migrations through the Highlands from east to west.

(iv) An example of the more recent findings is that which concerns the Koiarian family of Papuan or Non-Austronesian languages covering an area from
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the coast around Port Moresby almost to the sea on the north coast at the eastern end of the Hydrographer’s Ranges. It consists of six languages: Koita, Koiai, Mount Koiai, Barai, Managalasi and Aomie. The centre of distribution of the Koiaian peoples is somewhere in the mountains around the headwaters of the Kumusi River and from this point there has been population drift both north and south of this to develop the area now covered by this language family.19

In this first area of inquiry, historical linguistics, language is studied from the viewpoint of its structure and form, and by this process of analysis certain historical explanations are put forward based on patterns of relationship between the various structures and forms. In the second type of inquiry languages are placed into their particular human contexts to find out whether linguistic study can reveal any useful historical evidence about the society and culture of the people who have developed this particular language. This type of analysis has not as yet borne much fruit in New Guinea. However, it seems valid for the historian to propose it. Two assumptions are made here which, if not accepted, make it impossible to launch this type of enquiry. One is practical. It assumes that the person engaged in it is thoroughly steeped in the language and culture of the people being studied. This may therefore require cooperation between historians, anthropologists and linguists. Because of the developments in New Guinea linguistics in recent decades, this is becoming more of a possibility. More and more anthropological studies in New Guinea are based on field work employing local languages rather than a lingua franca like Pidgin English or Police Mutu. So eminent a pre-war anthropologist as F. E. Williams did not consider he had time enough to learn local languages and thus conducted his field work through bi-lingual intermediaries who spoke the local language as well as Police Mutu.20 In earlier decades, while Landman relied heavily on Pidgin for his work with the Kiwais, Malinowski saw the necessity for learning the Trobriand language rather than continuing with the Motu he had used with the Mailu. He also saw basic defects in using Pidgin as a form of communication in the Trobriand.21 The second assumption is theoretical. It assumes that language is a vital part of a whole culture and is functionally related to the particular culture. This has been a matter of controversy between anthropologists and linguists but is perhaps more readily accepted now. It has another more explicit assumption flowing from it, as one exponent H. J. Hoijer put it:

‘The fact of the matter, then, is not that linguistic patterns inescapably limit sensory perceptions and thought, but simply that, together with other cultural patterns, they direct perceptions and thinking into certain habitual channels... A language, then, as a cultural system, more or less faithfully reflects the structuring of reality which is peculiar to the group that speaks it.’22

If this theoretical assumption is correct, then linguistic studies could provide a tentative and, it would seem, productive field of inquiry for historians. In broad terms two lines of enquiry seem possible. First, through a comparative study of the content of vocabularies valuable evidence could be obtained about cultural elements borrowed by one group from another. This of course presupposes accuracy in the lists collected. Two recent studies suggest the possibilities. Dr Ann Chowning in a preliminary survey of the words used in the Melanesian region for basic food plants attempted to ‘reconstruct Proto-Melanesian plant names’. She also brought forward evidence to show borrowings and possible lines of migration and contact between various groups in the region. (A31) More recently Dr A. Capell proposed a linguistic study of two groups of ‘Butam’ people supposed to have once inhabited the Gazelle Peninsula and southern New Ireland. By establishing possible linguistic contacts between them it raises some fascinating historical questions about the peopling of this area and the contrasts between cultures in this region.23

The second line of inquiry concerns the use of linguistic methods to study institutions and ideas and their meaning and development in particular cultures. Again this is a necessary task for the historian to perform when working in a pre-literate situation, even though he thus enters a no-man’s-land bordered by linguistics and anthropology. Douglas Oliver engaged in this when he searched out the varieties of meaning the Siuai people gave to the term Mumi or ‘chief’. After explaining three major areas of meaning associated with this term Oliver reaches a conclusion which points up both the difficulties and the necessity of this type of inquiry:

‘There were a great many other meanings of mumi which were less accessible to investigation than the ones already
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discussed. Kea, the half-wit of Rennu village, the self-styled "\textit{mumi of all mumi}", certainly cherished his own private delusion, his own definition of the word. The same was true of Tomo, the ambitious young Government appointee who tried to become influential through identification with the power of the governing white men. One could go on at some length, and quite profitably too, describing other meanings, but enough has already been said to define the most popular uses of the word, and to indicate what pitfalls await ethnographers who attempt to define certain kinds of native words on evidence which is not based on direct observation of social interaction\textsuperscript{24}

A glimpse of the ways in which this type of linguistic investigation may help to detect post-contact institutional changes is to be found in Schwimmer’s discovery that the Mount Lamington Orokava distinguishes between a traditional leader as \textit{kiari embo} (a man of knowledge) and a modern middleman as \textit{keari embo} (a man of speech).\textsuperscript{25} We have already suggested earlier the need for this sort of intensive ethnolinguistic study of the terms used and the ideas and values associated with the ‘big-man’ concept if an adequate historical analysis of indigenous political life is to be achieved. This is equally necessary for work on other central areas of indigenous society. Haudricourt’s adage that ‘it is necessary to study things and also the specific words for things’\textsuperscript{26} is even more true for institutions and ideas than for aspects of material culture. In the same period that Oliver was probing the social meaning and context of some areas of Siuai language, Vicedom and Tischner conducted a similar inquiry as part of their research among the Mbowamb of Mount Hagen. (A32) The proposal being made here for this type of analysis is really nothing new to historians in their use of written sources. The problems and complexities associated with performing this task in preliterate communities create new difficulties and a new challenge.

These first two areas of enquiry are concerned with indigenous languages, mostly before the impact of European contact. It seems logical to discuss some of the aspects of European impact upon indigenous languages. The assessment of this impact needs to take account of the fact that in this country European missionaries, administrators and entrepreneurs were confronted with a bewildering multiplicity and variety of tongues.

Confronted with this, the missionaries decided to adopt and develop particular languages as \textit{lingue franche} to be used in teaching, worship and communication with their flocks. Nine of these can be detected. The Lutheran Missions developed three: \textit{Kafe} was spoken originally in the Finschhafen area and was adopted for teaching in Papuan linguistic areas; \textit{Tabem} originally spoken in the Huon Gulf and adopted for work among Melanesian speaking communities; and \textit{Graged}, a Madang area language, was used for this region. The Methodists developed \textit{Kuanua} for the New Britain and New Ireland area as did the Catholics in the earlier stages of their work in this region. The Methodists also used \textit{Dobu} for their Papuan mission in the south-eastern region. Their neighbours, the Anglicans, developed \textit{Wedau} for their mission work centred in Dogura and the Papuan northern district. The London Missionary Society was responsible for forming \textit{Motu, Toaripi} and \textit{Orokolo} into \textit{lingue franche} for their work in the Papuan Mission.\textsuperscript{27} The background for the adoption of these languages by missionaries is to be found in the policies formed by the mission bodies concerned. But the impact of their use as \textit{lingue franche} upon the original languages and upon the indigenous languages in the areas to which they spread needs to be investigated as a chapter in the linguistic history of this country. Perhaps that chapter is already closed as these indigenous \textit{lingue franche} are being superseded by two other more widespread \textit{lingue franche}, Police Motu and Pidgin English. The latter is already spreading so rapidly that it may well become a national language.

One theory about the origins and development of Police Motu is that it was the trade language used by Motuans of the Port Moresby region in their annual trading voyages to the Gulf of Papua\textsuperscript{28} and that it became adopted by the British administration as the language for native police. (There is clear evidence that in 1893 MacGregor adopted Motu as the language for communicating the Native Regulations to many communities.) (A33) By the time Australia assumed control of British New Guinea in 1906 this language became accepted as the unofficial administrative language for native affairs. This theory needs close study in the process of investigating the growth and spread of Motu as a post-contact language.\textsuperscript{29} Melanesian Pidgin’s origins are unclear. As early as 1840 the surgeon on the whaler \textit{Gypsy} noted that

some inhabitants of one place in the west coast of New Ireland spoke a broken English:

... Some of the natives spoke broken English which they had learnt from runaway sailors, a number of whom (twelve or more) had formed a settlement at Gower’s Harbour, where there are few or no natives...  

This language may have been Beach-la-Mar, an English-based South Seas pidgin language used by whalers, traders and ‘black birders’ and the language from which New Guinea pidgin may have grown and developed. But it may have been an early form of the language which was to develop in the Gazelle Peninsula as a means of contact between most Europeans and the local inhabitants and also for communication between different indigenous groups. Indeed there are cases where people in new settlements formed by speakers of different languages have adopted Pidgin as their language. The broad lines of the origins and spread of Pidgin have been suggested recently by R. F. Salisbury:

In short, Pidgin’s history, though a mixed one, is fairly clear and lengthy. Derived from the trading lingua franca developed earlier in the Indies and in Polynesia it has had from the start a quasi-Malayo-Polynesian grammatical structure. It arrived in New Britain and the Louisiades between 1875 and 1880. It was naturalised and converted into a variety of Pidgin Tolai between 1885 and 1921, when the German administration did not speak English. It has since been further naturalised as a New Guinea language. It was in existence and had developed as an indigenous language long before it became the contact language between English speaking administrators and employees and New Guineans. It is only the recent development of teaching in English, a foreign language, that has produced the view of it as a debased form of English. It has a large Tolai component, but should not be regarded as a debased form of Tolai either. Rather it should be regarded with pride by the whole of New Guinea as a locally evolved and eminently respectable indigenous language of 300,000 speakers.

This theory — a Tolai-centred origin for Pidgin — provides a good starting point for studying the history of this language. He has also put forward the interesting hypothesis that this may also be considered as an indigenous lingua franca. If the assumption about the vital role of language in culture is accepted then a close study of the evolution and context of this and the other major lingua franca, and to a lesser extent the earlier mission lingua franca, could prove a fruitful historical enquiry by which we could gauge not only the impact of European contact on language but also on the cultures which adopted these lingua franca.

Another area of inquiry closely allied to the growth, spread and impact of lingua franca, concerns the question of the impact of writing, printing and literacy in these and other languages upon New Guinea languages and cultures. Printing was introduced into the New Guinea mainland when Rev. W. G. Lawes began operating a simple printing press at Port Moresby in 1877. In the same year the first book in a New Guinea language, Motu, was published by him in Sydney. Through mission and government records it may be possible to assess the growth and effects of the written and printed word on pre-literate people. One product of the endeavour to spread literacy in English, was the Papuan Villager, the English language monthly paper for Papuans published by F. E. Williams from 1929 to the end of 1941. We have already seen that indigenous contributions to the Villager provide useful historical sources. The paper could also provide some source material for the study of the impact of literacy.

Finally, linguistic studies can assist historians in facing an even more complex issue, but one which in the context of contemporary New Guinea is vital. Since sustained European contact New Guinea communities have been undergoing a process that is now called ‘modernisation’. Perhaps prior to World War II this may have been more like a process of enforced change in both Papua and New Guinea. At the heart of this ever-changing process, cross-cultural communication has taken place, by which Western ideas, values and attitudes have been transmitted to and interpreted by indigenous communities. Sometimes in earlier times this communication took place through the medium of actions rather than words. Sir William MacGregor for instance, conveyed the idea of the supreme authority of British government law and order quite frequently through these means.
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One anthropologist, J. B. Watson, writes of the way in which a new model of leadership and power was communicated to Tairora people by the actions of Kiaps. Rev. James Chalmers risked his life many times to convey dramatically his message of Christian peace among warring groups along the Papuan coast. If we are to gauge the effectiveness and the meaning of this process of modernisation with any clarity, then we need to engage in an intensive historical inquiry employing the fieldwork techniques of the anthropologist and the methods of the linguists along with official and private records from European sources. Both sides of the communication process need to be studied and, if possible, one balanced against the other to see what distortions or adjustments may have taken place. The recently published studies of the 1964 House of Assembly elections contain some important evidence about some distortions of Western political concepts and in some cases a complete breakdown of communication. These studies are particularly helpful when the field worker is equipped with a thorough knowledge of local language and culture as well as familiarity with the pidgin used in the political education programme. C. Cripers study of the education process in two Chimbu Open Electorates in the 1964 campaign is an excellent example of this. This historical analysis should not be simply confined to the arena of government and politics despite its vital nature. Studies of the ideology of adjustment cults have demonstrated extreme cases of the ways in which concepts of Western Christianity may have been modified through this process of communication. The famous Long Story of God, the ideological basis for the early stages of Paliaus reform movement on Manus Island has been recorded in a number of versions and bears close scrutiny as a source. Western technology may have had a swift and direct effect upon the stone age technology of New Guinea as Salisbury has suggested in his work on the Siane people. But the question remains to be answered as to how effective the process of communication has been in the realm of western concepts of economics. Some sense of the complexity of this issue can be gained from the testimony obtained recently by an anthropologist who attended a party in Port Moresby held by a group of New Guineans for the dedication of a new truck.

Before the Europeans came we New Guineans were poor people. We lived the same way our ancestors had; we were just ignorant, good-for-nothing bush people. Then Europeans came, and they brought with them all kinds of goods the like of which we had never seen before, and they brought money, too. We wondered where these things came from, and we finally discovered that they came from a kind of work called business.

Although we did not really understand what business meant, we decided to try it. At first, we tried selling sweet potatoes or yams to each other, as we thought that might be business; we also tried growing coffee to sell. Then a few of us set up little trade stores, and bought rice, kerosene, tinned fish and other things to sell, thinking that might be business. After that, some people bought trucks for carrying passengers, believing that this was business. Now after all this time I must confess that I still do not know what business is all about—nevertheless I have bought this truck and I am going to give it a try. These twelve men you see before you have contributed money towards the purchase of the truck, and I have brought them here to this party tonight, so that you, my relatives and friends, will recognise the men who will take me to court when the business fails.

It would seem, therefore, from a brief consideration of five broad ways in which historians could profit from the use of linguistic evidence and methods, that some light could be thrown on significant issues in the development of this country and its people. This survey has pointed out some limitations and complexities associated with this evidence and these methods. These need to be weighed against what such inquiries may produce. Since modern linguistics is already suggesting a drastic revision of the long-held image of New Guinea as another tower of Babel then this would seem to suggest that linguists, anthropologists and historians could co-operate to produce some fruitful clarity about both the origins and identity of remote ancestors and the process of adaptation and modernisation more recent ancestors have lived through. These lines of inquiry into the historical and social context of New Guinea languages may also provide a further strand of evidence for weaving together a truly autonomous history of the new society and culture emerging in these islands.

---

42 J. Chalmers, Pioneering in New Guinea, pp. 106-18
46 R. F. Salisbury, From Stone to Steel
The following extract from a paper read by Professor Sidney H. Ray of Cambridge University at the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists held in London in 1892 marks the earliest attempt to classify systematically the languages of British New Guinea. Although at this stage Ray was relying on linguistic evidence gathered by others, when he published fifteen years later a far more extensive classification of New Guinea languages as a result of his own field work and that of others in the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait in 1898, he felt no need to revise the classification and terms suggested here.\(^1\) Moreover, a German linguist, Father W. Schmidt, working in the same period on the languages of German New Guinea, adopted Ray's terms and methods of classification (see e.g., W. Schmidt, 'Die Sprachlichen Verhältnisse von Deutsch Neu-Guinea', Zeitschrift für Afrikanische und Oceanische Sprachen, 1900-2, Vol. 5, pp. 345-84 and Vol. 6, pp. 1-99). Ray contributed much to the understanding of New Guinea languages between this survey and his last published work in 1939. His work has provided a foundation from which later analyses developed. Because of the stage in the development of linguistics at the time, later scholars have detected limitations in the pioneering methods used. One recent assessment pointed out that Ray's surveys 'are limited to giving lists of language names with indications as to how the languages itemised could be classed into groups of apparently interrelated languages, very sketchy notes on some structural features of a few of the languages listed, and short vocabularies. No attempt has been made ... to give conclusive proof of the interrelationship between languages, whenever it is suggested to exist, or of the lack of such interrelationships, and no figures indicating the number of the speakers of individual languages are as a rule given.'\(^2\) These limitations need to be taken into account in assessing Ray's contribution as a linguist. The relevance of the present extract to a historical study of language and society lies in its being an example of the early thinking and approach to the problem of the multiplicity of New Guinea languages. Ray later extended this comparative study in his A Comparative Study of the Melanesian Island Languages, Cambridge, 1926.

In the investigation of problems concerning Oceanic anthropology the nature and relations of the New Guinea languages ought to occupy an important place. It is in the neighbourhood of that island that the chief types of the Oceanic races—Malay, Papuan, Melanesian, Australian—meet, and it is there that we may most conveniently study the connection of the various sections of the races with each other. In New Guinea the relationship of the Australians to the other peoples of Oceania may most satisfactorily be investigated, and there only does it seem possible to obtain data which may be of use in determining the existence or non-existence of an earlier race in Melanesia or Polynesia than that now found.

Yet nothing is more perplexing or more indefinite than the present state of New Guinea anthropology. Hardly any two accounts of the physical characteristics of the people agree, the nomenclature of the races is uncertain, and travellers' descriptions of customs and habits are extremely vague. Recent advances, however, in our knowledge of British New Guinea have rendered it possible to use the languages as a basis of classification, and in this paper I propose to discuss the position of the New Guinea languages with regard to one another and also with regard to those of other portions of Oceania. The conclusions arrived at may not be found decisive by every anthropologist, but in future investigations they must necessarily form an important factor and ought not to be overlooked.

An endeavour will be here made to prove by linguistic evidence alone that the southern shores of British New Guinea, with the adjacent islands, form the meeting place of tribes speaking two widely different types of language, one of which is aboriginal and the other intrusive.

To distinguish the languages it will be convenient to use in a somewhat restricted sense the terms Melanesian and Papuan. These are not new to Oceanic Philology, but have been so loosely applied as to have become misleading, and hence require definition. They are here used in the most literal and special sense, and the term Melanesian is limited to the inhabitants and languages of the great island chain which extends from the eastern extremity of New Guinea to New Caledonia. With a similar limitation the term Papuan is used to name the darker and more frizzly-haired natives of the mainland of New Guinea. If this distinction be borne in mind, the designation of any language spoken in New Guinea as Melanesian will at once mark it as akin to the island tongues, and of intrusive origin, whilst the description of any language as Papuan will show that its nearest allies are among the languages characteristic of the true aborigines of New Guinea.

The languages here called Melanesian are not found in New Guinea further west than Cape Possession, and even on the south-eastern shores appear only in detached settlements which rarely extend far into the interior, unless along a river bank. In native tradition the tribes using these languages are said to have come across the sea at some remote period and to have occupied the villages and plantations on the coast. The name given by one section of these tribes to themselves is 'Motu,' a word which is commonly used in the Melanesian and Polynesian dialects for 'island.'

The speech of these intruders is in every essential a branch of the same linguistic family as that found in the southern portion of the Solomon Group, in Banks' Islands, Fiji, and the New Hebrides. In relation to one another the various dialects are homogeneous, and all apparently belong to the same stock. They have the same grammatical structure as the languages of the islands, and have similar variations in phonology. Their vocabularies are full of the same common words.

---

The *Papuan* languages of British New Guinea are spoken west of Cape Possession, on the islands of Torres Straits, in a few districts on the south-eastern shores, and in the inland districts so far as they have yet been explored. They present in nearly every respect the widest possible contrast to the Melanesian. Instead of the comparatively simple forms of the Melanesian grammar we have elaborate expressions built up after the Australian manner by suffixes. Entirely strange features of grammar are found, and there is hardly any agreement between one language and another in vocabulary or constructive particles. The appearance is presented of various linguistic stocks. The tribes speaking these tongues are represented as different in customs, frizzly-haired, and darker than the invaders from across the sea. There seems little doubt but that they are the true aborigines of New Guinea. Unfortunately, the difficulty of understanding the structure of the languages, and their diversity in vocabulary, have militated against the acquisition of accurate knowledge, but quite enough has been ascertained to show their complete separation from the Melanesian both in structure and vocabulary.

Besides these two types—Melanesian and Papuan—there are to be found at the Eastern end of the Possession, in the Louisiade Archipelago, other languages which are remarkably different from the Melanesian languages generally and yet have in many cases Melanesian words and grammatical forms. Though imperfectly known, it seems possible to regard these as languages belonging to originally Papuan stocks, upon which have been grafted in course of time words and idioms from the Melanesian tongue. Their Papuan origin will account for their diversity, and the Melanesian element, which is common to all, will account for partial agreements and show the amount of contact with the island languages. If this supposition be correct we may expect languages of a similar character in the Northern Solomon Islands, and such are indeed found. The languages of Alu (Treasury Island), Buka (Bougainville Island), New Georgia, and Savo show that there are in parts of the Solomon Islands some forms of speech which differ more or less from the typical Melanesian and probably contain some Papuan elements. For these mixed languages is proposed and here used the term *Melano-Papuan*.

... I do not propose to make any remarks this evening upon the customs of the New Guinea races. So far as I have been able to examine the very meagre accounts which we possess of the habits and customs of the people, they appear to confirm the distinctions which, based only upon the language, I have endeavoured to set before you. On some other occasion I hope to bring forward some evidence with regard to customs which will show that the Motu and allied tribes, as well as the Melanesians of South and East Capes, are connected with the island populations, though constant intercourse between Papuans and Melanesians for many generations have no doubt resulted in a partial assimilation.

In conclusion, two other matters may be briefly referred to. One relates to the place whence the Melanesian immigrants into New Guinea originally came, and the other to the direction in which the migrations of the Oceanic and Polynesian races have taken place.

With regard to the place of origin of the Melanesian population of New Guinea, it does not seem possible to ascertain the exact quarter from which it has come. There is at first sight much dissimilarity between the languages west and east, between the Motu and Kerepupu on the one side, and the Suau of South Cape on the other. Though this dissimilarity disappears on closer examination it may be stated that the language of Suau appears very similar to those of San Cristoval in the Solomon Islands, which lies almost due east of South Cape. The Motu and Kerepupu agree more with the languages of the Efate district in the Central New Hebrides.

In reference to the direction of Oceanic migrations the results here set forth are instructive. If the Melanesians, and by inference the Polynesians, were immigrants into the island region the stream of immigration flowed north of New Guinea and not via Terres Straits. Melanesians, like those of the islands, have not occupied the western shores of the Papuan Gulf.

The classification of New Guinea races proposed here may hereafter require modification, especially with regard to the very imperfectly understood Papuan tongues, which may perhaps be found more closely connected with the Australian than is now apparent. Their complicated structure is against the cultivation of any of them as a means of communication with the natives. Their difference, and the limited area they occupy, act in the same direction. The outlook for the student is not promising, as most of the mission work among the tribes is that of native teachers, Polynesians or Melanesians, whose native idioms are so very different to the Papuan, that the translations made by them can hardly be depended upon.

It is doubtful whether any accurate scientific data will be forthcoming unless an investigation is made similar to that undertaken by the British Association in North-West Canada. Science owes much to the labour and care of Sir William MacGregor in obtaining information upon the languages and customs of New Guinea natives, but there is still a large amount of information required. This will necessitate patient and laborious investigation...


---

A30 The Changing Linguistic Picture of New Guinea, 1960

This extract from S. A. Wurm's significant study of the patterns of interrelationships between many New Guinea languages marks a dramatic contrast to Ray's study published nearly seventy years previously. Not only is it based on a far greater range of languages, but it also employs more complex and refined linguistic methods. The evidence used included that provided by the studies of Ray and Schmidt already discussed. It also drew on the later work including that from West New Guinea by Dutch linguists such as Boelaars (see J. H. M. C. Boelaars, *The Linguistic Position of South-West New Guinea, 1950*), Cowan (see
e.g., H. K. J. Cowan, 'De Austronesisch-Papoca'se Taalgrens in de Onderaafdeling Hollandia (Nieuw-Guinea), Tijdschrift 'Nieuw-Guinea', 1952-3, Vol. 13, pp. 133-48, 161-78, 201-6), and Anceaux (see for e.g., J. C. Anceaux, 'Languages of the Bomberai Peninsula, Outline of a Linguistic Map', Nieuw-Guinea Studien, 1958, Vol. 2, pp. 109-20) as well as that provided by Capell, particularly in three of his major surveys: The Linguistic Position of South-Eastern Papua, 1943, 'The Distribution of Languages in the Central Highlands, New Guinea', Oceania, 1948-9, Vol. 19, pp. 104-29, 234-53, 349-77; and A Linguistic Survey of the South-Western Pacific, 1954. To this Wurm added the evidence from his own field work in the Highlands from May 1958 to January 1959. His aim was to determine the exact degree of interrelationship between individual languages and groups of languages. A modified form of lexicostatistics was applied to the material to determine these patterns. The assumption behind this method is that the percentages of cognates in the basic vocabularies of languages compared are believed to be indicative of the exact degree of interrelationships existing between such languages. Those languages which share between 12% and 28% of their basic vocabularies, are said to belong to the same family. Related languages sharing less than 12% of their basic vocabularies are said to belong to the same phylum. If the percentage shared is between 4% and 12% they are said to belong to the same microphylum. Using the relative dating methods provided by glottochronology, Wurm was able to give some sense of the time depth involved in the historical development of these New Guinea languages. The relevance of these methods and assumptions for historical inquiry have already been discussed above. The significance of this study by Wurm is that it has provided a framework and model for bringing some order out of the chaotic multiplicity of New Guinea languages which can give some clues to the history of its settlement.

During his field work in the three Highlands Districts from May 1958 to January 1959, the writer collected considerably extensive and detailed information on paper and tape on almost every language spoken in those three districts. Already in the field it became obvious to him that the suggested interrelationship between the Highlands languages was in fact much closer than originally assumed, and that the group of interrelated languages stretched much further and comprised a much greater number of languages, than had been believed by Capell and also by the writer himself when compiling his Preliminary Report.

After his return from the field, the writer assessed his
materials with a view to arriving at an accurate classification of the Highlands languages, and to determining the exact degree of interrelationship between individual languages and groups of languages encountered and studied. For this purpose, he applied to his materials the method known as lexicostatistics according to which the percentages of cognates in the basic vocabularies of languages compared are believed to be indicative of the exact degree of interrelationship existing between such languages.

The results of this comparative work ... are briefly as follows:

Of the sixty languages spoken in the three Highlands Districts, fifty-two, perhaps even fifty-three, are interrelated. The relationship of five of the fifty-two languages — disregarding the doubtful fifty-third case — to the other interrelated languages is comparatively distant. However, the remaining forty-seven languages are from fairly closely to very closely interrelated, and constitute what in linguistics is referred to as a stock consisting of five families. This stock and the five more distantly related languages referred to above form a microphyllum. The writer has decided to name this microphyllum the East New Guinea Highlands (Micro) Phylum (with 748,000 speakers) and the stock the East New Guinea Highlands Stock (731,000 speakers).

A sketch of the composition of the Stock may be given here:

1. Gadsup-Auyana-Awa-Tairora Family (29,979 speakers, eight languages)
   (a) Gadsup-Oyana Sub-Family (15,227 speakers, three languages with 6,388, 7,938 and 931 speakers)
   (b) Auyana-Ussurufa Sub-Family (5,263 speakers, two languages with 4,414 and 849 speakers)
   (c) Awa Sub-Family (1,185 speakers, one language only)
   (d) Tairora-Binumarien Sub-Family (8,304 speakers, two languages with 8,181 and 123 speakers)

2. Gende-Siane-Gahuku-Kamano-Fore Family (143,969 counted plus 8,400 estimated speakers, fourteen languages)
   (a) Gende-Biyom Sub-Family (approximately 8,400 speakers, two languages with approximately 8,000 and 400 speakers)
   (b) Siane Sub-Family (18,800 speakers, two languages with 15,336 and 4,464 speakers)
   (c) Gahuku-Benabena Sub-Family (34,752 speakers, three languages with 11,390, 11,597 and 11,765 speakers)
   (d) Kamano-Yagaria-Keigana Sub-Family (60,661 speakers, five languages with 31,342, 14,294, 8,443, 2,584 and 3,988 speakers)
   (e) Fore-Gimi Sub-Family (28,756 speakers, two languages with 12,021 and 16,735 speakers)

3. Hagen-Wahgi-Jimi-Chimbu Family (282,000 speakers, thirteen languages)
   (a) Hagen Sub-Family (90,200 speakers, three languages with 71,300, 18,500 and 439 speakers)
   (b) Wahgi Sub-Family (33,900 speakers, one language only)
   (c) Jimi Sub-Family (16,100 speakers, three languages with 3,200, 6,150 and 6,750 speakers)
   (d) Chimbu-Chuave Sub-Family (141,781 speakers, six languages with 60,273, 40,939, 15,608, 19,104, 4,290 and 1,567 speakers)

4. Enga-Huli-Pole-Wiru Family (253,000 speakers, eleven languages)
   (a) Enga-Ipili Sub-Family (112,965 counted plus over 10,500 estimated speakers, three languages with 109,965 plus over 5,000 estimated, 9,000 and approximately 4,500 speakers)
   (b) Huli Sub-Family (54,000 speakers, two languages with 35,900 and 18,100 speakers)
   (c) Mendi-Pole Sub-Family (63,750 speakers, five languages with 33,800, 18,200, 6,046, 3,100 and 2,611 speakers)
   (d) Wiru Sub-Family (11,541 speakers, one language only)

5. Duna Family (approximately 14,000 speakers, one language only)

To give the reader a notion of the degree of interrelationship and the actual differences between languages belonging to different sub-families and families within this Stock, it may be pointed out that lexicostatistics constitutes a method and tool with the help of which, according to its inventors, it may be possible to suggest the approximate length of time which may have elapsed since languages now belonging to different sub-families and families have begun to change along different linguistic lines, i.e. have become linguistically separate. In other words, the percentage of basic vocabulary items shared by two related languages is believed to be indicative of the length of time which has elapsed since the separation of the two languages. The matter is complicated by several factors which may affect the rate of change of basic vocabulary in relation to time, and a very considerable margin of error must be reckoned with, but this method — known as glottochronology — can certainly be useful for establishing relative, rather than absolute, magnitudes of time-depth in linguistic chronology.

The glottochronological assessment of the results arrived at by lexicostatistical comparisons between languages belonging to the Stock has shown that the time which has elapsed since languages belonging to different sub-families within the individual families have separated from each other, may in most instances range between 1,200 and 2,000 years. In view of this approximate time depth, the differences between such languages may be compared to those between Anglo-Saxon and modern English, Gothic and English, and Latin and modern Italian. At the same time, the time depth separating individual languages belonging to the same sub-family may be assumed to range as a rule between 600 and 1,200 years, which makes the differences between these languages comparable to those observed between Middle High German and Modern High German, thirteenth century English and Modern English, and Anglo-Saxon and Modern English. The time span that may be suggested as having elapsed since the separation of languages belonging to different families within the Stock may on the average be between 3,000 and 4,000 years, which makes the differences between such languages comparable in magnitude to those met with when comparing Homeric Greek with modern spoken Greek, Akkadian with modern spoken Arabic, and Middle Egyptian with late Coptic.

Together with the final discovery and establishment of this great group of interrelated languages in the Highlands Districts of Australian New Guinea, other observations were made by the writer that had a profound influence upon the nature of the linguistic picture of New Guinea. In the first place, he found that a number of forms of speech listed by earlier observers as different languages were in fact only dialects of one language. One of the major causes for the
erroneous classification of dialects as separate languages appears to lie in the natives’ attitude in describing forms of speech differing from their own, as ‘different languages’ (i.e. Pidgin—narapela tok ples, or Police Motu—gado idau-idaau) irrespective of the degree of divergence between the forms of speech. When urged to elaborate on exactly how different some particular language referred to by them is from their own, the natives may sometimes admit that the other language is similar enough to their own to enable them to communicate with its speakers without undue difficulty, but such information is not easily forthcoming. As a result, superficial observers may describe dialects as distinct languages in numerous instances.

What has been outlined in the last paragraph may suggest that the number of distinct languages in New Guinea may be smaller than has been believed to be the case. However, it has become quite clear that the very opposite is more likely to be true...

... The recent definite establishment of two large groups of interrelated languages in Australian New Guinea—the speakers of one of them comprising between a third and half of the total population of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea—has induced the writer to attach added importance to the existence of groups of interrelated languages when considering the linguistic picture of the New Guinea area.

The enumeration of the numerically more important groups as now known, or seriously believed, to exist, results in the following list:

1. East New Guinea Highlands Stock (731,000 speakers) as the most important member of the East New Guinea Highlands (Micro) Phylum (748,000 speakers).

2. Maprik Family or Middle Sepik Family (62,163 speakers).

3. The Huon Peninsula Group (over 40,000 speakers), apparently constituting a family or perhaps a stock consisting of about a dozen languages. It could be termed the Käte Family or Käte Stock, as the case may be. It appears likely that this group is distantly related to the East New Guinea Highlands (Micro) Phylum.

4. The Binandere Group (perhaps 25,000 or more speakers) along most of the coast and the hinterland of the Northern District. It constitutes a family consisting of a number of very similar forms of speech of which perhaps five can be regarded as being distinct languages, and it could conveniently be termed the Orokaiva Family, or Binandere-Tsia Family.

5. A group consisting of several of the languages spoken by ‘Kukukuku’ type natives on the Watut River in the Menyamnya area and to the east and west of the latter. The exact extent of this group which has tens of thousands of speakers is still undetermined.

6. The Koita-Koiari Group (thousands of speakers) in the Central District, stretching inland from Port Moresby. It constitutes a family consisting of three closely interrelated languages which could be named the Koita-Koiari Family.

7. The Toaripi Group (over 30,000 speakers) along the coast of the Gulf District to the east of the Purari Delta. This is a family of four closely interrelated languages for which the name Vailala-Orokolo-Toaripi Family or Kerema Family could be suggested.

8. The Kiwai Group (20,000 speakers or more) along the coast of the Western District from Mabuduan eastwards as far as the Era River in the Gulf District, on the near coastal islands and the islands in the Fly Delta, and along the lower courses of the Bamu, Paibuna, Omati, Turama and Kikori Rivers. The Kiwai languages constitute a family of eight very closely interrelated languages—some of which are almost dialects—which could be called the Kiwai Family, or Kiwai-Kerewa Family.

9. The Telefomin Group in the triangle between the Star Mountains, the Victor Emanuel Range and the D’Albertis Junction of the Fly River, and overlapping to the north and into Netherlands New Guinea. The number of speakers of languages belonging to this group may be in the vicinity of 30,000 or more. Whether these languages whose exact number is not yet known constitute a family or a stock still remains to be determined, though the former appears more likely.

10. The Dem-Ndani-Uhunduni Group (about 110,000 speakers) in the highlands of Netherlands New Guinea, stretching to the east of the Carstensz Toppen and the Doorman Top across the Balam Valley almost as far as the Idenburg River. This group appears to constitute a family consisting of at least three languages which could be called the Dem-Ndani-Uhunduni Family. It seems that this family is related to the East New Guinea Highlands (Micro) Phylum. If the assumption of the relationship of both this family and the Käte Family (or Stock) to the East New Guinea Highlands (Micro) Phylum proves to be correct, as is likely to be the case, the existence of a group of interrelated non-Melanesian languages in New Guinea with approximately 900,000 speakers would be established. This figure is more than one-third of the total native population of the entire New Guinea area which is approximately 2,480,500.

11. The Ekagi-Woćané-Moni Group (about 50,000 speakers) in the Wissel Lakes area in the Netherland New Guinea highlands, extending in an easterly direction as far as the Doorman Top and the Carstensz Toppen. This group may well constitute a family consisting of three languages, and could be referred to as the Ekagi-Woćané-Moni Family.

12. The Kamoro-Sempab-Asmat Group (39,000 speakers) on the south coast of Netherlands New Guinea, from Lakahia Bay in the west to beyond the mouth of the Ellenden River in the east, and in the hinterland of this coastal stretch. Boelaars’ findings seem to suggest that this group which appears to constitute a family composed of three languages may be related to the Ekagi-Woćané-Moni Family, and perhaps also to a few other, numerically insignificant, languages in south-western Netherlands New Guinea. If these assumptions can be sustained, then another numerically important group of interrelated non-Melanesian languages with approximately 90,000 speakers would be established.
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Apart from the groups listed, a number of numerically less significant groups of more or less distantly related languages have been found in New Guinea which need not be enumerated here.

It is possible, and even probable, that further major groups of interrelated languages will be found in New Guinea in the course of time, and that some more of the groups listed, or yet to be discovered, will prove to be interrelated.

Finally, mention must be made again here of the Melanesian languages which constitute one of the largest groups of interrelated languages in the New Guinea area. These languages ... are very numerous, and are spoken over wide, chiefly coastal, areas. In Australian New Guinea, they are found along the western half of the coast of the Sepik District, in a few coastal regions and on the eastern coast of the Morobe District, on the coasts of the Milne Bay and Central Districts and on the islands of the latter (with a few minor breaks), on the greater part of New Britain, on most of New Ireland and the Admiralty Islands, and in various coastal areas of Bougainville Island. In Netherlands New Guinea, Melanesian languages are spoken on the coast around Hollandia, and, with a short break, westwards almost as far as the mouth of the Mamberamo River, along most of the coast of the Geelvink Bay and on the islands in that bay, on parts of the north coast of the Vogelkop Peninsula and on the islands situated to the west of it, and finally in parts of the land bridge joining the mainland of Netherlands New Guinea with the Vogelkop Peninsula. The number of speakers of Melanesian languages in the whole New Guinea area can be estimated to be in the vicinity of 300,000. Close to 200,000 of these are in Australian New Guinea.

... The fact that it is becoming possible to combine many of the New Guinea languages into large groups, and to begin to bring some order into the apparently chaotic linguistic situation in New Guinea, makes it possible to make the following assumptions and suggestions:

It seems that a solution to the baffling puzzle of the apparent existence, side by side, of hundreds of unrelated languages in a comparatively small area is gradually moving into the realm of possibility. It appears not unreasonable to regard the presence of large groups of related languages in given areas as the result of migrations with a subsequent numerical and regional expansion of the population speaking the languages forming these groups. As a consequence of such migrations and expansions, the speakers of languages which, as may be presumed, were originally located in the areas nowadays occupied by the large groups, may be assumed to have been pushed back into regions frequently marginal in character and often split up into small fragments of population. This goes some way towards providing an explanation for the existence of the very numerous, and apparently unrelated, languages in some areas. The great number of these languages is still to some extent a puzzle, because if they constitute remnants of former regional languages, it could be assumed in the light of current glottochronological theory that those former regional languages must have been just as numerous as their present-day remnants, if these remnants have no apparent relationship to each other. The rate of change of basic vocabulary is believed to be comparatively constant and uniform in all languages. If a smaller number of regional languages is presumed to have existed in an area, it ought, therefore, to be possible to combine such present-day remnants near to that area into a not too great number of groups of related languages, their members showing approximately the same—or perhaps a somewhat greater—degree of difference as that observed between the most widely aberrant members of the adjacent large language group or groups. Very little work has been done which would be of use to verify or invalidate this theory, but the results of a lexicostatistical comparison of in some instances regionally widely separated, mostly small, languages in northern Netherlands New Guinea by Cowan have shown that those languages are distantly related to each other which may be regarded as encouraging in the light of the statements made above. In general, four points have to be borne in mind with regard to the problem of the apparent radical diversity of the very numerous small languages in New Guinea:

1. It still remains to be shown whether such languages are, in fact, radically different from each other and from languages belonging to large groups, or whether they can be combined into groups consisting of, perhaps very numerous, distantly related members.

2. Languages believed to be remnants of former larger regional languages or language groups may, in many cases, have their origin in aberrant dialects of such former languages, or in aberrant languages belonging to such former language groups. Of such former languages and language groups, dialects and members located in peripheral areas—often country of a marginal nature—may have stood a better chance of survival after the impact of an immigrant large alien language than may have been the case with more centrally situated dialects and languages. The same statement may be made with regard to the chances of the actual physical survival of the speakers of original dialects and languages in the face of the large-scale immigration of speakers of an alien language. If it is therefore assumed that present-day remnant languages originated in widely differing aberrant languages of former language groups, or in aberrant dialects of former languages, then this may explain the existence of a greater diversity between such remnant languages than that observed between the most aberrant members of a present-day large language group.

3. Though the rate of change of basic vocabulary is suggested by glottochronological theory to be fairly uniform in all languages, it is very likely that factors may be operating in very small and geographically isolated speech-communities which increase the rate of change. In such speech-communities word taboos and usages by prominent members of the community obviously have a more far-reaching effect upon the language as a whole than in large speech-communities.

4. A considerable number of mixed languages may be assumed to have come into being as a result of the clash between languages and of the splitting up of languages referred to above, which adds to the confusion of the present-day linguistic picture in the New Guinea area...

A31 Words, Plants and People in the History of Melanesia, 1961

The paper from which this document is taken was one of those read at the Symposium on 'Plants and Migrations of Pacific Peoples', held in Honolulu in 1961. Dr Ann Chowning, an anthropologist who has worked in New Britain and Ferguson Island presents evidence that is basically linguistic, but also botanical, in that it is 'a preliminary attempt to reconstruct Proto-Melanesian plant names'. In so doing she gives some tentative evidence for possible historic connections between Malaysia and Melanesia and illustrates the way in which linguistic study can give some clues to cultural development in this region. The languages used were from the Melanesian sub-group of the Austronesian family. 'Despite the attempt to secure geocultural coverage, it should be noted that the most complete data, were obtained from the Bismarck Archipelago, the Solomons, and Fiji, so that languages from these areas received disproportionate representation...'. The method adopted was to compile lists of vernacular names of clearly identified plants from Melanesian vocabularies. Each list was compared with all the others for names that might be cognates. Then the Proto-Melanesian forms were reconstructed, 'but only if convincing cognates appeared in at least three languages that were widely separated geographically. When two languages from geographically separate areas seemed to share an extraordinarily high proportion of vocabulary, cognates from such languages were counted as a single case.' These tasks were bedevilled by such problems as the great variety in scope and accuracy reflected in the vocabularies and the lack of clear and constant standards in recording the sounds. Aware of these problems, the author seems to have erred on the side of caution. Her difficulties in compiling this word list reflect the problems and dangers of using sources left by earlier generations of those in first contact with Pacific peoples. On the basis of the 37 names making up the list an interesting theory is developed. This linguistic study should be placed into the wider cultural context of the author's recent discussion of the pre-European history of Melanesia. (See A. Chowning, 'The Real Melanesia. An Appraisal of Parsonson's Theories', Mankind, 1968, Vol. 6, pp. 641-52.)

The reconstructions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocos nucifera (coconut)</td>
<td>*nul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colocasia esculenta (taro)</td>
<td>*kule; *moe; *talo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derris sp.</td>
<td>*tawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorea alata (yam)</td>
<td>*huni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrina sp. (coral tree)</td>
<td>*rara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excoecaria sp.</td>
<td>*lantola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inocarpus edulis (Polynesian chestnut)</td>
<td>*kivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laportea gigas (nettles tree)</td>
<td>*talo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangifera indica (mango)</td>
<td>*woi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroxylon rumphi (sago palm)</td>
<td>*hato; *labia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musa sapientum (banana)</td>
<td>*pudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandanus sp.</td>
<td>*mui; *panda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parinariurum (putty nut)</td>
<td>*titia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhizophora sp. (mangrove)</td>
<td>*longe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saccharum edule (pit, pitpit)</td>
<td>*tabukala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saccharum officinarum (sugar cane)</td>
<td>*toru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spondias dulcis (Polynesian plum)</td>
<td>*huri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syzygium malaccense (Malay apple)</td>
<td>*kasika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminalia catappa (Indian almond)</td>
<td>*talisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zingiber sp. (ginger)</td>
<td>*labia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, three names tend to be applied to any of three plants used primarily for decorative or magic-religious purposes. The plants, which may be called the 'croton group', are Codiaeum variegatum, Cordyline fruticosa, and Cynas rumphi, or their close relatives, and the names are *babaka, *dili, and *male.

Among themselves, the reconstructed names occur with varying frequency in the different Melanesian languages. Forms of the word for 'sugar cane,' for example, appear much more often than forms of the words for 'yam,' 'taro,' and 'pandanus.' Partly on the basis of ethnographic evidence, it may be suggested, very tentatively, that names of plants other than the starch staples tend to be stable—that is, to remain the same in related languages—as long as the plant itself is regarded and used in the same way by the speakers of those languages. Thus, the comparative stability of the names of sugar cane, Derris, and putty nut would result from their consistent and virtually exclusive use throughout Melanesia for, respectively, refreshment, fish poison, and canoe caulking. The great variation in the names of bamboo and pandanus, on the other hand, might be ascribed to the differential uses to which these plants are put by different tribes. Often they are given the names of artifacts commonly made from them, as 'pipe' or 'sleeping mat'. A second suggestion is that the starch staple, for any of several reasons connected with its importance to the tribe, is more likely to receive new names than are supplementary foods. Apart from a tendency to distinguish many varieties of such a staple, which might lead to abandonment of an original name or might permit a recorder to miss the generic name, if any, the focusing of garden magic on these plants may involve the creation and use of special names that may displace the original name. These two suggestions lack adequate support partly because my sources rarely specify which were the starch staples. Therefore the actual degree of correlation between dependence on a plant and the stability of its name remains to be investigated.

Finally, it is worth considering the distribution of these names outside Melanesia. Because I was proceeding on what may be the old-fashioned assumption that the Austronesian languages spread into Melanesia from the west, I confined my search for cognates to the Indonesian languages...
The Language of the Mbowamb

Of the 37 names on the list, cognates of 24 or 25 certainly occur in Indonesia. The higher number is correct if we accept Laféber's theory that the word for 'citrus' has undergone metathesis in Melanesia or Indonesia (Laféber, 1914, p. 268). Eighteen of the names appear, in somewhat different form, in Dempwolf's vocabulary of Proto-Austronesian. The words for which I have not found Indonesian cognates are the names for the croton group, *Evodia*, Malay apple, Polynesian chestnut, pit, patty nut, the first name for breadfruit and for pandanus, and the first two names for taro. My search of the Indonesian material has been brief, however, and some of these names may also have Indonesian cognates. In any case, the number of plant names shared by the two areas is large enough to support my basic conclusion.

Theories based on the distribution of plant names have often proceeded on the assumption that the migrants under consideration took the plants with them (but see Guppy, 1887, pp. 291-294, and Merrill, 1954, pp. 251 ff.). Presumably this assumption is true as regards most if not all of the cultigens on the list, for at least some of the migrations. But many of the plants on the list are not cultigens, some are not ordinarily used at all or at most add a little supplementary fruit to the diet, and one, the nettle tree, is poisonous to the touch. It seems highly unlikely that the distribution of this latter group owed anything to human agency. Consequently, the identity of the names over large areas must indicate that, whatever the direction of the migrations, speakers of the Austronesian languages, and particularly of Proto-Melanesian, spread through regions in which the native flora was essentially that of the homeland. Not only were the plants given the same names, but they were often used for the same purposes, even when these required fairly complex treatment. Certainly there is no reason to postulate independent invention in these cases.

The principal conclusion to be drawn from this investigation is that the problem of Pacific migrations cannot be handled adequately without consideration of the total flora of the regions involved. Exclusive concentration on cultigens may lead to the neglect of highly significant data. As regards this study, the material accumulated to date is explicable only in terms of migrations between Melanesia and Malaysia.


A32 The Language of the Mbowamb of Mount Hagen as Evidence of Attitudes to their Environment, 1938

This extract is from the extensive study made of the Mbowamb in 1938 by G. F. Vicedom of the Lutheran Mission and H. Tischner of the Hamburg Museum for Völkerkunde. Their knowledge of the local language enabled them to detect some basic elements in the Mbowamb world-view and value system before alien notions had brought any great modifications to their patterns of thought. This study provides a model of the way in which linguistic investigation can throw light on the attitudes and values of a community as a starting point for an analysis of adaptations to alien ideas. S. A. Wurm in his 'Language and Agriculture in New Guinea', *New Scientist*, 1966, Vol. 31 (506), pp. 216-8, has shown on a broader plane how linguistic study can assist in building up a reconstruction of the historical development and impact of agriculture in Highland societies in the pre-European era.

THE MBOWUA AND HIS LAND

**Man as Centre**

As everything else, the Mbowua's attitude to his land is egocentric. An objective co-existence does not even exist for him where his fellow men are concerned. This fact may be observed from every sentence the native says. Because, like many South Sea languages, this language does not possess any demonstratives in our meaning but only correlatives. By the correlative the person speaking is always placed in a relation to the person addressed, or a third person respectively. Thus there is no absolute reference, but the reference is always related to the person speaking. This fact has been known some time but as far as I know was only clearly demonstrated and proved by G. Pilhöver. Therefore, the correlatives cannot be simply applied to a person. Wu'ai, the man known to me; this; wuan, the man known to you and me, this; wundí, the man known to you and me and a third person; that; wuai, somebody, not known to any of us. It is the same with places, jaa'it, the place here with me, the place only known to me; endi itla, the place there with you; it is known to you and me; mditi, is the place known to the person speaking and a third person, but not the person addressed. Title is the neutral indication of a place, the place is not known to anyone. Mbíla means anywhere, the indeterminable place. The person speaking and acting therefore places himself always in relationship to someone else or another place. Therefore his thought is always ego-based. He places himself always in contradistinction to the others, respectively the place. As with this set of correlatives, it is also, with others because the language is very rich in just these. The starting point of speech and action is therefore always the person speaking. A matter can only be explained from his standpoint. When he speaks and acts he immediately enters into a relationship with someone and stands in opposition to him.

**Geographical Concepts**

As with the correlatives the native also acts towards his environment. This attitude is quite obvious from the geographical names. The language of the Mount Hagen natives is rich in geographical terms which is quite in contrast to
their infrequency in other New Guinea dialects. The whole country is symmetrically divided, just as was man's heart. If in the latter everything is radiating from the considered centre, the soul, the earth is divided geometrically from the standpoint of the centre, the person speaking.

'We live here on earth's navel (centre of the earth)!
On the one side spreads the land to the east (atil)
On the other side it goes to the west (wutl)
On the one side it goes to the south (met)
On the other side it goes to the north (wì)

Thus the division of the earth starts from the person speaking. The person is always the centre of this world. The environment is conceived entirely egocentrically.

... The person speaking stands entirely in the centre of his geographical environment. If someone goes from east to west then he passes the person speaking. If someone comes from east to west, then he only comes as far as the person speaking or the place he knows. If someone goes eastwards, then he goes away from the person speaking and goes to a place known to the speaker. These relations of the person speaking to the points of the compass are used so much that, according to our impression, the correlative are not given their due. The native simply cannot imagine an environment of which he is not the centre. He is, so to speak, interwoven with his environment. It is interesting to note that the Mbowua does not know the relation 'to' and 'from' in its absolute meaning; there does not exist any expression for it. These relations are only capable of being expressed by the verbs 'to go' and 'to come' and the addition of the compass point. Therefore the person speaking is always at the centre of the environment and in opposition to it.

If we ask how the Mbowua arrives at this marked geographical attitude, then we have to point to his concept of his heart or which it is based. It has to be explained psychologically. Outwardly it is determined by the landscape. Standing at Mount Hagen, two directions of the compass immediately impress themselves on our mind. They are the direction of the Waghi Valley, west-east. So these expressions may be used for the points of the compass in the absolute meaning. It is different for south and north. Met means the sloping-down terrain, wì the rising one, so that these terms can only be used for the directions of the compass in a certain connection. Only the fact that the north gives the impression of a rising landscape and the south that of sloping down makes it possible to use these two expressions for these two directions of the compass. But it is necessary to use caution when using them. It is possible to go north and yet have to use the word south, that is if going northwards down a river valley.

Geographical Knowledge

Of course the Mbowamb does not possess much geographical knowledge. Of course he has a good knowledge of the country and the people as far as he needs it for his trade and marriage relations; anything beyond was only known from reports of business friends or legends. Since the arrival of the Europeans the geographical horizon of the natives has become enormously enlarged.

It was known before that the axes with the black blades came from the east, and were manufactured south of the Waghi in the frontier mountains. It was known that the axes with the green stone were manufactured in the foothills of the Bismarck Range at the source of the Jimi. The great swamps of the Waghi Valley with the many aquatic birds were known. The other world was supposed to begin already at the Chimbu. Knowledge existed of the River Dorfer, also of the cannibals and headhunters who lived there. The Pygmies at the river Jimi were known. Good relations existed to the Enja west of Mount Hagen because there were the sources of salt. Of the peoples far to the west it was said that they went completely naked there. If they marry a woman from amongst people who wear clothes then they cut up the net bags of this woman and fashion themselves aprons from them. There were supposed to be many wild dogs there which a later expedition confirmed. South of Mt. Kilower it is said that very crafty people live. They come and invite other people to a feast at which they then eat the guest themselves. The geographical knowledge gathered in the days of migration has been nearly completely forgotten. The migration myths tell above all of cannibals and headhunters, but where these people are to be found is no longer known. There exists the knowledge of a giant lizard (crocodile) in the lower reaches of the river Dorfer and a large bird that attacks people.

As the Mbowamb possess altogether very little theoretical knowledge we must not be surprised if we don’t find a lot of geographical knowledge. But whatever there is, is bound up with man as the centre, man who told his experiences in stones, which were handed on as legends and fairy tales from generation to generation. In these legends the environment is related to man. Man is acting subject. The environment is not inanimate for the Mbowamb but an animated force and therefore he does not possess any theoretical knowledge but only experiences which are expressed in his legends.


A33 Sir William MacGregor Adopts Motu as a Means of Communicating Law and Order to the People of British New Guinea, 1893

Sir William MacGregor, almost five years after assuming the position of Administrator of the Crown Colony of British New Guinea in September 1888, instructed F. E. Lawes to translate selected Native Regulations into the Motu language. He had stated earlier in his report for the year 1893 that he considered that 'a multiplicity of laws and regulations would only confuse and discourage a native race passing from the darkness of savage barbarism into the light of civilisation'. This translation of Key Regulations appears to fit into that pattern of thought. The man he chose for the task of translation was well
Adoption of Motu

suited to the task, since he was fluent in the Motu language. He was the son of the pioneer L. M. S. Missionary W. G. Lawes who had published the first grammar and vocabulary of Motu in 1885 and he played an important role in the native administration of British New Guinea until his death in mysterious circumstances in 1895. MacGregor served as the first Administrator of British New Guinea for ten years until 1898 and was responsible in this time for laying the foundations of native policy on which his successors built. One of the most characteristic features of this was his establishment of the Native Regulations Board by Ordinance No. 9 of 1889. This had as its purpose the making of regulations 'affecting the native population exclusively in respect of certain matters specified in the Ordinance, such as the jurisdiction, powers and procedure of native courts, the observance of native customs and generally on matters bearing on or affecting the welfare of the native population.' At the same time the London Missionary Society adopted Motu as one of its principal means of communicating the message of the gospel to New Guineans. It would seem that this was the first official decision to adopt this language as a means of communicating the law to the people. The genesis of 'Police Motu' as a lingua franca could thus be traced from this point of official recognition. Two decades later Malinowski noted that in Mailu, for instance, 'a kind of "Pidgin-Motu" is now in process of formation. This "Pidgin-Motu" is however a form of the pure Motuan which, though simplified, is by no means distorted. It is infinitely better adapted to the natives’ forms of thinking, and infinitely more expressive for him and for the investigator, than that dreadful mixture called "Pidgin English". Moreover, in Mailu absolutely no one spoke the latter, whereas practically all men under forty, and some of the elderly men, spoke Motu, some of them even excellently.'

An important task connected with Native Regulations was undertaken by Mr Lawes, Secretary for Native Affairs, who translated the Penal Regulations into the Motu language, the best and most widely understood of all the native dialects. The first ten Regulations prescribe the procedure to be followed in the Native Courts, and their translation is unnecessary. Those translated by Mr Lawes deal with —

| Stealing | No. XI of 1890 |
| Injuries to persons | No. XII of 1890 |
| Burial of the dead | No. XIII of 1890 |
| Lying reports and threats | No. II of 1891 |

It is not necessary, as above stated, to translate the first ten into the native languages, as they are principally for the guidance of the magistrate; but it is of very great importance that the Penal Regulations should be translated, so that the natives can be made to understand what things are forbidden by Regulation.

Probably all teachers of the London Missionary Society can read and explain these Regulations in the Motu language; certainly all save one or two of the Government officers, and many settlers, can do so while a certain number of natives can read them...

AHEGANI HEREVANA NO. 1 of 1892.

HANUA IDAGAHUNA TAUDIA.

1 Gavana tau namona ta baie dibua, ia sibona baine kowalaia, unai tau hanua idagahuna tauna baine halano.
2. Idagahuna tauna ta Gavana ida taravatu e karaia guna, ia Gavana ena ahegani herevana iboudia bae badinadina.
3. Gavana dana idagahuna taudia dahuadia baine henidia mai davaida ida.
4. Tau ta ikouataona kara baine karaia, idagahuna tauna ta baie hakawa loa, ahemoaro taua varaina at.
5. Ikouataona kara ikarana tauna baine kowadede, idagahuna tauna baine daviun ahemoaro taua varaina at.
8. Kana dika taua baine dagudage, kana nomo taua i bazui i bazui i bazui idagahuna taudia bae kahadua bae bame.

1 The Administrator may appoint any good man to be a Village Constable.
2 When any man is appointed Village Constable he must promise the Administrator that he will be true to the Government.
3 A Village Constable will receive a Village Constable’s uniform, and such payment as the Administrator may direct.
4 When a native commits a forbidden act, the Village Constable will ask him to go before a Magistrate.
5 If the native refuses to go to the Magistrate, the Village Constable will arrest him and take him to the Magistrate.
6 A Village Constable must not take a native before a Magistrate unless he believes that the native has committed a forbidden act.
7 The Village Constable is a servant of the Government.
8 If the Village Constable requires help to arrest a person for a forbidden act, all good men are to help the Village Constable.
9 The Village Constable will listen to and obey the Magistrate.

Source: Annual Report of British New Guinea, 1892-3, Brisbane, 1894, p. vii, p. 122

1 British New Guinea Annual Report 1889-90, pp. 5-6
2 B. Malinowski, The Natives of Mailu, pp. 500-01