A PRELIMINARY SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND LINGUISTIC SURVEY OF MANUS PROVINCE, PAPUA NEW GUINEA

STEPHEN AND JANICE SCHOOLING

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 SURVEY

The survey of Manus Province described here took place from January 3rd until February 24th 1980, under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (PNG Branch), in cooperation with the Bible Translation Association of Papua New Guinea.[1]

The survey was divided into five stages:

1. Visiting government and church/mission leaders, and planning an itinerary.

2. Surveying the languages spoken on Los Negros, the eastern island adjacent to the main island.

3. A survey trip along the south coast, visiting Lowaia, Mbunai, Londru and Patu.

4. A survey trip along the north coast visiting Lessau, Bundralis, and Liap.

5. A survey of the language spoken in the vicinity of Lorengau. People from the more distant islands, who work in Lorengau were also interviewed.

1.2 THE ADMIRALTIES[2]

The Admiralty Islands, of which Manus is the principal island, are situated to the North of the Papuan mainland, at 2° longitude and at 146°-148° latitude.

Manus, the main island, consists mainly of lowland hill forest, as do most of the surrounding islands. To the extreme west and south, as well as in some other areas, there are mangrove swamps, while around Lorengau, the provincial centre, there is some grassland. In the north-east and south-east there are pockets of tree and palm swamp woodland. Mount Dremsel is the peak summit (718 metres) and from East to West the topographical profile consists of raised coral reefs, hills, low mountains, polygonal karst formations, then low mountains and hills again.

The geology consists of marine sediments (some volcanically derived) and some lavas and swamp deposits. Lou is a thermal area and Tuluman has recorded eruptions: both locations are near Baluan Island, south-east of the main island.

Rainfall, as recorded at Momote, averages 300-400mm per year, with peak months in March, June, July and December. Temperatures average 27°C, with May, October, and November the hottest, with a maximum of 30°C.

The people are most densely settled on Baluan Island (20-40 persons per square kilometre), and least in the Western parts of Manus Island (5-10 per square kilometre); elsewhere the rural population is 10-20 persons per square kilometre.

Lorengau is the province headquarters, as well as the agricultural centre, with a population of nearly 3,000. The workforce is fairly evenly spread over the following categories: primary production, manufacturing, building and construction, transport and communication, community and business services, and government.

Malaria in the area is hyperendemic, with 50-75% of the adults contributing to the spleen rate. There is an administration hospital in Lorengau and other health facilities in Lugos, Baluan, Momote, Bundralis, Patu and Lessau.

Local Government Councils were formed between 1950-1955, among the first on record in Papua New Guinea. There is a provincial office with supreme court, provincial court, as well as the local courts.

The main staples are taro and sago, supplemented by hunting and fishing. The main cash crop is coconuts (copra), although central marketing is an important avenue of exchange. In Lorengau there is an association of cooperatives and trade stores and other cooperatives are scattered throughout the Province.

There are over 20 government primary schools and over 30 mission ones. The missions in the Province are the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, the Evangelical Church of Manus (Liebenzell mission) and the Seventh Day Adventist. In addition to the Primary Schools there are two High Schools and four Technical Colleges.

1.3   THE AIMS

There were several broad sociolinguistic aims of the survey:

1. To ascertain the attitudes of the people of Manus to English, Pidgin and the vernaculars.

2. To ascertain the current usage of the different languages, with a view to predicting trends in their future use.

3. To note social trends which may affect the usage of the various languages.

The purpose of this investigation was to ascertain whether a linguistic program, culminating in the development of written literature for some, or all, of the Manus vernaculars, would be a viable project; and whether it would meet felt needs which could not be satisfied in any other way.

In order to satisfy the sociolinguistic aims, several linguistic goals were also determined:

1. An evaluation of the synthesised material presented in Alan Healey (1976), but not particularly to take issue with the groupings of languages into families proposed by earlier linguists. Rather, it

was our concern to identify the relationships between the languages as they are today. This would allow us to establish those languages which appear closely related and therefore form a suitable group for simultaneous development projects, contrasted with those languages which are different enough to require a totally separate analysis and development.[3]

2. To present the broad linguistic characteristics of the indigenous languages of Manus.

3. To compile a directory of villages and languages.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

A basic sociolinguistics checklist was compiled by Dr Franklin to outline the type and range of information which was required. It was intended that this questionnaire should be tested, adapted, and commented on, so that it could be improved and standardised for further use. As far as was possible, the information elicited by means of the questionnaire was checked and elucidated by observation (see Appendix A).

The primary linguistics tool used was the SIL Standard Wordlist, which consists of 190 lexical and grammatical items. An attempt was then made to synthesise the data and make some general statements regarding the relationships and characteristics of the languages found on Manus.

2. SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Particularly in the rural areas, the vernacular language is still the first language learned by all the children, and is constantly used in a wide variety of situations.

Pidgin is known and used by the vast majority of the population, and there is also considerable borrowing of Pidgin into the vernaculars. Nonetheless, there is no evidence for the wholesale abandonment of the vernaculars in favour of Pidgin. In general, Pidgin was felt to be inadequate for expressing complex ideas or fine shades of meaning.

There is little doubt that the vernaculars are changing due to the influence of Pidgin and English, but as long as the rural areas maintain viable and vigorous communities, it is highly probable that they will also retain a distinct vernacular language.

2.1 LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDES (ENGLISH AND PIDGIN)

High School students and graduates can speak English reasonably well, but only those who go on to tertiary education and/or work outside Manus speak it truly fluently.

However, if they stay in, or return to Manus, where they have little opportunity to use it, their ability tends to decline in proportion to the length of time away from the English speaking area.

English has a certain prestige, and there is pressure on children to learn it if they can, for people realise it is an essential pre-requisite for higher education and lucrative employment.

Pidgin is spoken by almost everybody over the age of eight years. It is gradually picked up by children as they move beyond the confines of their home and village and as they mix with children from other areas at school. Ability in Pidgin is related to social mobility and the degree of contact with people of other language groups, as well as expatriates.

Pidgin is generally associated with any situation or event which is connected with Western culture: hospital, government, business, shops and the judiciary (especially the District Courts). In mixed communities such as Lorengau and Mission Stations one would also expect to hear more Pidgin.

However, it should be noted that Pidgin is not exclusively heard in the above situations. When people get together informally to talk, wherever they are, vernacular languages are heard at least as often, if not more often, than Pidgin.

Pidgin does not have any particular prestige; people have a pragmatic attitude towards it, viewing it as a language which is very useful for communicating with people from a different area, but which otherwise has very little inherent value. Although they expressed it in different ways, people were unanimous in voicing the opinion that Pidgin was not adequate for every conceivable linguistic context. They felt, in particular, that it was not adequate for problem solving, involved discussion, expressing abstract or otherwise complex ideas, etc. They felt that it was not a real language which belonged to a particular place, and that they could not speak it very well (although to our ears, they could). Others, like pastors, teachers and magistrates, were more lucid in noting the inadequacy of Pidgin for handling complex subjects.

When people sense that Pidgin is inadequate they tend to switch back and forth to English. On a number of occasions, in mixed company, where someone was addressing an audience in Pidgin, we noted a large number of English words, phrases, and even whole sentences, incorporated directly into the Pidgin discourse. The implication of this is that as Pidgin continues to develop, it will become more and more like English, and less and less like the vernaculars. This means that Pidgin will become increasingly incomprehensible and decreasingly useful to people from rural areas. Educated people felt that this was already happening, and that many people do not understand Pidgin as well as they might appear, or pretend to.

Many people expressed the opinion that Pidgin would soon replace the vernacular languages (although linguistically this is debatable). However, they viewed this prospect with distaste, and would be very happy to see this trend reversed.

2.2 LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDES (VERNACULARS)

The vernacular is definitely the mother tongue of children growing up in Manus today, except possibly for Lorengau and other mixed community situations.

Learning of the vernacular first is the expected norm, and people of all ages hoped that it would continue. Those who return to Manus after a period away, are expected to, and do, revert very quickly to the vernacular. Those who marry into another community, learn the new language as a matter of course.

It is naturally used in the context of any village or traditional activity. It is also widely used in market and town situations. This is because 'wantoks' tend to converge wherever they are, but also because passive bilingualism is a major feature of the linguistic situation in Manus. The vernacular is also used as a bridge between the village situation and a foreign idea or project. For example, on nearly every occasion, the purpose of our visits to the various villages, was explained and discussed in the vernacular. In their opinion, the vernacular does not need explaining, as it is immediately understood, but that is not the case for Pidgin.

On the whole people do not approve of the influx of Pidgin words into the vernacular, although they feel this is inevitable. In any case they feel strongly that they would like to preserve their local language if this is at all possible.

2.3 LANGUAGE USE IN FORMAL CONTEXTS

In government affairs Pidgin is used primarily with a lot of English intermingled.

The official language of the judiciary is Pidgin, but the vernaculars are often used by the village magistrates. The magistrate from Loniu uses the vernacular as a matter of policy. In his opinion, when people are upset, and have a problem which needs to be straightened out, then they need to express themselves in the vernacular; Pidgin is not adequate for expressing all the nuances of emotion and explaining all the factors involved.

English is the primary language of education, even in the Primary Schools, but vernacular can also be heard in the playground. When the school system started, Pidgin and vernacular were officially proscribed in and around the schools. Today this policy has been abandoned and there is an increasing interest in teaching children things about their own culture.

When mission work first started both the Manus Evangelical Mission (Liebenzell) and the Catholic Mission made an effort to use the local languages. The MEM adopted one language (Lele, also known as Tingo or Sabon) as the official mission language for use in school and church. They also produced a New Testament and a songbook in this language. However, if people from another language group wanted education or to be involved in the church they had to learn this language. Individual Catholic priests made an effort to use the language of the area where their mission station was situated and subsequently translated prayers and songs. Since the rise of Pidgin this policy has been abandoned in favour of Pidgin.

The official language of the Seventh Day Adventist Church is English, but apparently Pidgin and even sometimes the vernacular are also used.

2.4 LANGUAGE CHANGE

Almost everyone who was interviewed had the impression that their language was changing due to the influx of Pidgin words. In fact, the impression was so strong, that, in their opinion, their language would die out within ten years. Despite that, we formed the opinion that, although the languages almost certainly are changing, it is highly unlikely that the vernacular languages will completely disappear while people are still living and working in the rural areas. The reasons for this are as follows:

1. *Pidgin is inadequate.* People are aware of this and to compensate they borrow from English. This means that those who drop out of school at Standard Six and spend most of their time in a village situation, Pidgin will increasingly become as difficult to master as English. Furthermore, in Manus in particular, where passive bilingualism is so prevalent, it is possible to manage very well on very limited Pidgin. As a consequence it seems likely that the village people, in particular, will continue to depend heavily on their vernacular and will not switch entirely to Pidgin.

2. *Borrowing does not necessarily lead to uniformity.* Although all the vernaculars probably have borrowed from Pidgin, they almost certainly have not and are not doing so in a uniform manner, both

in terms of the actual items borrowed and in terms of the phonetic adaptations which may or may not take place. While people continue living in separate communities in relative isolation, it seems likely that the differences between the languages will be retained.

Borrowing and interaction between languages has always been a feature of the situation in Manus, but this has not led to uniformity. There are similarities between all the languages but the differences are still so great that people normally cannot understand another language the first time they hear it. Intelligibility comes through regular contact with the other language. The introduction of Pidgin is merely another stage in this process of change and is not necessarily the herald of the demise of the vernacular languages.

2.5 PASSIVE BILINGUALISM

This term refers to a situation where people from one language group can understand the speech of another language group, but cannot necessarily speak it and vice versa. In this way they can communicate by each speaking their own language. In the vast majority of cases, the languages are not sufficiently similar for an immediate understanding of a new language. Rather, this skill is acquired through contact with people from another language group. Historically, geographical proximity and trading alliances would have been contexts in which another language would have been learned. More recently, men such as pastors or teachers who travelled around a lot acquired a knowledge of a large number of languages. The people of Manus seem to have a very pragmatic attitude towards language. They are not isolationists who keep jealously to their own linguistic territory; instead they seem to have a very fluid concept of language boundaries. Consequently whenever people from different language groups meet, it is considered quite natural to learn some of the other language and even incorporate it into their own speech. Whenever a person goes to live in another community for any length of time (e.g. because of marriage), that person's facility with the new language would soon quite naturally extend from understanding to speaking.

It would be reasonable to assume that the introduction of Pidgin would have decreased the need for passive bilingualism, but in fact, it appears that the process has merely been extended to embrace Pidgin (and English) and has not been replaced. Today passive bilingualism is still widely used, even by young people. In the towns one hears it at least as much as Pidgin, if not more; and in the rural areas, people always use passive bilingualism, unless they are truly a long way from home.

It should also be noted that there has been a marked increase in mobility in recent years. There are more roads and Public Motor Vehicles, more and faster boats, fighting has ceased, and there are many incentives for regularly visiting Lorengau. This means that there is more contact with other language groups and thus more passive bilingualism. These factors alone should ensure that passive bilingualism will at least hold its own against Pidgin, even if it does not increase.

2.6 LANGUAGE LEARNING PATTERNS

We noted several different language learning patterns which would apply to children born of parents from Manus:

1. Parents from different language groups living in Lorengau or (particularly) living elsewhere in PNG probably communicate mainly in Pidgin.

Children will therefore probably learn Pidgin first. If for any reason the children go back to the village, either for visits, or to stay for longer periods with grandparents etc., they are expected to learn at least some of the vernacular.

2. Parents from the same language group living in town situation will probably communicate in the vernacular in the home and children will learn this first. However, they will tend to pick up Pidgin more quickly and more thoroughly due to the need to use it outside the home.

3. Parents from different language groups who live in rural areas (normally the wife would go to the husband's village) will communicate by passive bilingualism and some Pidgin, especially if the language groups are not very close.

Children will tend to learn the mother's language first, but will very soon become fluent in the language of the village they are living in. This will be especially true as the mother becomes more fluent in the father's language.

4. Parents from the same language group living in their own community will definitely communicate in the vernacular and the children will grow up speaking it. They will pick up Pidgin much later as soon as they begin to have contact with people outside the community, for example, at school.

On the whole it seems that attitudes to language learning are very pragmatic. It is certainly considered normal to learn the language of the area where one lives as well as the language of ones parents, but nonetheless people will always use the language which is the easiest and most natural in any given situation. In thoroughly mixed communities, especially outside of Manus, this will almost inevitably be Pidgin.

Nonetheless, parents still have sufficient pride in their mother tongue that they would like their children to learn it, if at all possible, and they regret their own declining ability to use and fully control their use of their vernacular language.

2.7 SOCIAL MOBILITY

Due to the influence of the missions and the Paliau Movement, education came early to Manus, and today every village has access to a Primary School and there is a government High School (up to grade 10) at Lorengau, as well as a Catholic Mission High School at Papitalai. It seems that many of the Manus people had the aptitude and the ability to adapt to Western education and culture. In addition, the older people were quick to see the advantage of having children who could get jobs and send money home. Consequently, in the last 20 years large numbers of young people have left home to work elsewhere in PNG, and many of them have risen to positions of importance and influence.

It would be very interesting to compare census figures over the last 20 years to see what specific influence this migration has had on the population of Manus. The impression we gained on our visit, is that the population is probably holding its own, neither increasing nor decreasing. The evidence which supports this is as follows:

1. Although children are encouraged to do well at school and migrate to the mainland, the parents still see to it that one or two (often a boy and a girl) stay at home. This emerged as a regular pattern in our study. In addition, only a small percentage can go on to High School. Although some with a Standard Six education are able to get employment, it still means that a fairly large proportion of each age group have no alternative but to remain in the village.

2. Those who migrate often return. This is because there is often social pressure to marry back into the home community. In addition parents, as they get older or sick, need children at home to look after them; they need girls to look after the gardens, boys to run businesses (copra etc.) to take over kin responsibilities, to inherit the family land and continue the family line.

People also often return to look after a sibling's family if there has been bereavement. In cases of divorce, separation or bereavement, migrants (women especially or their children) will often return to the home community.

Even when people qualify in their particular profession, many voluntarily obtain posts back in Manus. The majority of government officials, teachers, and hospital staff, whom we met, were originally from Manus. Some people speak too, of retiring back to their villages, and in preparation, have even started building very comfortable homes there.

The present generation of Manus people are true social pioneers: they somehow have to harmonise the traditional culture of their parents, and the new Western culture which they have learned to adjust to. However, we detected a strong determination to do what was possible to retain both the traditions and the language of their ancestors. No doubt changes will come, but it seems likely that the people will seek a solution in terms of combination and compromise, rather than in the total abandonment of the traditional culture and language.

2.8 ATTITUDES TO LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Everyone we spoke to was in favour of language development work being done in the vernacular languages. The reasons are as follows:

1. A fear that the languages will die out if they are not written down.

2. There are many stories, traditions and skills which are worth preserving.

3. People in rural areas prefer to use the vernacular. For example, boys would prefer to have a handbook for an outboard motor written in the vernacular, rather than in Pidgin.

4. Pidgin is not adequate or fully understood by all.

5. Those who leave Manus would use books to maintain knowledge of the vernacular.

6. Christians would like to have Scriptures in the vernacular.

3. LINGUISTIC OBSERVATIONS

The purpose in collecting linguistic data was to obtain a general overview of the linguistic situation in Manus, using Healey (1976) as a starting point. There was neither the time nor the opportunity to go into too great detail. However, an attempt was made to verify the information presented by Healey and to isolate the areas of difficulty which require further investigation. The groupings which we have proposed were made on the basis of the opinions of the local inhabitants, and supported by an inspection of the wordlists which we collected.

3.1 HISTORICAL AND CONTACT FACTORS

The complexity of the linguistic situation on Manus militates against a straightforward categorisation of the various languages into families. This is probably due to the influence of two distinct factors, which we have called the 'historical' and 'contact' factors.

Historically, it is probable that most, if not all, of the languages derive from the same source. In some cases the historical connection can still be remembered, for example the island of Bipi was colonised by migrants from Loniu, and the two languages still have a relatively high cognate percentage. More recently, Bowat 2 (Koro) was settled by other people from Los Negros, probably Papitalai, and these two languages are 83% cognate. As would be expected, geographic isolation has led to the divergence of what was originally one language.

However, this process has been made more complex by convergence due to contact in the intervening period between the time of the migration of the original settlers and today. Taking the above example again: Bipi has far more in common with its neighbour Lindrou (36% cognate), than the two widely separated groups Loniu and Lindrou (only 21% cognate). This suggests that despite the difference that there probably was when Bipi was first settled, the two languages have since been converging due to geographical proximity and trading links.

A similar observation can be made for the languages of Levei-Tulu, Pohuai and Mondropolon. Historically the dialects of Levei-Tulu as spoken at Pujou in the south and at Tulu in the north are reputed to have been members of a single language. However, since the dispersion of the original speakers of this language, these two dialects have diverged to the extent that they are now only 36% cognate. By contrast, along the north coast there has been convergence between neighbouring languages such that Tulu is now 65% cognate with Pohuai and 54% cognate with Mondropolon.

Contact, or lack of it, is probably the factor which has made the difference. On the north coast, the settlements are closer together, there is relatively good access by land, and there is constant movement by canoe. This has made possible regular interaction between the speakers of these three languages, which in turn has promoted or maintained a relatively high level of linguistic similarity between the languages. On the south coast, however, there are much fewer people and Pujou in particular is almost completely cut off from its nearest neighbours by mountains, mangrove swamps and large river systems. This lack of contact with other speakers of the same original language, as well as speakers of other languages has undoubtedly contributed to its linguistic distinctiveness. Conversely, in other parts of the south coast where there has been contact between speakers of different languages, there has been convergence as in the case of the village of Loi. Originally the people of this village spoke Bohuai, but when the village was relocated in the Ere area, the people began to learn and speak Ere.

It appears then, that we are faced with an example of language chaining, especially on the north coast. That is, the present day linguistic relationships of the Manus languages are not just due to the straightforward process of natural divergence due to the passage of time, but in addition, where language communities have been in regular contact, closer relationships between their languages have been maintained or re-built.

	Lindrou	Tingo	Ndrano	Kurti	Titan	Nali	Loniu	Lou	Baluan	Pak	Penchal 1	Penchal 2	Leipon	Mokerang	Lenkau	Bipi/Sisi	Ere	Kele	Koro (Bowat)	Koro (Papitalai)	Mondropolon	L-Tulu (Pujou)	Pohuai	Ponam	L-Tulu (North)	Nauna
Lindrou	Lindrou																									
Tingo (Lele N)	24	Tingo																								
Ndrano (Lele S)	27	77	Ndrano																							
Kurti	24	38	39	Kurti																						
Titan	17	27	28	24	Titan																					
Nali	26	64	73	30	25	Nali																				
Loniu	21	44	38	27	21	32	Loniu																			
Lou	12	19	18	17	18	17	16	Lou																		
Baluan	12	16	15	14	14	14	15	59	Baluan																	
Pak	17	23	22	17	20	19	27	32	27	Pak																
Penchal 1	15	15	14	11	14	12	15	26	25	22	Penchal 1															
Penchal 2	10	15	11	8	14	9	12	23	25	20	81	Penchal 2														
Leipon	22	49	43	33	23	32	48	18	16	25	17	15	Leipon													
Mokerang	20	47	41	28	26	33	63	18	18	32	19	15	50	Mokerang												
Lenkau	13	22	19	14	18	18	16	51	50	33	33	28	19	18	Lenkau											
Bipi/Sisi	36	22	24	25	19	20	31	16	13	22	13	10	29	34	14	Bipi/Sisi										
Ere	28	36	38	28	22	30	25	13	9	16	13	9	27	27	11	25	Ere									
Kele	20	40	42	52	21	34	30	17	13	16	13	10	35	31	13	27	66	Kele								
Koro (Bowat)	26	62	56	37	31	51	39	23	17	24	16	13	44	47	22	21	35	37	Koro (Bowat)							
Koro (Papitalai)	27	60	56	38	33	47	45	21	17	26	18	14	48	55	20	23	34	40	83	Koro (Papitalai)						
Mondropolon	31	18	18	24	16	19	17	15	12	16	14	11	18	20	13	19	20	21	20	21	Mondropolon					
L-Tulu (Pujou)	31	16	16	17	10	14	15	7	7	13	8	5	13	14	11	18	20	19	14	15	33	L-Tulu (Pujou)				
Pohuai	25	12	11	17	15	14	15	10	8	12	9	6	15	16	9	16	18	19	15	17	47	38	Pohuai			
Ponam	26	24	23	28	19	20	24	13	13	19	11	9	22	27	13	23	24	22	24	24	29	22	19	Ponam		
L-Tulu (North)	25	12	11	18	12	13	14	11	9	13	10	9	15	16	9	15	17	17	15	15	54	36	65	21	L-Tulu (North)	
Nauna	10	19	19	13	10	13	16	25	18	23	39	35	17	19	21	13	14	14	20	23	11	6	8	10	11	Nauna

CHART 1: MANUS PROVINCE LEXICOSTATISTICS (EXCLUDING WESTERN ISLANDS)

3.2 CHARTS AND DIAGRAMS

The cognate percentages displayed in Chart 1 are based on a phonetic comparison of 100 words extracted from standard SIL wordlists. Two sets of data were obtained for Lele, Levei-Tulu, Koro and Penchal in order to give some indication of the variation that is possible within one language due to geographic distance, word taboo and individual idiolects.

The purpose of this stage of investigation is only to give a general impression of the linguistic relationships between the languages represented. It is recognised that more detailed phonological analysis and comparison still needs to be done in order to obtain a more definitive understanding of the complexities of the relationships that exist between the languages of Manus.

3.3 FURTHER COMMENTS

The notes which follow include comments on Healey's analysis, and on areas requiring further investigation:

1. Okro, Nane, and E.
   We visited the relevant areas but found no trace of these languages which are cited by Healey.

   Okro: The people of Warembu speak Lele, and *okero* is Lele for 'this is it', or 'that's all'.

   Nane: The people in Loi formerly spoke Bohuai and now speak Ere: the people in Patu area speak Bohuai and Lala does not appear to exist. *Nane* is a word in the Bohuai language used in the context of meeting for a discussion.

   E: The people of Peli Island have moved to Pelipohuai and speak Bohuai.

2. Likum.
   It appears that Likum (otherwise known as Malai).a distinct language. However, we were informed that most people of Likum now speak Lindrou. Likum is reported to be very different from other Manus languages.

3. Levei-Tulu.
   Due to rough weather, we were not able to visit this area, although we did obtain wordlists from Tulu and Pujou. From the information we have, this seems to be quite a complex area and needs further investigation. Originally these people were isolated and lived inland, probably speaking a single language. At some time in the early colonial period, they moved to the coast, some going to the north and some to the south. The resulting geographic isolation, and proximity to different languages (Pujou to Likum/Lindrou, Levei to Sori, and Tulu to Bohuai and Mondropolon) has stimulated a rapid process of linguistic divergence. This language is also known as Keli.

   In addition, our Tulu assistant felt that the people of Drehet spoke a language which was different from both Levei and Tulu, but we had no opportunity to verify this.

4. The Islands.
   Healey assigns the northern group of islands (Leipon, Andra, Ponam etc.) to one family, and languages in the south eastern group (Lou/Baluan, Penchal, Lenkau etc.) to another. Historically it may well be that they have a close relationship but it does not appear to be particularly striking according to our figures. Lou and Pam/Baluan which Healey treats as one language, are only 59% cognate; and Penchal and Lenkau, which are geographically adjacent,

are only 30% cognate. In addition the island languages often have as much in common with neighbouring languages on the mainland as they do with neighbouring island languages. This is not surprising, seeing that the traditional trading links (which still continue today) were between the islands and the mainland, rather than between the islands themselves.

5. Titan
   We were told that Titan was the original language of Manus, from which all the other languages were derived. Be that as it may, at the present time Titan has no clearcut or close relationship with any other language. Its closest relationship is with Nali (25% cognate) and Papitalai (33% cognate). The people who speak Titan are sea-going people and have settled in many widely spread areas along the coast and on the islands in the south-east part of Manus. It would be reasonable to assume, therefore, that there will be several dialectal differences within the main grouping called Titan. This would need to be investigated further.

6. Kurti and Elu
   According to our information, Elu is spoken in the vicinity of Lowa and is closely related to Kurti. This differs from Healey who links Elu with Lele, even though he assigns Lowa to the Kurti area. This needs further investigation.

7. Koro and Lele
   The language spoken in the vicinity of Bowat 2 (nambis) should be differentiated from Lele. It is known as Koro, as is the language spoken at Papitalai. Our data shows that these two languages are, in fact, quite closely related (83% cognate), whereas Koro and Lele are only 62% cognate. This is substantiated by the fact that Bowat 2 was settled by migrants from Los Negros. (Our informant, who comes from Loniu, actually said that the migrants left from Loniu, but they may just as well have gone from Papitalai.)

   Within Lele itself, there are still dialectal differences; for example, the Lele spoken at Warembei is not exactly the same as that spoken at Tingo.

8. Kaniet and Hermit
   It is reported that the Kaniet Islands are no longer inhabited and that the Kaniet language is extinct. Hermit is reportedly spoken by some older people on Luf Island in the Hermit Group but the younger generation speaks Seimat.

9. Intelligibility
   As far as a language development program is concerned, mutual intelligibility between different languages is a factor of crucial importance, which needs to be taken into account. It should be noted that the sets of relationships which we have proposed are based on fairly superficial cognate counts, coupled with the subjective impressions of the local inhabitants. It would be extremely useful, therefore, to actually test intelligibility in one or more areas of Manus and see how the scores correlate with the figures presented in this report.

3.4 BRIEF GRAMMATICAL NOTES

Needless to say, this is not a comprehensive and definitive study of this subject. The purpose of this section is to provide an indication of the general characteristics of the Manus languages, which can serve as a basis for further studies.

1. Characteristic consonants:

p	t		k	ʔ
mb	nd			
m	n			
	s			h
		tʃdʒ		
	l			
	r			
w		j		

2. Unusual consonants:
   Ponam has *[f]* although this could be an allophone of */P/*.
   Bipi has *[X]*, a voiceless uvular fricative.
   Lou and Baluan have *[B]*, a voiced bilabial fricative.

3. Notes on the consonants.
   The most notable characteristic is that there appears to be no contrast between voiced and voiceless stops. The phonetic description of the stops on the majority of occasions would be 'voiceless unaspirated'. However, because there is no contrast, there is a tendency towards free variation. In Lindrou, for example, the stops are consistently voiced, but there is still no voiced/voiceless contrast. In other languages, medial stops are also produced with slight voicing. Some of the earlier linguists, (e.g. Smythe) and the translator of the Lele N.T., indicated that the stops were voiced, viz: *b, d, g.*

4. Characteristic vowels

i		u
e	a	o

   Note that */e/* is the half-open variety of front spread vowels and that */o/* is the half-open variety of rounded back vowels.

5. Unusual vowels
   Penchal has both an */ɨ/*, a mid, close, spread vowel, and an */ø/*, a front, half-close, rounded vowel, in addition to the other vowels.

6. Notes on the vowels
   Note that:
   1. Some of the languages have length, for example Kurti and Mondropolon.
   2. Some languages have voiceless vowels, for example Pak.
   3. Some languages have diphthongs.

APPENDIX A.

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC QUESTIONNAIRE

It would certainly be useful to have a pre-prepared printed questionnaire available for this kind of survey work. It is much easier to handle from a researcher's point of view, and it would ensure that the same questions are consistently put to all the interviewees.

The aim of the survey reported above was to identify trends in language usage and attitudes to language; no attempt was made to quantify the various responses, or to identify the factors which had the most effect on the linguistic situation. Before a definitive questionnaire is drawn up, a decision would have to be made regarding how much detail is required in terms of data and analysis of the data. If more detail is required, the relevant chapters in Loving and Simons (1977) should be taken into account.

On the basis of our experience in using this Preliminary Sociolinguistic Information Checklist, we would make the following recommendations:

1. Divide the questionnaire into two distinct sections:

    (a) Questions regarding the whole language group or region, which need only be asked once. This would cover topics like: marriage/trade relationships, migration patterns, language name(s), village names, use of language in church, market, school, courts etc. It would, of course, be wise to double check this information with more than one informant, but there would be no need to write it out half a dozen times. This section could also be used with groups of people, thereby obtaining a consensus.

    (b) Questions which need to be put to each individual interviewee. This would cover topics like: mother tongue, bilingualism, language of parents, language used in home, place of birth, place(s) of residence, education, language use and occupation of siblings or children, attitude to different languages, attitude to literacy/translation in vernacular.

2. Take pains not to influence the informants' response to the various questions:

    (a) Avoid Yes/No questions where possible, for example, use 'Which language is used in church services?', Not 'Does the pastor use Pidgin in church services?'

    (b) Offer real choices, for example, 'If you could have a handbook for an outboard motor/New Testament (etc.) in only one of these languages, English, Pidgin, vernacular, which would you choose?'; 'Which languages would you like your children to learn to speak?' and 'Why?' and so on.

PRELIMINARY SOCIOLINGUISTIC INFORMATION CHECKLIST – MANUS/ADMIRALTY ISLANDS

0.   INTRODUCTION

The following list of categories and items, while not exhaustive, covers the basic communication network that must be considered in any long-range language program. For the most part, questions should be designed for each category in the checklist after careful discussion with the language speakers and leaders in the area. For example, the category 'Language acceptability' in 6.9 is put there to remind us that just because people speak or understand another language, it does not follow that printed materials in the other language will be acceptable. It is difficult, however, to frame

questions that do not bias the answer and even indirect questions, coupled with observations, will need to be applied to a variety of speakers and situations.

The checklist is, therefore, only a basic framework for outlining subsequent questions for this preliminary survey and a more detailed subsequent survey.

The crucial category is 7.5, on 'forecasting'. We need to evaluate the historical trends, the present climate toward the languages, and make some predictions on what will happen if such trends continue, or how trends can be reversed, if this is realistic and acceptable.

The present outline assumes that researchers are familiar with basic linguistic and sociolinguistic survey techniques as outlined in, for example, Loving and Simons (1977).

1.   GENERAL INFORMATION (G)
1.1   Name of person supplying information
1.2   Name of village (official spelling and local):
1.3   Name of dialect/language (official and local):
1.4   Language family/group (academic and local):
        1.41   Correlation of language and social group:
1.5   Other comments (alternative names, contacts, references, etc.):

2.   LANGUAGE/CULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS (L-C)
2.1   Multilingual in what vernaculars:
        2.11   Subgroup according to age (child, adolescent, young adult, young married, older) and sex:
        2.12   Samples from minority village areas:
2.2   Passive bilingualism in what vernaculars:
        2.21   (See 2.11)
2.3   Migration patterns of present group:
        2.31   (See 2.6)
2.4   Trade alliances or patterns:
        2.41   (See 2.6)
2.5   Marriage patterns:
2.6   If patterns have changed/are changing, effect on multilingualism:
2.7   Short wordlist:
2.8   Pronominal set(s):
2.9   Comments on phonology, pronunciations:
2.10 Standard vs. taboo vocabulary:

3.   COMMENTS ON DEMOGRAPHY AND ECOLOGY (D-E)
3.1   Size of community:
        3.11   Churches, markets, stores, schools, etc.:
3.2   Absenteeism (where, what percentage):
        3.21   Long term/short term:
3.3   Geographical setting:
        3.31   Ease of access
3.4   Principal foods:
        3.41   Traditional:

3.42   Introduced:
3.5   Cash crops:

4.   EDUCATIONAL SITUATION (E)
4.1   Standard of available education (include non-formal):
4.2   Administer ERU-SIL questionnaire:
4.3   Radio Manus listeners and comments:
       4.31   Languages used for songs:
       4.32   Songs most frequently played:

5.   SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS SITUATION (S-R)
5.1   Leadership structure:
5.2   Type and size of Christian communities:
5.3   Language used in church(es):
5.4   Council structure:
5.5   Cooperatives/other community groups:

6.   LANGUAGE ATTITUDES (A)
6.1   Attitude to vernacular:
       6.11   Government, Church, Provincial leaders:
6.2   Attitude to Pidgin:
       6.21   (See 6.11)
6.3   Attitude to English:
       6.31   (See 6.11)
6.4   Best second vernacular: Why?
6.5   Easy to read/write vernacular:
6.6   Attitude to vernacular literacy materials:
6.7   Attitude to vernacular Scriptures:
6.8   Attitudes to various parameters of language uses:
       6.81   Formal/informal:
       6.82   Stranger/non-stranger:
       6.83   Religious/home/school:
       6.84   Traditional (trade)/government:
       6.85   Joking, parties/ceremonies:
       6.86   Official business/informal contact:
       6.87   Economic life (shops, markets, trade, etc.):
       6.88   Courts (interpretation):
       6.89   School (classroom vs. play):
       6.90   Hymns/sermons/Bible readings:
6.9   Language acceptability:

7.   LANGUAGE PLANNING (P)
7.1   Factors relating to social change (school leavers, cash economy, Westernisation, etc.):
7.2   Literary and educational history:
7.3   Political and economic situation:
7.4   Expectations (what are goals, aspirations):
       7.41   All children become bilingual in Pidgin:
       7.42   Pidgin vocabulary replaces vernacular:

RESOURCES CONSULTED FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE

AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES BRANCH

1973   Types of translation programs. Mimeo.

rev.

1979

BENDOR-SAMUEL, John

1976   Language use and language policies. British SIL Lectures. Mimeo.

BENDOR-SAMUEL, Pam

1978   Suggested format for summary information sheet of Displaced Language Project material.

BROOKS, Bonnie, et al.

1972   Sociolinguistic background questionnaire: a measurement instrument for the study of bilingualism. The University of Texas at El Paso (For English-Spanish area). Mimeo.

BUSENITZ, Robert and Michael MARTENS

1979   Considerations for language identification surveys. *Notes on Linguistics* 10:10-27. SIL. (Outlines four stages in surveys, following preliminary research: a preliminary survey, word list surveys, dialect intelligibility surveys, and sociolinguistic surveys. Includes a good beginning bibliography.)

DAVIS, Irvine

n.d.   Ethnographic questionnaire to aid in evaluating translation needs. North American Branch SIL.

HEADLANG, Thomas N.

1977   Interviewing: A method of ethnographic research. Technical Memo #52, Philippines Branch SIL.
       (Seven interview schedules: genealogy, demography, death census, belief system, cultural values, second on demography, and acculturation effect.)

APPENDIX B.

A CHECKLIST OF THE VILLAGES AND ISLANDS OF THE ADMIRALTY ISLANDS

1. INTRODUCTION

The source materials for this checklist come from:

1. Alan Healey, Austronesian Languages, Admiralty Islands Area, in *Pacific Linguistics,* Series C, No.39, vol..2. Healey's article was used as a starting point; this information was then checked and amended as necessary, on the basis of our own investigations;

2. *The Village Directory 1973*, Department of Development Administration, Port Moresby, compared with the 1964 edition, and the preliminary round of the 1980 Census administered in November 1979;

3. Maps produced by the Lands Department of Port Moresby in 1957 (L.D. 1957). Available in the SIL Library at Ukarumpa;

4. A more recent map from the Lands Department entitled: S.A. Guinea, 1 : 250,000, Admiralty Islands East, Edition 1-AAS. This map should be referred to for detailed information regarding language boundaries, and location of villages;

5. Personal research, January – February 1980.

2. THE CHECKLIST

The categories in the Village/Island Index should be noted as follows:

(a)   Column 1, Village Names

In general we have followed the spelling used in *The Village Directory.* Variations in spelling are given in parentheses, and alternative names are cross-referenced.

Note the following difficulties which regularly occur:

p/b: in the Manus languages there is no distinction between *p* and *b.*

In strict phonetic terms, unaspirated *[p]* occurs more frequently than *[b].* However, other linguists and census administrators have often written names with a *b* rather than a *p.* Note the variations of *mb/b* and *nd/d*, such that some names commencing with an *mb* or an *nd*, are sometimes written simply with a '*b*' or a '*d*'.

(b)   Column 2, Language Names

To save unnecessary confusion we have retained the format of the name used by Healey for most of the languages, even though in some cases we disagree with the grouping and relationship implied by the name. Where the disagreement is clearcut we have amended Healey's usage in line with our findings.

Following Healey, we have used these conventions:

1. Names in parentheses indicate members of a particular grouping of languages. (It is these divisions which we feel are particularly dubious.)

2. Hyphenated names indicate one language with one or more dialects.

3. Slash marks indicate a single language spoken in different locations.

4. 'Mixed' refers to plantation settlements, mission stations etc., where people from different language groups live in the same community.

For a full discussion of the areas where our data conflicts with Healey's presentation, see section 3.3 of this report.

(c) Column 3, References to *The Village Directory 1973*.

The abbreviations refer to the Census Divisions as follows:

1. L.S.1 : Lorengau-Sou 1;

2. B.M.2 : Baluan-M'bunai 2;

3. S.B.3 : Sou-Bipi 3.

    All of these are on pages 236-239.

4. E.S; W; W.I. : East Sepik; Wewak; Western Isles, on page 205.

5. 1964 ed. : indicates that the village appears in the 1964 edition but not the 1973 edition. Where there is no reference, the village concerned does not appear in any of the Directories.

(d) Column 4, Locations.

This column should be read in conjunction with the 1 : 250,000 map.

'No location' indicates that, although the village exists, we have not been able to pinpoint it on the map.

'L.D.1957' refers to the Lands Department Map of 1957 as the source for the location.

It was not possible to include all the village names on the map appended to this survey report.

VILLAGE/ISLAND	LANGUAGE	*THE VILLAGE DIRECTORY* REFERENCE	LOCATION
Ahus – alternative name for Hus Is.			
Alukuk – original name for Johan 1.			
Andra Is.	Andra-Hus	L.S.1	off N coast, W end of Seeadler Harbour
Anchorite Is. – same as Kaniet Is.			
Apubai – original name for Johan 2.			
Aran	Mondropolon	S.B.3	N coast, central, opp. Ponam Is.
Aua Is. (Auna)	Wuvulu-Aua	E.S. W; W.I.	Western Islands
Badlock	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N coast, inland opposite Andra Is.
Baluan Is.	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	SSE of Manus
Banum – Healey:	Levei-Tulu	…	No record – possibly confusion of Ponam
Bipi Is.	Sisi/Bipi	S.B.3	off W coast
Bohuai 1	Bohuai	B.M.2	south coast central, SW of Mt Filiam
Bohuai 2	Bohuai	B.M.2	SW of Mt Filiam
Bowat 1 (bus)	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	N inland, south of Tingau River
Bowat 2 (nambis)	Koro	L.S.1	N coast, W of Lorengau
Buiat	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Pam Is.
Bulihan	Nali	L.S.1	E inland, S of Lauis River
Bulihat	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE, close to Lorengau (W)
Bumbanin (Bumbamin, Bumpalin)	Baluan	B.M.2	Baluan Is.
Bunai – alternative form of M'bunai			
Bundrahei	Lindrou	S.B.3	SW coast, Malai Bay
Bundralis	mixed	…	Catholic Mission Station N coast central, opp. Ponam Is.
Bundrou	Titan	L.S.1	Rambutyo Is. (North)
Bursu	Titan	…	Rambutyo Is. no location
Butjou – alternative version of Pujou			
Buyang 1	Ere (Kele)	L.S.1	N Central inland, south of Derimbat
Buyang 2	Ere (Kele)	L.S.1	Further south, near source of Tingau River
Dariu – alternative name for Karon			
Derimbat	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N coast, SW of Hus Is.

Drabitou 1 (Ndrabitou)	Nali	B.M.2	S coast, inland of Patusi Bay
Drabitou 2	Ere	L.S.1	S coast, inland of Patusi Bay
Drabwi – alternative name for Patu			
Dramdru – alternative (older) form of Londru			
Drano – alternative form of N'drano			
Drehet (Ndrehet)	Levei-Tulu	S.B.3	NW coast, E of Nares Harbour
Drelap (Delap) – alternative forms for Ndrelap			
Droia	Ere (Kele)	B.M.2	S coast, inland, near Wari River
Droli – alternative name for Kabuli			
Durour Is. – same as Aua Is.			
Hahai (Hahei)	Pak/Tong	B.M.2	Pak Is.
Harengan Is.	Sori-Harengan	S.B.3	off W coast
Hatwara	Ere and Nali	...	SE inland, between Pau and Drabitou
Hauwai Is. (Hauwei)	Leipon	L.S.1	N of Lorengau
Hermit Is.	Hermit	W.I.4	Western Islands
Horan	Koro	L.S.1	NE coast near Powat 2
Hus Is. (Ahus)	Andra-Hus	L.S.1	NW of Lorengau
Inrim – plantation only; Malabang is village			
Iruru – alternative form of Riu Riu			
Jowan 1 (Johan)	Lindrou	S.B.3	NW coast, islands in Seichte Bay
Jowan 2 (Johan)	Lindrou	S.B.3	NW coast, islands in Seichte Bay
Kabuli	Lindrou	S.B.3	SW coast – NW arm of Malai Bay
Kali Is.	Lindrou	S.B.3	W coast Is. in Kali Bay
Kaniet Is.	Kaniet	...	Western Islands
Kapou (Kapo, Kapor)	Nali	L.S.1	SE inland
Kareng	Elu	...	part of Lowa
Kari – alternative name for Badlok			
Karon	Nali	L.S.1	SE inland, S of Lauis River
Katin	Nali	...	SE inland, S of Lauis River
Kawaliap	Ere (Kele)	...	near Buyang
Kogo – name of a mountain			SW coast, W arm of Malai Bay
Kokou – same as Leihuwa			
Korrojih – alternative name for Kabuli			
Koru	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N coast central, part of Sou

Koruniat	Ere (Kele)	L.S.1	Island NE of Lorengau, outer edge of Seeadler Harbour
Kulep (Kuluo)	Penchal	B.M.2	Rambutyo Is.
Kup	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	...	Part of Sou
Kupano	Bohuai	B.M.2	S coast central, W of Patu
Labahan (Labakan)	Koro	L.S.1	N coast, W of Powat 2
Lago (Lakou)	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Lou Is.
Lahan (Lohan)	Nali	B.M.2	SE coast, E Patusi Bay
Lala – Healey:	Nane – both this village and language are unknown		
Langendrowa – plantation, S. Rambutyo; village name: Mouklen			
Laues (Lawes, Lauis)	Nali	B.M.2	E coast, mouth of Lauis River
Lehewa – same as Leihuwa			
Leihuwa (Leihwa; Leiwa)	Mondropolon	S.B.3	N coast, SE of Ponam Is.
Lenkau	Lenkau	B.M.2	SW Rambutyo Is.
Lessau	Lindrou	S.B.3	W coast (N)
Levei	Levei-Tulu	S.B.3	NW coast, Nares Harbour
Liap	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N coast, SW of Hus Is.
Likum	Lindrou	S.B.3	SW coast, W Malai Bay
Lindrou – regional name			
Lipan	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Baluan Is.
Liuliu	Titan	B.M.2	N Rambutyo Is.
Loamat	Titan	B.M.2	N Rambutyo Is.
Lohe (Lohi) – alternative forms of Loi			
– Loi was formerly in the Pohuai area. It has moved location into the Ere area, and now the people are speaking Ere.			
Loi	Ere and Pohuai	B.M.2	see above
Loitcha (Loisa)	Titan	B.M.2	SE coast, W Patusi Bay
Lolak	Loniu	L.S.1	two miles E of Loniu
Lolo – on Pityilu island			
Loemoi (Lomei; Lamoi)	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N coast, part of Sou
Lonal	Mixed: Kele/ Kurti/Lele	L.S.1	N coast inland from Bowat 2 – no exact location
Londru	Ere	1964 ed.	S coast, W Patusi Bay
Loniu	Loniu	L.S.1	S coast of Los Negros
Lou Is.	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	SE Is. N of Baluan Is.
Lowa	Elu	L.S.1	N coast SSE of Hus Is.
Lowaia	Nali	B.M.2	SE coast, E of Patusi Bay
Lowakai – same as Tulu 2			
Luf Is – one of the Hermit islands			
Lundret	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE inland, on highway, SE of Lorengau
Lugos	mixed	L.S.1	Mission, W of Lorengau

Malabang	mixed	L.S.1	plantation settlement N coast, NW of Lorengau
Malei	Nali	B.M.2	SW coast, E of Patusi Bay
Mandrelan – alternative name for Kupano			
Manuai	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Baluan Is.
Mara Yiri – same as Yiri			
Mariman	Elu	L.S.1	N coast, near Lowa
Maso (Masso)	Sisi/Bipi	S.B.3	Bipi Is.
Matahei	Sisi/Bipi	S.B.3	Bipi Is.
Matakau	Mondropolon	...	Bush village – abandoned
Maty Is. – see Wuvulu Is.			
M'buke Is.	Titan	B.M.2	due S of Manus
M'bunai	Titan	B.M.2	SE coast E of Patusi Bay
Metawari	Ere	B.M.2	SE inland; NW of Patusi Bay on Wari River
Metepong – alternative name for Pujou			
Mokera (Mokara)	Pak/Tong	B.M.2	Pak Is.
Mokerang (Mokareng, Mokerane)	Mokerang	L.S.1	NW coast of Los Negros
Momote	mixed	L.S.1	airport, Los Negros
Mouk Is.	Titan	B.M.2	NNE of Baluan Is.
Mouklen	Titan	B.M.2	S Rambutyo Is.
Mulierio (Muliro)	Pak/Tong	B.M.2	Pak Is.
Mundiburio	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N Coast, inland, SE of Sou
Mundrau	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N Coast, inland, SE of Sou
Naringel	Papitalai	L.S.1	S coast of Los Negros
Nauna Is.	Nauna	B.M.2	E of Rambutyo Island
Ndrabitou – alternative form of Drabitou			
Ndrano	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NW inland, between Tingau and Lauis Rivers
Ndrehet – alternative form of Drehet			
Ndrelap (Ndelap)	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE coast near Poluso
Ndrihol Is. (Ndriol)	Tital	...	N of Rambutyo Is.
Ndrilo Is. (N'dilou)	Leipon	L.S.1	NE of Lorengau
Ndroia – alternative name for Droia			
Ndrosun – same as Rossun			
Nihon Is.	Lindrou	S.B.3	off west coast in Kali Bay
Ninigo Islands	Seimat	W.I.4	Western Isles
Ngambouai	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Pam Is.
Nohang	Nali	B.M.2	S coast on Patusi Bay
Nyada	Lindrou	S.B.3	NW coast on Seichte Bay
Pak Is.	Pak/Tong	B.M.2	off E coast
Pam Is.	Baluan-Lou-Pam	...	N of Baluan Is.
Paniselu	Penchal	B.M.2	Rambutyo Is.
Papitalai	Papitalai	L.S.1	N coast of Los Negros

Parioi	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Baluan Is.
Patu	mixed	B.N.2	Catholic Mission Station S coast, W of Patusi Bay
Patusi	Titan	B.M.2	SE coast part of Pere
Pau	Ere	B.M.2	SE inland from centre of Patusi Bay
Paun	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Lou Is.
Peli Is.	Bohuai	...	S coast of central Pelikawa – now known as Pelipowai
Pelipowai	Bohuai	B.M.2	S coast central
Penchal	Penchal	B.M.2	Rambutyo Is.
Pere (Peri)	Titan	B.M.2	SE coast E of Patusi Bay
Perelik	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Baluan Is.
Piterait (Pitira'it)	Ere	B.M.2	SE inland NNW of Patusi
Pityilu Is.	Leipon	L.S.1	N of Lorengau
Poluso	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE coast, W of Lorengau
Polendran	Penchal	...	Penchal area of Rambutyo
Pomassau	Titan	...	E coast, S of Lauis (L.D. 1957)
Ponam Is.	Ponam	S.B.3	off N coast, W end of Seeadler Harbour
Ponchal	Titan	B.M.2	SE coast, part of Pere
Pondeles	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE coast, between Lorengau and Lugos
Popeu	Titan	B.M.2	Rambutyo Is.
Powat – alternative form of Bowat			
Pujou (Puju)	Levei-Tulu	S.B.3	SW coast, Malai Bay
Puluso	Ere (Lele)	...	N coast, W of Lugos
Pundru	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N inland; S of Andra-Hus
Rei	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Lou Is.
Riu Riu	mixed	L.S.1	plantation settlement on Los Negros
Rossun	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE inland/SE of Lorengau on highway
Sabandruem – alternative name for Nyada			
Sabon 1	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE inland, S of Lorengau
Sabon 2	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	NE inland, S of Lorengau
Saha	Mondropolon	S.B.3	NW coast, SE of Ponam
Salami	mixed	L.S.1	Los Negros – plantation settlement
Salapai (Salapi)	Sisi/Bipi	S.B.3	Bipi Is., off W coast
Salasia (Salesia)	mixed	L.S.1	plantation, E of Lorengau
Salien	Lindrou	S.B.3	W coast; S of Kali bay
Sapondralis	Lindrou	S.B.3	SW coast; W of Malai Bay
Sau – alternative form for Sou			

Selalou – island on which Pere is located · SE coast

Name	Language	Code	Location
Sira (Sirra)	Nali	L.S.1	E inland; S of Lauis River
Sisi Is.	Sisi/Bipi	…	off W coast
Sohonilu (Sonilu, Sohoneriu)	Nali	L.S.1	E inland; S of Lauis River
Solang	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Lou Is.
Soni (Soui)	Baluan-Lou-Pam	B.M.2	Baluan Is.
Sopa Sopa	Lindrou	…	plantation; peninsula on extreme NW coast
Sori Is.	Sori-Harengan	…	off NW coast; Nares Harbour
Sori 1	Sori-Harengan	S.B.3	NW coast, SSE of Sori Is.
Sori 2	Sori-Harengan	S.B.3	NW coast, SSE of Sori Is.
Sou (Sau)	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	W coast central, S of Andra Is.

Supeu – electorate area only; no village; Kurti area

Name	Language	Code	Location
Tandual	Pak/Tong	B.M.2	Pak Is.
Taui-Undrau	Ere	B.M.2 (Undrau)	SE inland; N of Patusi Bay
Tawi Is.	Titan	B.M.2 (Taui)	off S coast, central
Tilianu Is.	Titan	B.M.2	one of San Migual Is. W of Rambutyo Is.
Timoenai (Timolenai)	Titan	…	S coast central; W of Tawi Is.
Tingau 1	Ere (Kele)	L.S.1	E central inland; N of Patusi Bay
Tingau 2	Ere (Kele)	L.S.1	E central inland; N of Patusi Bay
Tingou (Tingo)	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	close to Lorengau
Tong Is.	Pak/Tong	B.M.2	off E coast
Tulu 1	Levei-Tulu	S.B.3	N coast; SSW of Ponam Is.
Tulu 2	Levei-Tulu	S.B.3	N coast; SSW of Ponam Is.
Waimundra	Ere (Kuruti-Pare)	L.S.1	N inland; S of Andra-Hus

Warambei (Warabei) – same as Warobi

Name	Language	Code	Location
Warembu	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	E inland; S of Lorengau on highway
Warobi	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1 (Warembei)	N inland; W of Lorengau

Warei (Worei) – regional name for Ere area

Name	Language	Code	Location
Wuvulu Is. (Auna, Onei)	Wuvulu-Aua	E.S.; W; W.I. to far W of Manus	

Yiri (Mara Yiri) – alternative name/part of Tulu 1

Name	Language	Code	Location
Yiringo	Ere (Lele)	L.S.1	N inland; SW of Lorengau on Tingau River
Yiriu (Yiru)	Nali	B.M.2	E coast (south)

APPENDIX C.   LANGUAGE INDEX

LANGUAGE	VILLAGE/ISLAND	LANGUAGE	VILLAGE/ISLAND
Andra-Hus	Andra Is.	Ere (Kele)(cont.)	Tingau 1
	Hus Is.		Tingau 2
Baluan	Bumbanin	Ere (Kuruti-Pare or Kurti)	Badlock
Baluan-Lou-Pam	Baluan Is.		Derimbat
	Buiat		Koru
	Lago		Kup
	Lipan		Liap
	Lou Is.		Loemoi
	Manuai		Mundiburio
	Ngambousi		Mundrau
	Pam Is.		Pundru
	Parioi		Sou
	Paun		Waimundra
	Perelik	Ere (Lele)	Bowat 1 (bus)
	Rei		Bulihat
	Solang		Lundret
	Soni		Ndrano
Bohuai	Bohuai 1		Ndrelap
	Bohuai 2		Ndrosun
	Kupano		Poluso
	Peli Is.		Pondeles
	Pelipowai		Puluso
Elu	Kareng		Rossun
	Lowa		Sabon 1
	Mariman		Sabon 2
Ere	Drabitou 2		Tingou
	Lohe		Warembei
	Londru		Warembu
	Metawari		Warobi
	Pau		Yiringo
	Piterait	Hermit	Hermit Is.
	Taui-Undrau		Luf Is.
Ere and Nali	Hatwara	Kaniet	Kaniet Is.
Ere and Bohuai	Loi	Koro	Bowat 2 (nambis)
Ere (Kele)	Buyang 1		Horen
	Buyang 2		Labahan
	Droia	Leipon	Hauwai Is.
	Kawaliap		Lolo
	Koruniat		Ndrilo Is.
			Pityilu Is.

LANGUAGE	VILLAGE/ISLAND	LANGUAGE	VILLAGE/ISLAND
Lenkau	Lenkau	Nali (cont.)	Sohonilu
			Yiriu
Levei-Tulu (Keli)	Banum	Nauna	Nauna Is.
	Drehet	Pak/Tong	Hahai
	Levei		Mokera
	Lowakai		Mulireio
	Mara Yiri		Pak Is.
	Pujou		Tandual
	Tulu 1		Tong Is.
	Tulu 2	Papitalai	Naringel
	Yiri		Papitalai
Lindrou	Bundrahei	Penchal	Kulep
	Jowan 1		Paniselu
	Jowan 2		Penchal
	Kabuli		Polendran
	Kali Is.	Ponam	Ponam Is.
	Likum	Seimat	Hermit Is.
	Nihon Is.		Ninigo Is.
	Hyada	Sisi/Bipi	Bipi Is.
	Salien		Maso
	Sapondralis		Matahei
	Sopa Sopa		Salapai
Loniu	Lolak		Sisi Is.
	Loniu	Sori-Harengan	Harengan Is.
Mokerang	Mokerang		Sori Is.
Mondropolon	Aran		Sori 1
	Kokou		Sori 2
	Lehewa	Titan	Bundrou
	Leihuwa		Bursu
	Matakau		Langendrowa Plantation
	Saha		Liuliu
Nali	Bulihan		Loamat
	Drabitou 1		Loitche
	Kapou		M'buke Is.
	Karon		M'bunai
	Katin		Mouk Is.
	Lahan		Mouklen
	Laues		Ndrihol Is.
	Lowaia		Patusi
	Malei		Pere
	Nohang		Pomassau
	Sira		

LANGUAGE	VILLAGE/ISLAND	LANGUAGE	VILLAGE/ISLAND
Titan (cont.)	Ponchal	Wuvulu-Aua	Aua Is.
	Popeu		Durour Is.
	Selalou		Maty Is.
	Tawi Is.		Wuvulu Is.
	Tilianu Is.		
	Timoensi		

APPENDIX D.

PUBLISHED MATERIALS IN MANUS VERNACULARS

1. *Lele New Testament.* In 1956 The British and Foreign Bible Society published a New Testament in Lele, as spoken at Tingo near Lorengau, which had been translated by a member of the Manus Evangelical Mission. When the mission first started working in Manus, it adopted this language as the official church language. The intention was that members of other language groups would learn this language and thereby benefit from the educational and other services offered by the church. This system worked for a while, but was never an ideal situation, and with the advent of Pidgin, the policy was abandoned.

Unfortunately, even the Lele speakers do not now use this translation. When investigating the reasons for this, we received some rather contradictory answers. However, on balance it appears likely that the primary problem lies with the translation itself, more than anything else.

The original translation was done with the help of one or two people from Tingo and was not checked for comprehension by people from other areas. Silas Pokikau, pastor of the Evangelical Church in Lorengau, is of the opinion that a revision could and should be made, drawing on representatives from all parts of the Lele area. He thinks that a vernacular which was easy to read and understand, would be far superior to the Pidgin.

There is a copy of this New Testament in the SIL library at Ukarumpa.

2. *Song books.* Song books have been produced at various times in Lele, Lindrou and Mondropolon. These are not usually used in church services, but people still request them on occasions of community hymn singing.

3. *Other projects.*
(a) Some of the early Catholic fathers did a considerable amount of linguistic research, some of which may still be at the Papitalai Station.

(b) Students at the Christian Leaders' Training College (Banz, W.H.P.) have been encouraged to put a series of Bible stories onto cassette in their mother tongue, as part of their course. Silas Mana (Lele), currently working at Loniu, has done this, and there may be others.

(c) Since this survey was completed several projects of language development and translation were initiated. As at the date of publication the project for Lindrou under the leadership of Timothy Kundrake, and the project for Nali under the leadership of Luke Pahur were still active.

NOTES

1.   We wish to acknowledge the following: Dr Karl Franklin (SIL), for his sympathetic direction of this project, as well as the final editing of this paper; Mr Cholai Polume (BTA), for his advice and assistance in the initial organisation of the actual survey; Mr Barnabas Kambil (Premier of Manus Province), and members of the Provincial Government, for their enthusiastic encouragement and support; members of the Manus Evangelical Mission, and the Catholic Mission, for their warm hospitality and their help in arranging transport; the people of Manus who freely gave of their time to answer questions and provide data for this survey; and also for their spontaneous hospitality and generosity, and Bill Martin for his help in compiling the map.

2.   The material from this section may need updating in terms of certain figures. It is from E. Ford, ed. (1974).

3.   As indicated in the title, the present study is preliminary to a continuing study of the Manus Province linguistic and sociolinguistic picture.

4.   A cognate percentage was also computed between English and German, using the same method. Comparison with this figure (57%) suggests that the languages in Manus have diverged significantly in the course of their history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCES FOR THIS RESEARCH: (See also materials listed at the end of Appendix A)

FORD, Edgar, ed.
    1974   *The Papua New Guinea resource atlas.* Brisbane: Jacaranda Press.

HEALEY, Alan
    1976   Austronesian languages: Admiralty Islands area. In S.A. Wurm, ed. *New Guinea area languages and language study,* vol.2: *Austronesian languages. PL,* C-39.

LOVING, R. and G. SIMONS, eds
    1977   *Language variation and survey techniques. Workpapers in PNG Languages* 21. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

SMYTHE, W.E. and J. Z'GRAGGEN, compilers
    1975   Comparative wordlists of the Admiralty Islands. In *Comparative wordlists 1. Workpapers in PNG Languages* 14. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

GENERAL REFERENCES OF INTEREST:

BADNER, Mino
    1968   The Figural sculpture and iconography of the Admiralty Islands. Ph.D. thesis. Columbia University. (UPNG Microfilm No.70-23422)

BRUNTON, Ronald Gregory
    1971   Cargo cults and systems of exchange in Melanesia. *Mankind* 8/2:115-128.

CRAIG, Ruth
    1961   A reconstruction of the definition of ancestor worship. B.A. thesis, University of Sydney.

CREAMER, Raymond Joseph
    1948   The Admiralty Islands: a geographical interpretation. M.A. thesis, University of Virginia.

FORTUNE, R.F.
    1931   Manus religion. *Oceania* 2:74-108.
    1935   *Manus religion: an ethnological study of the Manus natives of the Admiralty Islands.*
            Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

HEALEY, Alan
    1976   History of research in Austronesian languages: Admiralty Islands area. *PL*, C-39.

MEAD, M.
    1954   *Growing up in New Guinea: a study of adolescence and sex in primitive societies.*
            Edinburgh: Pelican.
    1956   *New lives for old: cultural transformation – (Manus 1928-1953).* London: Victor
            Golancz.

POKAWIN, Stephen
    1976   Politics at village level: development of village associations in Manus. B.A. thesis,
            University of Papua New Guinea.

ROONEY, Wesley
    1977   Calamity and migration in Manus. B.A. thesis, University of Papua New Guinea.

SCHIEFFELIN, Edward L.
    1972   Manus religion: a Jungian perspective. M.A. thesis, University of Chicago.

SCHWARTZ, Theodore
    1962   *The Paliau movement in the Admiralty Islands, 1946-1953. Anthropological Papers of
            American Museum of Natural History,* 49/2. New York.
    1963   Systems of areal integration: some considerations based on the Admiralty Islands of
            Northern Melanesia. *Anthropological Forum* 1:56-97. University of Western Australia
            Press.

SMYTHE, W.E.
    1970   Melanesian, Micronesian, and Indonesian features in languages of the Admiralty Islands.
            In S.A. Wurm and D.C. Laycock, eds *Pacific linguistic studies in honour of Arthur
            Capell*, 1209-1234. *PL*, C-13.

ADMIRALTY ISLANDS

Ponam 1

Sori-Harengan 1

Andra-Hus 1

Leipon 1

Mokerang 3

Bundralis

Mondropolon 2

Liap Elu 4

Kurti 3

Koro 3

Kele 3

Tingo

Lorengau

Los Negros Island

Pak-Tong 4

2° S

Lessau

Levei-Tulu (Keli) 2

Manus Island

Lele 3

Momote Airport

Ndrano

3

Loniu

Papitalai

Sisi 1

Bipi

Kele 2

Bohuai

Kele 3

Lauis

Nali 3

Lowaia

Lindrou

Likum

Pujou

Ere 3

Londru

Loi

Patu

Mbunai

Titan 3

Patusi Bay

Malai 2

Titan 3

Titan 3

Penchal 4

Rambutyo Island

Nauna 4

Lenkau 1

Austronesian Languages of Manus Province

MANUS FAMILY:

1 Northwest Islands Sub-Family
2 West Manus Sub-Family
3 East Manus Sub-Family
4 Southeast Manus Sub-Family
5 NINIGO FAMILY
6 WUVULU ISOLATE

Titan 3

Lou 4

Titan 3

Pam-Baluan 4

Seimat 5

Ninigo Group

1°30'S

144°30'E

Aua I.

1°30'S

Wuvulu-Aua 6

Wuvulu I. 143° E

Hermit 1

Seimat 1

1°30'S

145° E

0   10   20

Kilometres

Manus Province Population by Language (1980)

No.	Language	Population
1.	Andra-Hus	986
2.	Bipi	1068
3.	Bohuai	707
4.	Elu	216
5.	Ere	1030
6.	Hermit	50
7.	Kele	894
8.	Koro	400
9.	Kurti	2409
10.	Leipon	832
11.	Lele	1865
12.	Lenkau	240
13.	Levei-Tulu (Keli)	1403
14.	Lindrou	2552
15.	Loniu	489
16.	Lou	902
17.	Malai	unknown
18.	Mokerang	228
19.	Mondropolon	301
20.	Nali	986
21.	Nauna	207
22.	Pak-Tong	659
23.	Pam-Baluan	1522
24.	Papitalai	274
25.	Penchal	517
26.	Ponam	479
27.	Seimat	627
28.	Sori-Harengan	619
29.	Titan	3654
30.	Wuvulu-Aua approx.	1600

Total 27.716