

## SAA NOTES

ISIDORE DYEN

This article is the result of reviewing some of the Saa evidence for the reconstruction of Proto-Austronesian phonemes.<sup>1</sup> It is a privilege to be able to offer it as a sign of my great regard for Arthur Capell, whose devotion to and activity in the field of Oceanic linguistics has contributed so importantly to the recent extensive advances in this branch of the study of the Austronesian languages.

On the basis of correspondences exhibited by New Caledonian languages Haudricourt concluded that there were labiovelars in *mélanésien commun* (1951:144) and that it was worthwhile considering the proposition that there was a nasal labiovelar in *malayopolynésien commun* because of arguments which would likewise support the reconstruction of a non-nasal labiovelar as well (1951:145). Goodenough (1962) agreed with Haudricourt's suggested hypothesis, saying (407) 'We must reconstruct labio-velars for PAN, and if this is contrary to our preconceptions about PAN phonology, then our preconceptions are wrong'.

Haudricourt has apparently moved somewhat away from supporting his suggestion of 1951 for he says (1965:325 fn. 17): 'I am not as certain as W.H. Goodenough (... 1962...406 f.) about the ancient status of an Oceanic labio-velar order'.

Capell seems to favor (1962:389) the view that the origin of these phonemes of double articulation should be assigned to the substratum rather than to Proto-Austronesian.

Dyen (1949:424,426) had suggested that certain Trukese velolabial phonemes *pw*, *mw* (there written *q*, *b* respectively and called *velarized bilabials*) resulted from contact of pre-Trukese *p*, *m*

respectively before u, o. Evidence to be presented will tend to show that a similar explanation for velolabials everywhere will not suffice and that the substratum hypothesis of Capell (1962) is not necessary, thus favoring Haudricourt's original suggestion.

Saa and Lau are closely related languages. Saa is spoken on Maramasiki Island south of Malaita and, under the name Ulawa, on Contrariété Island. Despite their close relationship, Saa and Lau exhibit a number of different correspondences that cannot be accounted for under current reconstructions. The correspondences involved seem to concern proto-phonemes with a labial or a velar articulation or both.

Two labial stops \*p and \*b are reconstructed in Proto-Austronesian (PAN). They are believed to have fallen together, presumably in f, by the time of the latest mesolanguage of Saa and Lau, which we shall call Proto-Saa-Lau (PSL):

PAN panaq, Mal. panah *bow*, PSL fana, L. fana, S. hana *shoot*.

PAN batu, Mal. batu *stone*, PSL fau, L. fou, S. häu *stone*.

Proto-Saa-Lau had a number of phonemes with labial articulation which cannot be assigned simply to PAN \*p or \*b. One of these, PSL b, can be assigned to the PAN clusters \*mp, \*mb: PAN Sampir,<sup>2</sup> Tag. hampil *near*, Saa äpi *to border*. Thus the \*b of PSL bono, L. bono *close a hole*, S. pono *close, stuff*, can be explained as from PAN mp, perhaps by analogical wrong division of a derivation from PAN pened, Tag. pinid *forced in*, Saa hono *shut, bar* with a prefix ending in a nasal.<sup>3</sup> So similarly can PSL buri, L. buri, S. puri *back, stern* from PAN. BuDesi Jav. buri *rear* probably containing \*uDesi, Bis. qulihi *rear*.<sup>2</sup>

Under this hypothesis Lau ili *choose* with transitive ilisi could be regarded as a loanword from a language like Saa which regularly shows hili *choose* from PAN piliq, Tag. pi·liq *choose*. Lau's failure to show an initial consonant can be attributed to the absence of a Lau phoneme h. The Saa transitive hiliisi must then have s by an analogical change and it is this form which presumably is the source of Lau ilisi.

These hypotheses offer no easy way of explaining the association of S. pepe, L. bebe *butterfly* with Macassarese pipipipi *small*

*butterfly*, without claiming that the PSL form had an internal nasal as well as an analogical initial nasal in its prehistory.

In any case the hypotheses regarding labial stops above offer no way of explaining the correspondence in Saa *pwäu*, Lau *gwau*, *gwou head*. The Saa word was associated with, among others, Tag. *batok nape*, Jav. *baṭoq forehead* under the PAN reconstruction *baʔuk*. Similar correspondences appear in the following comparisons which do not have such distant cognates as far as is known: S. *pwaoha*, L. *gwaofa ridge-pole*; S. *pwälu*, L. *gwalisu nose*; U. *pwini-'a*, L. *gwini wet*; S. *tata-pwelu*, L. *gwelu headlong*. We are forced to reconstruct a phoneme in Proto-Saa-Lau which is different from both PSL *f* and PSL *p*. Let us use *\*gw* for the PSL proto-phoneme.

We could now construct the hypothesis that PSL *gw* in inter-vocalic position became Saa *pw* and Lau *g*. This hypothesis would explain the following comparisons:

PSL *ogwa*, S. *opwa*, L. *oga belly*.

PSL *ugwa*, S. *upwe complain*, L. *uga-ni grumble at*.

PSL *agwo*, S. *ha'a-opo* (? *ha? a-opwo*) *re-heat*, L. *ago hot*.

It is interesting, though not particularly germane to our discussion, that the S. *w* regularly corresponds with L. *kw*; S. *wälu*, L. *kwalu eight* (PAN *walu*[']); S. *siwe*, L. *sikwa nine* (PAN *siwa* [']).

The phonetic nature of PAN *w* is not certain. The fact that a labiovelar articulation appears in Alune (= Aloene, West Ceram)<sup>4</sup> as well as Lau argues for assigning this articulation to the PAN phoneme. On the other hand it remains not impossible to imagine the change of *\*w* from [w] to [kw] independently in the separate history of the two languages, though the probability of such an event cannot be high despite the fact that all evidence appears to point to Chamorro /gw/ as reflecting a phoneme that was original [u] just as its /dy/ (or /j/) reflects one that was originally [i]. If PAN *w* were a labiovelar, we should probably wish to change our notation of the PAN phoneme and would also immediately assign the value [kw] to the PSL phoneme and wish to use a notation other than *\*w*. However in view of the present state of our knowledge we continue the present PAN notation and thus perforce employ *\*w* for PSL; we do it however without abandoning the competitive hypothesis that PAN *w* and PSL *w* not only had a labial feature but also a velar feature.

Haudricourt implied that the correspondences in New Caledonian cognates with the PSL words for *head* above suggested considering a PAN reconstruction with labiovelar instead of the b in \*baTuk.<sup>5</sup> He saw another instance in the New Caledonian cognates to be associated with Tbt. bornin, Jav. beŋi = weŋi, Fiji mboni *night*, To. poŋi-poŋi *morning*; these could otherwise be explained under a reconstructed \*beŋi[']. Although Saa pwoŋi *day, time, season* agrees with Haudricourt's hypothesis, Lau iboboŋi *tomorrow* exhibits b instead of the anticipated gw.

It would nevertheless be possible to reconcile the Lau b from PSL gw as conditioned by the following PSL o (from PAN e). This could likewise explain as from PSL gw the following PSL comparison: S. pwole, L. bole *dream*.

The difficulty is that there is a correspondence of Saa pw with Lau b before vowels other than o in comparisons lacking a PAN etymology: S. pwito, L. bito *sprout*; S. pwiipwii, L. bibii *mud*. Thus there can be no doubt that L. b corresponds to S. pw (as well as S. p, see above) so that to account for this correspondence we are compelled to reconstruct a PSL phoneme different from PSL gw, say \*pw. However it is possible to simplify the phonemic history if we say that the pre-PSL gw implied by PSL gwau *head* also occurred in a pre-PSL \*gwoŋi, but fell together with \*pw before \*o and thus became PSL pwoŋi which gave rise to Saa pwoŋi and presumably pre-Lau \*boŋi.

The foregoing analysis of Saa and Lau comparisons appears to favor the reconstruction of a labiovelar of some kind in Proto-Austronesian, and a velolabial \*pw as well as a labiovelar \*gw in Proto-Saa-Lau. In view of the falling together of the PAN voiced and voiceless labials in pre-PSL one should probably take into account the chances that the PAN labiovelar, though found in such few cases, represents the merger of a voiced and voiceless pair. The effect of this consideration is simply to introduce voice ambiguity into the reconstruction, which is merely a phonetic consideration.

There is further evidence for an articulation like that of \*gw in PAN. PSL had a phoneme \*mw that appears in initial position in the following words:

PSL mwaa, L. mwaa, S. mwaa *snake*

PSL mwane, L. mwane, S. mwane *uncle, man, boy*.

PSL *mwaa snake* is certainly cognate with Fiji *ɲata*, Gilberts *mwata snake*. It has been suggested that the same etymon is to be found in Sam. *taɲata person* (? with *snake* metaphorical for *penis*, despite the faulty semantism). Cognates indubitably appear in Sanigrese *taumata* (? contaminated with *tau person*) and Paulohi (Ceram) *tamata*. Blupblup *tamwat person* points toward a velolabial or labiovelar. However Fiji *tamata person* shows a different nasal from that in the word for *snake* and militates against finding the same nasal in the word for *person* as in the word for *snake*. Perhaps the word for *snake* is to be reconstructed with a labiovelar \*ɲw whereas that for *person* is to be reconstructed with a velolabial \*mw in Proto-Austronesian.

PSL *mwane* is cognate with Fiji *ɲane sibling of opposite sex*, Trukese *mwään male, brother* (woman speaking), and with Sumba *meni*, Sawu *mone*, Kisar *mooni man*. Fiji *taɲane male* contains the same etymon as is to be associated with Enggano *kamani man* (not with Sam. *tane male* which is cognate with Palau *sachal male*). The second part of Balinese *anak muani man* is difficult to dissociate from the set of cognates already mentioned, but its *u* may eventually offer difficulties. Except for any problems offered by the last citation the words for *male* lend themselves to a reconstruction with the labiovelar \*ɲw suggested above for Proto-Austronesian.

S. *mwo-mwona fat rich (of viands)* can be associated with the comparison of Mer. *ménaka oil*, Fiji *mona brain*, To., Sam. *mo-mona fat (of meat)*, Fut. *mo-mona meat*. That the nasal is probably part of a prefix is indicated by Ngaju-Dayak *eñak fat, lard*. The distinction between labiovelar and velolabial could not be made here because the Polynesian cognates require that their *m* be explained as due to its position before *o*, an explanation which would also suffice for the Fi. *m* regardless of its origin.

Similarly ambiguous is the Saa 'reciprocal collective' prefix *mwa-* as in *mwa-ihana siblings-in-law of same sex* (S. *ihe- sibling-in-law*). It is no doubt cognate with the Tagalog prefix *mag-* in words like *magqama father and son*. The Saa prefix has an alternant *ma-* in one instance before a root with *u* as the first vowel, presumably by dissimilation: *ma-hungaona father-and-son-in-law*. Similarly the closely related Ulawa has *ma-uwelina persons in the mother's brother sister's son relation*; here however Saa has *mwa-uwelina* with *mwa* perhaps restored by analogy.

The Lau element *mwai-* functions like S. *mwa-*: L. *mwai-telana* *mother and child*, *mwai-fungona* *parent and-child-in-law*. It is possible that this *mwai* is the result of a contamination of an earlier \**mwa-* with the plural particle *mwai* cognate with Ulawa *mwai* 'plural' (? somehow related to Saa *mu*, *mui* 'plural').

Saa *nume*, Ulawa *nima dwelling house* not only differ in their first vowel, but are presumably cognate with words in other languages which show velolabials and in some cases *i* and in others *u*: Mota *imwa*, San Cristoval (Ivens) *rumwa*, Fagani (San Cristoval) *rima*, Trukese *jiimw house*. The Saa reflex has presumably lost the velar feature. The same variation in vowel appears if one compares Malay *rumah house* with Sundanese *imah house*. It is more plausible that the first vowel of the Proto-Austronesian word was originally \**i* and assimilated to the labial element in the following consonant than that it was originally \**u* and became *i* by dissimilation. In either case however, the odd distribution of the vowels among the languages favors the hypothesis that there was a Proto-Austronesian doublet, the difference between the two members being in the first vowel.

Lau and Saa correspondences involving velars and glottal stop are numerous. The following can be ascribed a Proto-Austronesian etymology:

- (1a). S. *iʔa*, L. *ia*, Mal. *ikan fish*.  
 S. *ma-taʔi* *have malarial fever*, L. *ma-tai* *have attack of ague*, Mal. *saket ill*.
- (1b). S. *kia*, L. *gia*, Bis. *kita we (inclusive)*.  
 S. *ku*, L. *gu*, Tag. *ko of me*.  
 S. *aka* *pull out*, *aka-n-i* *gouge out*, L. *aga-n-i* *pluck out*, Mal. *aŋkat lift*.
- (1c). S. *ʔämu*, L. *gamu*, Bis. *kamu ye*  
 S. *ʔämi*, L. *gami*, Tag. *kami we (exclusive)*.
- (2). S. *in-eu*, L. *n-au*, Tag. *qako I*.  
 S. *ilala* *to divine*, L. *inala* (dissimilation)  
*discern by lots*, Tag. *kilala know*.  
 S. *ʔae*, L. *ae*, Mal. *kaki leg*.
- (3). S. *takuh-i* L. *takuf-i*, *receive*, Mal. *cakop snatch*.

Dempwolff treated the Saa reflex in correspondence (1a) as the reflex of PAN *k* and the Saa reflex in correspondence (1b) as the

reflex of a PAN ŋk. The Saa reflex in correspondence (1c) would thus normally be assigned immediately to PAN k as was done by Dempwolff. The Lau reflex of correspondence (1c) would then have to be explained as reflecting PAN ŋk under a hypothesis that it reflected a nasal cluster like that of S. ku, L. gu (see 2a) presumably as the result of analogy.

What is most interesting is that this leaves correspondences (2) and (3) unexplained under Dempwolff's reconstructions, and no way of reaching an explanation by analogy. It follows that we are forced to reconstruct either one or two different proto-phonemes. But other interpretations are also possible. To facilitate the discussion we first assign \*k<sub>1</sub> to the \*k reconstructed by Dempwolff, and assign \*k<sub>2</sub> to correspondence (2) and \*k<sub>3</sub> to correspondence (3).<sup>6</sup>

Dempwolff interpreted the Saa correspondence of \*k<sub>2</sub> as being due to an error in recording on the part of Ivens, the chief source of our information on Saa Dempwolff used Ivens 1929. There he found for example Saa *omu to mumble food as a toothless person* which he regarded as an error for the \*ʔomu required in the regular cognate for Jav. *kĕmu* Mäl. *kĕmor rinse the mouth*, Mer. *hĭmuka to mumble food as toothless person* under a reconstruction \*kemuR. What is most interesting is that Ivens 1918 actually records ʔomu in the given meaning. Similarly we find in Ivens 1918 ʔaia *bite* (\*kaRat *bite*), ʔeli *dig* (\*keli), ʔunu *say* (\*kunu *it is said*), for Dempwolff's citation from Ivens 1929 of respectively aia, eii, unu corrected to the form above without reference to Ivens 1918. There thus appears to be some reason to consider Ivens 1918 as more reliable for Dempwolff's chosen reflex than Ivens 1929 despite Ivens' claim (1929.v) that the 'original edition has now been carefully revised and corrected, and several thousand new entries of words have been made. The revision was undertaken during my stay in 1924-5 at Sa'a and Ulawā, when I had the fullest opportunity both of revision and also of enrichment of the material'.

The source of Dempwolff's confidence in his correction of these words which lacked ʔ was no doubt connected with the appearance of the spelling ʔeli in Ray (1926), who based his writings on Ivens 1918. However there is reason to believe that Ray must have used some additional source in view of his citation of words like his äliŋe *ear* where Ivens 1918 has ʔäliŋe. We will take up this point later.

Both Ivens 1918 and 1929 agree in showing S. *ineu*, I, *inala to divine*, *?ae leg* (lacking ? internally in the last example) for \*k<sub>2</sub>. Fiji au I and To., Fut. au I likewise exhibit the exceptional non-appearance of a reflex for the reconstructed \*k in the word for I as Saa *ineu*. It is perhaps worth noting that the absence of an intervocalic reflex in S. *?ae* cannot reasonably be attributed to dissimilation in view of Tolo (a dialect of Saa) *?u?u toe* assigned to \*kuku *nail*. There is thus evidence that Dempwolff's wholesale reinterpretation of the missing ? may have led to some errors.

The correspondence associated with \*k<sub>3</sub> is found in many other pairs of presumed Saa-Lau cognates than the one cited above, but these cannot be traced to Proto-Austronesian. The following is a list:

- S., L. *kale child*  
 S. *käu clutch with fingers*, L. *ka-kau finger*  
 S. *kao-kao*, L. *ka-kao coconut shell*  
 U., L. *kilu hole, grave*  
 S., L. *kone be in flood*  
 S. *kue*, L. *kua fowl*  
 S., L. *kulu bury at sea*  
 S. *kute*, L. *kuta shake*  
 S. *kakamu edge, border*, L. *kakamu fringe, skirt*  
 Tolo *kämu*, L. *kamu chew betel*  
 S. *komu-komu*, L. *ko-komu islet*  
 U., L. *nuku wrinkle*

It would be difficult to maintain a hypothesis that all of these could have resulted from borrowing.

There is still another Saa-Lau correspondence, assigned now to \*k<sub>4</sub>, that is illustrated in the following. It is dubious whether it can be traced to Proto-Austronesian, but until this uncertainty is removed, we keep the possibility open. The examples are:

- S. *ta?e*, L. *take stand*  
 S. *?ile*, L. *kila stone axe*  
 S. *?iri?o* (1918), *irio* (1929), L. *kirio porpoise*

Of these the last offers the possibility of association with PAN *kuRita*['], Jav. *keritò*, Mer. *hurita*, Fi. *kuita polyp*. The obstacles are the semantism and the internal ? which would seemingly then have to reflect \*t. In any case there are different PSL



phonemes to be associated with \*k<sub>1</sub>, \*k<sub>3</sub>, and \*k<sub>4</sub>, whereas apparently \*k<sub>2</sub> was lost in PSL.

Dempwolff formed the hypothesis that PAN t was lost in Saa everywhere except in clusters. In fact however Ivens (1918) regularly exhibits ? for initial PAN t and loss for intervocalic (and of course final) PAN t. The exceptions are very few, being the following found in both editions of Ivens: S. *aau season* (\*taqun, Tag. taqon year), *uunu burn* (\*tunu['], Jav. tunu burn), *ulu wade* (\*tuRun Mal. turon descend), *äuhenu native* (\*tau['], Tag. ta·wo person). There are in addition some words in which an internal \*t is reflected by ? in 1918 and nothing in 1929. Thus S. (1918) hi-?olo, (1929) hlolo hungry (\*telen, Mal. telan swallow); S. (1918) sa?olu, (1929) saolu egg (\*-teluR, Tag. qltlog egg). The second ? of S. ?iri?o (1918), irio (1929) could be interpreted in the same way as the preceding in connection with the etymology suggested above.

These discrepancies in respect to Saa ? as recorded in Ivens 1918 and Ivens 1929 which concern reflexes of \*t can not be dissociated from the discrepancies with respect to \*k cited above. Combined they show distinct differences in the determination of Saa ? which are not satisfactorily explained as corrections. Rather it appears that they are enveloped in a mystery which can be resolved only by another examination.

#### SUMMARY

A review of Saa words cognate both with Lau words and with those of more distant Austronesian languages has developed stronger evidence than before suggesting that Dempwolff's reconstructions were insufficient to explain the Saa velolabials and that the best provisional hypothesis is that Proto-Austronesian had phonemes with combined labial and velar articulation such as those hinted at by Haudricourt (1951) and felt necessary by Goodenough. It is however not clear that even this hypothesis will prove sufficient, so that the possibility of some such series as a velolabial distinct from labiovelar should be kept in view as well.

Evidence also accumulated that Proto-Saa-Lau shows different reflexes for PAN k. The explanation of these reflexes where they occur in cognate sets implying a Proto-Austronesian etymon has yet to be made. Provisionally they have been assigned to \*k<sub>1</sub>, \*k<sub>2</sub>, \*k<sub>3</sub> and \*k<sub>4</sub>.

The evidence also raised doubts about the reliability of Dempwolff's conclusions about Saa reflexes of PAN k, t, principally because of the inconsistencies discovered between Ivens 1918 and Ivens 1929 in the recording of ?.

## ABBREVIATIONS

<b>Bis.</b>	-	Bisayan
<b>Fi.</b>	-	Fiji
<b>Fut.</b>	-	Futuna
<b>Jav.</b>	-	Javanese
<b>Mal.</b>	-	Malay
<b>Mer.</b>	-	Merina (= Hova)
<b>PAN</b>	-	Proto-Austronesian
<b>PSL</b>	-	Proto-Saa-Lau
<b>S.</b>	-	Saa, Sa'a
<b>Sam.</b>	-	Samoa
<b>Tag.</b>	-	Tagalog
<b>To.</b>	-	Tonga
<b>Tr.</b>	-	Trukese
<b>U.</b>	-	Ulawa

## N O T E S

1. This article represents partial results obtained with the support of National Science Foundation grant GS-01468.
2. For \*s, *cf.* I. Dyen, 'Formosan evidence for some new Proto-Austronesian phonemes'. *Lingua* 14:285-305 (1965), pp. 298 ff.
3. *Cf.* Dyen 1949; p.425.
4. *Cf.* Dyen 1962.
5. Haudricourt 1951:145.
6. One thinks of the \*K and \*k reconstructed by W.H. Goodenough in his 'The Willaumez languages of New Britain' (presented to the Xth Pacific Science Congress, Honolulu) (mimeograph 1961), p.28 f. What evidence there is points to an agreement between \*k<sub>1</sub> with his \*K and \*k, whereas \*k<sub>2</sub> is apparently likewise lost in Proto-Willaumez.

## POSTSCRIPT

After submitting the preceding article I had the opportunity of interviewing Frank (Pororara) Marau of the village Suʔutaluhia, Ulawa. A very striking feature of his speech relevant to the preceding discussion is that initial single vowel was very rare, though it did occur in one word: *ococo straight*. Except for this single word, no word that I recorded begins with a vowel followed immediately by a consonant. Any word reflecting initial PAN *t* or any other initial that is lost in PSL appears in this type of Ulawa with an initial double vowel: \**taliŋa*[], U. *aaiŋe ear*; \**ipaR*, U. *iie sibling-in-law of same sex*; \**tasik*, U. *aasi sea*.

Furthermore PAN *t* is regularly reflected by nothing as Ivens 1929: U. *aau season* (\**taqun*), *uunu burn* (\**tunu*[]), *uulu wade* (\**tuRun*), *hiolo hungry* (\**telen*), *saulu egg* (\**teluR*).

The Ulawa reflexes associated with PAN *k*<sub>1</sub> are, as in Saa, respectively ʔ and *k* (presumably from \**ŋk*). The reflex is U. ʔ: U. *iie fish* (\**ikan*), *mataʔi sick* (\**sakit*), *ʔeli dig* (\**kali*[]), *ʔirio porpoise* (\**kuRita*[]), *ʔala bite* (\**kaRat*), *ʔuunu-a say it* (\**kunu*[]). The reflex is U. *k*: *ʔi-kie we* (\**kita*[]), *-ku my* (\**ku*[]), *ʔi-ʔemu ye* (\**kamu*[]), *ʔi-ʔemi we (excl.)* (\**kami*[]).

The Ulawa reflex of \**k*<sub>2</sub> is nothing: U. *ʔin-eu I* (\**aku*[]), *ʔaʔae leg* (\**kaki*[]).

No example is available for the correspondence assigned to \**k*<sub>3</sub>. However, U. *ʔele-kale child* undoubtedly contains a cognate for S., L. *kale child*, but it is the only example of this type I found.

The Ulawa examples thus suggest that Dempwolff's citation of Saa *ʔaʔe* (based on Ivens 1929 *ae leg* in connection with cognates leading to a reconstruction \**kaki*[]) is partly in error.

Though this is the only error that I have found of this type, this brief contact with Ulawa evidence makes it highly desirable to have the Saa cognates in Dempwolff reviewed and corrected wherever necessary.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### CAPELL, ARTHUR

- 1941     *A new Fijian dictionary.*     Sydney.
- 1962     'Oceanic linguistics today'. *Current Anthropology*  
3:371-431.

### DEMPWOLFF, OTTO

- 1934-37 'Vergleichende lautlehre des austronesischen wortschatzes'.  
*Zeitschr. f. Eingeb. -Spr. Beihefte* 15, 17, 19.

### DYEN, ISIDORE

- 1949     'On the history of the Trukese vowels'. *Language*  
25:420-436.
- 1962     'Some new proto-Malayopolynesian initial phonemes'.  
*Journal of the American Oriental Society.* 82:214-215.

### GOODENOUGH, G.W.

- 1962     Comment on A. Capell, 'Oceanic linguistics today'.  
*Current Anthropology* 3:371-431.

### HAUDRICOURT, ANDRÉ G.

- 1951     'Variations parallèles en mélanésien'. *Bulletin de la*  
*Society Linguistique* 47:1.140-153.
- 1965     'Problems of Austronesian comparative Philology'. *Lingua*  
14:315-329.

### IVENS, WALTER G.

- 1918     *Dictionary and grammar of the language of Sa'a and*  
*Ulawa, Solomon Islands.*     Washington.

1921 *Grammar and vocabulary of the Lau language, Solomon Islands.* Washington.

1929 *A dictionary of the language of Sa'a (Mala) and Ulawa, South-east Solomon Islands.* London.

**RAY, SIDNEY HERBERT**

1926 *A comparative study of the Melanesian island languages.* Cambridge.

