# A NOTE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE MOTU TERM hiri

# Tom Dutton Australian National University

During the course of research into the origin and history of Police Motu (now called Hiri Motu) I have come upon suggestions that run counter to the long-established ones of the origin of the <a href="https://hith.com/hiri">hithe annual trading voyages made by the Motu to the Gulf of Papua, which involve folk observations on the origin of the word itself. Briefly these suggestions claim that the <a href="https://hiri">hiri</a> was to all intents and purposes a Gulf, specifically Koriki (or <a href="https://Purari">Purari</a>), invention, and not a Motu one, and that the word <a href="hiri">hiri</a> and the idea of the <a href="https://lagatoi.com/hiri">lagatoi</a> (trading vessel or canoe) used on those <a href="hiri">hiri</a> are borrowings of Koriki words and ideas.

Normally one could easily refute or support such suggestions by appealing to other readily available evidence but, given the present rather rudimentary state of research into the origin of the <a href="https://linear.com/hirithmentary.com/hirithm

The recognised Motu tradition is that the <a href="https://hitto.com/hitto.c

From the Koriki point of view, although there is no one recognized legend attributing the hiri directly to Koriki inventiveness, there are a number of stories which do so indirectly. These stories all attribute contact with the Motu to Koriki men or women who left their homeland for various reasons and ended up in the Motu area where they married. Principal actors in these stories are Vaipa, Api, Kairi, Ke'a, I'a, and Aua. In one of these, Aua, the protagonist, was put on a raft like a lagatoi, bound up with birdlime as punishment for stealing, and sent down the Purari into the Gulf of Papua. He sang as he went and at each village he came to he tried to get the people to set him free but no one could or would. So he eventually ended up where Fisherman's Island (Daugo) is today. There the Motu found him and set him free. He stayed with them and told them about his village and sago. When they asked him how to get there he showed them, after demonstrating how to make the necessary sailing craft. He was welcomed home but because he had married a Motu woman he did

not stay. That, according to the legend, is how Fisherman's Island came to be - it is Aua's petrified <u>iri vapea</u> or raft - and how the <u>hiri</u> began. It also explains how the <u>Motu came</u> by the word <u>hiri</u> and the idea of a <u>hiri lagatoi</u>-- they did so by borrowing the Koriki word <u>iri</u> for 'tree' and transliterating their phrase <u>iri vapea</u> (lit. 'tree canoe') into their own form hiri lagatoi.<sup>4</sup>

Now these "explanations" of the observed similarities between the Koriki word for 'tree' and the Motu word for 'trading voyage', and that between the (physical) nature of the <u>lagatoi</u> and an <u>iri vapea</u> are, as already noted, indeed attractive, <u>especially given (a) the close social ties that evidently existed between the Motu and the Koriki and which provided an opportunity for linguistic borrowing, and (b) the linguistic arguments that can be advanced for deriving the Motu word <u>hiri</u> from the Koriki word <u>iri</u> and the Motu meaning 'trading voyage' from the Koriki meaning 'tree'.</u>

The social ties are incontrovertible, being embodied as they are in oral tradition of the kind quoted above and also manifested by Motu use of a simplified form of the Koriki language for trade purposes with them (Dutton, 1979), as well as by the presence of at least one identifiable borrowing from Koriki in Motu and perhaps a second. The linguistic arguments involve explaining why there is an  $\underline{h}$  in the Motu form (i.e., how it came to be there) and how, or why, the semantic change from 'tree' to 'trading voyage' could have occurred.

In the former case the <u>h</u> can be "explained" by claiming that it was added (to borrowed <u>iri</u>) by a particular group of speakers and subsequently (for some unexplained reason) adopted by others as the standard pronunciation. Support for the second part is never likely to be forthcoming given that the society never had a written tradition. However, support for the first part of such a claim is to be found in Taylor (1970:265-66) where some examples of words are given in which Kapakapa speakers use an <u>h</u> where others do not. Since at least one of those words, <u>hura</u> 'lobster', is a reflex of Proto-Oceanic (POC) \*quda( $\underline{n}$ ) (Wurm and Wilson, 1975:123) which, by Motu sound laws should be <u>ura</u>, the form used in fact in other Motu villages, it is clear that the <u>h</u> has been added in Kapakapa rather than lost in other communalects.

Similarly the semantic shift from 'tree' to 'trading voyage' can be "explained" by pointing to the fact that, universally, words do change their meanings by association, that is, by speakers transferring the name of one thing to another closely associated with it or by using the term for a part of something to refer to the whole etc. So in this case one could argue that 'tree' became 'trading voyage' through the association of 'tree' with 'log' with 'canoe' and finally with 'trading voyage'.

Now although these arguments are quite plausible and despite certain weaknesses in them (e.g., they involve a number of steps which

weaken the argument in proportion to the numbers of such steps involved), they are but one side of the coin; there are other possibilities that have to be considered before a proper decision can be made. These other possibilities have to do with the fact that Motu is an Austronesian language (AN), and that it was, and still is, surrounded by and in contact with other AN and non-Austronesian (NAN) languages. Thus there are, a priori, two other cases to consider. In one the question is: Did Motu inherit the word from some earlier stage in its history when it was part of some former proto-language? In the other, the question is: Did Motu borrow the word from some language other than Koriki that it was in contact with? However, as both these questions are mutually exclusive (i.e., both cannot be correct) it is not necessary to consider both cases equally thoroughly before making a decision: the second case need only be investigated if the former is non-productive, or vice versa. Let us begin with the first one.

Given that Motu is an AN language most closely related to languages in the immediate vicinity (Pawley, 1975) and thence to languages further east around the south-east tip of the mainland (Pawley, 1975; Ross, 1979) and thence most probably to languages in that sub-group of Oceanic that are often referred to as Eastern Oceanic (Biggs, 1965; Pawley, 1972; Grace, 1976), it is amongst these languages that one is most likely to find related, or cognate, forms that one needs to determine the case one way or the other, if such forms exist in any AN languages at all.

Actually there are two hiri words in Motu (excluding derived forms)7: one, hiri $_1$ , can be either a noun or a verb and means 'trading voyage', 8 and the other, hiri2, is a verb meaning 'to fasten by twisting round and round etc' (Lister-Turner & Clark, n.d.). A survey of some of the relevant languages in the sub-groups just mentioned above is sufficient to show that both have cognates in most of The full list is given in Appendix 1 where it is pointed out that cognates have been established by appealing, for each language in turn, to sound laws for deriving present-day sounds in those languages from established POC ones. From this evidence it is clear that the two Motu forms are derived from one or two proto-forms of shape \*pidi.9 Just how many, however, is not important to the discussion.10 What is important is that the Motu forms are reflexes of one or more POC forms so that they must be inherited words and not borrowed ones.  $^{11}$  Thus there is no way that Motu <u>hiri</u> 'trading voyage' can be a borrowing of Koriki iri 'tree' or of any similar word from any other language for that matter. But if that is true where does that leave Koriki iri? Is it to be seen, in reverse, as a borrowing from Motu or from some other language, or is it, like Motu hiri, also a reflex of some earlier proto-form?

If it is to be seen as a borrowing from Motu, then one has to explain not only the loss of  $\underline{h}$  but also the meaning change from 'trade' to 'tree'. While the former is a plausible change given that there is no  $\underline{h}$  in Koriki, the other is not nearly so. This is so because

for one thing 'tree' is an item of basic vocabulary, and, as such (by definition), is not likely to have been borrowed as 'trade' to replace an existing word for 'tree', 12 especially when there is no evidence of word taboo in Koriki which might have assisted such a process. Another, better, explanation of the origin of <u>iri</u> 'tree' that is based on the observation that there appear to be cognates in Koiarian and other NAN language families of the area (see Appendix 2) is that it is either a retention from some earlier NAN proto-language which has Koriki and other NAN languages of Southern Papua New Guinea as daughter languages, or is a borrowing from one of them. Which of these two latter possibilities (i.e., retention or borrowing) is the more probable is impossible to say as there are insufficient lexical similarities (i.e., apparent cognates) between Koriki and other NAN languages (e.g., no more than 4%, or chance) for regular sound correspondences to be established and used in making a principled decision.

That then leaves us with the iri vapea - hiri lagatoi relation-I have shown above that Motu hiri is derived from POC \*pidi. It is also clear that lagator is derived from the POC forms \*wanka(n) 'canoe' and \*tolu 'three' and so cannot be derived from vapea by any set of other than arbitrary Koriki-to-Motu sound laws. Thus hiri lagatoi cannot be a borrowing of Koriki iri vapea. It is also clear that iri vapea is not a borrowing of hiri lagatoi for similar reasons. Yet there is a connection between the two, notably a semantic one based on the similarity in reference of the words for 'canoe', vapea and lagatoi, in each. Given then that both Motu hiri and lagatoi derive from POC forms and that the Koriki "see" (albeit mistakenly) a connection between Motu hiri and their own iri, it must be the case that the Koriki phrase is derived in some way from the Motu one and The only possible explanation remaining is that the not vice versa. Koriki phrase represents a loan translation, or calque, of the Motu one which is based on the wrong premise that Koriki iri and Motu hiri are formally and semantically related. That is, the Koriki once having perceived a certain similarity between one of their own sailing craft and a Motu one, and having made the connection between the Motu word hiri and their own iri translated the idea contained in the Motu phrase hiri lagatoi into their own iri vapea. That the two phrases mean entirely different things (viz. that hiri lagatoi means 'a canoe for going on a hiri' while iri vapea means 'a canoe made of logs')13 is immaterial, since non-congruence of meaning is an expected feature, nay, almost a defining feature, of such calques.

 Motu <u>hiri</u> and Koriki <u>iri</u> are not related words but are chance correspondences;

2. Motu hiri lagatoi and Koriki iri vapea are not related formally although they are semantically related, the latter being a folk translation or calque of the former;

3. The origin of Koriki iri is unclear - it could be either a

retention from an earlier proto-language of which Koriki is one daughter language, or a borrowing from some neighbouring

NAN language;

#### NOTES

- 1. This is a revised version of a paper presented to the Thirteenth Annual Congress of the Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea, Port Moresby, September, 1979. I should like to thank the Australian National University for the funds it has given me over the years to enable me to continue research work in Papua New Guinea. I should also like to thank the following colleagues for supplying additional information and/or making suggestions for improving the quality of this paper: Andrew Taylor, Malcolm Ross, John Lynch, Ray Johnston, Paul Brennan, Brian Cheetham, and Don Laycock.
- Readers not familiar with the location of the Motu and the general nature of the hiri should see Barton (1910) and Groves (1972). More recent observations are to be found in Dutton (ed) (1982).
- 3. Compare this with Williams' comment (1924:124-7) that he did not find "any general legend concerning the origin of the traffic though the names Avaia and Kairi obviously local Koriki names have been given for the leaders of the first lagatoi to visit Koriki."
- 4. Although the Motu never use the phrase <a href="hiri lagatoi">hiri lagatoi</a>, the Koriki did in putting forward their claim that this paper examines and so it is used throughout this paper where relevant.
- The identifiable one is <u>nakimi</u> 'brother-in-law' or 'sister-in-law' (Lister-Turner & Clarke, n.d.) which has long been re-5. cognised as a Koriki word (Chatterton, 1970:96) although the form as such is not an actual Koriki lexical item but a fusion of the Koriki possessive pronoun na 'my' and the noun kimi 'in-law' (Kairi and Kolia, 1977:24). This fusion is interesting since as Andrew Taylor has pointed out to me (pers.comm.) nakimi is the only Motu kinship term which does not take the normal Motu kinship possessive suffixes but is possessed like alienable nouns, e.g., (lau) egu nakimi 'my brother/ sister-in-law'. The term of address 'my-in-law' was presumably borrowed as it was the most commonly heard. The na- would have meant 'my' to people who knew the trading language and this may explain why, when the term was initially borrowed by the Motu, no possessive suffix was added. Motu had, and still has, a word for 'in-law of the same generation', iha-na. Nakimi means 'in-law of the same generation' now in Motu, i.e., is narrower than 'in-law' but wider than 'brother-in-law' or 'sister-inlaw'. Of less import, but of some interest, is the fact that nakimi is the only kin term in Motu with three syllables. It is also often shortened to naki and may be used as a verb as in idia be daika e naki-a-mu? (lit. they be who they call.

naki-singular object- present continuous) "Who are they calling naki?" in the sense of "Who do they think they are?"

The second possible borrowing is the suffix -bu (or as it is sometimes written, -pu) in Koitabu, the Motu name for the Koita, the Non-Austronesian speakers living in and around their own villages at the time of first European contact. In Koriki -pu indicates a group of people (Holmes, 1924:290) so that given again the Motu-Koriki contact it is possible (although difficult to tell how probable) that that contact is the source of the -bu suffix in Koitabu. Why the Motu would have done this, however, in this particular case and not in others is puzzling and seriously weakens the probability that this is indeed the source.

- 6. This hierarchy of relationships has yet to be determined conclusively but the present discussion does not depend on this. All that is needed here is a suggestion of where best to look for probable cognates.
- 7. There are two such derived forms: <a href="https://hit
- 8. For full definitions see Appendix 1. Note, however, here that <a href="https://hitsub.com/hitights-notes">hitights-notes</a> a specific cultural concept and as such cannot be defined so easily. To go on a <a href="https://hitights-notes">hitights-notes</a> into only the trading voyage itself but also all the supporting preparation, ritual, magic, politics, etc. that go with it.
- 9. I use Pawley's (1975:17, 19) orthography for reconstructed Proto-Oceanic forms, although Wurm and Wilson (1975), and references therein, were actually used as the checklist of presently available reconstructed forms.
- 10. The question is nevertheless interesting. Semantically, <a href="https://hiri.google.com">hiri.google.com</a> seems to be derived from a hitherto unreconstructed protoform \*pidi having something to do with 'assistance, help, paying a debt etc' as evidenced by the data in the left-hand column of Appendix 1. Yet one cannot help feeling that there is a close semantic relation between this meaning and the 'twist, plait etc' meanings of the previously reconstructed form \*pidi particularly, as Don Laycock (pers.comm.) has pointed out, that in plaiting Melanesians regard one strand as helping the others to form the plait. Note also that another

possible form \*piRi (from which Motu hiri and hiri could equally well be derived by Motu sound laws) is blocked by the hiri form in Mangarevan (Tahitian). If this were to be a reflex of \*piRi it should have had the form hii and since there is no form in the language with the relevant meaning \*piRi cannot be the putative proto-form.

- 11. Actually it is not necessary to go beyond the Hula evidence in Appendix 1 for this (except for deciding between \*piRi and \*pidi as the "correct" reconstruction as already noted) for, as John Lynch (pers.comm.) pointed out to me, Motu hiri cannot be a borrowing of Hula vili, the most likely source since the Motu and Hula traded with each other quite extensively, because they both reflect POC \*pidi in the right form for their respective languages.
- 12. Whereas note that 'trade' in the Motu case is not.
- I should like to thank Andrew Taylor again for drawing my attention to this.

#### APPENDIX 1

### Cognates of Motu hiri and hiri in some Oceanic Languages

In what follows forms have been established as cognates on the basis of their semantic similarity to the meanings of the Motu forms as well as on the basis of regular sound correspondences between the languages concerned and as summarized in established Proto-Oceanic reconstructions (Wurm and Wilson, 1975). Relevant Motu and Hula rules of derivation are to be found in Pawley (1975); Dobu and Molima in Cochran (1978) and Ross (1979); Fijian, Sa'a, Mota, Rotuman, Samoan, Tongan, and Tahitian in Cashmore (1969) and Biggs (1978). The rest were determined by me using Grace (1969) and available published materials in the individual languages.

In the listing the symbol ? is used to indicate that I could not find any evidence in the source consulted but that the search was limited by the nature of the source itself (e.g, because it was not very detailed or contained only English-to-vernacular entries); while the symbol # is used to indicate that the relevant form does not occur in the source and therefore probably does not occur in the language since the sources used were good-to-very good dictionaries.

Language	<u>hiri</u> 1	hiri <sub>2</sub>	<u>Source</u>
Motu	hiri: a long trading voyage to the west	hiri: to fasten by twisting round and round; tie up a parcel or bundle by twisting string all round it; to kill (e.g., pig) for visitors	Lister-Turner & Clark (n.d.)
Hula	vilipara: trading fleet ['Trade' as such is voivoi and 'voyage' is ravuravu.]	? [There is, however, vavepinu 'to twist' and vepinu 'twisted which have the right semantics but the wrong reflexes of POC *pidi. This suggests that they are either innovations or borrowings from a related language in which POC *p > p, *d > n, and	

		sound changes in these particular items in the language.]	
Dobu	? <sup>2</sup>	? 2	Bromilow (1904)
Tolai	<sub>#</sub> 3	Either pir 'to plait, as a basket or mat', or wir 'to plait, weave; plait coconut leaves round trees to make them tapu'4	Lanyon- Orgill (1960)
Lau	firi: to help, assist firi(t)a: penalty, fine firisia: money given after death	firi: to twist round, coil round; tie up [Also, firo 'to twist', and firu 'tangled, of hair; to fight, dispute' but the final vowels are unexplained.]	Fox (1974)
The e gives ili form but i gives the in the Dob bir, Are m wile/a, Id to turn o described Vario avai or av bination o (POC *pa(k problem wi	re this with the Muyuw for xpected Dobuan reflex of 'to mix or stir food in a s of doubtful semantics. following established cogularea, however: Suau: tasi-bira, Wedau mamai/ta-vuna havi-vila, Kilivila theself around'. The prefixes the second of ahi for 'to make a journe f prefixes the second of a)- ) leaving hi as the process of the second of the se	*pidi is $(\phi, ')$ i $(r, 1)$ i. pot' which is one poss Malcolm Ross (pers.com nates for hiriz in othe 'i-ili, Misima tata-pilire/i, Tavara (East Capo-vila, Muyuw tou-vin, ixes are the classificator languages of this action or the coast of New Bey in a canoe' where avawhich, va-, is a causatossible reflex of POC *eflex is, however, that	Grant (1953) ible right m. 23.9.79) r languages , Ubir mata- e) lahuga- katu-vin tory ones rea. ritain) have is a com- ive one

Hula (con't)

\*i • u finally,  $^{1}$  or they

contain unexplained

According to Tolai sound laws both these forms are equally expected. Malcolm Ross (pers.comm. 23.9.79) also adds Tolai vila, likun and Lihir wir 'turn (oneself) around' as other possible candidates.

form is vi (Ray Johnston, pers.comm.).

Arosi	hiri: pay a fine for, make atone- ment for, death by violence	hiri: twist, twine round, coil (of a snake), wind a line around	Fox (1978)
'Are'Are	hiri'a: pay a fine hiri'i hiri'a: make atonement for a death by violence, by poisoning, drowning, or otherwise	hiri'i-a: twist, entwine; tie bind, with a vine	Geerts (1970)
Sa'a	#	#	Ivens (1929)
Mota	#	vir: twist, wring, squeeze with a twist; plait a cord; vivir: throw with a twist given to the stone	Codrington & Palmer (1896)
Fijian	#	# [viri 'to throw' has the correct for but the wrong seman tics; but compare with Mota vivir above]	
Samoan	#	fili: plait, braid (of sennit, hair etc) tafili: decorate, dress (something) by plaiting coconut (or other) leaves around it filifili: chain	Milner (1966)
Rotuman	#	hiri: plait (three strands) of sennit, hair etc	
Tongan	? [There is, however,	?	Tregear (1969)

Tongan (con't) hilihili 'to seek fruit when only a few and scarce' which has the right semantics but the wrong form -- the expected form is filifili. This suggests that hili hili is either an innovation or a borrowing from a related language in which POC \*p > h and \*d >1, or the POC \*p >h is an unexplained sound change in this particular word in the language]

Mangarevan (Tahitian) <u>aka-hiri</u>: to help <u>hiri</u>: to weave Tregear (1969)
a sick person;
aka-hirihiri: to
put the food all
round the sides of
the oven

### APPENDIX 2

## Words for 'Tree' in Some Non-Austronesian Languages and Language Families in Southern Papua New Guinea

In this listing probable cognates are underlined.

Language/Language Family	'tree'	Source
Kiwaian	a) ota b) nu'a	Franklin (1973)
Koriki (Purari)	<u>iri</u>	Dutton (1979) Franklin (1973)
Ipiko	<u>dé</u>	Franklin (1973)
Teberan and Pawaian	a) <u>ni</u> b) <u>i</u>	Franklin (1973)
Huli	<u>iria</u>	Cheetham (pers.comm.)
Kewa	a) <u>re</u> pona b) <u>re</u> pena c) ri	Franklin <u>et al</u> . (1978)
Enga	ita	Lang (1973)
Eleman	a) kora b) tola	Franklin (1973)
Koiarian	<u>idi</u>	Dutton (1969)
Manubaran	yabo	Dutton (1970)
Kwalean	a) <u>ire</u> b) ibado c) tuba'a	Dutton (1970)
Mailuan	ana	Dutton (1966-69)
Dagan	a) ano b) (y)oma c) kaiyam d) <u>itura</u> e) <u>ira</u> f) <u>iye</u>	Dutton (1966-69)
Binanderean	a) <u>ri</u> b) <del>ik</del> a c) ĩ	Dutton (1966-69)
Yareban	ana	Dutton (1966-69)
Angan	a) i-pati b) <u>ika(')</u> c) <u>iya</u> d) <u>ita</u>	Franklin (1973)
	201	

e) igya igya f) isa g) iga(') Angan (con't) នាក់ការ ម៉ែន ស្រាស់ Willy all our  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{C}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{C}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\sqrt{C}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} + \frac{$ NOTES OF MARKET 45 1 12.91 State House 1 161 - 613.0 PART REPORT (4.4 克特拉) (4.5 g) A (CONTRACTOR Activity is i

### REFERENCES

- Barton, F.R. 1910. 'The Annual Trading Expedition to the Papuan Gulf'. In C.G. Seligmann: The Melanesians of British New Guinea, Cambridge University Press, pp.96-120.
- Biggs, B. 1965. 'Direct and Indirect Inheritance in Rotuman', Lingua 14: 383-415.
- ----- 1978. 'The History of Polynesian Phonology'. In S.A.
  Wurm and L. Carrington (eds): Second International Conference
  on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings (PL, C61, Canberra),
  pp.691-716.
- Bromilow, W.E. 1904. Vocabulary of English Words with Equivalents in Dobu (British New Guinea), Fijian and Samoan, with a short Dobuan Grammar. Geelong: Thacker.
- Brown, H.A. 1968. A <u>Dictionary of Toaripi</u>. Oceanic Linguistics Monograph No.11, <u>University of Sydney</u>.
- Capell, A. 1973. <u>A New Fijian Dictionary</u>. 4th Edition. Suva: Government Printer.
- Cashmore, C. 1969. 'Some Proto-Eastern Oceanic Reconstructions', Oceanic Linguistics 8(1): 1-25.
- Chatterton, P. 1970. 'The Origin and Development of Police Motu', Kivung 3: 95-98.
- Churchward, C.M. 1940. <u>Rotuman Grammar and Dictionary</u>. Sydney: Australasian Medical Publishing Co.
- Cochran, A. 1978. 'A Comparative Study of Milne Bay Phonology'. In S.A. Wurm and L. Carrington (eds): Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings (PL, C61, Canberra), pp.851-866.
- Codrington, R.H. and J. Palmer. 1896. A <u>Dictionary of the Language of Mota</u>. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Dutton, T.E. 1966-69. Unpublished Vocabularies. Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.
- Observations. PL, B9, Canberra. Some Preliminary
- ----- 1970. 'Notes on the Languages of the Rigo Area of the Central District of Papua'. In S.A. Wurm and D.C. Laycock (eds):

- Pacific Linguistic Studies in Honour of Arthur Capell (PL, C13, Canberra), pp.879-983.
- Papua', Mankind 11: 341-54.
- Used by the Motu in the Gulf of Papua', <u>Kivung</u>, 12(1):1-73.
- Long Distance Motu Trade in Central Papua. Canberra, The
  Australian National University, Pacific Research Monograph Number
- Central Papua: A First Survey. Occasional Paper No.15,
  Department of Language, University of Papua New Guinea.
- Dyen, I. 1965. A Lexicostatistical Classification of the Austronesian Languages. IJAL Memoir 19, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Fox, C.E. 1974. Lau Dictionary. PL, C25, Canberra.
- Arosi Index prepared by Mary Craft. PL, C57, Canberra.
- Franklin, K.J. (ed). 1973. The Linguistic Situation in the Gulf

  District and Adjacent Areas, Papua New Guinea. PL, C26,
  Canberra.
- Grammatical and Anthropological Materials. PL, C53, Canberra.
- Geerts, P. 1970. 'Are'Are Dictionary. PL, C14, Canberra.
- Grace, G. 1955. 'Subgrouping of Malayo-Polynesian: A Report of Tentative Findings', American Anthropologist 62:337-39.
- ----- 1969. 'A Proto-Oceanic Finder List', <u>University of Hawaii</u> Working Papers in <u>Linguistics</u>, 1(1):39-84.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1976. Review Article: R.C. Green and M. Kelly (eds):

  Studies in Oceanic Culture History, Vol.3 (Pacific Anthropological Records 13, Bishop Museum, Honolulu), Journal of the Polynesian Society 85(1):103-12.
- Grant, R.V. 1953. A School Dictionary in the Dobu Language.
  Methodist Mission Press, Rabaul.
- Groves, M. 1972. 'Hiri'. In P. Ryan (ed) Encyclopedia of Papua New Guinea (Melbourne University Press in association with the

....

- University of Papua New Guinea), pp.523-27.
- Holmes, J.H. 1924. In Primitive New Guinea. London: Seeley Service.
- Ivens, W.G. 1929. A Dictionary of the Language of Sa'a (Mala) and Ulawa. London: Oxford University Press and Melbourne University Press.
- Kairi, T. and J. Kolia. 1977. 'Purari Language Notes', Oral History 5(10):2-90.
- Lang, A. 1973. Enga Dictionary with English Index. PL, C20, Canberra.
- Lanyon-Orgill, P.A. 1960. A Dictionary of the Raluana Language (New Britain, S.W. Pacific). The Author, Canada.
- Levy, R. and N. Smith. 1969. 'A Proto-Malaitan Lexicon'. Mimeo. University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Lister-Turner, R. and J.B. Clark. n.d. A Dictionary of the Motu Language of Papua. 2nd edition edited by Percy Chatterton. Government Printer, Sydney.
- Lithgow, D.R. 1978. 'Austronesian Languages: Milne Bay and Adjacent Islands (Milne Bay Province)'. Section 4.4.10 in S.A. Wurm (ed)

  New Guinea Area Languages and Language Study: Vol.2:

  Austronesian Languages, PL, C39, Canberra, pp. 441-525.
- Milner, G.B. 1966. <u>Samoan Dictionary</u>. Oxford University Press.
- Oram, N.D. 1981. 'The History of the Motu-Speaking and Koita-Speaking Peoples According to their Own Traditions'. In D. Denoon and R. Lacey (eds) Oral Tradition in Melanesia, Port Moresby, pp.207-229.
- Pawley, A.K. 1972. 'On the Internal Relationships of Eastern Oceanic Languages'. In R.M. Green and M. Kelly (eds) <u>Studies in Oceanic Culture History, Vol.3</u> (Pacific Anthropological Records 13, Bishop Museum, Honolulu), pp.1-135.
- of Central Papua: A Preliminary Study'. In T.E. Dutton (ed)
  Studies in Languages of Central and South-East Papua, PL, C29,
  Canberra pp.3-107.
- ----- 1976. 'Austronesian Languages: Western Part of South-Eastern Mainland Papua'. In Wurm (ed) (1976), pp.301-21.
- Ross, M. 1979. 'The Austronesian Languages of Papua: Towards A Family Tree'. Mimeo. University of Papua New Guinea.

- Short, L.M. 1963. The Phonetics and Grammar of the Hula Language with Vocabulary and Translation and Notes of Other Dialects of the Hood Bay District. Unpub. MA Thesis, University of Adelaide.
- Taylor, A. 1970. Syntax and Phonology of Motu (Papua): A Transformational Approach. Unpub. PhD Thesis, The Australian National University.
- Tregear, E. 1969. The Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary. Reprint. Anthropological Publications, The Netherlands.
- Williams, F.E. 1924. <u>The Natives of the Purari Delta</u>. Port Moresby: Government Printer.
- Wurm, S.A. (ed) 1976. New Guinea Area Languages and Language Study Vol.2, Austronesian Languages. PL, C39, Canberra.
- ----- and B. Wilson. 1975. English Finderlist of Reconstructions in Austronesian Languages (Post-Brandstetter). PL, C33, Canberra.