27)   *Wo-bigi-ya   lama-bigi-bigi   wo-yo-bigi   airstrip.*
      1pxS-OC-OF   1pxPS3-PL-thing   1pxS-fly-OC   airstrip
      'We (got) our things and we quickly (carried them) to the airstrip.'
28)   *Ya-njogha   ya-thin   lo-nambo.*
      1sS-move.back   1sS-OC   1sPS3-basket
      'I went back and (got) my basket.'
29)   *I-voro   i-wo   gaeba   na   i-mban   gha-nji   we.*
      3sS-move.up   3sS-OC   dish   and   3sS-OC   food-3pPS1   there.
      'She went up, (got) a dish and (put) their food there.'

References

Ross, M. D. 1988. *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia*. Pacific
        Linguistics C-98. Canberra: Australian National University.
Senft, Gunter. 1986. *Kilivila, the language of the Trobriand Islanders*. Berlin: Mouten de Gruyter.

SIL, Box 356
Ukarumpa via Lae
PAPUA NEW GUINEA

A note on Hees' 'Tolai-Nakanai' trade language

Tom Dutton and Malcolm Ross

In the 1915-16 volume of *Anthropos* Fr Friedrich Hees published a paper on myths and stories of the Nakanai people of the north coast of New Britain. In a footnote to that paper (pp.48-49) Hees mentions that the coastal inhabitants of the Gazelle Peninsua - speakers of what he calls 'Tuna', i.e. the Tolai - used a trade language[1] in trading (mainly for shells) with the Nakanai.

Although Hees gives examples of this trade language, his description of the socio-linguistic situation obtaining between the parties is unclear. The reader cannot tell whether

---

[1] Hees' term for this was *Mittelsprache*, literally a 'middle' or go-between language.

it was one of passive bilingualism (or 'dual lingualism'), such as is commonly found elsewhere in Papua New Guinea (Lincoln 1979-80), or whether this trade language was some simplified or pidginised form of Nakanai or Tolai, or merely a dialectal variant of one of them. To illustrate the kinds of things said and the nature of the language used he published five short sentences in it together with corresponding sentences in the 'Nakanai dialects' of Mount Pago (*Zweispitzberg*) with which Hees was familiar and of the Open Bay area.

When Hees wrote, little was known of the linguistic relationships among the languages of the area except that they were "Melanesian" (p.48) and clearly similar to one another in many respects. Thus Hees (p.48, fn.2) cites Fr Rascher, who worked among the Masava people of the Gazelle Peninsula and had made a trip to the 'Nakanai' area in 1897:

> Fr Rascher says in his report that the Nakanai dialect is very similar to that of the Masava people (i.e. the Massokonapuka people of the Gazelle Peninsula) and that he could understand many a sentence in the conversation between his people and those of the Nakanai.[2]

At the same time Hees writes that he himself had also noticed some striking similarities between the Masava dialect and that of Open Bay. However, he believed that the reason for Rascher's ability to understand the Nakanai was not so much the similarities of the dialects used but that the inhabitants of the Gazelle Peninsula ('Tuna' speakers) used a trade language to converse with the Nakanai.

Since then no one has taken up the challenge inherent in Hees' claim to investigate the nature of this trade language. Recently, however, in response to increasing interest in indigenous pidgins in Papua New Guinea one of us (Dutton) began looking more closely at Hees' material. Unfortunately he was unable to come to a clear-cut decision about the nature of the trade language because of his lack of knowledge of the area and of the languages concerned. It was then that the other of us (Ross) came to his aid and clarified a number of points.

Hees bases his use of the terms 'dialect' (German *Dialekt*) and 'language' (*Sprache*) on ethnographic rather than linguistic similarity. Thus his reference to two 'Nakanai dialects', Mount Pago and Open Bay, seems to be influenced more by ethnographic than linguistic similarity, as they are clearly distinct languages. (Hees himself gives ample data to show that they are not lingustically similar.) Hees in fact makes reference to four separate languages, but does so in a way which implies that there are only two. These languages are listed below by the terms with which Hees refers to them, together with the names used in Ross (1988: 258, 260).

.

---

[2] Translations from Hees' German are ours.

a)   The Mount Pago (*Zweispitzberg*) Nakanai 'dialect' which Hees spoke. This is indeed Nakanai, probably the Bileki dialect described by Johnston (1980), to judge from its location and from the ample data cited by Hees.

b)   The 'dialect' spoken by the 'Nakanai' of Open Bay and Lolobao Island. This was **Meramera** (or Melamela), as is clear both from the locations given by Hees and from the data he cites (these include the Meramera equivalents of numerous Nakanai words and a Meramera text on life after death on page 55, and they match data collected by Ross). Meramera is decidely not a dialect of Nakanai, as the sample below illustrates.

c)   The 'Tuna language', usually known today as the Tolai language of the Gazelle Peninsula.

d)   The 'dialect' of the Masava or Massokonapuka people. Hees assumes this to be a dialect of 'Tuna', but cites no data from it. As we will see below, however, the trade language data he gives have a large element from this language. The names Masava and Massokonapuka refer, according to a map of the Gazelle Peninsula in Burger (1913:6), to the people living around the cape at the north-westernmost point of *Weber-Hafen* (on modern maps Ataliklikun Bay), i.e. on the coastal strip at the northern end of the Bainings mountains. This was the **Minigir** language, whose speakers, or a remnant of them (it is not known exactly which), have moved to Lungalunga village on the east coast of the bay but still have gardens at the old location (Ross 1988: 259).[3]

All four languages are members of the Meso-Melanesian linkage of Oceanic Austronesian languages. Nakanai and Meramera are members of the Willaumez family of that linkage (Ross 1988:258, 262-264), whilst Tolai and Minigir are members of the South New Ireland/Northwest Solomonic network (Ross 1988:258-259, 301-314) within that linkage.

With these identifications, we are in a position to turn to Hees' five short sentences in the trade language (T) and in what we now know to be Nakanai (N) and Meramera (M). These are set out below with morpheme boundaries and interlinear glosses provided by us.[4]

---

[3] Map 13 of Wurm and Hattori (1981) shows the whole of the west coast of Ataliklikun Bay as the territory of speakers of the Masava dialect of Tolai. This is inaccurate both in that Masava is not properly a Tolai dialect and that its speakers never seem to have occupied such a large area.

[4] Other changes from Hees are that glottal stops have been inserted where appropriate in Meramera and, in the Nakanai and Meramera versions of the third sentence, the second person singular pronoun (given as an alternative by Hees) has been substituted for its plural counterpart in order to match the pronoun of the trade language version. Abbreviations used in interlinear glosses for pronouns have two parts separated by a colon. The letter before the colon indicates the paradigm to which the pronoun belongs: D = disjunctive (independent), O = object clitic, P = possessor suffix. The digit 1, 2 or 3 immediately after the pronoun indicates the person, and letters following the digit are S (singular), P (plural), and E (exclusive). Other abbreviations in interlinear glosses are A = article, LOC = local deictic, POSS = possessive classifier, TA = tense/aspect/mood clitic.

T: *tau-gu,*   *evou mi*   *tabari-au a*   *pasu,*   *a*   *tubeni, iau*   *mi*
N: *e tau-gu,*   *eme*   *abia-gu la*   *mavo, la*   *tubeli, eau*   *ge*
M: *tau-gu,*   *oʔo*   *paane-au a*   *mavo,*   *a*   *tubeni eau*   *na*

     A cousin-P:1S D:2S TA give-O:1S A   taro   A   shell   D:1S   TA

    T: *tabar*   *evou a*   *buei*
    N: *abia-m*   *la*   *bua*
    M: *bili-o*   *a*   *bua*

        give-O:2S D:2S A   betelnut

    'Cousin, give me taro and shells and I'll give you betelnut.'

T: *amutou me*   *mugamuga amiteu*
N: *amutou*   *lobelobe*   *amiteu*
M: *amutou*   *gilogilo*   *amiteu*

    D:2P   TA   insult   D:1EP

    'You insult us.'

T: *iau*   *susugi evou la*   *tumali*   *karigu*[5]
N: *eau*   *puli*   *me*   *somuli la*   *mautu*   *tegeaku*
M: *eau ni*[6] *lage*   *oʔo*   *umuli a*   *ubu*   *minau*

    D:1S TA take   D:2S LOC go.to   A   homestead POSS.P:1S

    'I'll take you to my homestead.'

T: *tau-gu*   *a*   *boroi me*   *lulueli*   *mi*   *toku*   *mi*   *lali*
N: *e tau-gu,*   *la*   *bolo*   *usu*   *sesele*   *mai*
M: *tau-gu*   *a*   *bolo*   *gunuana*   *boasele*   *too-mane*[7]

    A cousin-P:1S A pig   TA many   TA   be.true TA   be.like

    T: *asava?*
    N: *larova?*
    M: *asava?*

        what

    'Cousin, aren't there a lot of pigs?'

---

[5] The independent possessives in all three languages are glossed the same way (POSS.P:1S) for the sake of convenience, and also because the paradigms in N and M languages are odd and it is unclear what morpheme breaks, if any, should be made. Technically, T *karigu* should be *kari-gu* 'POSS-P:1S'.

[6] The Meramera future tense/aspect/mood markers include *na* 'first person singular' and *ni* 'third person singular'. The occurrence of *ni* here, where *na* is expected (cf the first sentence), may be an error on Hees' part.

[7] Hees writes *too mane* as two words. In modern Meramera this appears to be a single morpheme *tomwane* 'be like'.

T:	*evou*	*gologolo*	*iau*	*asava?*
N:	*eme*	*vasigologolo*	*au*	*larova?*
M:	*oʔo*	*toto*	*eau*	*asava?*
	D:2S	deceive	D:1S	what

'Why are you lying to me?'

It turns out that the trade language is largely Minigir (the data match those collected by Ross). The the first and second person singular pronouns *iau* and *evou* (Minigir *iau* and *iavau*), the possessive form *karigu* 'my', *tabar(i)* 'give', *pasu* 'taro', *buei* 'betelnut', *boroi* 'pig' and *lali* 'be like, resemble' are all recognisably Minigir, and clearly not Nakanai or Meramera. Whilst *iau*, *tabar*, *buei*, and *boroi* also occur in Tolai, *evou*, *karigu*, *pasu*, and *lali* do not. Minigir is a very conservative sister of Tolai and retains forms lost or replaced in Tolai. Thus Tolai has only the short form of the second person singular pronoun, *u*, and lacks a cognate of *evou*. Tolai has *kaugu* for Minigir *karigu*. Most notable is that Tolai has lost the phoneme /s/ and some final vowels, so that it has *pa* 'taro' for Mingir *pasu*.

Trade Language *asava* 'what?' is also markedly not Tolai (where /s/ is lost: *ava*). However, the Minigir form for 'what?' recorded by Ross is *asa*. It may be that this is a short form (synchronically or diachronically) of *asava*, as the latter is the expected reflex of Proto Oceanic **a sapa*. But it is also possible that Trade Language asava is from Meramera *asava*.

The article *a* occurs in Minigir, Tolai and Meramera, and in the light of the foregoing is attributable to Minigir.

The only trade language elements which are clearly not Minigir are the pronouns *amiteu* 'we (exclusive)' and *amutou* 'you (plural)', both of which occur in Meramera and Nakanai (their Minigir equivalents are *iamamami* and *iamui*).

Hees' examples indicate that the syntax of the three languages is very similar. Since Tolai and Minigir follow a very similar pattern, the syntax of the trade language is not criterial for distinguishing them. However, the trade language uses the construction *la tumali* '(down) to the homestead', apparently from Minigir *ura ra tamani* (LOC + A + homestead), a pattern peculiar to Minigir and Tolai, where Nakanai and Meramera use a coverb meaning 'to go', as described by Johnston (1980: 201-204).

We would normally expect a trade language to entail some simplifications and/or adaptations to the trade partners' language. Those which occur in this tiny corpus are minor, but they are there. Phonologically, we find:

(i)   *tumali* 'homestead' for Minigir *tamani*. This is a characteristically Nakanai adaptation, since /n/ has become /l/ in all cases in Nakanai, but the adaptation does not occur consistently in the trade language (Nakanai *tubeli* 'shell', but Trade Language *tubeni*).

(ii)   *lali* 'resemble' for Minigir *lari*. This may be an adaptive assimilation, as /l/ and /r/ do not contrast in Meramera (they do contrast in Nakanai).

(iii)   *la* 'to', apparently for Minigir *ura* 'down to',

Given the similarity of the structures of Minigir, Meramera and Nakanai, we would not expect much morphosyntactic simplification. However, there are also two possible such simplifications. The first is that Minigir, like Nakanai and Meramera, has a special paradigm of enclitic object pronouns. Thus we find Nakanai *abia-m* and Meramera *bili-o* 'give you', where *-m* and *-o* are enclitic objects. The trade language, however, has *tabar evou*, where *evou* is clearly the disjunctive second person singular pronoun. The Minigir form would be *tabari-u*. The only possible case in Hees' corpus of an object enclitic is *tabari-au*, which Hees writes *tabariau*. In the light of *gologolo iau* 'deceive me', however, it is plausible to interpret this as *tabar iau*, with the disjunctive pronoun. Hence it appears that the trade language may have replaced enclitic object pronouns with disjunctive pronouns.

The second possible morphosyntactic simplification is *la tumali*, which, as noted above, probably reflects Minigir *ura ra tamani* 'down to the homestead'. *Ura* is a member of a class of local deictics found in Tolai, Minigir and certain other south New Ireland languages (see Mosel 1982 on Tolai). When a common noun follows a local deictic, the article is inserted; since *ura* has a final vowel, the appropriate article form is *ra* rather than *a*. In the trade language, however, the pattern is simplified: *u-*, crucial in Mingir as it indicates 'direction towards', is deleted, as is the article.

The trade language has one puzzling feature, the marker *mi* or *me* which occurs in the tense/aspect/mood slot before all verbs, but which seems to have no function except to mark them as verbs. There is no corresponding marker, either functionally or formally, in the modern forms of Minigir, Tolai, Meramera and Nakanai, and it is difficult to know whether or not its occurrence in the trade language is a feature of pidginisation.

These findings indicate that Hees' trade language was basically Minigir with some Meramera/Nakanai pronouns and a small measure of simplification. It seems likely that the Meramera/Nakanai pronouns for 'we' and 'you' were used by Minigir speakers in order to convey their identification with their trading partners. The simplification which is normally a characteristic of a pidgin was hardly necessary as the languages of the area have such similar syntactic patterns. It seems that the trade language was therefore hardly a pidgin as this term is usually understood. The degree of simplification comes nowhere near that of the one well described Oceanic Austronesian trade language in Papua New Guinea, Police Motu (see Dutton 1985).

A superficial reading of Hees suggests that the trade language was of Tolai-Nakanai composition, but it is now clear that its composition was Minigir with a little Meramera/Nakanai. This is hardly surprising, as Minigir is the westernmost member of the South New Ireland/Northwest Solomonic network and Meramera the easternmost member of the

Willaumez family, and it is quite plausible that the Minigir should have trade from their former location along the coast to Open Bay. However, it seems likely that this trade language was also used between the Minigir and the Nakanai. In his report Hees claims (p.49) that his Nakanai informant told him that "the coastal inhabitants of the Gazelle come to us and just talk away and we do the same back." Since he gives this quotation in Nakanai, not in Meramera, it seems probable that his Nakanai informant spoke or knew this language. The presence in Hees' corpus of *tumali* for *tamani* also suggests that Hees acquired his trade language data from a Nakanai-speaking informant.

It also appears that Hees is right when he says that what the (Minigir-speaking) Fr Rascher perceived as a similarity between Minigir and 'Nakanai' was really a close similarity between Minigir and the trade language.

References

Burger, Friedrich. 1913. *Die Küsten- und Bergvölker der Gazellehalbinsel*. Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder.

Dutton, Tom. 1985. *Police Motu: Iena sivarai*. Port Moresby: University of Papua New Guinea Press.

Hees, Friedrich. 1915-16. Ein Beitrag aus den Sagen und Erzählungen der Nakanai (Neupommern, Südsee). *Anthropos* 10-11: 34-64, 562-86, 861-88.

Johnston, R.L. 1980. *Nakanai of New Britain: the grammar of an Oceanic language*. Pacific Linguistics B-70. Canberra: Australian National University.

Lincoln, P.C. 1979-80. Dual lingualism: passive bilingualism in action. *Te Reo* 22-23: 65-72.

Mosel, Ulrike. 1982. Local deixis in Tolai. In *Here and there: cross-linguistic studies in deixis and demonstration*, ed. J. Weissenborn and W. Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ross, M.D. 1988. *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia*. Pacific Linguistics C-98. Canberra: Australian National University.

Department of Linguistics, RSPacS
Australian National University
G.P.O. Box 4
CANBERRA, A.C.T.
Australia 2601