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Vanuatu is one of the world’s ‘richest’ countries. It is not rich in economic resources, perhaps, but it is certainly rich in terms of its linguistic and cultural diversity: Vanuatu possibly has the honour of having more indigenous languages per head of population than any other country on earth. However, despite this immense linguistic diversity, the languages of this country are surprisingly poorly known. Of the numerous languages, only a handful (Anejoffi, Lenakel, Erromangan and Paamese) can be described as ‘well known’ in the sense that there is an extensive published grammar and dictionary of the language.

We are certainly aware that considerable amounts of information have been assembled on a number of other languages, yet this has for the most part remained unpublished. We regard it as regrettable that such information often remains inaccessible both to the academic community of linguistic researchers, and to local people. Too often, such valuable information is stored away in archives or on library shelves in places that most people do not know about, or where they cannot gain access to it.

It is of even greater concern where such unpublished information remains in private hands, subject to the vagaries of cyclonic devastation, fire, flood, or even cockroaches and mould. There are repeated references to large vocabularies compiled by missionaries in different parts of Vanuatu which appear to have been completely lost. The last speaker of the now extinct Utaha language of Erromango reportedly wrote down quite a lot of information in two exercise books before he died in 1954. Nobody on the island now knows where these books are, and it can only be presumed that they have been lost. These kinds of observations should be lessons to us all.

Comprehensive documentation of sources of information about Vanuatu languages has been attempted in the past, but these have all become out of date for a variety of reasons. Capell’s (1954) survey of the South-western Pacific represented a valiant attempt based on very patchy sources to describe the linguistic situation in this region, which included Vanuatu. The abandonment of vernacular education in these countries necessitated major revisions, and Capell’s (1962a) new survey concentrated more on the needs of academic researchers than of educational planners, though on the basis of similarly scanty data. Tryon’s (1976) survey filled in many gaps that were inevitably left blank by Capell, as new information on many parts of Vanuatu had come to hand, though at that stage there was still not a single language in the country that met our current criteria for being recognised as ‘well known’.

Since then, there have been significant changes in how much is known about the linguistic situation in the country, as graduate students – some of whom are now a little longer in the tooth – have produced the results of their descriptive work in a number of different parts of the country. Terry Crowley, Robert Early, Catriona Hyslop, Dorothy Jauncey, John Lynch,
Jill Musgrave, Wolfgang Sperlich and David Walsh have all produced descriptions of languages in Vanuatu. In addition, a number of researchers – either academic or missionary – have produced significant descriptive accounts of individual languages: Jean-Michel Charpentier, Ross Clark, Janet Dixon Keller (formerly Dougherty), Greg Fox, Jacques Guy and Lamont Lindstrom.

Lynch (1994a) set out to make available to the academic community detailed information about what was – and was not – known about the languages of Vanuatu. While this compilation of sources was quite extensive, there were some inevitable gaps. Moreover, circumstances within Vanuatu have changed considerably since 1994 in that the government is considering the formal adoption an Education Master Plan, which includes provisions for the reintroduction of initial vernacular education throughout the country. The consideration of this plan has occasioned the appearance of the present volume, as it was felt necessary to update and re-evaluate information on all the languages of the country to take into account this additional need.

We would like to explicitly point out that this volume, given its aim of becoming a reference survey and bibliographical tool, does not purport to be a linguistic study as such of the languages of Vanuatu. This means that anybody who is interested in the linguistic typology of these languages, their historical development and their linguogenetic relationships, will find very little discussion of matters relating to their particular interests within the text of this volume. Such information, however, certainly can be gained from an examination of the various sources to which we make reference.

No doubt information in this volume will eventually become outdated. In fact, we most sincerely hope so, as this can only mean that significant amounts of additional work will have been carried out on the languages of Vanuatu. At the same time, as new information comes to hand, we hope to provide a constant update to this volume at the following website:

http://www.linguistics.unimelb.edu.au/vanlangs/VANLANGS.HTM

While we have attempted to be as comprehensive as possible, we must accept that occasional gaps may remain, and we look forward to being informed of such gaps, as well as any new sources.

Finally, as far as new information is concerned, we would like to encourage graduate students and established academics to participate in the continued documentation of the languages of Vanuatu. Given that so many languages are so poorly described, there is great scope for many scholars to make significant contributions. Of course, given the Vanuatu government’s proposal to reinstitute initial vernacular education, there is also a great opportunity for the results of that research to be applied in a way that is of immediate tangible benefit to local communities. In the interests of encouraging future research, we have included, at the end of this volume, information about procedures for making proposals to conduct linguistic research in the country.

We would like to thank the following for their help in producing particular sections of this volume: Margaret Austrai-Kailo, Naomi Bolenga, Bob Blust, Jeremiah Chung, Ross Clark, Robert Early, Alexandre François, David Healey, Liz Hudson, Annette Kausiama, Janet Dixon Keller, Miriam Meyerhoff, Peter Murgatroyd, Gilbert Read, Ralph Regenvanu, Malcolm Ross, Nick Thieberger, Jeff Siegel, Wolfgang Sperlich, Jim Stahl, Sylvie Tapasei, Bob Tonkinson, and Pioni Willie. Catriona Hyslop in particular has provided valuable information from a number of areas of Vanuatu. However, we acknowledge a real debt to all past and present researchers of Vanuatu languages, regardless of whether or not we agree
xiv  Preface

with every individual finding. Without these people, this volume could not have been the comprehensive survey that it now is.

John Lynch
Terry Crowley
1 **Introduction**

1.1 The languages of Vanuatu

1.1.1 Language numbers

It is obviously of considerable interest to both specialists and non-specialists to be able to give a figure for the total number of indigenous languages spoken in Vanuatu. Perhaps the most widely quoted figure is 105 languages, which derives from the work of Tryon (1976, 1979a, 1981), though numbers have ranged from 52 in Capell (1954:95–110) to 109 in Grimes (1996:918–928), 110 in Tryon (1972:45), and 113 in Tryon (1996c:171).

Such a lack of agreement among specialists may be puzzling to non-linguists, but there are several good reasons which can be offered for this:

(a) In some parts of Vanuatu, the precise linguistic situation has not yet been fully documented. For example, Charpentier’s (1982a, 1982b) documentation of southern Malakula is more detailed than that of Tryon (1976), and for the same area Charpentier recorded a further six languages. Espiritu Santo is another linguistically diverse island that requires more detailed documentation, and further surprises may await us there as more research is carried out.

(b) Some figures have been based on information which has subsequently been corrected either by later research or by applying different interpretive strategies. For example, Capell (1954:102) referred to a single language on Ambrym, which, on the basis of current evidence, appears to have at least four distinct languages. On Malakula, Tryon (1976) regards Atchin as a separate language from Uripiv-Wala-Rano; more detailed evidence from McKerras (1989a), however, shows that these are all dialects of a single language, which we refer to in this volume as Northeast Malakula. Tryon (1976) indicates that the speech of Lamen Island represents a variety of the same language as Lewo on Epi; Early (1994:38) says that the two actually represent mutually unintelligible languages. Similarly, Tryon (1976) treats the villages of Axamb and Avok in southern Malakula as speaking the same language; Charpentier (1982a: 46–47), however, indicates that there are two separate languages here.

(c) The difference between ‘dialects’ of a single language and separate ‘languages’ is not always easy to define. While Lamen and Lewo on Epi clearly constitute separate languages, Early (1994:31–32) reports that in the single small village of Paia, there is a variety that is similar enough to both Lamen and Lewo that it could equally well be
called a dialect of both. Alternatively, perhaps, it could be called a separate language in its own right. Such situations are referred to by linguists as 'dialect chains', and they result in sometimes arbitrary decisions being made as to how many languages are involved. The situation on Tanna today is of the same nature, though of rather greater magnitude (Lynch 1978c:719–720), as is the situation on Efate (Clark 1985a), and the scanty evidence that we have from some parts of Espiritu Santo suggests that such phenomena may well be widespread there as well. In this context, however, it should be mentioned that there are situations where both linguistic criteria and local opinion clearly point to different varieties constituting separate languages, despite the suggestion—not based, however, on local knowledge—in Croft (1990:22) that we can never know if Bierebo, Baki, Mari [i.e. Mkir], Bieria and Lewo on Epi really do constitute five separate languages.

(d) Many languages in Vanuatu do not have any names at all, being referred to, for example, simply as "the language of such-and-such a place"—see Crowley (in press b). Yet other languages may share the same name, although they are still regarded by the local people as being separate languages; for example, Lewo and the separate language of Lamen Island are both known locally as Lewo. Finally, some mutually intelligible varieties (i.e. dialects of the same language) may each have separate names, without any overall name for the language as a whole, for example Ayiauleian, Mbotkot, Natanggan and Nioleian, which are all mutually intelligible varieties of a single unnamed language (referred to in this volume as Lendamboi) in southern Malakula (Charpentier 1982a:43–44).

(e) With moribund (i.e. disappearing) languages, it is difficult to decide how low the number of speakers has to be before we decide no longer to count it in the total of languages that are actually 'spoken'. If a speaker population drops to, say, half a dozen, and those people are located in different villages, the language may well never actually be used, so in that sense it should not be counted (and a language with just a single speaker would normally, of course, never be used). On the other hand, a moribund language clearly could be used, so in that sense it should be counted (and even a language with a single speaker can still be used, as we know of cases where the last speaker of a language has continued to use it to speak to their animals, or in prayer to God).

(f) There are good reasons for not including documented extinct languages in a count of the number of languages in the country, though it is understandable that people may want to see even such languages included in the interests of historical accuracy. However, there is often a problem in cases like this, as such languages are typically completely unrecorded, so it is difficult to assess the reliability of any claims that these were actually separate languages, rather than being locally named dialects of an existing language. Many recent overviews of the linguistic situation in Vanuatu (for example Tryon 1981, Crowley 1989b:112, Thomas 1990:234, Siegel 1996a:9, Lynch 1998:28) rely on Tryon (1976) for an estimation of the number of languages in the country. However, we feel that it is essential to attempt a reassessment of the interpretation of published linguistic sources in an effort to produce what we feel to be a more realistic and up-to-date view of the distribution of languages in the country.
For some areas, the only sources of information are very short wordlists, gathered in most cases by people who had little (or no) special familiarity with the languages of that area. In such cases, it is perhaps inevitable that forms will be either phonemically over- or underdifferentiated, as well as sometimes being incorrectly transcribed or given an incorrect translation, and indeed being mixed with illicit loans (Geraghty 1978:76, Clark 1980). When such lists are taken as the basis for a lexicostatistical comparison, the results should at best be regarded as suggestive, to be tested later against more detailed information involving observations of local language choice and statements about mutual intelligibility, along with information about degrees of structural and phonological divergence between linguistic varieties. For some parts of Vanuatu – most notably parts of the Torres and Banks Islands, Espiritu Santo and Malakula – we are completely reliant on very short wordlists for any conclusions about how many languages may be spoken.

Tryon's (1976) massive lexicostatistical survey of the languages of Vanuatu produced some valuable hypotheses about the numbers of languages in some areas, but sometimes writers have taken these as being the 'last word'. Semantic errors – or not recognising that different forms in two wordlists represent legitimate variants in both varieties – resulted in a published figure of 88.3 per cent shared cognacy between the Paamese villages of Lironessa (i.e. Lironesa) and Faulili (i.e. Vauleli). Applying Tryon's own criteria on the basis of the published lists, our own calculation for cognacy is 84 per cent; while more accurate information suggests a figure of 96.7 per cent. In fact, two wordlists collected by different people from the same location – Shark Bay on Espiritu Santo – were calculated as having shared cognacy of only 87.4 per cent, rather than the 100 per cent that we would have expected if lexicostatistical comparisons are to have any meaning at all.

Such discrepancies can clearly lead to errors in the drawing of language boundaries. Tryon's Lametin and Malmariv wordlists from Espiritu Santo were assigned to separate languages on the basis of 74.9 per cent cognacy, yet recent work has demonstrated that these actually represent mutually intelligible dialects of a single language (Chung 1998:6). Unua and Pangkumu (Tryon's Rerep wordlist) on Malakula were also regarded as separate languages on the basis of 76 per cent cognacy, yet Charpentier (1982a:50) indicates that these varieties are also mutually intelligible. In the case of wordlists from Uripiv, Wala, Rano and Atchin, again on Malakula, McKerras (1989a) reports that Tryon's figures were as much as 20 per cent lower than they should have been, resulting in the mistaken separation of Atchin as a separate language from Uripiv-Wala-Rano.

Given that there is clearly a substantial margin of error with these published lexicostatistical calculations, we have chosen to provide a tentative reinterpretation of these figures by dropping Tryon's 81 per cent cut-off between language and dialect to about 70 per cent in areas for which we are solely reliant on such wordlists. In some cases, this results in a substantial reduction in the number of putative languages. It should be noted, however, that in making this reassessment we are not necessarily saying that earlier claims about the distributions of languages are necessarily incorrect. Rather, we simply feel that greater caution is justified until further more reliable evidence comes to hand. We therefore hope that future linguistic investigations will not be limited to simply describing single languages, but that scholars will attempt to provide a more up-to-date survey of the surrounding situation as well.

In recognition of all the issues we have discussed in this section, we prefer not to give a single total for the number of languages in Vanuatu today. Rather, we give a number of
different totals, taking into account the points raised above, which represent our best estimates based on the most recent information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extinct languages</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moribund languages</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living languages still actively spoken</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should also be recognised, however, that with some languages which exhibit significant degrees of dialect diversity there may be separate traditions of writing which derive from different regional varieties. For instance, there are printed materials in both the Wala and Atchin varieties of the Northeast Malakula language, as well as both the Futuna and Aniwa varieties of the language that we have called Futuna-Aniwa. There are also cases of previously unwritten varieties which are so divergent from other dialects of the same language that local opinion may ultimately lead to the establishment of separate written traditions in the context of the development of educational and literacy materials. We are thinking in particular of cases such as Lelepa in relation to the rest of the Nakanamangaspeaking areas of Efate and offshore islands, and the villages of Epau and Eton vis-à-vis the South Efate villages of Eratap, Erakor and Pango. Some of the poorly recorded dialect chains of Espiritu Santo may also fall into this category. Ultimately, then, the number of distinct written traditions may well be higher than 81, which is the number that we have just suggested for the total number of 'languages' that are actively spoken in the country.

1.1.2 Populations

Earlier surveys have often attempted to provide approximate populations for the various languages, which is obviously of considerable interest not only to linguistic researchers, but also to anybody who is involved with cultural or educational policy or vernacular literacy. However, published figures are often problematic, for a variety of reasons.

In some cases the figures, while based on accurate local census counts, may now be considerably out of date. For example, Charpentier (1982a:41–42) provides detailed population figures for the languages of southern Malakula, but by the normal processes of demographic change over the intervening twenty years since his figures were compiled, a Ni-Vanuatu population of 100 then corresponds (on average) to 173 today.

Other figures are problematic because we cannot be certain of how they were derived and, therefore, how reliably we should treat them. For example, Tryon (1979a:11) provides population figures for all the languages of Vanuatu at a time when the indigenous population was estimated to have been over 90,000. However, the total population for all indigenous languages in this source amounts to only about two-thirds of that figure, and there is no explanation for this discrepancy. Similarly, while the figures in Tryon (1996c:171) have been

---

1. The figure for extinct languages includes only those which we know were spoken at one time. There may, of course, have been other languages which became extinct and of which there is no memory today.

2. Citizens of Vanuatu are referred to as Ni-Vanuatu. The prefix Ni- derives from a preposition meaning 'of' in a number of the languages of the country (see 'Definitions' in the Appendix).
upgraded to take into account the natural growth in population, the total number of speakers of individual languages is again short of the total population by about the same proportion. Some—but certainly not all—such discrepancies are possibly due to the exclusion of 'absentee' speakers, i.e. town dwellers or people living outside of their home communities, as well as the small proportion of the population which speaks no local vernacular. Obviously, an accurate account of the linguistic demography of Vanuatu needs to take into account speakers of languages, wherever they happen to live.

For each language, therefore, we have attempted to provide up-to-date estimates of the likely current number of speakers. This is information that is often far from easy to find out. In some cases, we are fortunate enough to have the benefit of detailed census figures (or at least good estimates) produced by researchers with close familiarity with particular language areas. In other cases, we are reliant on published census figures, usually dating from the 1989 census. However, the village-by-village census figures cannot always be easily converted into language populations, as precise language boundaries are not always known. Another census was held in 1999, but the detailed results were not available in time for the figures to be taken into account in population estimates for this volume. However, we have attempted to extrapolate from the earlier 1989 figures (or figures from other years) to a figure for the year 2000 by assuming an annual population growth of 2.8 per cent, which represents the national average for Ni-Vanuatu according to the previous census.

As far as possible, we have also attempted to take into account the numbers of likely absentee speakers of particular languages. The rate of out-migration (and the destination) varies considerably from island to island (and conceivably even from language group to language group within islands). Crowley (1994a), for example, illustrates the difficulties involved in estimating the likely total number of speakers of Paamese given the restricted nature of demographic information that is available from the published census relating to vernacular languages.

In cases where specific information about in- and out-migration patterns is unavailable, we have adopted a policy of adjusting figures upwards on the basis of an average 16.8 per cent urbanisation rate among Ni-Vanuatu, with the resulting figures rounded off downwards to take into account the numbers of town dwellers who do not grow up speaking a local vernacular. This therefore amounts to multiplying the 1989 census figures by 1.355 to give an estimate of the current rural population, with this figure then multiplied by 1.168 to give a current estimate of the total population of rural and urban areas for a given language community. Thus, a published rural population of 100 in 1989 corresponds to an estimated combined total of rural and urban 158 speakers in 2000.

In some cases, we felt unable to come up with a single figure for the estimated number of speakers of a language. Such instances typically involved situations where we know of the existence of substantial centres with mixed populations (for example Lenakel and Whitesands on Tanna, Norsup on Malakula, and Vanafo on Espiritu Santo), where the precise linguistic make-up cannot be determined from published census figures. The figures that we have produced in such cases represent ranges between the likely minimum number of speakers and the maximum possible, recognising that the actual number probably lies somewhere between these extremes.

Given the guesswork involved in arriving at some of our population estimates, as well as the fact that we have rounded off any resulting figures, it should not be expected that there will be an exact correspondence between the total number of speakers of all of the languages of Vanuatu and the estimated population of the country as a whole. In any case, we have
tended to round off our estimates downwards rather than upwards to take into account the relatively small proportion of (predominantly younger urban) Ni-Vanuatu who reported in the census that they did not speak any indigenous vernacular.

The population figures we give here, then, should be treated as approximations, and we welcome more detailed figures for individual languages based on individual researchers' closer experience with particular situations. Map 1 shows the location of the largest languages in the country, i.e. those with estimated populations of over (or around) 5,000. These languages, and their estimated populations, are as follows:

- Lenakel: 11,500
- Nakanamanga (North Efate/Shepherds): 9,500
- Northeast Malakula: 9,000
- Duidui (Ambae): 8,700
- Apma (Pentecost): 7,800
- Whitesands (Tanna): 7,500
- Raga (Pentecost): 6,500
- South Efate: 6,000
- Paamese: 6,000
- North Ambrym: 5,250
- Northeast Ambae: 5,000
- Southwest Tanna: 5,000
- North Tanna: 5,000

### 1.1.3 Maps

Many previously published maps of Vanuatu and other parts of the Pacific have usually included every part of an island within some language area or another, even if some parts are uninhabited. In the maps which accompany entries for each island, we have indicated those areas where each language is spoken. Our approach has been to link together as 'language areas' those parts of an island where there are villages in which people speaking the same language are to be found. For many of our maps, therefore, language areas are drawn to include only populated areas – which are most frequently coastal strips – with often substantial unpopulated areas usually being completely unmapped.

We have located languages on maps by means of the same number code which is used to refer to the section of this volume where that language is discussed. The Duidui language of Ambae, for example, is numbered 3.4.1 on the relevant map (Map 6), as the full entry for that language is located in §3.4.1. Where our tentative reassessment of the linguistic geography differs from Tryon (1976) as a result of our suggested realignment of dialect and language distinctions, we have indicated the approximate location of the previously proposed communalects with the addition of a, b, c etc. (with dotted lines representing communalect boundaries where enough information is available). For example, our proposed Ureparapara language is numbered 3.2.1 on Map 4. This corresponds to Tryon's separately named Lehali and Lehalurup languages, which are numbered 3.2.1a and 3.2.1b respectively on our map. Within each map, a key is provided to indicate the language name which corresponds to each of the number codes.
Map 1: Languages with over 5,000 speakers
Many of the entries for individual languages in Chapter 3 refer to village names or other specific geographical locations and reference points. Because of the scale involved, it would be enormously demanding to produce maps which would clearly show most of these locations. (In any case, many placenames appear in a variety of spellings, as noted in §1.2.3.) It is expected, therefore, that readers wanting to find more specific information about the geographical spread of a language or dialect will refer to more detailed published maps of individual islands, or to recent census maps, which provide names for almost all inhabited locations in the country. (However, some of the places to which we have referred appear to be based on local knowledge, with no published maps showing their locations.)

It should be pointed out that these maps are intended purely as guides to language areas, and they should not be interpreted as corresponding to claims of land ownership in any way. It is recognised also that many languages are today spoken along the coast (and are therefore mapped as such), though the traditional homeland of that group may well have been some distance from the coast in the interior of the island.

For the larger and linguistically more complex island of Malakula, it has not always been easy to show all of the details of the current—and past—linguistic situations on a single map. For example, areas that are now unoccupied but where now extinct languages were once spoken, or areas where an entire language group has moved from the interior to the coast, are mapped separately in such a way that it is possible to observe both traditional and modern distributions of languages.

We have also attempted to show the location of significant migrant communities from other islands. To avoid suggesting permanent ownership of land in such new settlements, we have chosen to show such population movements simply by showing an arrow indicating the geographical source of such immigrant languages. On Map 15, for example, there is an arrow leading from the Futuna-ANIWA speaking islands of Futuna and ANiwa (labelled as language 3.14.1) to different parts of Tanna where other languages are spoken. It should be noted that, while there are many large migrant populations from outer islands in both Port Vila and Luganville and surrounding areas, we have for the most part not attempted to locate settlers, because such migrants generally tend to be dispersed around the urban area, rather than being concentrated in single definable communities.

1.1.4 Writing systems

The languages of Vanuatu were not written prior to colonial contact. Those writing systems for languages that are in use today were generally devised in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by Christian missionaries, though some writing systems are currently being developed for a number of languages under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and occasionally also by academic researchers or other literacy workers.

Some writing systems for Vanuatu languages represent efficient ways of writing the languages, and they are in well-established usage throughout the community, as well as being utilised in a reasonably wide range of printed religious materials. Such writing systems sometimes make use of special symbols that were devised to enable the missionaries to represent sounds that occur in Vanuatu languages but not in English or French, or they use letters of the Roman alphabet to represent sounds that the familiar alphabet is not equipped to represent. For instance, in the Mota language of the Banks, the letter q is used to represent the sound that linguists refer to as a voiceless labio-velar stop (a sort of kpw sound), while
italicised *m* is used to represent the corresponding nasal (something like \textit{ngmw}). The same sounds in other languages, however, are represented by means of a tilde over the letters \textit{p} and \textit{m}, i.e. as \textit{p} and \textit{m} respectively, while in yet other languages, the sounds are written as \textit{pw} and \textit{mw}. Familiar letters such as \textit{g} are also often used in Vanuatu languages to represent the sound that is written in English and Bislama as \textit{ng}.

In yet other cases, however, the writing systems that were developed by earlier missionaries are less than ideal in that certain kinds of sounds that were unfamiliar to those English- or French-speaking missionaries were either confused with other sounds in the languages, or they were simply not written at all. There are, for example, written materials in some languages in which the sounds that we just mentioned are not distinguished in any way from ordinary \textit{p} and \textit{m}, and in some cases 'difficult' sounds were completely ignored. Printed materials in Vanuatu languages sometimes even show evidence that the designers of writing systems misheard perfectly straightforward sounds, or that they inserted sounds that simply should not have been there. For instance, in the Erromangan language, the phrase that we would have expected to see written as \textbf{Nam Nompusok Itvau} 'The New Testament' was actually written incorrectly as \textbf{Nam Numpusok Itevau} (with a \textit{v} missing in the second word and an unnecessary \textit{e} in the third).\(^3\)

In our summaries for each island, we indicate – Michelin-style – whether or not a language has a writing system, and we evaluate that writing system as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*****</td>
<td>writing system available in print that is fully in accord with modern principles of orthography design (sometimes alongside older writing systems of less reliability that are perhaps more familiar to local people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td>writing system that is fully in accord with modern principles of orthography design which is not yet in print or which is currently undergoing development (sometimes alongside older writing systems of less reliability that are perhaps more familiar to local people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>writing system in print which is basically sound according to modern principles of orthography design, but perhaps with relatively minor imperfections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>writing system in print only in old sources with no recent study to attest to its reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>writing system in print only in old sources which is known to be of dubious quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no writing system at all in print as far as we are aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) We have for the most part consciously avoided the use of phonetic symbols in writing placenames and language names to avoid confusing the non-specialist reader. In the absence of any further explanation, the following orthographic symbols should be interpreted phonetically as follows: \textit{kh} is \([x]\), ' is \([?]\), \textit{e} is \([\varepsilon]\), \textit{\ddot{a}} is \([\alpha]\) and \textit{\dddot{i}} is \([\eta]\).
It should also be recognised that speakers of many of the languages indicated as having no writing systems no doubt from time to time write those languages. What usually happens in such cases is that people simply attempt to transfer their literacy skills from their knowledge of English, French, Bislama or some other local language that they know and produce ad hoc, and often inconsistent, solutions to particular orthographic problems in their own languages.

1.2 Bibliographical information

This volume represents more than just a survey of the current state of affairs regarding the distribution of the languages of Vanuatu and the numbers of their speakers. We have written this volume also to provide a detailed statement of the current state of knowledge about each of the languages of the country, as well as information about what sorts of materials have been written in each language. We will now explain some of the organisational principles underpinning this bibliographical information.

1.2.1 Inclusions and exclusions

One difficulty in compiling this bibliographical information has been to decide what kinds of sources to include and what to exclude. We have adopted the following policies:

We have decided to include the following categories of sources:

- any published descriptive, sociolinguistic or comparative study of Vanuatu languages, including Bislama and Vanuatu-specific studies of English and French;
- published works on languages of the wider Pacific which make a reasonably significant contribution to our knowledge of one or more of the languages of Vanuatu;
- published studies on language policy and language planning in Vanuatu and similar topics;
- books and articles in the above categories known to be in press at the time of writing;
- unpublished dissertations and theses, which are nevertheless publicly accessible through the relevant university libraries, or held on deposit at the Vanuatu Collections in either the Vanuatu National Library or the Emalus Campus Library of the University of the South Pacific;
- unpublished but publicly available reports that have been submitted to official bodies; and
- publications on any non-linguistic topic, secular or religious, written in a Vanuatu language.

We will also make mention of work – academic or translated – which we know is in progress and which is likely to lead to publication in the near future.

We have decided to exclude material which falls into the following categories:

- general works on Pacific languages which mention Vanuatu languages, but which make no specific additional contribution to our knowledge of them;
- reviews of other publications (although typically more substantial review articles are included, as well as shorter reviews which do make some more substantial comment);
articles in newspapers and popular magazines; and
conference papers not (yet) submitted for publication, or other unpublished papers.

Where we have been unsure as to whether a particular publication should be included or excluded, we have generally made the decision to include it here. Occasionally, for example, mimeographed materials have been included where they were distributed to a number of people, where there is no specific indication that these were drafts or work in progress, and where the authors themselves have cited these works in publications of their own. Where work on a language is currently in progress, we have also indicated this, along with the name(s) of the relevant researcher(s) and their institutional affiliations, to enable interested persons to initiate contact even where there have not yet been any published outcomes of the research.

Within our criteria, we have attempted to provide as comprehensive a listing of sources as possible. For the most part, we have attempted to include a brief summary of the content of the source involved, usually also with a subjective indication of the usefulness of the source. Some materials, however, have remained elusive and we have not actually seen them, though they have still been included in the interests of comprehensiveness.

While we have attempted to include references to all printed materials in Vanuatu languages, this has sometimes proved to be a rather difficult task. Many such materials were produced in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and are obviously out of print, and for the most part not locally available. Many are so rare that they have even become collectors' items. Even finding a full listing of materials that have been produced is difficult, as this kind of information seems to have been patchily documented. We recognise, therefore, that there may be significant gaps in this aspect of our bibliography, though we do hope that more complete information relating to such sources eventually comes to hand. Uncertainties and gaps with such materials are indicated by means of question marks. Many such items have titles only in the local language. Where the meaning of the title is known, or where the nature of the content of the material is known, this is indicated by means of a translation into English or a note about the content in square brackets following the title.

### 1.2.2 Organisation

This volume is divided into four major sections:

(a) a general and comparative section, which deals with publications on Vanuatu languages generally, or on groups of Vanuatu languages;
(b) a section on vernaculars, which proceeds island by island from north to south, and which generally deals with individual languages;
(c) a section on Bislama; and
(d) the full bibliographical entries for all of the sources referred to.

The general and comparative section covers surveys; collected works and bibliographies; publications on social aspects of language, including language policy and language in education; historical-comparative studies, detailing among other things the internal and external relationships of the Vanuatu languages; and typological studies comparing aspects of the structure of Vanuatu languages.
In the section on vernaculars, under each island we first of all include general studies of the linguistic situation on that island as a whole, as well as a map showing the location of the languages spoken there. We then give some demographic and bibliographic information on each of the languages spoken on that island, including where possible details of publications in the language. Where there are substantial modern sources, we have listed these separately from earlier or less substantial sources. We also make brief mention of extinct or moribund languages, and of languages spoken by significant immigrant communities (usually from other islands, but sometimes from overseas). Towards the end of each island entry is a summary chart showing what is known about each language.

Within each of these two sections we have adopted the following policies. Early, or marginal, or peripheral studies are generally referred to by author and date but with very little other information, unless they are still of some relevance today. More modern and/or 'useful' studies are referred to by author and date, followed by a brief summary of their contents. In these latter cases, the entries are listed \textit{chronologically} rather than alphabetically by author.

Older materials in vernaculars are almost exclusively translations of religious materials, so it seems inappropriate to enter such items by author. Such entries begin with the date of publication, while the translator (if known) is listed after the publisher. For many of these older sources, publication details are only partly known, so there may be some missing dates, titles, places of publication and publishers; in addition, with scriptural materials we have generally cited only the most recent translations in full, though have made reference to the dates of earlier translations of the same book. However, modern materials that have been written in vernacular languages – rather than simply being translations – have been entered in the bibliography in the usual way.

In discussing dictionaries, we have used some slightly subjective terminology:

(a) ‘smallish’ usually means no more than 75 or so pages, with little semantic detail, no (or few) example sentences, and little other information within entries, with or without a finderlist;

(b) ‘medium-sized/good-sized’ means roughly between 75 and 150 pages, with greater semantic detail and more useful example sentences, sometimes with other information within entries, and generally including a reasonably detailed finderlist; and

(c) ‘extensive’ means more than 150 pages, with substantial semantic detail, example sentences and other information within entries, and including a detailed finderlist.

Comprehensiveness in dictionaries is difficult to define in terms of numbers of entries because dictionaries often differ quite considerably in what they put together under a single entry.

Applying the same criteria to Bislama, however, would have resulted in an unmanageably large task, so we have necessarily been more selective. We have deliberately avoided including works that are written \textit{in} Bislama, or which include some material about Bislama, unless they fall into one of the following categories:

(a) Reference works, i.e. dictionaries or other descriptive materials about the language that are intended to be referred to by users of the language.

(b) Pedagogical materials, i.e. works that are intended primarily to be used to teach foreigners the language.

(c) Descriptive grammar, i.e. works that are primarily of a descriptive nature on Bislama phonology, morphology or syntax.
(d) Sociolinguistic works, i.e. works which concentrate on the status of Bislama in Vanuatu society, or on sociolinguistic variability.

(e) Historical works, i.e. those in which the primary focus is on the historical development of the language since the middle of the nineteenth century.

(f) Theoretical works, i.e. materials which make substantial use of Bislama data, but whose focus is generally on some theoretical issue of little direct relevance to the sociopolitical context of Vanuatu.

(g) Substantial publications in Bislama (but excluding less substantial works).

It has not always proved possible to place a particular work into a single category; so, if a work covers more than one area, we have placed it separately in different categories.

A full bibliography of sources on Vanuatu languages, including Bislama, is provided at the end of this volume with information set out according to normal bibliographical principles. This listing is alphabetical by author. As far as publications by a single author are concerned, these are set out in chronological order, with publications in the same year being distinguished by the letters a, b, etc. following the date. However, publications by a single author precede edited publications, and these both precede publications with joint authorship. Book and journal titles are in italics.

1.2.3 Placenames and language names

Map 1 gives the location of all the major islands in Vanuatu, and uses the current standard names for the islands, partly following Tryon and Gély, eds (1979), though amended following modern popular usage. These names will be found as headings in Chapter 3. However, many islands have had different names in the past, or the current name has been spelt differently (these differences sometimes, though not always, corresponding to British and French variants). Ambae, for example, was once known as Leper's Island, and has also been referred to variously as Aoba, Oba and Omba; while Malakula has the aliases Malekula and Mallicolo. Reasonably common variant names for each island will be mentioned in the entry for that island.

Names of villages and other locations can also be tricky. While some placenames may be more or less standardised in their spellings, many appear in various guises, with some spellings of the same placename being different enough that we are uncertain as to whether a single place is being referred to, or more than one place. Readers can therefore expect to find variation from source to source between spellings such as Hiw and Hiu, or Axamb, Akhamb and Akamb. Apart from attempting to settle upon a single spelling in our own discussion, there is little that can be done to avoid this problem, particularly since when citing other people's work, we are obviously obliged to present whatever spellings appear in those sources.

If the issue of island and village names is a bit tricky, the issue of language names in Vanuatu – as in most parts of Melanesia – is an extremely complex one. There is first of all the problem of differentiating language and dialect – no easy task in an area like a single island where the speech varieties of different communities are different but quite closely related (see Crowley in press b). Speakers of many languages do not have a name for the language in the language, and often refer to it as 'the language', 'our language', or 'the language of such-and-such a place or a people'.
Geographical names have thus often been bestowed upon Vanuatu languages by outsiders: sometimes by Ni-Vanuatu from other language areas, sometimes by foreign missionaries, anthropologists, linguists or administrators, and sometimes by local people themselves, when language names that were reported to have been used in the past have been abandoned in favour of some kind of a geographical designation. The situation is complicated by the fact that different outsiders have sometimes given different names to the same language, and sometimes even the same writer names the same language after different locations within a language area in different sources. Sometimes, different dialects of the same language are named separately in the literature. A further complication arises when the 'same' name is spelled differently by different writers (or even by the same writer). For example, the Whitesands language of Tanna has also been referred to in the literature as East Tanna, Napuanmen, Waesisi and Weasisi; the Raga language of Pentecost has been called Lamalanga, Hano, Loltavola, Loltong, North Pentecost, Qatvenua and Vunmarama; and the Nakanamanga language of Efate/Shepherds (or one or more of its dialects) has had numerous aliases, including Efate, Efatese, Emao, Havannah Harbour, Ngunese, Sesake, North Efate, Tongoan and others.

In this bibliography, we will generally follow names that are widely used by language communities, many of which are included in Tryon's 1976 survey. Where Tryon (or other general surveys) have adopted a language name that differs widely from modern local usage, our preference has been to follow local usage. However, we have ourselves had to 'invent' geographically derived names for some languages, especially those (like Cape Cumberland or Northeast Malakula, for example) where we have tentatively reclassified two or more of Tryon's named 'languages' into a single larger 'language'.

1.3 Current state of knowledge: a summary

In this final section of the introduction, we present a summary of the current state of affairs regarding the linguistic situation in Vanuatu.

1.3.1 Language list

The first part of this section is an alphabetical listing of all of the languages of the country, listed according to the name used in this bibliography; the symbol ‡ appears after the name of a language which is moribund or extinct. For each language, we have given the island(s) on which it is (or was) spoken, and have attempted to assess – also in Michelin-style – the amount and quality of published information available. The following annotations, which appear in the column headed 'Status', are used for this:
***** Well known and well described. A fairly extensive modern grammar and dictionary, as well as other publications of a descriptive, sociolinguistic and/or comparative nature. Some literature in the language.

**** Reasonably well known and well described. Similar to the five-star category, but having only an extensive grammar or an extensive dictionary rather than both, or else having both a grammar and dictionary that are less extensive.

*** Middling. Some publications on or in the language – enough to have a general idea as to the nature of phonology and grammar of the language – and lexical data consisting of more than a simple wordlist.

** Not well known. A little more than a short wordlist, but no structural information, and an uncertain idea of the phonology.

* Poorly known. This category is best represented by those languages which are represented in the literature only by a standard wordlist in Tryon (1976) or a similarly restricted amount of information.

Ø No information in print.

Note also that in the column which provides information about writing systems, languages indicated as having four- or five-star status include parentheses to indicate that, while a modern efficient spelling system is currently under development or has been made publicly available in print, people are likely to be more familiar with an older system with a lower star-rating. For instance, the Erromangan writing system is entered as *(****), which means that while there is a five-star writing system available in print, most people are only familiar with an older much less efficient one-star system. On the other hand, the entry (****) for Central Santo\(^4\) means that while a modern writing system is currently under development, there has been no tradition of writing the language in print at all.

It is hoped that this classification, subjective as it is, may be of assistance to those directing or contemplating research on the languages of Vanuatu in the future, as well as those involved with the implementation of vernacular education and vernacular literacy programs. Map 2 shows the location of the best known languages in the country, i.e. those which have four- or five-star status: Mota (Banks), Tamambo (Malo), Northeast Ambae, V'ënen Taut and Port Sandwich (Malakula), West Ambrym, Paamese, Lewo (Epi), Namakir (Shepherd Islands), Ifira-Mele (Efate), Ura and Erromangan (Erromango), Lenakel and Kwamera (Tanna), Futuna-ANIwa, and Anejoð (Aneityum).

\(^4\) The name 'Santo' in language names is an abbreviation for Espiritu Santo, following widespread local practice.
Map 2: Best-documented languages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Name</th>
<th>Island</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anejom</td>
<td>Aneityum</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aore ‡</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apma</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulua</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aveteian ‡</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful?</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avok</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axamb</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baetora</td>
<td>Maewo</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baki</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banam Bay</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangsa ‡</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bierebo</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bieria ‡</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cumberland</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Santo</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirak</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duidui</td>
<td>Ambae</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emae</td>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erromangan</td>
<td>Erromango</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>(***)</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futuna-ANIWA</td>
<td>Futuna, Aniwa</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiw</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakanaga ‡</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianigi ‡</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifira-Mele</td>
<td>Efate</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiai</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwamera</td>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td><strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakona</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamen</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larëvat</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenakel</td>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td><strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lendamboi</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewo</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livara ‡</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loh</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombal ‡</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafea</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malua Bay</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskelynes</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matanvat ‡</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful?</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbwenelang ‡</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlav</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkir</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mores</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mota</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpotovoro</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwotlav</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naha'ai</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakanamanga</td>
<td>Efate, Shepherds</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namakir</td>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naman ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarian ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasvang</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navava</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navwien ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve'ei</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newervwer</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninde</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisvai</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivat ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niviar ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ambrym</td>
<td>Ambrym</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tanna</td>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Ambae</td>
<td>Ambae</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Malakula</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nume</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkon ‡</td>
<td>Ambrym, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paamese</td>
<td>Paama, Lopevi</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Sandwich</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raga</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaliu ‡</td>
<td>Epi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakao</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seke</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark Bay</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinesip</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sörsörian ‡</td>
<td>Malakula, handful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ambrym</td>
<td>Ambrym</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Efate</td>
<td>Efate</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gaua</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Maewo ‡</td>
<td>Maewo, extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central Santo</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Ambrym</td>
<td>Ambrym</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Santo</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Santo</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Tanna</td>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwadaga</td>
<td>Maewo</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwadia</td>
<td>Maewo</td>
<td>650</td>
<td><strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surua Hole</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamambo</td>
<td>Malo</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolomako</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutuba</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrul</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unua-Pangkumu</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>Erromango</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ureparapara</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utaha</td>
<td>Erromango</td>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vao</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V'ënen Taut</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera'a</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vovo</td>
<td>Malakula</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vurès</td>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ambrym</td>
<td>Ambrym</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesands</td>
<td>Tanna</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wusi</td>
<td>Santo</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the record, the following numbers of languages have been classified in each of the five categories:

- **** Well known and well described: 4 languages
- **** Reasonably well known and well described: 12 languages
- *** Middling: 11 languages
- ** Not well known: 31 languages
- * Poorly known: 35 languages
- Ø No information in print: 13 languages

### 1.3.2 Relationships of Vanuatu languages

The languages of Vanuatu are all members of the Oceanic subgroup of the Austronesian family. The Austronesian family includes over 1,000 languages spoken mainly in Taiwan, Madagascar, Island Southeast Asia (including the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia), and Oceania.

Within the Oceanic subgroup, there seem to be three major lower-level groupings:
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1. Admiralties (Manus and neighbouring islands in PNG);
2. Western Oceanic (coastal New Guinea, New Britain, New Ireland, Bougainville, and the western half of Solomon Islands), and
3. Central-Eastern Oceanic, which itself has a number of subgroups:
   (a) Southeast Solomons
   (b) Utupua-Vanikoro (Eastern Outer Islands, Solomon Islands)
   (c) Southern Oceanic (Vanuatu and New Caledonia)
   (d) Central Pacific (Fiji, Rotuma and Polynesia)
   (e) Micronesia

Three Vanuatu languages – Emae, Ifira-Mele and Futuna-Aniwa – belong to the Polynesian branch of the Central Pacific group. They are part of the Nuclear Polynesian subgroup, along with such languages as Samoan, Tuvaluan, Hawaiian and Tahitian, as well as a number of other Polynesian ‘Outlier’ languages spoken outside geographical Polynesia.

The remaining languages of Vanuatu, along with the languages of New Caledonia, belong to the large Southern Oceanic subgroup. Given the present state of knowledge – and despite publications on the interrelationships of these languages like Tryon (1976), Clark (1985b, 1986b) and Lynch (1978c, 2000c) – it is difficult to present a clear overall picture of the internal relationships of the languages of this subgroup. Although more recent hypotheses have been based on the comparative method (including studies of phonological and grammatical innovations) rather than simply on lexicostatistics, the data available on many languages are simply inadequate to allow us to come to a clear overall picture. About all we feel we can confidently say here is the following:

1. Although the non-Polynesian languages of Vanuatu are all related, there appears to be a clear linguistic break in the north, with the languages of the Torres and Banks Islands, Espiritu Santo, Ambae and Maewo, along with the Raga language of North Pentecost, forming a Northern Vanuatu subgroup distinct from the remainder.
2. There appears to be another clear linguistic break in the Efate area. The languages of the rest of Pentecost, Malakula, Ambrym, Paama, Epi, the Shepherds and Efate seem to form a Central Vanuatu subgroup.
3. The South Efate language seems to be in an intermediate position between this Central subgroup and a Southern subgroup, consisting of the languages of Erromango, Tanna and Aneityum, and almost certainly the languages of New Caledonia as well.

These interrelationships should be regarded as quite tentative at this stage of research, and further study may well bring about changes in this hypothesis. However, what is presented above gives some idea of how linguists think the languages of the country are related. More details about past and present attitudes to linguistic subgrouping for the languages of Vanuatu can be obtained from the various sources listed in §2.3 below.
2 General and comparative studies

2.1 Surveys, collections and bibliographies

This section contains works which can be classified as either surveys, collections or bibliographies. The last term speaks for itself. By the term survey we mean the result of research which set out to find how many languages are spoken in a certain area, the numbers of speakers of those languages, what has been published in and on them, and so on (just as we have set out to do in the present volume). By the term collection we mean a set of studies on a particular area containing grammatical sketches, wordlists or similar kinds of information from a number of languages. In both cases, we include here not only works which are specific to Vanuatu, but also works which include parts or all of Vanuatu within some wider survey area.

Some of the material below is quite old, but in some cases remains the only information on particular Vanuatu languages. Surveys or collections which have not been sighted by the present authors include Somerville (1892) and Leverd (1918). The sources are presented primarily in chronological order, rather than alphabetically.

2.1.1 Surveys

Ray (1893) is a list of the “known languages and dialects” of the then New Hebrides, some grammatical and lexical comparisons, and an attempt to trace the origin of some vocabulary items.

Humphreys (1926), as part of an anthropological study, contains brief and usually not very useful notes about languages on each of the islands in the Tafea Province.

Capell (1954) is a survey covering what is now the Indonesian province of Papua (formerly Irian Jaya), Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia and Nauru. It lists languages and their genetic classification, and gives information on what linguistic research had been done, and what needed to be done at the time, in the light of the needs of the educational systems of the region.

Capell (1962a) is a revised edition of Capell (1954). This new survey was carried out in response to changing circumstances, as the primary objective of linguistic research had shifted from educational to academic as regional governments, which had previously
made use of local languages, replaced vernacular education with education through metropolitan languages.

Grace (1971) is an outline history of research into the languages of Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, including some general conclusions on their internal and external relationships.

Tryon (1972) lists all languages in Vanuatu on the basis of current information, with locations and number of speakers, and attempts a preliminary genetic classification. The numbers of speakers are based on census results from outer islands only; urban populations or other dislocated communities are not included.

Tryon (1973) expands somewhat on Tyron (1972), especially in terms of morphological data, and presents in summary form the results which are given in more detail in Tryon (1976).

Gowers (1976) provides names in a range of languages for a number of tree species found in Vanuatu. (The names are not always phonetically accurate.) These names are scattered throughout the volume, but are gathered together in Wheatley (1992:247–266).

Tryon (1976) is the first comprehensive discussion of the genetic classification of the languages of Vanuatu. The volume takes into account both phonological and lexicostatistical evidence in reaching conclusions about the internal relationships of the Vanuatu languages. The wordlists which form the basis of the lexicostatistical calculations are also included. This volume was reviewed by Geraghty (1978). A number of the lexicostatistical figures have since been shown to be incorrect, however. Many of the wordlists were collected without any detailed knowledge of the languages in question, so errors in transcription, meaning and grammatical segmentation have sometimes been incorporated.

Tryon (1981) is a map showing the geographical distribution of most of the attested languages of Vanuatu, based on previous surveys in Tryon (1972, 1976, 1979a). The map contains some subgrouping information, but this is based on the same data and methods as Tryon (1976) and probably needs to be treated cautiously – as do the language boundaries themselves.

Charpentier (1982a, 1982b) is a massive comparative dictionary in two volumes, in both English and French: one (1982a) a general introduction, the other (1982b) a set of many hundreds of maps showing the distribution of words with comparable meanings in the South Malakula languages. It contains a little grammatical information, but no phonological information. However, the wordlists are much more extensive than those found in most surveys, containing about 1,700 items for each language, in contrast to the 200-odd words included within Tryon's lists. As with Tryon (1976), it is not always clear whether the forms should be viewed as being phonetic or phonemic. This work has some unfortunate features for anybody who attempts seriously to locate or refer to information in it. Firstly, there is no alphabetical finderlist to allow one to search for a word on the basis of its meaning in either English or French. Secondly, Charpentier (1982b) is a massive volume consisting of nearly 1,000 pages, yet it was printed with no page numbers.

Wheatley (1992:247–266) provides lists of varying lengths for names of trees from 35 different language areas. These lists were compiled without the assistance of phonetic training, so need to be treated cautiously. The lists incorporate all the lexical material recorded by Gowers (1976), and some additional material gathered by Wheatley, as well as a small amount of material from Johnson (1971).
Tryon, ed., (1995) is a multi-authored and multi-volume work which aims to provide annotated wordlists of up to 1,200 items, with introductory comments, for about 80 different Austronesian languages, including half a dozen languages from Vanuatu: Raga, Paamese, Lewo, Port Sandwich, North Tanna and Kwamera. For three of these (Raga, Lewo, North Tanna), this represents the only significant published source of lexical information.

Grimes (1996:918–928) is the thirteenth – and at this stage the most recent – edition of Ethnologue, which is a survey of the languages of the world, including a section on Vanuatu. It is not necessarily completely accurate, relying in many cases on fairly old information. (It is also on-line at http://www.sil.org/ethnologue/.)

Lynch (1998) is a general introduction to the languages of the Pacific, with a considerable amount of information on the languages of Vanuatu.

2.1.2 Collections

Turner (1861) includes as an appendix wordlists from a number of Vanuatu languages.

Gabelentz (1861–73) consists mainly of sets of grammar sketches and vocabularies based on information supplied by missionaries.

Codrington (1885a). The following subtitle indicates the nature of this work: ‘A linguistic survey of the groups of dialects and languages spread over the islands of Melanesia comprising their comparative grammar, numerals, vocabularies and phonology, and the grammars of some thirty-five languages, preceded by a general introduction’. Of these grammars – 34 in fact, since No.13 is missing – twenty are of Vanuatu languages (based on materials supplied by missionaries in the field), with the languages of the Banks Islands receiving prominent attention. There are sketch grammars of the following languages/dialects:1 Mota, Mwotlav (Motlav, Volow), Vanualava (Pak, Leon and Sasar, Vuras, Mosin, and Alo Teqel), Merlav, Nume (Gog), Lakona, and Ureparapara (Norbarbar) in the Banks; Loh in the Torres; Suñwadia (Marino) on Maewo; Duidui (Oba) on Ambae; Raga (Arag) on Pentecost; Tolomako (Marina) on Santo; West Ambrym (Lonwolwol) on Ambrym; and Nakanamanga (Sesake, Fate) in the Shepherds and on Efate.

Hagen and Pineau (1888) includes vocabularies and other information on a number of Vanuatu languages.

Macdonald (1889, 1891) consist of outline grammatical sketches, together with short vocabularies, of ten Vanuatu languages; three of these were in the 1889 volume (“Efatese”, actually Nakanamanga; Erromangan; and “Santo”, actually the Nokuku variety of our proposed Cape Cumberland language), and seven in the 1891 volume (Tangoa in Santo; “Malo”, i.e. Tamambo; “Malekula”, actually Unua-Pangkumu; Baki and Bieria, both on Epi; “Tanna”, i.e. Whitesands; and Futuna, i.e. our Futuna-Aniwa). Many of the sketches were authored by individual missionaries working in Vanuatu.

1 Modern language names are given here, with Codrington’s names in parentheses.
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Ray (1926), building on Codrington (1885a), not only provides more information on Melanesian languages, but also attempts to establish the relationship between Melanesian and Indonesian languages. It covers a wide range of languages in the Loyalty Islands, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands, with grammatical sketches of a number of Vanuatu languages. The sketches were based on published materials that were available at the time, as well as unpublished material derived from correspondence with missionaries operating in Vanuatu and elsewhere. Given the nature of the materials that he was operating with, some of these sketches represented remarkably good work, though for the most part they are easily superseded by any modern descriptions.

Brunton, Lynch and Tryon (1978) is written in Bislama in order to pass on to Ni-Vanuatu some of the results of academic research. This volume contains short articles on various aspects of archaeology, anthropology and linguistics.

Tryon, ed., (1995) is a massive compilation of a relatively standard dictionary list for a wide range of Austronesian languages, including a number from Vanuatu.

Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2001) provides a general introduction to the Oceanic languages – their geography, their speakers and their history – as well as to the ancestral Proto Oceanic. It also includes grammar sketches of 43 languages, of which eleven are spoken in Vanuatu: Mwotlav, Sakao, Tamambo, Raga, Neve’ei (referred to as Vinmavis), Port Sandwich, Southeast Ambrym, Lamen, Ifira-Mele, Erromangan (referred to as Sye) and Anejofu.

2.1.3 Bibliographies

Ferguson (1917, 1918, 1943) is a three-volume bibliography and a history of the Presbyterian Mission Press, detailing what has been published in various languages. Volume 1 deals with Aneityum, Futuna and Erromango, Volume 2 with Tanna, Aniwa and Efate, and Volume 3 with the Shepherds, Epi, Paama and Ambrym. Two further volumes (one on the remaining islands and the other a general bibliography) were mentioned in Volume 3, but it is not known if they ever appeared.

O’Reilly, Patrick (1951) is a bibliography of unpublished works by the Marist missionaries in Vanuatu.

O’Reilly (1957) is a dictionary of Vanuatu biography, which contains notes on the historical significance of all major players in Vanuatu’s colonial history, as well as a handful of references to Ni-Vanuatu. This contains an extensive listing of publications under the various names entered.

Klieneberger (1957) is a general bibliography on Pacific languages, with 71 general entries on Melanesia and 70 more specifically on Vanuatu.

O’Reilly, Patrick (1958) is a bibliography of publications and other works on Vanuatu up until the mid-1950s by one of the Pacific’s premier bibliographers.

Tryon and Gély, eds, (1979) is an attempt to provide a standardised spelling list for all place names in Vanuatu; the introductory text is in both English and French.

Lynch (1994a) is a considerably updated bibliography of works on the languages of Vanuatu, though still with some gaps. This constitutes the core of the current volume.
2.2 Social aspects of language

In this section, we list items which refer to various aspects of language use in Vanuatu or in particular parts of the country. We exclude sociolinguistic studies of individual vernacular languages, since they are listed under the appropriate language. The list here includes the following:

(i) Language and Society
(ii) Language Policy
(iii) Language and Education
(iv) English and French in Vanuatu

Bislama is not treated in this section, as it has a separate chapter of its own (Chapter 4).

2.2.1 Language and society

This section lists works which treat various social, socio-cultural, demographic or geographical aspects of language in Vanuatu.

Brunton, Lynch and Tryon, eds, (1978) was written in Bislama in order to pass on to Ni-Vanuatu some of the results of academic research. It contains short articles on various aspects of archaeology, anthropology and linguistics.

Dougherty (1978a) discusses bilingualism and multilingualism in Vanuatu, with special reference to Futuna. (In Bislama.)

Lynch (1978d) briefly discusses the work of linguists in Vanuatu for a local readership. (In Bislama.)

Tryon (1979a) discusses in general terms the internal relationships of Vanuatu languages, but also looks at their social role, as well as the role of Bislama, and of English, French and other non-indigenous languages.

Elley (1983) discusses the linguistic make-up in Vanuatu from a political perspective, concentrating on the development and functions of Bislama.

McKerras (1987) provides a few names of stars in Uripiv, Maskelynes and Sye (Erromangan), with a request for other researchers to provide more information on this topic.

Dixon (1991) predicts massive language extinction in the Pacific in the coming century, arguing that the current healthy status of languages in Vanuatu "no doubt ... will soon [change]". Based on out-of-date census figures (probably the 1979 census, though this is not clear from the article) and no first-hand knowledge of language use in the country.

Masing (1992) discusses uses to which literacy is put in rural Malakula, making reference to literacy in metropolitan languages, Bislama and the local vernacular.

Crowley (1994a) interprets data arising from the single language question that was asked in the 1989 census, demonstrating that most earlier estimates of numbers of speakers for languages have underestimated the totals by excluding dislocated communities and urban immigrants.
Crowley (1995c) discusses predictions of widespread language loss throughout Melanesia, including Vanuatu, on the basis of local experience and the 1989 census results.

G.J. Fox (1996) briefly examines some problems in phonetics, vocabulary and syntax which cause difficulties in translation.

Tryon (1996d) briefly discusses languages that have been used for religious purposes in Melanesia, including reference to the use of languages in Vanuatu by mission organisations.

Crowley (1998g) assesses published views concerning the imminent loss of many Pacific languages, including those of Vanuatu.

Crowley (2000b) discusses the impact of introduced literacy on the basis of translated religious materials in the Erromangan language.

Crowley (in press b) discusses various views about the distinction between language and dialect among the languages of the Pacific, making reference to a number of Vanuatu situations.

Crowley (in press c) discusses the impact of borrowing into Pacific languages in the light of predictions of imminent massive loss of languages, giving many examples from Erromangan.

Crowley (in press d) discusses the impact of missionary literacy practices in Vanuatu based largely on data from translations of religious materials into Erromangan.

### 2.2.2 Language policy

In this section we list studies of language policy and planning at the national level, excluding those specifically dealing with the question of language use in the education system.

Lynch (1979) is a critique of mission and state language policy before and after independence in Melanesia, with some specific reference to the situation in Vanuatu.

Pacific Churches Research Centre and the University of the South Pacific (1981) is a report of a conference which made recommendations on the use of Bislama and vernaculars in Vanuatu (almost none of which have been implemented). Three separate versions of this were published, in English, French and Bislama.

Crowley and Lynch (1983) is an unpublished report to UNESCO, commissioned to document issues relating to the preservation and development of languages in Oceania. Some attention is given specifically to Vanuatu, while a (now somewhat dated) list of languages and their numbers of speakers in Vanuatu is appended.

Pacific Languages Unit (1984) is a report of a conference which discussed the use and status of Pacific languages, including those of Vanuatu.

Crowley and Lynch (1985a) arose from a UNESCO-sponsored regional workshop. This examines a range of issues related to the development and preservation of Melanesian languages.

Crowley and Lynch (1985b) is a translation of Crowley and Lynch (1985a) into French.
Ligo (1987) is a brief survey of language use in the Vanuatu media, written in Bislama. This is a published version of a paper presented at a conference held at the University of the South Pacific in Vila in 1981. The proceedings of this conference are summarised in Pacific Churches Research Centre and the University of the South Pacific (1981).

Crowley (1987f) reprints the published summary of the proceedings of parliament from 30 April 1982, in which the status of Bislama and other languages in the education system and public life in Vanuatu was debated.

Charpentier and Tryon (1989) outlines the linguistic demography of the country, and discusses problems relating to language and education and the development of Bislama as a national language.

Crowley (1989b) discusses colonial and current language policy and language use in Vanuatu, and makes some suggestions regarding future developments.

Ombudsman of the Republic of Vanuatu (1995) is the first of the constitutionally required annual reports on the maintenance of multilingualism in Vanuatu, after a fifteen-year gap since the gaining of independence in 1980.

Ombudsman of the Republic of Vanuatu (1996) is the second of these annual reports.

Ombudsman of the Republic of Vanuatu (1997) is the third of these annual reports.

Early (1999) is a response to the 1997 official report from the Ombudsman concerning the status of English and French in Vanuatu. This discussion stresses the need for genuine multilingualism in language policy in Vanuatu.

Crowley (2000g) is a detailed discussion of the historical and present-day distribution and use of metropolitan languages, Bislama and local vernaculars in Vanuatu, both in written and spoken form.

2.2.3 Language and education

This section deals specifically with language and formal education, as well as with literacy. Most of the studies listed here deal with alternative proposals to the system in place since independence, and focus on the possible use of vernaculars and Bislama in the formal and non-formal education systems.

Fasquel (1981) concentrates on the integration of French and English into the unified education system of newly independent Vanuatu, with some discussion of the position of vernaculars and Bislama.

Crowley (1987b) discusses the status of vernaculars and Bislama in relation to education (formal and non-formal), and points to some lessons which Papua New Guinea could learn from the Vanuatu situation.

Tryon (1988) is a brief report on the current status of literacy in the Melanesian countries, with a fair amount of specific reference to the situation in Vanuatu. This report was commissioned as a contribution to UNESCO's International Literacy Year in 1990.

Thomas (1990). Though it is a general discussion on language policy, the main focus of this paper is on the education system, and particularly on the possible introduction of vernaculars and Bislama as media of instruction at various levels.
Liddicoat (1990) is a report on a conference held in 1988 at the University of the South Pacific in Vila on the subject of vernacular education in the South Pacific, with some specific reference to the situation in Vanuatu.

Early (1991) discusses the viability of Vanuatu languages and the prospects for vernacular literacy in them.

Matthews (1994) reviews the language-in-education situation in pre- and post-Independence Vanuatu up until about 1990, and applies a particular planning model to the education system, exploring various options that could be implemented.

Lynch (1996e) discusses various misconceptions about the nature of Bislama and the reasons why, despite its being the national language of Vanuatu, it currently has no place in the formal education system of the country.

Siegel (1996a) gives an overview of the language-education policies of the countries of the South Pacific region, including some discussion devoted exclusively to the situation in Vanuatu.

Lotherington (1996) presents a case for the use of Bislama in school-based literacy in Vanuatu.

Crowley (2000a) is an unpublished report prepared for the Vanuatu Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport which provides background linguistic information relevant to the Education Master Plan which was under consideration by the Vanuatu government at the time that this volume was being prepared.

Crowley (in press e) discusses the current proposal to incorporate vernaculars into the primary education system, and assesses the various kinds of difficulties that face such a proposal.

2.2.4 English and French in Vanuatu

This section deals with the roles played by the two metropolitan languages in Vanuatu, English and French.

Jacomb (1929). While this is certainly not an academic source, we have included reference to it both for its historical value and as a source of entertainment. This is a play set in the farcical Joint Court of the early Condominium era in which protagonists alternately speak in English and French, making much implicit comment on the relationship between the two languages in the legal system of the time.

O'Connor (1933) is a reissue of a volume originally designed for Fiji, aimed at teaching English to speakers of Mota. It contains an English–Mota dictionary.

Charpentier (1982c) has not been seen, but the title indicates that the article discusses the future of French in Vanuatu and New Caledonia.

Crowley (1989a) is a brief discussion of the role, status and use of English in Vanuatu vis-à-vis French in the education system, pointing to the decline of French-medium school enrolments since independence.
Tryon (1991a) looks at the use and status of French in those Pacific states in which it is an official language, and also describes some of the special linguistic characteristics of Pacific French.


### 2.3 Historical-comparative studies

Listed in this section are references to works of a historical nature. Some deal with the interrelationships of (some or all) of the languages of Vanuatu, and their relationships with other languages in the Pacific. Some have to do with the historical development of particular languages. Others deal with contact between languages, which also provides historical information. And some have to do with historical comparisons of the phonology, grammar or lexicon of Vanuatu languages.

#### 2.3.1 Early or peripheral studies

A number of studies published in the nineteenth century or the first half of the twentieth century make reference to the wider genetic relationships of the languages of Vanuatu, to some forms of internal subgrouping, or to some other aspects of the history of these languages. These are listed here for the sake of completeness, although in many cases much or all of what they have to say has been superseded by greater understanding of historical methodology and more recent data. Such studies include Codrington (1885a, 1885b, 1885c), Ray (1896), Schmidt (1899), Kern (1906), Fox (1910, 1947), Churchill (1911a), Gunn (1914:228–240), Doucère (1936), and Capell (1954, 1962a).

The Reverend D. Macdonald, a nineteenth-century missionary in Vanuatu, believed that the Oceanic languages derived from the Semitic languages of the Middle East. His publications in this area are included here for the sake of completeness (though certainly not reliability): Macdonald (1883–87, 1892, 1893, 1896, 1898, 1899, 1901, 1902, 1904a, 1904b). In similar idiosyncratic vein we can include Anonymous (1901).

#### 2.3.2 Classification and subgrouping

1. **Wider Oceanic and Austronesian subgrouping**

In this subsection, we list contributions to the classification and subgrouping of languages of the Austronesian family or the Oceanic subgroup of that family in which there is a significant input of data from Vanuatu languages. Naturally enough, the more recent of these publications are based on a much wider range of data, and those data are generally far more reliable; thus their conclusions are probably more valid than those in earlier publications.

Grace (1955) is a very brief and tentative presentation of possible subgroups of what is now known as Oceanic, based on the relatively restricted amount of data that was available at the time.
Walsh (1963) examines the lexicostatistical results obtained in comparing the same six Oceanic languages (one of which is Mota) using dictionaries and informants as the sources of data, and shows that very different figures may emerge in each case.

Dyen (1965) is an attempt to classify and subgroup the Austronesian languages using the techniques of lexicostatistics. Of the forty first-order branches in this classification, four are found in Vanuatu. This proposal never gained much credibility.

Grace (1971) is an outline history of research into the languages of Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, including some general conclusions on their internal and external relationships.

Pawley (1972). This important study gave some evidence for the existence of a major subgroup of Oceanic – known as Eastern Oceanic – based on shared innovations in phonology and morphology, as well as on some lexical data. The monograph demonstrates well-supported subgroups in central and north Vanuatu.

Tryon (1978a) summarises the results presented in Tryon (1973, 1976), and makes lexicostatistical comparisons between Vanuatu and other Oceanic languages to examine their external relationships.

Tryon (1978b) is a brief account of the internal and external relationships of the languages of Vanuatu. (Reprinted in Crowley 1987e:18–26).

Guy (1982) proposes some new ways of making lexicostatistical comparisons, and applies these to the languages of Vanuatu, as well as to some other Austronesian languages.

Lynch and Tryon (1985) makes a case, based on shared morphological innovations, for the establishment of a subgroup of Oceanic which includes not only the well recognised Eastern Oceanic group (Southeast Solomons, North and Central Vanuatu, Fiji and Polynesia), but also the languages of Micronesia, Southern Vanuatu, and Utupua and Vanikoro in Solomon Islands.

Lynch (2000c) proposes a subgroup called “Southern Oceanic” which includes all the non-Polynesian languages of Vanuatu and New Caledonia.

(2) The languages of Vanuatu

This subsection contains references which deal exclusively with the interrelationships of the languages of Vanuatu.

Tryon (1976) is the first major work on the genetic classification of the languages of Vanuatu. It takes into account both phonological and lexicostatistical evidence in reaching conclusions about the internal relationships of the Vanuatu languages.

Tryon (1977) discusses the problem of “sharp cut-offs” with respect to the subgrouping of the languages of Vanuatu, and talks of “subgroup chains” with overlapping membership.

Lynch (1978b) briefly outlines the internal and external relationships of the languages of the southern islands. (Reprinted in Crowley 1987e:27–32).

Lynch (1978c) is the first detailed attempt to show that the languages of Erromango, Tanna and Aneityum form a single subgroup of Oceanic, based mainly on phonological evidence.
Tyron (1981) presents in cartographic form the results of his earlier classification of Vanuatu languages.

Clark (1985b) presents additional phonological, grammatical and lexical evidence which confirms the existence of a North-Central Vanuatu grouping within Oceanic, and shows that it is composed of a Northern Vanuatu subgroup (the languages of Torres, Banks, Santo, Ambae, Maewo and the Raga language on Pentecost) and a Central Vanuatu subgroup (the remainder of the Pentecost languages along with the languages of Malakula, Ambrym, Paama, Epi, the Shepherds and Efate).

Lynch (1999a) shows how rapid language change may obscure the nature or closeness of genetic relationship by examining the Southern Vanuatu languages.

Lynch (2001a) is a comparative study of the Southern Vanuatu subgroup. It includes historical phonology and morphosyntax, lexical reconstructions, and a discussion of the historical development and interrelationships of the languages of Southern Vanuatu on the basis of substantial amounts of recently documented information.

### 2.3.3 Language and culture-history

Pawley (1981) proposes a sequence of linguistic diversification which has been followed in both Melanesia (including Vanuatu) and Polynesia, with length of settlement being the major factor accounting for the multilingual nature of Melanesian islands as opposed to the monolingual nature of Polynesian islands. It received strong criticism from Lynch (1981).

Pawley and Green (1984) looks at the culture-historical conclusions that can be drawn about the settlement of the Pacific, the culture of the original Proto Oceanic–speaking community, and the diversification of languages in this region. Some of the data and conclusions relate to the languages of Vanuatu.

Clark (1986b) examines the contact between Melanesian languages and Polynesian Outliers in Central Vanuatu.

Lynch (1991b) traces the distribution of different terms for 'pig' and 'dog' in the languages of Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and New Caledonia, looking particularly at borrowing from Polynesian sources, and attempting to make some culture-historical inferences.

Crowley (1994b) examines linguistic evidence of reconstructible kava terminology and argues that this is consistent with biological evidence for a northern Vanuatu origin of the drink, rather than a Papua New Guinea origin as has been suggested by other writers.

Lynch (1994b) describes how the non-Polynesian languages of the Tafea Province have borrowed large numbers of terms relating to maritime vocabulary from Futuna-Aniwa and/or other Polynesian languages.

Lynch and Fakamuria (1994) examines linguistic and sociological evidence which suggests that Tanna societies borrowed a moiety system from Futuna or Aniwa, which then later borrowed the Tanna names for their moieties.

Lynch (1996a) shows on the basis of linguistic evidence that, although the kava plant had a northern Vanuatu origin, it seems to have been introduced into the non-Polynesian...
languages of the Tafea Province from a Polynesian source, along with a whole Polynesian-style cultural complex surrounding preparation and drinking.

Tryon (1996b) is a brief summary of what is generally accepted about the original settlement of the Pacific, with specific reference to Vanuatu.

Tryon (1996c) aligns the major linguistic subgroups in Vanuatu with cultural "subgroups" on the basis of differences in certain aspects of material culture.

Tryon (1999) discusses the distribution of languages and linguistic subgroups in Vanuatu, with some reference to cultural correlates of these boundaries, and some mention of archaeology. This article repeats much of what appears in Tryon (1996c).

Lynch (1999b), following from Lynch (2000c), outlines the cultural-historical implications of the establishment of the Southern Oceanic subgroup.

Lynch (1999c) traces a complex sequence of borrowing between Polynesian, Loyalty Islands and Southern Vanuatu languages, of a word referring to the sweet yam or the sweet potato.

2.3.4 Phonological and morphophonemic reconstruction

Lynch (1975a) examines the alternation between oral- and nasal-grade consonants in a number of Oceanic languages, including several in Central and Southern Vanuatu, and concludes that this phenomenon can be accounted for by the fusion of preverbal tense/aspect particles (of the form nasal + vowel) with the initial consonant of the root.

Lynch (1976) suggests that Proto Oceanic may originally have had a four-vowel system, developing into six vowels, and later stabilising as a five-vowel system, based partly on evidence from languages of Southern Vanuatu.

Walsh (1982a) discusses Raga /k/, which is found almost exclusively in pronouns and other grammatical items, a feature which is shared with other languages of a hypothesised East Vanuatu–West Santo subgroup.

Walsh (1982b) is a detailed comparison of sound correspondences between Raga, Apma and Mota.

Maddieson (1989) is a study of the historical development of linguo-labial consonants in a number of the languages of Malakula and Espiritu Santo.

Crowley (1991b) discusses the notorious problem of root-initial alternations in verbs in central Vanuatu languages, corresponding to a realis–irrealis distinction, and shows that the patterns in different languages do not derive from a single Proto Central Vanuatu system, though they may have evolved due to a certain morphophonemic instability in that language.

Lynch (1992a) shows how the majority of verbs in the languages of the Southern Vanuatu subgroup have accreted an initial vowel, and points to the difficulty in finding a historical explanation for this.

Blust (1996) looks at dissimilation of low vowels in Oceanic languages, with data from Southern Vanuatu languages.

### 2.3.5 Grammatical reconstruction and change

Capell (1957) is a brief discussion of the origin of some grammatical morphemes.

Lynch (1977b) shows how the Proto Oceanic numerals developed in different ways in Tanna, with numerals, number-marking prefixes to verbs and number-marking suffixes to pronouns having different phonological histories.

Lynch (1982d) develops the theme outlined in Lynch (1973a), and attempts to account for the morphology of possessive constructions in terms of their underlying verbal nature. Data are drawn from a number of Melanesian languages, including Lenakel, Kwamera, Futuna-Aniwa and Mota.

Crowley (1983) shows how, although Paamese seems to have basically lost the Proto Oceanic transitive suffixes, a new suffix -ni, identical in form with one of the old suffixes, has developed out of a preposition which followed a formally intransitive verb. This discussion also shows that similar developments have taken place in other Vanuatu languages, like West Ambrym (Lonwolwol) and V'ënen Taut (Big Nambas).

Lichtenberk (1985) examines the development of the Proto Oceanic verb *pa(nñ)i 'to give' into a grammatical marker or case-marking preposition, and uses data from a wide variety of Oceanic languages, including Baki, Nakanamanga (Nguna) and Paamese in Vanuatu.

Lynch (1986) is an attempt to reconstruct the pronoun system of Proto Southern Vanuatu, showing continuities and innovations from Proto Oceanic.

Lynch (1996d) proposes a somewhat different Proto Oceanic possessive-marking system from that previously reconstructed, based in part on data from Vanuatu languages.

Lynch (in press) examines changes which have taken place in the Proto Oceanic possessive-marking system as it has developed in the languages of Southern Vanuatu.

### 2.3.6 Lexical reconstruction

Guy (1978) examines the diachronic phonology of a number of Northern Vanuatu languages and makes a considerable number of reconstructions of "Proto-North New Hebridean".

Lynch (1984) shows that the Proto Oceanic word for 'citrus' was *molis and not *moli, and is thus not a metathesis of Proto Austronesian *limaw as previously claimed. Some of the supporting evidence is from Southern Vanuatu languages.

Lynch (1996c) proposes some theories as to why most Oceanic languages retain the Proto Oceanic word *tama- for 'father' but many, especially in Vanuatu, have either lost the word *tina- 'mother' or have formally modified it in unexpected ways.

Lynch (1997) reconstructs on the basis of Proto Austronesian and Anejoë evidence the Proto Oceanic word *paRiu 'cyclone'.
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Clark (in press) is an extensive set of lexical reconstructions in Proto North-Central Vanuatu with reflexes in a number of well-described languages.

2.4 Typological-comparative studies

Early studies of various aspects of grammar include Copeland (1888), Ray (1919), Ivens (1938, 1940–41), and Fox (1948). While often presenting useful data, these appeared before modern linguistics came into its own, and are thus not of great use today.

Lynch (1973a) presents the view that many aspects of possessive constructions in Oceanic languages can be satisfactorily explained only in terms of underlying verbal constructions; data are drawn mainly from four Melanesian languages, including Lenakel.

Walsh (1982c) surveys the phenomenon whereby a number of Eastern Oceanic languages show variation in the initial consonant in some verb forms. The paper draws on data from a number of languages of northern and central Vanuatu.

Crowley (1985) examines the system of marking common noun phrases with 'articles' in Proto Oceanic, and draws on information from a number of Oceanic languages, including several from Vanuatu.

Tryon (1986a) examines consonant alternation in verb-initial position in the languages of Epi as well as some other central Vanuatu languages and concludes that the phenomena are independent parallel developments.

Charpentier (1987) is a comparison of the numeral systems of nineteen South Malakula languages and dialects.

Crowley (1991b) examines consonant alternation in verb-initial position in a number of languages of Central Vanuatu, and argues for independent parallel development arising out of a reconstructible structural asymmetry that predisposed the languages to acquiring these patterns.

Lynch (1992b) shows how different nouns participate in a variety of possessive constructions in Tanna languages, and suggests that degrees of inalienability are of importance in deciding what specific possessive construction will be used.
3 Vernacular languages

3.1 Torres Islands

The Torres group in the northernmost part of the country consists of the islands of Hiw, Metoma, Tegua, Loh and Toga. There appear to be two languages spoken in the group, with estimated populations as given below (Map 3):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiw</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loh</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ray (1926:441–446) provides a small amount of information on both these languages, focusing mainly on phonological developments from Proto Austronesian.
3.1.1 Hiw

Hiw is spoken by about 235 people, most of whom live on the island of Hiw, with a handful living on Metoma and on the northern part of Tegua. Apart from the reference in Ray mentioned above, and a standard wordlist collected by Tryon and Archdeacon Rawcliffe and published in Tryon (1976), there have been no publications on or in this language.

3.1.2 Loh

Loh – referred to as Lo by Codrington (1885a), as Loh-Toga in Tryon (1972), and as Toga in Tryon (1976) – is spoken by about 500 people, most of whom live on the islands of Loh and Toga, and also on the southern part of Tegua. There is apparently some dialect variation between Loh and Tegua on the one hand and Toga on the other. There is a grammar sketch of this language by Codrington (1885a:391–401), based on earlier accounts by Edward Wogale. Lanyon-Orgill (1953) has vocabularies from Tegua and Torres, while Tryon (1976) includes the standard vocabulary list from Toga, recorded by Tryon and Rawcliffe. A manuscript dictionary by Reverend W.J. Durrad was never published (Capell 1954:206), nor, apparently, was his translation of Genesis (Ray 1926:441), though Durrad (1939–41) did publish some substantial wordlists.

Materials in Loh


3.1.3 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiw</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loh</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>a few religious publications</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In a number of older missionary publications involving languages from the northern parts of Vanuatu, the difference between plain and italic letters was orthographically significant. Italicised m, for example, was often used to represent a labiovelar nasal, while the same letter in plain type represented a plain bilabial nasal. In citing translations such as these where it is now the convention to render the full title in italics, the originally italicised letters have been romanised.
3.2 Banks Islands

The Banks group consists of a number of islands located between the Torres group and Espiritu Santo, Ambae and Maewo; these include Ureparapara, Rowa, Motlav, Mota, Vanualava, Gaua, Merig and Merlav. This area was the early headquarters of the Melanesian Mission (the Anglican Church), and the Mota language was used as a lingua franca not only within the Banks but also in the Torres Islands, in other areas in the northern part of Vanuatu, and in the southern part of Solomon Islands. Because of this, literate speakers of other Banks languages generally learned to read and write in Mota but not in their own languages, which accounts for the minimal written literature in all languages except Mota.

The total population of the Banks group is over 7,000. Tryon (1976) reports that eleven languages are spoken there. This may turn out to be a higher figure than it should be, and we suspect that the total is more likely to be nine. These are listed below (basically north-to-south), with estimated current populations (Map 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ureparapara</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motlav</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera’a</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vurès</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mota</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nume</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakona</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gaua</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlav</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ray (1926:427–440) has some discussion of the language situation in the Banks, but the bulk of his section on these languages deals with phonological developments from what is now known as Proto Austronesian. Wheatley (1992:254) provides several dozen names of trees for Vanualava, though we are not sure which language these represent.

3.2.1 Ureparapara

Tryon (1976) recognises two separate languages on Ureparapara (locally Nobarbar): Lehali (spoken in the northern part of the island) and Lehalurup (spoken in a single village of that name to the south of this area). This decision was arrived at solely on a lexicostatistical comparison based on his own wordlists, which revealed that the two communalects exhibited 77.6 per cent cognate sharing. Given that this figure lies well within the error range for Tryon’s lexicostatistical figures, we suspect that these two varieties may in fact turn out to be mutually intelligible. The total number of speakers for this language is currently estimated to be approximately 440.

---

2 Vanualava is often written as Vanua Lava. Motlav and Merlav are very commonly also referred to as Motalava (or Mota Lava) and as Merelava (or Mere Lava) respectively.
Lehali is the original variety of Ureparapara, and is now spoken mainly in the northern part of the island by almost 250 people. Capell (1962a, map XVI) refers to it as Tekel, and (1962a:207) also refers to a language/dialect called Leha spoken on Ureparapara, which is not, however, shown on his map. There appears indeed to have been some dialect differentiation in the past, though there is very little nowadays. Codrington (1885a:357–367) has a sketch grammar, which also indicates differences between an eastern and a western dialect. Vocabularies of “Tekel” (compiled by E. Routel in 1908) and “Leha” (compiled by C. Milling in 1910) were published in Lanyon-Orgill (1958). There is also a single standard wordlist in Tryon (1976) recorded by Tryon and Rawcliffe. There is no record of any religious or secular literature in this variety.
(b) Lehalurup

Speakers of this variety originated on the small island of Rowa (one of the Reef Islands) to the southeast of Ureparapara, but apparently moved to Lehalurup village on the southern part of Ureparapara around 1930 after a tsunami struck their island (Tryon 1972:46–47); the census, however, gives no such name, but it may be that speakers of this language now inhabit Lesereplag in the southwest of the island. There do not appear to be any publications on this variety (which is also known as Rowa), apart from a single standard wordlist in Tryon (1976) collected by Tryon and Rawcliffe, nor do there appear to be any publications in it. Lebot and Cabalion (1986:83) provide just over half a dozen names for kava types.

3.2.2 Mwotlav

This language is spoken by a total population estimated at slightly over 2,000, on the island of Motalava (alternatively known as Motlav, but known locally as Mwotlav), as well as in three villages in the northeastern part of neighbouring Vanualava. Mwotlav was originally more diverse linguistically than is the case today: Tryon (1972:47) cites four dialects – Totoglag, Bun, Beklag and Valuwa or Volow – but there is now apparently only a single dialect spoken on the island, the last speakers of Bun, Beklag and Valuwa having died recently.

Codrington (1885a:322–331) has sketches of both the southwestern dialect, which he calls Motlav, and of the eastern Volow or Valuwa dialect. Kasarhérou (1962) is a brief morphophonemic study of the remaining variety. The only available lexical data is a single list collected by Tryon (1976), although Lebot and Cabalion (1986:84) provide just over half a dozen names for kava varieties, and Wheatley (1992:253–254) presents an extensive listing of names of trees from this language, which is supplemented by a handful of additional forms from Gowers (1976). It is not known if there is any written literature in the language, secular or religious. Alexandre François is currently working on this language.

Sources for Mwotlav

François (1999a) discusses in considerable detail various aspects of vowel shifting, vowel copying/harmonisation and syllabic epenthesis.

François (1999b) is a general introduction to the linguistic and cultural origins of the island, including a summary of the grammar and discussion of oral tradition, with songs and traditional stories in Mwotlav with French translations.

François (1999c) presents a discussion of typological issues in noun classification, including data on Mwotlav possessive classifiers.

François (2000a) presents essentially the same material as in François (1999a), this time in English rather than in French.

François (2000b) presents a discussion of the syntax and semantics of a verbal particle in this language.

Crowley (2001d) is a brief sketch of the phonology and grammar based on a short period of original work with a speaker.

François (in press a) is a short survey of this language.

François (in press b) is a detailed account of Mwotlav aspectual categories.
3.2.3 Vera’a

Apart from three Mwotlav-speaking villages on the northeastern part of the island, there are two languages spoken on Vanualava: Vera’a in the north and west, and Vurēs in the southeast. Vera’a, referred to after the village name Vatrata in Tryon (1976), is spoken mainly in that village but also apparently in some smaller neighbouring villages, including Leon in the west and a few small settlements to the north of it. Tryon (1976) has three standard wordlists, from Vatrata, Sasar and Bek (= Ambek?), the first collected with the assistance of Rawcliffe, while Lebot and Cabalion (1986:84) provide names for just over half a dozen kava varieties. A number of now abandoned villages were also occupied by speakers of additional dialects in this area: Codrington (1885a:332–337) has sketches of the Pak dialect, which may represent the same place as Bek, and also of the Leon and Sasar dialect (Codrington 1885a:337–344). There is no record of any publication in this language.

There is some suggestion (Catriona Hyslop pers. comm.) that the variety spoken in Ambek (= Bek or Pak?) may be a different language, with only a handful of speakers, but this requires further checking.

3.2.4 Vurēs

Vurēs3 is the name of the language that Tryon (1976) referred to as Mosina, and is spoken in the south of Vanualava, apparently in slightly different varieties in the west (also referred to as Vuras or Vureas), in a number of villages in the area of Vetumboso, Wasaka (Wosaga) and Kerepita (or Kerembitia), and in the east (from around the village of Mosin – Mosina being apparently the Mota name – to Port Patteson). The now uninhabited villages of Nawono and Alo Teqel were also home to speakers of different dialects from this area. Codrington (1885a) has sketches of Vuras (pp.345–350), Mosin (pp.350–354) and Alo Teqel (pp.355–357). Two standard wordlists are represented in Tryon (1976), from Vetumboso (collected by Tryon and Rawcliffe) and Mosina (Tryon). A small Anglican prayer book was reportedly published in this communalect in 1940, which suggests that it may have a standard written form.

There are reports (Catriona Hyslop pers. comm.) of another language – so far unnamed – being spoken within the Vurēs-speaking area, with a handful of speakers, but this has yet to be confirmed.

3.2.5 Mota

Despite having only a small number of native speakers, Mota is by far the best known of the Banks languages, due to its use as a mission lingua franca in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Because of this, it was well studied in the nineteenth century, but in later years, as English and Bislama replaced it as a church language, it lost much of its earlier prestige, and little work has been done on it in the last hundred years or so. It is not known how many people today still use it as a second language. Codrington (1885a) and Tryon (1976) both note that there were two dialects, but whether that is still true today is not known.

---

3 The phonemic value of ɛ' is not known.
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Von der Gabelaert (1873:124) has brief notes on the language, and there is a short vocabulary in Goodenough (1876:354–355) and a longer one in Ray (1893). Mota is also one of the four languages used by Walsh in both his evaluation of lexicostatistical classifications (Walsh 1963) and in a discussion of sound changes in some northern Vanuatu languages (Walsh 1982b). Tryon (1976) included the standard wordlist, collected by Tryon and Rawcliffe. Gowers (1976) includes over a dozen names of trees, all of which are reproduced in Wheatley (1992:253).

Sources for Mota

Unlike in most other entries, most of the major sources given here are not ‘modern’, but they do represent more detailed information than was available on most Vanuatu languages before the 1960s.

Codrington (1877), as the title implies, is an outline grammar of the Mota language.

Codrington (1885a:253–310) is a lengthy sketch grammar of Mota.

Codrington and Palmer (1896) was described by Tryon (1976:2) as then “still perhaps the most complete dictionary available for any New Hebridean language to the present day”, although more recent published dictionaries of languages like Paamese, Erromangan and Anejom are probably more extensive. Codrington (1897) has some comments on this dictionary and the culture it represents.

O’Connor (1933) is a reissue of a volume originally designed for Fiji, aimed at teaching English to speakers of Mota. It contains an English–Mota dictionary.

Ivens (1936) is an introduction to Mota for those wanting to learn it. (It is not clear if this was intended for English-speaking missionaries only, or for speakers of other Vanuatu and Solomon Islands languages.)

Materials in Mota

A vast amount of material (in Vanuatu terms) was published in Mota, the language of the Melanesian Mission. O’Reilly (1958:138–145) lists ninety items, and we will not repeat that whole list here. Publication began in 1862, with most printing being done by the Melanesian Mission Press at Kohimarama in New Zealand until about 1866, then successively at Norfolk Island until 1920, Guadalcanal (cited as Guadalcanar) in Solomon Islands until 1942, and then Sydney from 1944. The whole Bible was translated into Mota (see below), and there were also many editions of prayer books, hymnals, etc., as well as books for learning English, histories, folktales and other narratives (Ray 1926:427–428), though it is not known how much of this is still accessible today. A mission newspaper (O Sala Ususur) was published on a regular basis from 1896 until after World War II, and there were also almanacs, calendars and suchlike.

The list below includes only a few major items, many of which are revisions of earlier works. The publisher in each case is the Mission Press unless otherwise stated.

1925. O line tatataro nan talo loglue a Melanesia [Book of Common Prayer].
1928. O loglue ta England ... [A history of the Church of England].
1928. O Raverave nan we Rono. [Bible]. London: British and Foreign Bible Society. (Revised version.)
3.2.6 Nume

Nume is spoken in a number of villages in the northeast of Gaua Island. A sketch of the grammar of this language, under the name Gog, appeared in Codrington (1885a:367–377). There is a single wordlist in Tryon (1976), from Nume, collected by Tryon and Rawcliffe. There are apparently no publications in the language.

3.2.7 Lakona

Lakon, or Lakona, is spoken in the west of Gaua Island. Codrington (1885a:377–384) has a sketch of the grammar, and there is a single wordlist in Tryon (1976) collected by Tryon and Rawcliffe.

Materials in Lakona

n.d. *Vala at Gau*. [Ray (1926:428) says that this is a “lesson sheet”]. Norfolk Island?: Melanesian Mission Press?


3.2.8 South Gaua

Remaining areas on Gaua in the south are occupied by what is possibly a third language, which we refer to simply as South Gaua. The only information that we have from this area are three very limited wordlists from Tryon (1976), labelled as Koro, Wetamut and Dorig. On the basis of a lexicostatistical comparison of these lists, Tryon (1976) divided this part of the island into two languages: Koro (spoken in the southwestern village of that name, as well as in Mekeon, or Biam) and Wetamut (spoken in the southeastern village of that name, as well as in Dorig). See 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b on Map 4.

While the Dorig and Wetamut lists indisputably come from the same language, the status of the Koro list is more problematic. The Dorig and Koro lists are shown as sharing 72.5 per cent cognates, which is arguably within the range of lexicostatistical error encountered in Tryon’s lists for the same language. The Koro–Wetamut figure is lower – 68.9 per cent – though it is only very marginally below the somewhat arbitrary cut-off point that we have adopted for revising some of Tryon’s conclusions elsewhere in the country. Without specific information about the degree of mutual intelligibility between these different varieties, we would prefer to regard these lists tentatively as representing a single language, though we accept that Koro may turn out to be a separate language.
3.2.9 Merlav

Merlav (sometimes Mwerlav) is spoken on the islands of Merlav (or Merelava) and Merig, as well as in a couple of villages on the east coast of Gaua, where people have moved fairly recently because of population pressure. A sketch of the grammar of the Merelava dialect is found in Codrington (1885a:357–367), and there are two standard wordlists in Tryon (1976) – one from Merelava (collected by Tryon) and the other from Merig (collected by Tryon and Rawcliffe). There is no record of any publication in this language.

3.2.10 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ureparapara</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwotlav</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera'a</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vures</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mota</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>substantial amount of religious literature, and regular newspaper in the past</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nume</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakona</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gaua</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlav</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Espiritu Santo and Malo

Espiritu Santo is the largest island in Vanuatu. The combined Ni-Vanuatu rural population of the main island and all of the offshore islands (including Malo) in 1989 was 18,485, which extrapolates in present-day terms to just about 25,000. However, a substantial – and so far indeterminate – population lives in the peri-urban area in the east and southeast, where there appear to be minimal numbers of villages containing local languages. Most of the residents of this area, then, are apparently from other islands in Vanuatu, or from a variety of different parts of Espiritu Santo. The same is also true of the settlement of Vanafo further into the interior, where there are possibly as many as 1,000 people living today.

Despite its large size, and the fact that Luganville – the second largest urban area in the country – is located on the island, Espiritu Santo is linguistically extremely poorly known. Tamambo is the only four-star language; there is not a single four- or five-star language among all the languages on the mainland reported to be spoken there, and there are only two languages to which we would give a three-star rating. This island has the greatest concentration of locations in the country which are known only from the very short wordlists published in Tryon (1976), as well as the greatest number of geographical areas which have been completely undocumented linguistically.
There are substantial areas which are indicated on census maps as being occupied but from which we have no linguistic information whatsoever; these are indicated on Map 5 with question marks. However, some areas that are indicated as showing where particular languages are spoken should also be treated with caution. Very often, linguistic information has been recorded from only a handful of locations and the actual situation on the ground may in some cases turn out to be rather different.

Because of the level of error in the lexicostatistical figures upon which decisions have been made about language boundaries, many earlier statements about the number of languages found in some areas must be treated with caution on Espiritu Santo until more detailed and more reliable information comes to hand. Our tentative reassessment based on an examination of existing sources suggests that the number of distinct languages on Espiritu Santo could at this stage possibly be almost halved from Tryon’s 28 to 15.

We offer the following preliminary summary of our provisional reassessment of the linguistic situation on Espiritu Santo, with the locations of these languages roughly as set out in Map 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamambo</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutuba</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafea</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark Bay</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakao</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolomako</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cumberland</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wusi</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Santo</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Santo</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mores</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiai</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central Santo</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Santo</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Espiritu Santo—along with Tanna—is unusual among the islands of Vanuatu in that it has a significant population in the interior. There are also substantial areas in the southern and eastern parts of the island which are not indicated as having any vernacular languages spoken there (Map 5). These areas are not uninhabited; indeed, they are fairly densely populated, but the populations largely involve settlers from a variety of locations living in a peri-urban environment.

Ray (1926:348–356) includes some general information about the languages of Espiritu Santo, but Chung (1998:8) reports that it is often difficult to ascertain precisely which languages Ray was referring to because there have often been major realignments of the population since the collection of the data on which he based his observations. It is also possible that some of Ray’s data derives from areas which are still otherwise completely unrecorded.
3.3.1 Tamambo

Tamambo is the sole language of the island of Malo (formerly St Bartholomew), spoken in total by possibly as many as 4,000 people, including those living on Malo itself as well a considerable number of people who have settled on the Santo mainland and in Port Vila. Ray (1926:349) refers to three “dialects”: Malo (“the island of St Bartholomew”), Savann (“west end of Malo”) and Mavia (“island on coast north of Malo”). The predominant dialect today is originally the one spoken on the west side of the island; the eastern dialect, Tamapo, is now spoken by only a handful of people. While Tamambo is the local name for the language, outsiders refer to it as lanwis Malo. There has been considerable intermarriage with people from other islands, to the extent that quite a few children born on Malo of only one Tamambo-speaking parent have Bislama as their first language, though they often also speak or at least have passive knowledge of Tamambo.

Early sources include a short wordlist in Goodenough (1876:361–367), and a sketch grammar and wordlist by the missionary Landels in Macdonald (1891:15–30). Ray (1926:351–356) has some discussion on the phonological development from Proto Austronesian of a number of languages in the Santo area, including Malo. Tryon (1976) has a standard wordlist from the north of the island and an abbreviated one from the south, while Rubinstein (1978) provides a short wordlist, which records some terms associated with the now defunct sumbwe pig-killing ritual. A handful of terms referring to kava varieties is provided in Lebot and Cabalion (1986:89). Gowers (1976) provides the names of a couple of dozen trees, which are reproduced in Wheatley (1992:257).

Sources for Tamambo

Sykes, Miller and Miller (1990) is a dictionary of limited usefulness, since it includes no example phrases or sentences.

Jauncey (1997) is a comprehensive description of the phonology, morphology and syntax of the language, with two short texts.

Jauncey (2000) is a discussion of the category ‘adjective’ in Tamambo.

Jauncey (2001) is a brief summary of the main points in Jauncey (1997) for a readership of typologists and comparativists.

Materials in Tamambo

No copies apparently survive of many of the early mission publications, and few of the later ones. Publication in the language began in 1892, with various books of the Bible being published individually – Mark in 1892 and 1897, Luke in 1897, John in 1901 and Matthew in 1906 – before the New Testament appeared in 1922 (O’Reilly 1958:165–166). Other publications include:


4 A significant number of these people, however, have Bislama as their first language and speak Tamambo as a second language, as indicated in §3.3.17.
| 3.3.1 Tamambo    | 3.3.9c Tangoa       |
| 3.3.2 Tutuba    | 3.3.9d Araki        |
| 3.3.3 Mafea     | 3.3.10 Central Santo|
| 3.3.4 Shark Bay | 3.3.10a Merei-Tiale |
| 3.3.5 Sakao     | 3.3.10b Okula       |
| 3.3.6 Tolomako  | 3.3.11 Mores        |
| 3.3.7 Cape Cumberland | 3.3.12 Kiai |
| 3.3.7a Vunapu   | 3.3.13 South-Central Santo |
| 3.3.7b Piamatsina | 3.3.13a Morouas    |
| 3.3.7c Valpei   | 3.3.13b Amblong    |
| 3.3.7d Nokuku   | 3.3.13c Narango    |
| 3.3.7e Tasmate  | 3.3.14 Southeast Santo |
| 3.3.7f Vunapu   | 3.3.14a Butmas-Tur  |
| 3.3.7g Nokuku   | 3.3.14b Polonombauk|
| 3.3.7h Vunapu   | 3.3.14c Tambotalo  |
| 3.3.7i Vunapu   | 3.3.15 Aore        |

Map 5: Espiritu Santo and Malo


3.3.2 Tutuba

Tutuba is located off the southeastern point of Espiritu Santo just to the north of Malo. Tryon (1972:50) indicates that one language is spoken on this island. The only source of information is a single wordlist collected by Jacques Guy and published in Tryon (1976). The estimated number of speakers of this language today is 500.

3.3.3 Mafea

The island of Mafea lies offshore from southeastern Espiritu Santo to the north of Tutuba, and its language – seemingly also spoken in a couple of small villages on the adjacent mainland – is estimated to have approximately 250 speakers. Tryon (1972:49) reports that it was apparently formerly spoken on the neighbouring island of Ais, though that island is currently unpopulated. There is only a single source for the language of Mafea – Jacques Guy’s short vocabulary published in Tryon (1976).

3.3.4 Shark Bay

In the area immediately to the south of Sakao on the eastern part of Espiritu Santo, Tryon (1976) posits two separate languages, one spoken in the interior and another spoken on the coast of the Shark Bay area. The grounds for recognising two languages rather than one here are not strong, as the lexicostatistical scores are only marginally under Tryon’s cut-off point of 81 per cent, and easily within the margin of lexicostatistical error. The estimated total number of speakers from this area is currently about 800.

Tryon (1972:49) reports that the communalect that he referred to as Shark Bay was spoken on Litaro Island offshore from Shark Bay (though this island is now indicated on census maps as being unpopulated), as well as on the adjacent mainland. Tryon (1976) includes two wordlists from this variety, one collected by himself and the other by Jacques Guy. The communalect of Lorediakarkar is spoken in the small village of Lorediakarkar (entered as Lorethiakarkar on census maps) a short distance inland from Shark Bay. Tryon (1972:49) also reports that this variety was spoken in a small bush hamlet to the south of Lowerie in the interior, though recent census maps suggest that both locations are now
abandoned. The only source of information from Lorediakarkar is Jacques Guy’s wordlist published in Tryon (1976).

3.3.5 Sakao

This – along with the language of Southwest Santo – is the largest language on Espiritu Santo, spoken by an estimated 4,000 people in villages throughout the Cape Quiros Peninsula, as well as in urban areas. The largest centres in the Sakao-speaking area are Hog Harbour and Port Olry, while speakers are also found in smaller villages along the east coast as far south as Kole. There are also some Sakao-speaking villages and scattered settlements in the interior, and around the Matantas area on the west coast (though the settlement of Matantas itself is apparently relatively recent, with a population that is possibly a mixture of Sakao and Tolomako speakers). Sakao is the name of an uninhabited island off the northern tip of Cape Quiros, as well as being the name of the language. Many people use the name Nekep to refer to the language, and it is also referred to by the geographical terms Hog Harbour and Port Olry (which is usually metathesised to Pot Lori in local usage).

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist from this language, labelled simply as Sakao, which was contributed by Jacques Guy. Gowers (1976) also listed a couple of dozen tree names in this language, which are reproduced in Wheatley (1992:258). Guy (1974b:80) refers to an apparently unpublished (and undated) dictionary entitled *Dictionnaire français-langue de Port-Olry et langue de Port-Olry-français* which was held on deposit by the South Pacific Commission, though we have not sighted this work. Independent work on orthography development is currently underway.

Sources for Sakao

Guy (1974b) aims to describe the phonology, morphology and syntax of this complex language, though the style and format of the volume are highly idiosyncratic and at times frustrating to deal with (Clark 1981). There is sadly little exemplification of the patterns that are described, and where there are examples there is no interlinear glossing. A sample text of six lines is included, with a free translation and several pages of structural comment.

Guy (1977) proposes a number of hypotheses which explain the derivation of modern Sakao’s twelve vowels from the five vowels of Proto Oceanic.

Crowley (2001g) is an attempt to render the major features of the language – as represented in Guy (1974b) – accessible and intelligible to a broader readership of Oceanic specialists and linguistic typologists.

Materials in Sakao

Churches appear to have made considerable use of Sakao as a written language since the turn of the century, though no secular materials are known to have been produced in this language. Given the complexity of the phonological system of the language, it is likely that the spelling system does not accurately represent the phonemic contrasts in the language.


### 3.3.6 Tolomako

Guy (1974b:7) locates Tolomako on the southwestern coast of Big Bay, in the area of Turebiu/Jereviu, Tolomako, Maloeta and Malao. This area extends from the mouth of the Jordan River along a narrow coastal strip apparently as far as the mouth of the Pialapa River. The current estimated population of Tolomako speakers is approximately 900.

Codrington (1885a:441-449) includes a short sketch of this language, which he referred to by the older name of Big Bay, i.e. the Bay of Saints Philip and James. Hagen and Pineau (1888) provide a wordlist, which they mislabelled as deriving from southeast Espiritu Santo (Tryon 1972:53). Ray (1926:401–416) also provides a short sketch based on older materials. Gowers (1976) provides a couple of dozen names of trees labelled as coming from Big Bay, all of which are reproduced in Wheatley (1992:257). Guy (1974b:7–10) includes a handful of lexical items, as well as some grammatical morphemes, while Tryon (1976) includes a standard wordlist from Tolomako, which was contributed by Jacques Guy.

#### Materials in Tolomako

The following materials were printed in this language in the early twentieth century (O'Reilly 1958:165):


1904. *Na taveti tahonae hi Iesu Kristo, Matiu moulia* ... [Matthew, plus Jonah and Malachy]. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.


### 3.3.7 Cape Cumberland

While Tryon (1976) recognises five separate languages along the eastern and western coasts of Cape Cumberland, all these locations share more than 70 per cent cognacy on the basis of his lexicostatistical figures. In the absence of any comparative structural information, we suggest that, until further investigation has been carried out, the following communalects should be treated tentatively as belonging to a single dialectally diverse and geographically dispersed language. The total present-day population for this area is estimated to be in the region of 2,400.
(a) **Vunapu**

Tryon (1972:52) refers to a single language spoken along the eastern coast of Big Bay from the Piamatsina area, apparently as far south as the Pialapa River. However, Tryon (1976) later recognised Vunapu as a separate language in the southern part of this area, which we assume to involve coastal villages between Vasi and Peavot on the 1989 census map. However, no village with the name of Vunapu appears to be currently occupied, and this could not be located on the map. The only published source for this communalect is Tryon's (1976) wordlist from Vunapu.

(b) **Piamatsina**

Tryon's (1976) wordlist from Piamatsina – collected again by Jacques Guy – was assigned in this later publication to a separate language entered under this name, in contrast to his earlier grouping of the Vunapu and Piamatsina wordlists together as representative of a single language. There is a series of contiguous villages to the north of Piamatsina along the coast of Big Bay as far as Unap.

Further north, from Malovuko to the northernmost tip of Cape Cumberland, there is another series of contiguous small villages from which no linguistic information has ever been recorded. We have no way of knowing, therefore, whether they represent a distinct language, or if they form part of the same Cape Cumberland language to which we have tentatively assigned the Vunapu and Piamatsina wordlists.

(c) **Valpei**

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist, collected by himself, from Valpei, which is located on the western side of Cape Cumberland just south of the northernmost tip. Gowers (1976) includes a couple of dozen names of trees, which are cited as deriving from the northwest coast of Espiritu Santo. It is not known if these represent forms from Valpei, or if they come from the Nokuku area immediately to the south. Wheatley (1992:258) reproduces these forms in a single list.

(d) **Nokuku**

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist from Nokuku, collected by himself. This village is located further down the west coast of Cape Cumberland, and the same variety is reportedly spoken between Olpoi in the north and Petawota in the south. Ray (1926:384–401) includes a short sketch of this variety, while Gordon (1889:85–134) includes a longer sketch.

**Materials in Nokuku**

This variety was adopted for missionary use in the nineteenth century, and O'Reilly (1958:166–167) indicates that the following materials were published in the early twentieth century:


1946. Ne tavet ta lele Jon ta ulia ... [Various epistles]. Sydney: Commonwealth of Australia Council of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (Earlier version by J.N. Mackenzie published in 1918.)

(e) Tasmate

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist, collected by himself, from the village of Tasmate, which is located further down the west coast of Cape Cumberland. This is indicated as being spoken in the villages of Tasmate, Vasalea and Wunsule, though the latter appears to be entered on the latest census map as the separate villages of Wunavae and Sulesai. No other information on this variety is available, although Catriona Hyslop (pers. comm.) says that this is the same language as that referred to as Vunapu, on the opposite side of the peninsula.

3.3.8 Wusi

Another language is spoken to the south of Tasmate along the west coast of Santo in the villages of Wusi, Kerepua and Elia, which is generally referred to in the literature as Wusi. The estimated number of speakers of this language is currently 300. (There is an area to the south of Wusi in the shadow of Mount Tabwemasana along the coast, which contains a large number of villages and has a current estimated population of perhaps 1,200, from which no linguistic data has ever been recorded. This may represent a Wusi-speaking area; equally plausibly, however, it may represent a continuation of the Southwest Santo language, or there may be a completely different language spoken there altogether.) An orthography is currently being developed for the Wusi language.

Tryon (1976) includes two wordlists recorded by himself from the village of Wusi, as well as an additional list from Kerepua, supplied by B. Bomo, and a fourth list from Nonona supplied by Jacques Guy. The only other published information from this language apart from these wordlists are several names for kava varieties from Kerepua village (Lebot and Cabalion 1986:88).

It should be pointed out that in Tryon (1972:52) the Nonona wordlist — purporting to represent the speech of Lamak, Rata and Nonona villages in the interior — was regarded as belonging to a distinct language rather than being a variety of Wusi. However, none of these villages — including also Nonona — is indicated as currently being occupied on the latest census map, so we have no way of establishing the geographical provenance of this list.

This communalex was described as being “closely related” to the language named in §3.3.10b as Navut (which we have included in the entry for Central Santo). This means that the degree of similarity or distance between linguistic data from these two areas warrants further investigation, particularly as the only sources of information that we have are these short wordlists. However, the similarities are not so close that we are prepared at this stage to propose a link between the two as dialects of the same language.

3.3.9 Southwest Santo

Tryon (1976) treats the southwestern corner of Espiritu Santo as having four separate languages: Akei, Wailapa, Tangoa and Araki. However, on Tryon's (1976) figures, Tangoa and Araki share 79.1 per cent cognacy, which is very high, and his proposed Akei and
Wailapa languages also exhibit cognate percentages within the margin of error. Within this area, the only lexicostatistical figures which drop below our revised cut-off point of 70 per cent are those for the locations of Akei and Tangoa-Araki, which suggests that we may be dealing with a single dialect chain with possibly significant divergence at the geographical extremities. The individual components within this putative dialect chain are discussed separately below. The estimated current population of speakers of these communalects combined is 4,000.

(a) Akei

Guy (1974:b:vii) locates this communalect in the southwestern area of Espiritu Santo, centred on the coastal village of Tasiriki, and extending north and east some distance along the coast. Both Guy and Tryon (1976:63) suggest that this language extends a considerable distance inland to a village that they name alternately as Bilibil or Pilipili (which is named Pilipili on current census maps). This village is located immediately to the east of Santo Peak and we suspect that attributing this wordlist to this area may represent some kind of error by Guy that was repeated by Tryon, as there are villages well to the south of this which are more reliably reported as speaking the Kiai language.

Ray (1926:371–384) provides a sketch of this communalect, while Tryon (1976) provides three wordlists, one from Tasiriki (gathered by Tryon), one from Akei/Pilipili and a final list from Penantsiro (the latter two contributed by Guy). Guy (1974b:7) also provides a handful of lexical items, while Lebot and Cabalion (1986:88) provide names for four different types of kava from Tasiriki.

Materials in Akei

O’Reilly (1958:168) lists published materials in this communalect produced by missionaries, including the following:


(b) Wailapa

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist – collected by himself – representing the communalect of Wailapa village on the southern coast of Espiritu Santo. Information in Tryon (1972:51) and Guy (1974b:vii) is consistent with our suggestion that Akei and Wailapa are possibly mutually intelligible.

(c) Tangoa

This communalect is spoken on the small offshore island of Tangoa, as well as in a number of villages on the adjacent mainland. Annand (1891) and Ray (1926:356–370) represent short sketches of this variety based on earlier missionary translations, while Ray (1892) is a short collection of vocabulary.
Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist from Tangoa, collected by Jacques Guy, while Gowers (1976) includes several dozen names of trees, which are reproduced in Wheatley (1992:258). Maddieson (1989) provides a discussion of the articulatory and acoustic properties of linguo-labial consonants that are present in this language. Camden (1979) provides a strong argument for parallels in structure and lexicon between Bislama and the communalec of Tangoa, and in doing so provides a fair amount of lexical and grammatical information about this variety.

Work on the production of a grammar and dictionary of this variety is currently under way by Jeff and Sue Batcock under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Materials in Tangoa

The first scripture fragments and devotional literature in Tangoan variety appeared in 1890 (O'Reilly 1958:168–169), and these were followed by:


1952. *Reti ulia na retin Tagoa* [Matthew, John, Acts, some epistles]. Sydney: National Bible Society of Scotland and British and Foreign Bible Society. (Earlier versions of some of these appeared in 1892, 1894, 1912 and 1923.)

(d) *Araki*

Tryon (1976) provides an additional wordlist, collected by himself, from the nearby island of Araki, which he treats as a separate language. Since this represents our only source of information, and given that the degree of lexicostatistical divergence is well within our recognised margin of error, we prefer to keep an open mind and treat this as possibly being mutually intelligible with the communalec of Tangoa and other parts of the mainland of southwestern Espiritu Santo. This variety has fewer than fifteen speakers and is moribund, with the neighbouring Tangoa communalec replacing it. However, a substantial body of descriptive material has been gathered by Alexandre François, and this is currently being prepared for publication.

3.3.10 Central Santo

Linguistic information about much of the interior of Espiritu Santo is patchy and confusing, so our conclusions about the linguistic geography in this section, as well as in §3.3.11–§3.3.14, should be treated with particular caution (as well, of course, as any other previously published statements). Sources often refer to village names that we have not been able to locate on published maps. Some sources suggest discontiguous distributions of languages, which may reflect either the actual situation on the ground or, possibly more likely, confusion by data gatherers as to the precise geographical provenance of a linguistic source. The situation is confused further by the fact that villages in this part of the island are traditionally abandoned after the death of a chief, which means that earlier statements about where a language was spoken may now be only partly valid.

Tryon (1976) regards the inland area to the west of Mount Tabwemasana as containing four separate languages: Navut, Malmariv and Lametin, as well as a northerly offshoot of Akei (or perhaps some kind of northern enclave surrounded by other languages). However,
the first three communalects just mentioned are all lexicostatistically within the margin of error, sharing published cognate figures above 70 per cent, and we have already indicated that we suspect some kind of error in attributing the Akei list to the village of Pilipili.

A Summer Institute of Linguistics survey has recently shown that the communalects represented by Tryon's Malmariv and Lametin lists are in fact mutually intelligible, and that the correct cognate figures should be revised upwards from Tryon's 74.9 per cent to over 90 per cent (Chung 1998:6). On this basis, we regard the latter two communalects as definitively constituting a single language, and we suspect that geographically contiguous Navut may also turn out to belong here. The total estimated current population for this proposed enlarged Central Santo language is possibly as much as 1,400.

(a) **Merei-Tiale**

Chung (1998:3) indicates that the variety that is known locally as Merei (meaning 'no') corresponds to Tryon's (1976) Lametin wordlist. This communalect is spoken in the villages of Navele, Vutioro, Tombet, Anguru, Vusvongo, Mbo, Vusdungdum, Malores, Bengie, Vutoto, Venue and Punoro between the Ora and Lape rivers in central Espiritu Santo.

Merei is mutually intelligible with the separately named variety known locally as Tiale, which corresponds to Tryon's (1976) Malmariv wordlist. This variety is spoken to the west of the Ora River, from the Big Bay area in the villages of Mangalavara, Vutikara, Navelala, Junei Tavara, Vunarei, Lasunat, Mat characterization, Valui, Sukalato, Naurota, Vusiro, Varasule, Vunaman, VUTPanar, Tanokara, Tupelel, Sureta, Winsau, Vutioro, Maram, Tsaraparo, Paluitano, Liosara, Ora, Navelala and Mataipevu. (The boundaries drawn on Map 5 to indicate the limits of this language area should be regarded as tentative until all these villages can be located. Speakers of this language appear to be particularly mobile, as it is usual for a village to relocate when a chief dies.) Taken together, the number of speakers of Tiale and Merei based on the 1989 census results was at least 600, which extrapolates to approximately 800 in today's terms (assuming that there has been relatively little urban migration from Santo bush areas).

Tryon's (1976) short wordlists from Lametin and Malmariv have been supplemented by Chung's (1998) substantial descriptive account of the phonology, morphology and syntax of the Merei variety. Further work is proceeding, and it is hoped that Merei-Tiale will soon progress from being one of the least known languages of Espiritu Santo to one of the best known, as work by Jeremiah and Loretta Chung as well as Norman Candy (Summer Institute of Linguistics) progresses.

It should be noted that the survey work carried out by the Summer Institute of Linguistics indicates that some of the communalects identified by Tryon (1976) should be referred to as Okula, Toksige and Tiai, though it is not known at this stage which of his names these should be substituted for.

(b) **Okula**

Navuti is the name of a village to the immediate east of Mount Tabwemasana and to the west of the area occupied by Merei-Tiale, where the variety known locally as Okula is spoken also in the village of Saktui (Jim Stahl, pers. comm.). Tryon's wordlist labelled as Navut comes from this area, as well as another wordlist labelled as Matae (which we have not been able to locate on published maps), and these represent the only published information for this variety. These two wordlists were tentatively identified in Tryon
(1972:51) as representing separate languages, though they were treated in Tryon (1976) as representing a single language. However, both of these wordlists are within Tryon’s margin of lexicostatistical error in his comparisons with Merei-Tiale, so we prefer to keep an open mind as to the possibility that both the Navut and the Matae communalects may also turn out to be mutually intelligible with Merei-Tiale.

Guy (1974b:vii) associates the village of Pilipili just to the south of the Okula-speaking area with the coastal Southwest Santo language (§3.3.9). If this is correct, then this language would have a strangely discontiguous geographical distribution, and we suspect that Pilipili correctly belongs in the broader Central Santo language area.

(c) Other varieties (Navele, Tiai)

Jim Stahl (pers. comm.) reports the existence of a number of other named varieties within this geographical area, which possibly represent additional mutually intelligible dialects of this putative Central Santo language. Just to the north of the Merei-speaking area the Navele variety is spoken, while in the most northerly villages in the Central Santo area along the Apuna River we find the variety that is known locally as Tiai.

3.3.11 Mores

Recent information from Jim Stahl of the Summer Institute of Linguistics indicates that a language known as Mores is spoken in the villages of Lotunai and Patunbangen. Tryon’s (1976) Roria wordlist appears to correspond to the language of this geographical area, which he associates with Tonvar village, as well as the now unlocatable Roria (Tryon 1972:51). However, his association of this language with Morgrif appears to be incorrect or outdated, as Stahl (pers. comm.) indicates that Kiai is now spoken there.

This is a very small geographical area, and the current estimated population of these villages is only about 75 in total. This number may be higher if we have incorrectly drawn the boundary to the east with the South-Central Santo language. The only source for this language is a single wordlist in Tryon (1976), labelled as Roria, and collected by Jacques Guy. Despite its small size and the limited amount of data available, this variety does appear to represent a distinct language, though our suggestion that Tryon’s Roria corresponds to locally named Mores has not yet been confirmed by those who have surveyed the area.

3.3.12 Kiai

Ludvigson (1991) reports that Kiai is the local name for the language that is spoken in the interior of the southwestern part of Espiritu Santo, just inland from Santo Peak in the area around Fortsenal, as well as in Vunpati and Morikiriv villages (the latter corresponding Tryon’s Morgrif, which was incorrectly described as inhabited by Mores/Roria speakers). Stahl (pers. comm.) indicates that this language extends southwards as far as Mataipevu. Ludvigson (1989) represents a substantial wordlist for this language. The only other published material is Jacques Guy’s Fortsenal vocabulary in Tryon (1976). The estimated number of speakers of this language is currently 450.

Jim Stahl (pers. comm.) also reports the existence of a variety known as Toksigi, spoken in the area of Tonsiki village. This geographical area lies between the area occupied by Mores and Kiai. In the complete absence of any recorded information on this variety, we have no
way of knowing if Toksigi represents an additional language, or if it represents a separately named variety of either Kiai or Mores.

### 3.3.13 South-Central Santo

On the basis of lexicostatistical comparisons, Tryon (1976) concluded that there were three separate languages in this area, though he had indicated earlier that there may be a single language involved (Tryon 1972:50–51). Tryon’s (1976) percentages of shared cognates for his Morouas, Amblong and Narango communities lie in the 70s (or only marginally below this), and even the lowest figures here are within the broadest margin of error. As the only sources of information from these areas are the short wordlists in Tryon (1976), until further information comes to hand we prefer to group these varieties tentatively together as representing a single language, which possibly has about 2,200 speakers, a conclusion which is supported by informal reports of mutual intelligibility between the Narango area on the coast and Tanmet in the interior.

(a) *Morouas*

Tryon (1976) cites his wordlists labelled as Morouas and Batunlamak as coming from a single communauté spoken in the central area of Espiritu Santo in the villages of Morouas, Batunlamak, Fusrumbus, Batunfaramb and Tabulan in the northern part of this language area (Tryon 1972:51). Tryon (1972:51) also mentions a dislocated community in the village of Mafun to the south as containing speakers of the same variety, though we have not yet been able to locate this village.

(b) *Amblong*

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist from Amblong, located in the interior between Morouas and Narango. We have not been able to locate this village either.

(c) *Narango*

Finally, Tryon’s (1976) Nambel and Narango wordlists represent a different communauté, which he refers to as Narango. These villages are located in the central coast of southern Espiritu Santo, as well as the adjacent interior. Note that Tryon (1972:49–50) had earlier also treated Nambel and Narango as separate languages.

### 3.3.14 Southeast Santo

Tryon (1976) regards the inland area of southeastern Espiritu Santo as containing three separate languages. Again, with very short wordlists as our only source of information, we feel that greater caution needs to be exercised in interpreting the published lexicostatistical figures until more detailed data comes to hand. All of these communautés fall within the margin of lexicostatistical error, so we prefer to regard the communautés of this area as possibly being mutually intelligible. The total number of speakers of Southeast Santo excluding the settlement of Vanafo is estimated today to be at least 800.

There is, however, a particular difficulty in estimating the population for this language, as included within this area is the relatively large settlement of Vanafo. In 1989, the population
of Vanafo was reported as 789. However, a significant – but as yet unknown – proportion of Vanafo residents are people from other parts of Espiritu Santo, or from different islands in Vanuatu. We estimate that it is likely that the total number of Southeast Santo speakers might be 1,000 or more.

(a) Butmas-Tur

This communalect is reportedly spoken in the villages of Butmas, Tur and Naturuk in the interior of eastern Espiritu Santo (though only Butmas can be located as a populated centre on the most recent census map). Tryon (1972:49) reports that many speakers of this variety moved to the settlements of Palon and Vanafo (which were originally occupied by speakers of the Shark Bay language before they moved to the coast). Tryon’s (1976) wordlists from Butmas and Tur, collected by A.L. Jackson, represent our only source of information on this variety.

(b) Polonombauk

Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist from Polonombauk village – which actually appears on modern census maps as Nambauk – in the interior Espiritu Santo to the south of Vanafo. This wordlist again represents our sole source of information on this communalect. It should be noted that Tryon (1972:49) had earlier treated this as a dialect of the same language as Butmas-Tur, and we wish tentatively to uphold this earlier suggestion given the unreliability of the lexicostatistical data.

(c) Tambotalo

Tryon (1972:50) reports that this communalect is spoken in the single village of Tambotalo, which is located about halfway between Vanafo and the coast directly to the south. Our only source of information on this variety is Jacques Guy’s short wordlist, which was published in Tryon (1976).

3.3.15 Moribund and extinct languages

Tryon (1972:50) indicates that the indigenous language of Aore (located as language 3.3.15 on Map 5) had just a single elderly speaker, who has recently died. The decline of this language apparently resulted from loss of population, and the present-day inhabitants of the island are a mixture of peri-urban settlers who speak a variety of languages from different parts of Vanuatu, as well as Bislama. Jacques Guy’s wordlist, published in Tryon (1976), represents the only published information on this extinct language, though Robert Early more recently recorded some still unpublished data on the language.

Apart from this, however, we know of no reliable reports of other moribund and extinct languages from the island. It may be that Espiritu Santo suffered much less demographic decline during the nineteenth century, an observation which is consistent with the fact that there is still a reasonable distribution of villages throughout remote parts of the interior. However, it must also be recognised that the very poor linguistic documentation may have left some information of this sort unrecorded.
### 3.3.16 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamambo</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not very useful</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutuba</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafea</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark Bay</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakao</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolomako</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cumberland</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wusi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Santo</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Santo</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mores</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiai</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central Santo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Santo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aore</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.17 Immigrant languages

The southeastern corner of Espiritu Santo is where the linguistically mixed urban area of Luganville is located. There are also substantial numbers of off-island settlers living in the peri-urban area along the main roads leading up the east coast to Hog Harbour and along the south coast to Tangoa, as well as on the island of Aore, much as we find in some of the rural areas of Efate. At this stage, however, we do not have any information to indicate whether these areas include any linguistically definable resettled communities from other islands, though most communities do appear to be fairly mixed, with significant numbers of settlers from a variety of northern and central islands, especially Pentecost and Paama. Even outside this peri-urban area, however, there appear to be small settlements of people from other islands. Jim Stahl (pers. comm.) reports, for example, that there are small numbers of settlers from the Raga-speaking area of Pentecost in the Central Santo–speaking area.

Regarding the situation on Malo, Jauncey (1997:6) notes that “in the last fifty years, there has been extensive movement from the neighbouring islands of Malakula and Ambrym to settle in the east and south”. It is not clear how many people are involved, and what languages they speak, except that “most of the people living in the south-east and east speak Bislama [as a first language], most understand the western dialect [of Tamambo] and speak it to some degree, and some retain use of languages from their island”.

3.4 Ambae

The island now known as Ambae has been referred to by various names in the past: Lepers' Island, Aoba, Oba and Ombe. It is generally recognised that there are two languages spoken on Ambae, which are listed below with their current estimated populations (Map 6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duidui</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Ambae</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting that, despite these languages being among the largest in Vanuatu in terms of the number of speakers, and despite an impressive amount of ethnographic research done on the island, there had been very little linguistic research done on the two Ambae languages, until the very recent work of Hyslop (1998).

Ray (1926:418–420) has a brief discussion of the linguistic situation on the island, though he refers to there being only a single language, with a “slight distinction of dialect” (1926:419). Hagen and Pineau (1888:308–319) has a vocabulary, but it is not clear which language it represents.

3.4.1 Duidui

Duidui (sometimes Duindui or Nduindui, and also known as West Ambae) is spoken in the heavily populated southwestern corner of the island, in the Duidui and Walaha districts, in each of which a different dialect of the language is spoken. The name of the language comes from the name of the district in which one of its dialects is spoken. The language is represented in Tryon (1976) by a single wordlist, which he collected from Ngwatua village (Walaha dialect). Lebot and Cabalion (1986:87) provide names for nine different varieties of kava. Dorothy Dewar has been working for some years on translation-related work in Duidui and has written a number of unpublished papers on phonology, the verb phrase and syntax which have been deposited with the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Port Vila.

Materials in Duidui

Publication began with a prayer book and hymnal in 1876, and various small items were published before the turn of the century (O'Reilly 1958:136–137). Significant publications include:


1930. A leoi tataro veda tataro vataha Boni Ginie Lolo valei tataro [Prayer Book; earlier versions were published in 1876 and 1918]. Norfolk Island: Melanesian Mission Press.

1976–77. A roro Kare hurt-kita, Buku 1–4 ['The good news for us']. Bible Society in the South Pacific.
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Viralalao (1981). This is an illustrated collection of stories for speakers of the Duidui language, with no translation or interlinear gloss.

Vira, Early and Tahi (1997). This is a small booklet which gives some information on traditional custom, artefacts, and so on.

3.4.2 Northeast Ambae


Sources for Northeast Ambae

Hyslop (1998) is a thorough phonology and grammar, with a number of texts.

Hyslop (1999) describes the word class of directionals in this language, emphasising the way in which these forms express the close relationship that the speakers of the language have with their physical environment.

Materials in Northeast Ambae

Suas (1912–16) contains a number of myths and legends, with French translations. The early missionaries translated a number of religious materials into the language: Capell (1962a) mentions parts of the New Testament, as well as prayer books and hymnals. Hyslop (1998:9) says that a new translation is being worked on. Dorothy Dewar has reportedly been studying the language for some time, though no details of recently published materials in the language are known. Other materials include the following:


3.4.3 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duidui</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>one Epistle</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Ambae</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious material; more in progress</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

3.5 Maewo

The island of Maewo, formerly known as Aurora Island, is relatively sparsely populated, with just over 3,000 people. Maewo was missionised by the Anglicans, and thus Mota was used here as a church language, although some use was also made of one of the local languages.

Tryon (1976) lists four languages for Maewo, with the South Maewo language now reportedly extinct. The extant languages are given below, with estimated total current populations (Map 6):

- **Suñwadia**: 650
- **Suñwadaga**: 1,400
- **Baetora**: 1,330

Ray (1926:420–426) has a brief discussion of the linguistic situation, though he treats the differences between varieties as dialectal only; most of his discussion (as with his discussion of the Banks languages) is to do with phonological developments from Proto Austronesian. Gowers (1976) lists about a dozen tree names in an unidentified Maewo language, and these are reproduced in Wheatley (1992:259).

3.5.1 Suñwadia

Suñwadia, also known as Marino or North Maewo, is spoken in a number of villages in the northwest of the island, with an estimated total of about 650 speakers. It was previously spoken in a number of other (now abandoned?) villages, and there was some dialect variation. There are brief sketches of the grammar by Codrington (1885a:39–52, 408–420) and Ivens (1940–42a); Ivens refers to the language as Lotora, and Capell (1962a) as Tanoriki. Hagen and Pineau (1888:308–319) have a brief vocabulary from Bangoro, while Ray (1889, 1893) has vocabularies from Tanoriki. There is a single wordlist, from Marino village, in Tryon (1976), collected by Archdeacon Rawcliffe. A modern orthography is being developed, though currently very few people write in this language.

Materials in Suñwadia

There was some translation of parts of the New Testament, and also an Anglican prayer book in the language.


3.5.2 Suñwadaga

Suñwadaga or Central Maewo – called Peterara in Tryon (1972) – is spoken in a number of villages in the north-central part of the island by an estimated 1,400 people. Our only knowledge of the language is from a single wordlist from Peterara village collected by Tryon...
Vernacular languages

(Tryon 1976), although Lebot and Cabalion (1986:85) list over a dozen names for different types of kava recorded in Kereibei village. Catriona Hyslop (pers. comm.) notes that an orthography is being developed and that currently a number of people can write in the language, using the Suñwadia religious material as the basis for their spelling system.

3.5.3 Baetora

The Baetora language (also known as Nasawa) is spoken by an estimated 1,330 people living in a number of villages on the west coast, from Navenevene in the centre of the island to around Mandiri in the south. It takes its name from the village of Baetora. There are apparently two main dialects (Catriona Hyslop pers. comm.): Tawet is spoken from Navenevene to just past Narovorovo, and also at Naviso on the east coast, while Surtas is spoken in the remainder of the language area. Again, our only knowledge of this language is from Tryon (1976) – in this case five wordlists, from Nasawa (collected by Tryon), Navenevene (Tryon and Rawcliffe), Tam, Narovorovo and Baetora (all collected by Rawcliffe). An orthography is being developed.

Materials in Baetora


3.5.4 Moribund and extinct languages

Tryon (1972:59) reports that there was another language spoken in the south of the island, but at the time of Tryon's visit thirty years ago it was “remembered by [only] a few old people”. No written record of South Maewo (located as language 3.5.4 on Map 6) exists.

3.5.5 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suñwadia</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>no?</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious material</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunwadaga</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baetora</td>
<td>(****)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>a small amount of religious material</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Maewo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.6 Immigrant languages

Although the South Maewo language is now presumably extinct, parts of the southern end of the island are now occupied by speakers of Raga, who have moved there in recent times from north Pentecost because of population pressure. Capell (1962a) says that Raga speakers live in the villages of Lavui and Vavanae, while Tryon (1972) says that there are Raga speakers in Asanvari and Avanbatai. This immigrant population today would number about 400.
In contrast to most of the languages to which we have referred so far, the languages of Pentecost all have specific names: Raga (phonemically /raxa/), Apma, Seke and Sa, though Raga at least appears also to have geographical reference, being the name in northern Pentecost for the whole of the island. (Grimes (1996) indicates that the preferred local name for Raga is Hano, though local people inform us that this is simply a word meaning 'what', and is not known to be used by anybody as a language name). The languages of Pentecost (Map 6), and their estimated current numbers of speakers, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raga</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apma</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seke</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite intensive missionary activity for well over a century, and an active tradition of vernacular literacy on this island, no detailed account of any Pentecost language has ever been published. Ray (1926:417–426) presents a commentary on the geographical distribution and the historical development of these languages. Walsh (1978a) includes a brief explanation in Bislama about the principles of comparative linguistics, which is illustrated using a small amount of data from the five different speech varieties on Pentecost. Cabalion and Morat (1983) provide some botanical terminology from the island, though it is not certain at this stage which language (or languages) is involved.

### 3.6.1 Raga

Raga, phonemically /raxa/, is spoken in a large number of villages on the northern part of Pentecost from Tasvarongo in the southwest and Renbura in the southeast, including the main centres of Loltong, Abwatuntora, Labultamata and Lamalanga. However, large numbers of speakers of this language (as well as speakers of other Pentecost languages) live off the island, and people in a number of villages in southern Maewo also speak this language (Capell 1954:100, Tryon 1972:59).

Haberkorn (1989:28) provides an up-to-date population figure for the Raga-speaking area of 3,125 based on the 1979 census, which extrapolates to an estimated 5,560 rural dwellers today. Assuming an average proportion of absentees, the total number of Raga speakers is estimated today at around 6,500.


Walsh (1978b, 1978c) includes some Raga data in lexicostatistical comparisons between two Vanuatu and two Fijian languages, which come up with somewhat different results from earlier work in this area. Work is reportedly proceeding on the production of a major dictionary of Raga, on the basis of research carried out since the 1960s by Walsh, though no publication is as yet in press.
Sources for Raga

Walsh (1962) is basically a set of minimal pairs showing phonemic contrasts in Raga.

Walsh (1966) represents a medium-length description of the phonology, morphology and syntax, cast in a strict structuralist model.

Walsh (1980) examines botanical terminology in Raga, showing the widespread use of metaphorical expressions for specific and varietal terms.

Walsh (1982a) finds that Raga /k/ occurs almost exclusively in pronouns and other grammatical items, a feature which is shared with other languages of a hypothesised East Vanuatu–West Santo subgroup.

Walsh (1982b) discusses sound changes in Raga and some other northern Vanuatu languages.

Walsh (1990) is a comparison of kinship terminology recorded by the author with that recorded by Rivers in 1914, showing that a number of terms have broadened or narrowed their reference, possibly as a result of the disappearance of sections and totems from Raga society.


Walsh and Leona (1996) is a folk taxonomy of the birds of Raga.

Yoshioka and Leona (1992) is a list of about 800 words in Raga, with equivalents in English and Bislama.

Walsh, Leona and Pond (2000) is a folk taxonomy for land fauna in Raga.

Crowley (2001c) is a short sketch of the language adapted from material in Walsh (1966), and supplemented by some additional data from speakers of Raga.

Materials in Raga

Walsh and Liini (1981) is a longish text in Raga, which is provided with a free translation into English, linguistic analysis, and annotations. Apart from this, however, all materials in Raga appear to be of a religious nature, beginning with various small prayer books which appeared between 1882 and 1911 (O'Reilly 1958:163–165). More significant religious publications include the following:


1937. *Iboi Gaha* [Hymnal]. Guadalcanar: Melanesian Mission Press. (Revision of versions published in 1911 and 1924.)


### 3.6.2 Apma

This language is spoken on the west coast of Pentecost to the south of the Raga-speaking area, from Namaram in the north to Ranmawat in the south, including a substantial inland population in the Melsisi and Bwatnapne areas. This is also a large language, and our current estimate is that it probably has approximately 7,800 speakers. Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist, collected by the author from the central Pentecost area, while Wheatley (1992: 262–264) provides a lengthy list of tree names in this language. Lebot and Cabalion (1986:86) provide over a dozen names for different kava varieties.

Tryon (1972:60) mentions a possible additional language spoken in the village of Kassap within the Apma-speaking area. However, we have not yet been able to locate this village on maps, and no linguistic information of any kind has been provided on it. No information was given on its number of speakers, and whether it is a viable or a moribund language. Tryon (1972:60) states that the report of this language “remains to be investigated”, but since no further mention is made of this language in subsequent surveys, we have omitted it from our summary statements.

The only published grammatical information of any kind on Apma is Haudricourt (1960), though Tattevin (1929–31) includes a collection of stories, and Capell (1962a:233) reports that Père Tattevin had produced a manuscript dictionary, which we have not seen. Tabi and Buli (1985) is a collection of stories in Apma, while Mabonlala (1986) is a longish collection of stories for children in Apma, with translations into French and Bislama. Walsh (1982b) provides a discussion of sound changes in Apma and some other northern Vanuatu languages.

**Materials in Apma**


### 3.6.3 Seke

Tryon (1972:15) indicates that this language – which we have heard referred to by speakers of other Pentecost languages as Ske rather than Seke – is spoken in the villages of Baravet and Hot Water (between Lonorore and Ranmawat) on the western coast of the island just to the south of the Apma-speaking area. The estimated number of speakers today is about 600. Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist for this language, which was collected by himself. This represents the only published information on this language.

Tryon (1972:15) lists another communalect named Sowa as having only about twenty speakers at that time, all located in a single village between the areas occupied by the Seke and Apma languages. With such a small number of speakers, this was presumably a moribund variety. Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist for this communalect, which was
collected by D.S. Walsh, which represents our sole source of information. Tryon (1976) listed Seke and Sowa as separate languages on the basis of their shared cognate score of only 77.4 per cent, though we are reluctant to recognise the two as separate languages given the margin of error that we have encountered with such figures.

### 3.6.4 Sa

This language is spoken in the southernmost villages of Pentecost on both the eastern and western sides of the island, by an estimated 2,500 speakers today. Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist, collected by himself, and this is the only published source, apart from Lebot and Cabalion’s (1986:86) list of just under a dozen names for different kava varieties. Tryon (1972:60) indicates that this language is alternately known as Ponorwal.

### 3.6.5 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing System</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raga</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>significant religious publications, few secular publications</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apma</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious publications, few secular publications</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seke</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 Malakula

Malakula\(^5\) – or at least major parts of it – suffered massive depopulation in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Deacon 1934:18–22), though some parts of the island were evidently completely unoccupied during pre-contact times (Deacon 1934:5–9, Charpentier 1982a:41). However, the island has a substantial population today, recorded in the 1989 census as almost 20,000, which extrapolates to approximately 27,000 in today’s terms. A minority of indeterminate size, however, represents immigrant plantation labourers from other islands – especially on the eastern coast – though the number of speakers of Malakula languages is still very substantial.

Malakula has some of the largest and some of the smallest languages in the country, as well as hosting the largest number of reliably recognised distinct languages. Not only this, but Malakula hosts the largest number of moribund languages. In the discussion which follows, we note those moribund (and also extinct) languages for which we currently have information (§3.7.25). However, new information relating to such languages has surfaced at a dramatic rate even during the period during which this volume was compiled. It is therefore possible that further moribund languages may still await documentation on some parts of the island,

---

\(^5\) Sometimes spelt Malekula or Mallicolo (the latter especially in French).
while other separate listings of moribund languages may turn out on further investigation not to be separate languages at all.

The population estimates presented below derive from a number of sources which vary in their reliability. We have estimated speaker populations based in large part on the published results of the 1989 census, though indeterminacy regarding language boundaries in some cases resulted in some uncertainty as to which language group the residents of a particular location should be ascribed to. It was also difficult to determine which locations represent indigenous populations and which are substantially – or even predominantly – people from other islands.

For the southern part of Malakula, population estimates are also based on Charpentier’s (1982a) detailed language census based on information collected in the late 1970s. These figures have been adjusted upwards to allow for natural population increase, as well as more information provided by figures from the 1989 census. At the same time, however, we recognise that due to the dispersal of populations, some languages may not have gained speakers (and may even be losing speakers to other languages). Taking these comments into account, the current estimated populations for the languages of Malakula which it is thought are currently actively spoken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lendamboi</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninde</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinesip</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naha’ai</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasvang</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axamb</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avok</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskelynes</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Sandwich</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisvai</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banam Bay</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulua</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unua-Pangkumu</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navava</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevwervwer</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirak</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Malakula</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vao</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpotovoro</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vovo</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malua Bay</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V’ënen Taut</td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larëvat</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve’ei</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Malakula is the second largest island in the country (after Espiritu Santo), and while it has a population similar to Tanna (which has the largest rural population for a single island in the country), there is just a handful of reasonably well-described languages on
Malakula. Although not exactly linguistic terra incognita, Malakula certainly offers linguists plenty of scope for descriptive research. In fact, there is even a need for basic linguistic surveys over much of the island to confirm the number of distinct languages, as well as their geographic extents, along with accounts of population movements over the last century or so.

As a result of the earlier demographic decline, an indeterminate number of smaller languages spoken in the interior have probably disappeared. Charpentier (1982a:41–42) lists five communalets from southern Malakula which were reportedly extinct by 1980, though it turns out that one of these – Nātī – still has a handful of speakers. There is also one other language which, on the basis of Charpentier’s (1982a:41) population figures, appears to have been moribund at that time, and it may well now be extinct.

Yet other languages have had significant proportions of their populations dispersed to a number of different coastal locations. These dislocated populations have generally retained the ancestral languages in their new locations, while at the same time acquiring an additive competence in the language of their new home communities (Charpentier 1982a:43). This means, of course, that a map showing the traditional distribution of languages for the island would look very different from what we find today, with numerous geographically discontiguous languages and complex – and new – patterns of both societal and individual multilingualism within a number of coastal villages which have acted as magnets for interior populations from a variety of locations.

We have heard numerous accounts from a variety of sources and from a number of different locations of situations where small numbers of older people are able to speak languages which are not known to members of the general local community. It is not always possible to establish a connection between these reported languages and any of the languages referred to in this section, so it is possible that there may be yet other moribund languages awaiting documentation on Malakula. Such reports therefore add to the urgency of the task of basic linguistic survey work on Malakula, along with more detailed linguistic documentation.

Ray (1926:258–260) attempted to describe the distribution of languages on the basis of the very imperfect information that was available at the time, while Ray (1926:260–266) is a brief comparative study of Malakula languages based on equally poor materials. Von der Gabelentz (1861–73:167–170) includes a brief discussion of linguistic material from Malakula, the precise linguistic provenance of which is not clear.

Deacon (1934) represents a massive compilation of ethnographic material relating to Malakula, throughout which is scattered a considerable amount of cultural vocabulary from different parts of Malakula, along with idioms and ritualistic expressions, as well as a number of texts with interlinear translations. This added significantly to the amount of information on Malakula languages that was available at the time, and it is surprising that subsequent surveys have ignored it.

It is not always easy to be certain of the precise linguistic provenance of some of Deacon’s material, so careful textual exegesis is sometimes required, as well as comparison with other linguistic sources. This material was compiled on the basis of his fieldwork on Malakula in the 1920s, so caution also needs to be exercised in the interpretation of some of his phonetic representations, and it must be accepted that he was completely unfamiliar with the concept of the phoneme. Another difficulty with Deacon’s materials is that they were edited posthumously on the basis of his fieldnotes by an anthropologist with no background in Vanuatu linguistics, and there is a possibility that some of his handwritten vernacular forms were misrepresented in the typesetting process.
Deacon (1934:5–9) divides those parts of Malakula that he studied into a number of named “districts”, but his comments about language in relation to these districts generally do not give information about mutual intelligibility or otherwise between communalects from different locations. The greatest concentration of his linguistic material is in the Sinesip language of Southwest Bay (§3.7.3), though there are considerable amounts of material also in the Neve’ei language of the Lambumbu area (§3.7.24), as well as Ninde, spoken in the area known as Mewun just to the north of Southwest Bay (§3.7.2). Much of his vernacular lexical material is collected into a single glossary, where unmarked items are from the Sinesip language, while material from other languages is specifically marked (Deacon 1934:737–755).

Deacon also includes snippets of materials from a wide variety of languages from many other parts of Malakula, which are sometimes difficult to associate with specific modern languages, in part because of a lack of semantic overlap between his own vocabularies and those in more recent published sources. Another problem is that settlement patterns have changed considerably since the 1920s, with previously unoccupied areas now being occupied (for example, Toman Island) and previously occupied areas now being deserted, or very nearly so (for example, much of the interior of southern and northern Malakula), so any geographical reference in the 1920s may be of little relevance in locating speakers of that language today.

Charpentier (1982a, 1982b) represents a massive compilation of data from a large number of communalects from southern Malakula. Charpentier (1987) compares the numeral systems of nineteen of the languages from the same area, while Charpentier (2000) compares the terms for body parts and parts of trees in the same languages. Tryon (1976) provides data from a total of thirteen languages for the southern part of Malakula, while Charpentier (1982a, 1982b) includes data from a total of fifteen extant languages, and Crowley (1998d) adds data from yet another.

Sources for other parts of Malakula are rather more patchy, with the languages of some areas being relatively clearly delineated, and some languages even being quite well described. However, there remain significant areas where details of the distribution of languages needs confirmation, and where the languages themselves are very poorly known. In particular, there are some areas where the only source of information is Tryon (1976). Crowley has recently commenced a survey of the north-central parts of Malakula with a particular view to document moribund languages of the area, while Martin Paviour-Smith of Victoria University of Wellington has carried out some preliminary linguistic documentation of the Aulua area in the southeast.

For the other islands of Vanuatu, we have included maps in the various introductory sections which summarise the current geographical distribution of languages for the whole area. Some areas of Malakula prove particularly difficult to map, in part because there are so many languages involved, and in part because there has been so much recent movement of people from the interior to the coast, resulting in many linguistically mixed populations, as well as some loss of languages due to depopulation and migration. For this reason, we have decided to provide separate maps for those languages where the situation is particularly complex, in order to show both the traditional language areas, as well as areas where the languages are currently spoken. However, those languages which are still spoken within their ancestral areas, or which can be mapped without particular complications, are shown on Map 7.
Charpentier (1982a:44) indicates that there are four separately named but mutually intelligible varieties that were spoken traditionally over a wide area of the interior of south Malakula (§3.7.1 on Map 8): Ayiauleian [ayiauleían], Mbotkot [mbotk6te], Natanggan [natanggan] (which is moribund) and Nioleien (referred to in Tryon (1972:54, 1976:64) as Repanbitipmbangir, Tryon (1979a:15, 1981) as Repanbitip, and Tryon (1996c:171) as Niolenien [sic]/Repanbitip). Charpentier also supplied a much shorter vocabulary in this language which was included in Tryon (1976) under the village name Letemboi (which is referred to in Charpentier (1982a:42) and current census maps as Lendamboi), as well as a similar list included under Repanbitipmbangir.

---

6 Charpentier (1982a:63) notes that in “the languages of the center of the island, there is a strong tonic accent on the next to last syllable, and the final vowel is so destressed as to become almost unrecognizable [sic]”, which accounts for the transcriptions with subscript vowel symbols. However, the phonemic status of these is not clearly indicated.

7 This appears to represent a combination of two location names, Repanbitip and Mbangir.
This language currently has a geographically discontiguous distribution as a result of post-contact movements of people from the interior to a variety of coastal locations (§3.7.1 on Map 7). In addition to scattered bush hamlets in the Lendamboi area, this language is now spoken in Tavendrua (Dixon Reef) and Letokhas (Bamboo Bay) on the west coast, and Mbwitin and Mbangir to the east. In addition, there are significant numbers of speakers of this language in Lawa' on the west coast (which is a Ninde-speaking village) and Mbonvor on the south coast (which is a Naha'ai-speaking village). Map 8 shows the post-contact shifts in the geographical distribution of speakers of this language.

According to the 1989 census, there were about 100 people living in the interior in the Lendamboi area, about 170 in Tavendrua and Letokhas and about 210 in Mbwitin and Mbangir. Assuming constant population growth and language maintenance in coastal locations, the total number of Lendamboi speakers today could be about 800, though it is possible that some of the smaller populations in coastal villages may have begun to shift to some of the local languages.

Deacon (1934:5–6) refers to separate districts named Laus and Wien. These lie geographically within the area that is occupied by the Lendamboi language, and he provides some linguistic data from both these areas. From Laus, he provides a single short text (Deacon 1934:725–726), as well as a little cultural vocabulary (Deacon 1934:90), while from Wien he provides some cultural vocabulary (Deacon 1934:89–90), as well as a single short text (Deacon 1934:726). We have not been able to verify, however, that these materials do in fact come from this language, or if they have some other provenance.
3.7.2 Ninde

Ninde (also meaning ‘what’) is the name of the language that is spoken in the area that was traditionally referred to as Mewun (Deacon 1934:5–7; Charpentier 1982a:45). This area stretched from north of the area known as Seniang from the top of Southwest Bay as far as Hook Point, and a short distance into the interior (see Map 7). Charpentier (1982a:45) indicates that the interior population moved down to the coast into the modern villages of Windua and Labo, and the entire population is estimated today at around 1,100. Charpentier (1982a:45) reports that few people speak Ninde as a second language.

Ray (1926:293–302) provides a short sketch of this language – which he called Meaun, presumably for Mewun – based on written records provided by missionaries. Deacon (1934:730) provides a single short text in this language along with an extensive listing of cultural vocabulary. Gowers (1976) includes a dozen or so names of trees, which are collected into a single list by Wheatley (1992:260). Tryon (1976) provides wordlists from Labo and Windua villages, which he refers to as the Labo language, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a much more extensive vocabulary in the language, along with some grammatical morphemes.

Materials in Ninde


The following are indicated as deriving geographically from southwest Malakula. We therefore assume that these also represent translations into Ninde:


We have heard reports that some people from the Ninde-speaking village of Lawa' are able to switch to another language when they do not want other local people to understand them. This language is reportedly different to the language that is currently used in Dixon Reef (i.e. Lendamboi, discussed in §3.7.1). It is possible that this represents a previously unreported language originating from the Labulwol area inland from (and to the north of) Lawa'. Alternatively, it may be that these are speakers of moribund Nasarian (discussed in 3.7.25(1) below) or Nāti (see §3.7.25(3) below).

---

3.7.3 Sinesip

Deacon (1934:715) indicates that the traditional name of the language of the Seniang area of southern Malakula is Sinesip. This area was defined as the coastal region between Caroline Bay to the village of Lamangkau on the northern side of the mouth of the lagoon at Southwest Bay (Deacon 1934:5).


Charpentier’s (1982a:45) Nahava (‘what’) is an alternative name for this language, the speakers of which are now predominantly located in the villages of Lenbinwen, Benaur and Witawa in the Southwest Bay area. Extrapolating from Charpentier’s 1980 population figures and taking into account 1989 census results, it is estimated that there are now possibly about 600 speakers of this language. Charpentier (1982b) includes a lengthy vocabulary in this language, while Tryon (1976) includes two short vocabularies, gathered from Benaur and Lenbinwen, under the heading Southwest Bay.

Materials in Sinesip


3.7.4 Naha’ai

In the area that is known traditionally as Hurtes, which lies along the coast from Caroline Bay to the Matanui River, including Toman Island (Deacon 1934:5), we find a language that is spoken in two separately named but mutually intelligible dialects: Naha’ai in the west (on Toman Island, in Witawa, Milip and Mbwatmbang) and Nahaxai in the east (in Malfaxal and Mbonvor). We estimate that the current number of speakers today is about 1,100. Almost the same number of people do not speak but can understand the language. Tryon (1976) includes a single short vocabulary from Malfaxal compiled by himself, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a more extensive vocabulary. Curtis (1999), while primarily an anthropological source, lists a number of words in the domain of ritual grade-taking. Tryon (1972:58) refers to this language as Nakahai.

---

3.7.5 Nasvang

The Nasvang (‘what’) – or Nisanggen (‘what is it?’) – language was traditionally spoken in the interior adjacent to the coastal area where Axamb is spoken (Map 8). A handful of people remained in the bush hamlets in 1980, though most speakers of the language had moved to the coastal communities of Axamb, Faru (where Axamb is the dominant language) and Farun (where Nasvang is dominant). The total number of speakers in 1980 was about 140, which extrapolates to about 275 today, on the assumption that the language has been retained over the intervening generation (Charpentier 1982a:46–47). Charpentier (1982b) represents the only source for this language.

3.7.6 Axamb

This language is spoken on the offshore island of Axamb, and by smaller numbers of people on the island of Faru to the east, as well as a small number in the village of Farun on the mainland adjacent to Axamb (Charpentier 1982a:46). The latest census suggests that the total number of speakers from these areas is about 750 today. Tryon (1976) provides a wordlist, entered as Axamb, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a much longer vocabulary list for this language. Tryon (1972:53) indicates that this language is sometimes referred to also as Limilandr.

Materials in Axamb

The only materials printed in this language are:


3.7.7 Avok

There is a single language spoken on the offshore island of Avok. The nearby mainland village that is recorded by Charpentier (1982a:47) as Marpagho and Tryon (1976) as Maxbaxo appears to be labelled as Hokai in the 1989 census. We estimate that there are about 500 speakers of this language today. Tryon (1976) includes separate wordlists from Avok and Maxbaxo, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a much more extensive list. Tryon (1976) treats this as a dialect of the same language as Axamb, though with lexicostatistical comparisons between these varieties being in the range of 60–75 per cent, we are below his stated cut-off point for separate language status and for the most part outside the normal margin of error.

3.7.8 Maskelynes

Uliveo is the local name for the island in the Maskelynes off the southeastern tip of Malakula where the language that is referred to locally as *nasoruan naut a Uliveo* ‘language of Uliveo’ is spoken, though there is no name for the language as such (David Healey, pers.
Other islands in the group were once occupied by speakers of the same language prior to the amalgamation of the population on Uliveo because of an earlier tsunami, as well as encouragement by the Presbyterian church. In an earlier source, Charpentier (1979a:10) refers to Uliveo as Koliveu: this possibly represents a confusion of Uliveo and the formerly occupied island of Xuniveo. Ray's (1926) reference to Kuliviu possibly reflects the same confusion. The 1989 census figures suggest that there are probably around 1,100 speakers of this language today, taking into account Charpentier's (1982a:48) report that there are substantial numbers of settlers on Uliveo from other language groups.

Ray (1926:266–273) represents a grammatical sketch of the same language, which includes just over 200 lexical items. This sketch was based on his analysis of translated biblical materials produced by the Reverend T.W. Leggatt in the first decade of the 1900s (Ray 1926:259). Tryon (1976) includes lexical (and a little grammatical) information involving more than 200 items under the language labelled as Maskelynes. Charpentier (1982b) provides a more extensive listing of lexical (and some grammatical) forms. David and Sue Healey (Summer Institute of Linguistics) have recently begun working on the language.

Materials in Maskelynes


3.7.9 Port Sandwich

On the mainland adjacent to the Maskelynes is the government centre of Lamap, along with a number of villages along the shore of the peninsula that defines the harbour of Port Sandwich. The language that is spoken there is referred to by the geographical name Port Sandwich, in the absence of any indigenous name (Charpentier 1979a:16–17, Charpentier 1982a:48). We estimate the present-day population to be in the order of 1,200.

Doucéré (1936) is the only older source on this language, which Charpentier (1995:831) reports as being a comparison between Port Sandwich and European languages. We have not sighted this work, though O'Reilly (1958:124) commented disparagingly that “l'auteur connaissait la langue de Port Sandwich...malheureusement il ignorait tout de la linguistique”.10 Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist for this language gathered by the author, which is identified by location as Port Sandwich.

Sources for Port Sandwich

Charpentier (1979a) is a fairly detailed account of the phonology, morphology and syntax of this language, written in French. No vocabulary or textual materials are included.

Charpentier (1995:836) also refers to an extensive dictionary for Port Sandwich that he had compiled in 1974, though this is still unpublished.

---

10 Translation: "The author knew the Port Sandwich language...unfortunately he knew nothing about linguistics".
Charpentier (1982b) is a wordlist of about 1,700 items, supplemented with some information on grammatical items.
Charpentier (1995) is a brief linguistic introduction to the vocabulary for this language that is included in Tryon, ed. (1995).
Crowley (2001e) is a slightly longer sketch of the language, adapted from material in Charpentier (1979a) according to a standardised format – and in English – to allow for typological or historical comparison with other Oceanic languages.

3.7.10 Nisvai

The Nisvai ('what') language was traditionally spoken in the interior, to the immediate east of Nasvang. Since the late 1960s, most members of this community are reported as having migrated to the coastal village of Vetbong (which possibly corresponds to Levetbao on current census maps). However, a small number also moved to the predominantly Nasvang-speaking village of Farun (Map 8). We estimate that the language today possibly has around 100 speakers.11 The language is known only from Charpentier's (1982b) vocabulary.

3.7.11 Banam Bay

Charpentier (1982a:48–49) indicates that another language is spoken in the area of Banam Bay in the villages of Retur, Rapersivir – Tryon's (1976) Lepaxsivir – Remep and Vartabo – Tryon’s (1972:54, 1976) Vartavo. We estimate there to be approximately 900 speakers of this language today. Tryon (1976) includes three short wordlists in this language, gathered by himself, taken from Burmbar (which he also used as the language name), Lepaxsivir and Vartavo villages, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a longer vocabulary.

3.7.12 Aulua

This is the language of an estimated 750 people, extrapolated from the 1989 census results, in the village of Aulua and the surrounding coastal area. This language was propagated by the Presbyterian Church as a mission lingua franca among speakers of Axamb, Nasvang, Nisvai, Avok, Maskelynes, Port Sandwich and Banam Bay, so there are (or were?) significant numbers of people speaking Aulua as a second language.

Ray (1893) provides a grammatical outline of this language produced on the basis of materials written in the language by missionaries, along with a short vocabulary, while Ray (1926:273–283) includes a grammatical outline of the same language. Tryon (1976) includes a short wordlist labelled as Aulua, which he collected himself, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a more extensive vocabulary, including also some grammatical items. Martin Paviour-Smith of Victoria University of Wellington has recently gathered some data in this language, though none of this material has yet been published.

11 Charpentier (1982a:42) found that this language had only about 20 native speakers, which would lead to a suspicion that the language is moribund. However, he also claimed that it was “understood” by over 700. Since he did not attempt to account for the circumstances which might have brought about the unusual demographic distribution of the language, we are not in a position to say definitively if this language is actively spoken or if it is moribund.
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Materials in Aulua


3.7.13 Unua-Pangkumu

Along the coast from Blacksand Bay to Retok Bay we find another language spoken by an estimated 800 people. Charpentier (1982a:50) states that “all...Panggumu native speakers have no difficulty in speaking Unua...and vice versa”, which suggests that people from these areas all speak a common language.12 Tryon (1976) recognised two separate languages in this area: Pangkumu (in the villages of Mbangir, Penuvre, Rerep, Pandehur and Retchar) and Unua (in the villages of Repenunur, Rukmbo, Mbwansarit, Mbangete and Mbwatambur, or Batambu) (Tryon 1972:54–55). However, the sole basis for this conclusion was the published lexicostatistical figure of 76 per cent shared cognacy between his two wordlists. Given that this lies within the margin of error, combined with Charpentier’s suggestion of mutual intelligibility, we have concluded that these two communalects should tentatively be regarded as dialects of a single language.

Morton (1891) provides a grammatical sketch of the Pangkumu variety of this language. Tryon (1976) includes two wordlists, gathered by himself, one which he recorded from Rerep village (and this was also the name that he used for one of his putative languages) and another which he recorded from Unua (which represents the only source of information on that variety). The best source for this language is Charpentier’s (1982b) vocabulary from Pangkumu.

Materials in Unua-Pangkumu


---

12 It could also mean, of course, that all members of both communities are universally bilingual in two separate languages, though the cognate figures referred to in the following discussion are consistent with the idea that Unua and Pangkumu are in fact mutually intelligible dialects of a single language.
### 3.7.14 Navava

The Navava language traditionally bordered on the Neve'ei-speaking area to its southeast (§3.7.24) and extended south to include the southern banks of the Tisvel River. From the head of the Tisvel River, Navava territory extended to about halfway to Levarmas mountain, and was then bounded by a line drawn to the Nurumbat River, excluding the southwestern slopes of Levarmas. Tryon (1972:55) listed Navava, Nevat (actually Nivat) and Nevaar (actually Niviar) as alternative names of the same language, though these possibly all represented different language names (see §3.7.25(10) and (11) below).

Navava is actively spoken today, though none of its speakers live within the traditional territory just described; in fact, the language is now spoken in a geographically discontiguous area straddling the island. Some Navava speakers moved to the west coast to establish the modern village of Tisvel, while others moved to the northeast to establish the inland village of Khatbol, and yet others moved to the east coast to establish the Navava-speaking villages of Taremp and Tembimbi, as shown on Maps 7 and 8. The total number of speakers of this language in all of these locations is estimated at around 675.

This language is documented in print only in the form of two fairly short wordlists in Tryon (1976) labelled as being from Katbol (i.e. Khatbol) and Timbembe (correctly, Tembimbi) respectively. Tryon (1972:55) refers to this language as Timbembe, while in Tryon (1976, 1979a) he refers to it instead as Katbol. Gilbert Read of Melbourne has also gathered a limited amount of unpublished lexical data from the village of Tisvel, and is reportedly interested in doing further work on this language.

Members of the Navava-speaking community indicate that there are some differences between the way that the language is spoken in Tisvel, Khatbol and Taremp-Tembimbi respectively. A lexicostatistical comparison – which is all that we have to go on in the complete absence of any reliable grammatical or phonological information – between wordlists from Khatbol and Taremp-Tembimbi reveals that cognate scores are above 80%. Comparing an unpublished vocabulary taken from Tisvel with published wordlists from Khatbol and Taremp-Tembimbi, the cognate figures are rather lower, in the region of 67–70%, but this involves a much smaller sample so the results should be treated with caution, especially given local observations as to the mutual intelligibility of the varieties from all locations.

### 3.7.15 Neuwerwwe

This language was originally spoken to the east of the lower reaches of the Nurumbat River (where it is named the Mbatniriv River) and along the coast. It is now spoken in the villages of Sarmet and Lirnap, as well as across the river in Lingarakh. It should be noted that the village of Khatbol, on the other side of the river, is occupied by Navava speakers (§3.7.14). Extrapolating from the previous census, we estimate that there are probably about 1,250 speakers of this language.

Tryon (1972:55) refers to this language as Bushman's Bay, and mentions that it has also been referred to as Wuli and Mindu. Tryon (1976) provides a single wordlist for this language of the eastern coast of Malakula, which he refers to as Lingarak (correctly, 13 Kindly supplied by Gilbert Read.)
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Lingarakh). Gowers (1976) includes a couple of dozen names of trees, which are collected into a single list by Wheatley (1992:259). These represent the sole sources of published information on this language.

3.7.16 Dirak

The Dirak language was traditionally spoken in the mountainous interior on the eastern slopes of the main range around the Orap River just to the north of the area originally occupied by the Lombal language, as shown on Map 9. Dirak speakers abandoned their interior villages and have resettled in the village of Mae, which is located several kilometres from the coast not far from Tautu, as well as the village of Bethel, located on the coast about halfway between Norsup and Pinalum. Tryon (1972:56) also indicates that some speakers of this language – which he refers to as Mae – also settled as a minority in the predominantly Northeast Malakula-speaking village of Orap, located on the mainland coast just to the north of Wala Island. The only published source for this language are wordlists in Tryon (1976), one of which is labelled as Mae and the other as Orap.

It is estimated that there are currently just under 1,000 speakers of this language. However, it is spoken in close proximity to the large and spreading Northeast Malakula language, and we have heard unconfirmed reports that Dirak may also be showing signs of losing ground to its larger neighbour.

3.7.17 Northeast Malakula

This is a large language that is spoken on the offshore islands of Uripiv, Wala, Rano and Atchin, as well as on adjacent mainland areas, including around the main centre of Norsup, and along the coast as far south as Potinder near Bushman’s Bay. The Litzlitz area was earlier occupied by the separate Naman language (see §3.7.25(12) below), though this has now largely been replaced by the Northeast Malakula language. Northeast Malakula has also largely replaced the Tape language in Tautu village (see §3.7.25(14) below) and it has completely replaced the Lombal language on Uri island (see §3.7.25(13) below).

There is considerable dialect diversity within this language area, and there is no accepted name for the language as a whole. Tryon (1976) treats Atchin and Uripiv-Wala-Rano as two separate languages, though McKerras (1989a) indicates that the cognate percentages on which Tryon based his conclusion were about 20 per cent lower than more recent data indicate, and that there is mutual intelligibility throughout this area.

McKerras (1989a) describes the dialect situation within this language area as follows: Uripiv (spoken on Uripiv Island and the adjacent mainland as far north as Tautu), Wala-Rano (spoken on Wala and Rano Islands, as well as Pinalum) and Atchin (spoken on Atchin Island, as well as Orap on the mainland). The total number of speakers today is estimated to be about 9,000 including both rural and urban speakers.

Ray (1926:284–293) provided a short sketch of this language based on materials derived from Uripiv. Tryon (1976) includes wordlists from Atchin, Uri, Uripiv, Tautu, Pinalum, Wala and Rano. Another wordlist from Orap is assigned to the same language as Mae, though McKerras (1989a) indicates that this is incorrect and that the speech of Orap should also be considered as a dialect of Uripiv-Wala-Rano-Atchin. Gowers (1976) includes a couple of dozen names of trees, which are collected into separate lists for Pinalum and Uripiv.
Vernacular languages


Capell (1935) provides a discussion of some grammatical categories in the Atchin variety, arguing that conceptions of 'time' and 'object' are quite different than in European languages. Capell and Layard (1980), while being published relatively recently, is actually a sketch grammar in the Atchin variety that is of some antiquity, along with some lexical and textual material. This material is difficult to use for comparative purposes because of the phonologically uncertain status of forms as they are given, and the arrangement of material is confusing (Clark 1985c). Kenichi and Saiko Shibusawa of the Summer Institute of Linguistics are currently working on this language, concentrating on the Uripiv variety, and Ross McKerras has also worked extensively on the language, and is reportedly preparing a substantial body of material for publication.

Sources for Northeast Malakula

McKerras (1988) is a short discussion of number in the Uripiv variety.

McKerras (1989a) is a short mimeographed grammatical sketch of the Uripiv variety.

McKerras (1989b) is a very short mimeographed sketch of Uripiv phonology. Neither this source, nor McKerras (1989b), has been published. An extensive dictionary – referred to in McKerras (1996:420) – also remains unpublished, though work is reportedly in progress.

McKerras (1996) is a brief discussion of borrowings in the Uripiv variety, looking at grammatical changes taking in the language as a result of these borrowings, as well as some 'unnecessary' borrowings.

Materials in Northeast Malakula

The different varieties of this language have been developed extensively and for a considerable time as the basis of written religious literatures. For some time, there have also been teams from the Summer Institute of Linguistics operating from Uripiv. Materials that have been produced in this language are listed below. The precise dialectal provenance of some of these is not known, while in other cases the location is indicated in the title.


3.7.18 Vao

A separate language is spoken on the island of Vao and an adjacent area of the mainland. Some vocabulary from this language is entered under Fooa by Hagen and Pineau (1888), and Guy (1974b:7) includes a handful of additional forms. The only other lexical source for this language is a single wordlist in Tryon (1976), which he gathered himself. Maddieson (1989) includes some discussion of the articulatory and acoustic properties of linguo-labial consonants that are present in this language. Based on the 1989 census, it is possible that the language has something like 1,900 speakers today. The only known printed material in this language is:


3.7.19 Mpotovoro

Tryon (1976) provides a single short wordlist from the village of Mpotovoro (which is entered on recent census maps as Botovro), collected by himself. This language is shown in Tryon (1981) as occupying the coast on the extreme north of Malakula. Census figures suggest that there are approximately 430 speakers of this language today.

3.7.20 Vovo

Further along the coast and around the point to the south we find the Vovo language, which is known only from a single wordlist in Tryon (1976). There are probably about 475 speakers of this language. Tryon (1972:56) lists this language as Wowo.

3.7.21 Malua Bay

Tryon (1976) provides wordlists from this language collected by himself from the coastal community of Malua Bay and the interior community of Petarmur (which appears on census maps as Peterngar). No other information on this language has been published. The estimated number of speakers of this language is 500.

3.7.22 V'ënén Taut

V'ënén Taut is the local name for the language that has often been referred to in the ethnographic and linguistic literature as Big Nambas (for example, Deacon 1934, Fox 1979), after the characteristic style of men's traditional clothing. Deacon (1934: 116–118, 260–269, 371–374, 582–585) provides some cultural vocabulary from this language. Corlette (1947) appears to be a short sketch of the language, though this has not been sighted. Gowers (1976) includes a couple of dozen names of trees, which are collected into a single
list by Wheatley (1992:259). Given that these are labelled as coming from Northwest Malakula, it seems likely that these represent forms in V'ënen Taut, though in the absence of a published dictionary, it is not possible to check the precise provenance of this list.

The language was traditionally spoken over a large area of northwestern Malakula, in coastal villages from Uarnap' in the north to Anuatak in the south, as well as a number of villages in the interior (Fox 1979:xi–xii). However, most of the interior population has moved to coastal villages in recent years, leaving the interior occupied only by small residual populations. Based on the 1989 census figures, we estimate that the current population is about 3,350. Tryon (1976) includes short vocabularies from Leviamp and Unmet.

Sources for V'ënen Taut

Fox (1979) is a quite detailed modern account of the phonology, morphology and syntax, along with a number of texts with interlinear glosses and free translations. There is mention of work in progress towards the publication of a dictionary of this language (Fox 1979:iii), though this work has not yet appeared.

Fox (1996) examines lexical avoidance among women when addressing members of their husbands' families, a phenomenon which had already been commented on briefly by Guiart (1952).

Maddieson (1989) is a discussion of the articulatory and acoustic properties of linguolabial consonants that are present in this language.

Materials in V'ënen Taut

G.J. and Helen Fox spent a number of years living in the V'ënen Taut area as missionaries. Arising out of their work was the following translation of the New Testament: 1986. *Turanien m'dah*. Strathpine North (Australia): Covenanter Press.

3.7.23 Larëvat

To the south of the last V'ënen Taut-speaking village is the village of Larëvat, given as Larevat in Tryon (1972:57, 1976:87, 1981) and on many maps as Laravat. The current population of Larëvat-speaking villages is estimated today at around 675. Deacon (1934:111–114, 256–257, 575–578) provides some cultural vocabulary in this language, while Tryon (1976) provides a short basic wordlist, representing all that has been published on this language. Crowley has also gathered a few hundred items of vocabulary in this language, though this information has not yet been published.

3.7.24 Neve'ei

Neve'ei ('what') is the traditional name of the language that is spoken in Vinmavis village on the central west coast of Malakula, as well as by a substantial proportion of the population of the much smaller neighbouring Vilmbil village to the north. This language is also fairly widely spoken as a second language by speakers of the neighbouring Larëvat (§3.7.23) and Navava (§3.7.14) languages. While Neve'ei is the traditional name of the language, most younger people refer to it simply as Nabusian ('the language'). Deacon (1934:715) suggests
that Mwetelang is the traditional 'name' of this language, though local information indicates that this is simply a name for an older village site. A current estimate of the total number of speakers of this language is 750.

Deacon (1934:37–40, 182–184, 730–734) provides five short to medium-length texts in this language, with interlinear glosses, and a wide range of cultural vocabulary in Neve’ei is scattered throughout the volume, while Tryon (1976) includes a short wordlist entered under the village name Vinmavis. The only published structural information is in Crowley (2001f), which is a short sketch based on original fieldwork. A more detailed unpublished description has been prepared by Musgrave (2001), where the language is referred to as Nefe’ei.15

3.7.25 Moribund and extinct languages

There has been a significant amount of linguistic attrition in the interior of Malakula resulting from depopulation and migration to the coasts from the mountainous and inaccessible interior. The traditional areas where the languages discussed below were spoken are set out Map 9, based on information in Deacon (1934), Charpentier (1982a:43–50), Tryon (1972, 1976, 1981), and local oral sources.

(1) Nasarian

The name Nasarian given by Charpentier (1982a:43) for this language is represented phonetically as [nasariana], which is a nominalisation of the local word for 'speak'. The area where this language was traditionally spoken was some distance inland, but the original population moved to various coastal locations after World War II, and present-day generations have all but abandoned the language in favour of the languages of their new locations, leaving just five speakers in 1980 in the coastal village of Tavendrua, also known as Dixon Reef. It is not known if this language has any remaining speakers (though it is possible that this may be the unidentified language with a small number of speakers in Lawa’ village mentioned in §3.7.2). Tryon (1976) includes a short vocabulary for this language entered under Dixon Reef II, which was supplied by Jean-Michel Charpentier, while Charpentier (1982b) provides a much longer vocabulary.

(2) Aveteian

Charpentier (1982a:45) indicates that, in the early twentieth century, a few families lived to the north of the Ninde-speaking area and spoke the separate language Aveteian, with a name that he represents phonetically as [aveteianA]. This language is possibly now extinct, and Charpentier (1982b) records nothing of it. Tryon (1976) includes a vocabulary gathered by G.J. Fox under the heading Dixon Reef I. From its geographical source, this vocabulary may well represent Aveteian, especially as it is different to both of Charpentier’s vocabularies for Nasarian and Letemboi, speakers of which currently live at Dixon Reef.

---

15 The difference between [f] and [v] in many of the languages of this part of Malakula is non-contrastive.
Charpentier (1982a:46) refers to a language spoken in the interior between Malfaxal and Southwest Bay known as Nahati, which he understood to have become extinct in the 1970s. In fact, the language is maintained by a single family living in Windua village, who refer to it as Nāti. (The basis for Tryon’s (1981) count of 25 speakers for this language is not known.) The only published source for this language is a short grammatical sketch and a vocabulary of about 750 items (Crowley 1998d).

(4) Navwien

Charpentier (1982a:46) indicates that Navwien, formerly spoken in the interior to the east of Nāti (Charpentier 1982a:41) at the time had only five speakers, four of whom lived in Mbonvor (Map 8). All of these speakers exhibited varying patterns of bilingualism with other vernaculars.
(5) Sōrsōrian

Charpentier (1982a:49) reports that Sōrsōrian was originally spoken in the interior adjacent to Natanggan and extending in the direction of the area where Mbwenelang was spoken on the coast to the northeast. In 1976 there was reportedly only a single speaker left, though Tryon (1996c:171) increases the number of speakers to four. There is no material recorded from this language.

(6) Mbwenelang

Charpentier (1982a:42) reports Mbwenelang as having only five native speakers, resulting from a movement from the interior into the Aulua-speaking area, which resulted in a wholesale shift to the latter language. Charpentier (1982b) provides a lengthy published lexicon for this otherwise unknown language, though Tryon (1972:54) refers to an apparently unpublished vocabulary gathered by Corlette. He also mentions earlier sources which referred to this language as Benelang or Boinelang.

(7) Surua Hole

Masing (1992:30) refers to a language known as Surua Hole which was formerly spoken inland from Aulua on the southeast coast. Speakers of this language settled along the coast among Aulua speakers in the 1940s, and there is only a small number of people in their 50s and older who still speak this language. Martin Paviour-Smith has reportedly collected some data on Surua Hole, though his data has not yet been published.

(8) Bangsa'

The Bangsa' language traditionally occupied the western slopes of Levarmas peak, bordering on Nivat and Niviar. Information about its other boundaries is not available. This language is now moribund, though a few speakers reportedly now live in the Nevewervwer-speaking village of Lingarakh, as well as in the predominantly Nevewervwer-speaking villages of Sarmet and Limap. This language is completely undocumented apart from a collection of kin terms in Deacon (1934:125).

(9) Umbrul

Speakers refer to this language as Umbrul (phonetically, [umb'uP mb'ul]), though its name in the neighbouring Neve'ei language to the north is Numbuwul. This language reportedly occupied an area to the south of the Tisvel River. There are now two known speakers of Umbrul living in the predominantly Navava-speaking village of Tisvel, and there is possibly another speaker living in Navava-speaking village of Tembimbi on the west coast. A very small amount of unpublished lexical data in this language has been recorded by Crowley.

The linguistic status of Umbrul is somewhat problematic. Lexicostatistical comparisons – all that we have to go on at this stage – between Crowley's Umbrul list and Tryon's Navava lists from Khatbol and Tembimbi (§3.7.14) point to cognate scores above 80%, which

16 See also Deacon (1934:8).
17 The symbol [b'] represents a voiced bilabial trill.
strongly suggests the possibility of mutual intelligibility, while the cognate score between Crowley’s Umbrul wordlist and a wordlist from Tisvel gathered by Gilbert Read is substantially lower, around 70%. However, the local perception in Tisvel that Umbrul is a “different language” from theirs could well reflect reality. If Umbrul is indeed mutually intelligible with the Khatbol and Tembimbi dialects of Navava – but not the Tisvel dialect – then we may be dealing with a dialect chain situation.

(10) Niviar

Niviar was traditionally spoken to the east of the Nurumbat River from somewhere above Khatbol, and inland as far as Levarmas peak. This is the language that was cited as Nevaar in Tryon (1972:55), where the name was also mentioned as referring to the same speech variety as Navava (§3.7.14). Niviar is now moribund, reportedly having only two elderly speakers who now live in Khatbol village. The only documented information on this language is a collection of kin terms in Deacon (1934:125).

(11) Nivat

The communalect of Nivat – referred to in Tryon (1972:55) as Nevat – was spoken in a relatively small area on the western slopes of Levarmas peak. No information has been recorded in this language apart from a collection of kin terms in Deacon (1934:125). This language is now moribund, though there is reportedly a substantial minority of about thirty or forty people who still use it in the predominantly Navava-speaking village of Khatbol, as well as a number of people in the Nevwervwer-speaking village of Limap.

While separately named Nivat and Niviar traditionally occupied geographical areas that are separate from – but contiguous with – Navava, in the absence to date of any substantial linguistic information on both of these varieties, it is impossible to say for sure if these represented three mutually unintelligible languages, if they are simply separate names for geographical variants of the same language.

(12) Naman

The language that is known by its speakers as Naman was traditionally spoken over a large area of the interior from the east bank of the Lambumbu River just inland from modern Lambumbu and Vilmbil villages. Its southern border extended inland to just south of Norumb mountain in the interior and then southeast to the site of modern Lowisal village on the Nurumbat River. It extended across the central divide and was spoken along the coast in the area of modern Lakatoro and Litzlitz. It was spoken along the coast from the Aup River in the north as far south as Bushmans Bay. This is the local name for the language that is more commonly referred to in the literature as Langalang or Langalanga (e.g. Deacon 1934:8), spellings which approximate to the local pronunciation of the name of the area where this language was spoken, i.e. Lëngalëng.

Although Naman traditionally occupied quite a substantial area, it is now very much a moribund language. Its speakers moved from the interior to the modern village of Litzlitz where younger people have already shifted to the Northeast Malakula language (§3.7.17). However, a number of Naman speakers over the age of fifty or so still live in Litzlitz. There has also been some recent movement of Naman people from Litzlitz to the newly established interior village of Ameli on the other side of the island in the Lambumbu area, though the
dominant languages of this community are Northeast Malakula and Bislama (as some non-
Malakulan families also live there). Small numbers of speakers of Naman also live in the
villages of Vilmbil and Vinmavis, though the language is not often used. There are in all
possibly 15–20 speakers of this moribund language scattered between these various
locations.

Deacon (1934:613–614, 734–736) recorded four short texts in this language, while some
cultural vocabulary is scattered throughout this volume.\(^{18}\) On the basis of recent fieldwork by
Crowley, Deacon’s texts have now been correctly transcribed, analysed and translated, while
a lexicon of several hundred items has also been collected. Tryon (1976) also includes a short
wordlist in this language, which is labelled as Litzlitz. Tryon (1972:55) referred to this
language as Port Stanley, and mentions that it has also been referred to as Lolnarrong and
Netenesal (which may be an error for the old village name Metenesel, which is now used for
a large cocoa plantation).

(13) Lombal

Located in the interior just to the south of the ancestral Dirak-speaking area (§3.7.16)
were a people who spoke the Lombal language. In order to escape the depredations of their
Big Nambas neighbours, these people relocated to the island of Uri immediately to the south
of Uripiv. Their language was replaced by the language of Uripiv, and the last speaker of
Lombal language – now usually referred to locally as the Uri language – reportedly died in
the the 1980s. Ross McKerras (pers. comm.) indicates that he collected a small amount of
data on this language from its last speaker, though that information has apparently been lost.

(14) Tape

This language traditionally bordered on the V’ë nen Taut-speaking area (§3.7.22), and was
spoken along the coast from just west of Anuatakh as far east as the river that enters the sea
just past Lowisinwei. It extended inland up the Lowisinwei and Brenwei Rivers to the south
of the high peaks in the interior of the island.

Tape is the local name for the language that is referred to elsewhere as Maragus or
Marakus (Deacon 1934:7, Tryon 1976). Tape speakers report that Marakhus – as the word
should be correctly written – is not a word in their language at all, and attribute it to the
Larëvat language (§3.7.23), where it is said to mean ‘far away’.\(^{19}\)

The Big Nambas were traditionally war-like neighbours and in the early twentieth century
launched a series of attacks on Tape people, reportedly killing over thirty, some of whom
were eaten. To escape the depredations of their neighbours, they moved to a series of new
locations in the interior within or adjacent to their traditional territory in the east, as far as
possible away from the territory of the Big Nambas. However, the attacks continued, and the
Big Nambas were also joined in their attacks against Tape speakers by speakers of the Dirak
language to their northwest.

In desperation, the entire Tape-speaking population relocated in the late 1920s to the
modern village of Tautu on the mainland opposite the island of Uripiv near modern Norsup.
This coastal area was originally completely unpopulated, so Tautu began its history as a

---


\(^{19}\) We have not been able to verify this with Larëvat speakers, however.
Tape-speaking refugee village. Over the years, increasing numbers of people from Uripiv settled among the Tape speakers in Tautu and there was considerable intermarriage. By the 1950s and 1960s, the village had become linguistically mixed, with Tape speakers generally being bilingual in their own language and the Uripiv variety of the Northeast Malakula language. However, few people from Uripiv living in the village learned to speak Tape and children born since then have grown up speaking only the Northeast Malakula language.

More than half of the current population of Tautu identify ancestrally as Tape though the vast majority now are first-language speakers of the Uripiv variety of the Northeast Malakula language and know no Tape language at all. A handful of the very elderly original refugees from the interior are still alive and living in Tautu. Including also the remaining Tautu-born speakers of Tape over the age of 50, the total number of fluent speakers of this language today is approximately fifteen. There are reportedly also very small numbers of speakers of this language living in the V'ënen Taut-speaking village of Anuatakh, as well as in Larevat.

The only published information on this language is a short wordlist in Tryon (1976) labelled as Maragus. Crowley has recently gathered a larger vocabulary from the field, and has also collected a limited amount of grammatical and textual data, though this information is still preliminary and has not yet been prepared for publication.

(15) Matanvat

Tryon (1972:56–57) reports on a claim that between Vovo and Malua Bay on the north coast of Malakula, a language known as Matanavat is spoken that is supposed to be different from both the neighbouring languages. No information was recorded on this language, and subsequent publications make no mention of it (Tryon 1976, 1979a, 1981), though Layard (1934:132) does mention Matan-vat as an area of northern Malakula, and local information suggests that the correct representation of this name is Matanvat. Local information also suggests that there was indeed a separate language in this area, though it is now moribund, with Bislama being the replacement language.

### 3.7.26 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lendamboi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninde</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinesip</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naha'ai</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasvang</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axamb</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avok</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskelynes</td>
<td>(***)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Sandwich</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisvai</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banam Bay</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulua</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.7.27: Immigrant languages

Malakula is a large island and developed early as both plantation and government centre. As we might expect, there are significant numbers of people from other islands living in sometimes semi-urban settlements, though these are typically linguistically mixed, rather than representing specific linguistic communities. Bislama, therefore, tends to predominate in settlements such as Norsup, Lakatoro and Lamap.

Charpentier (1982a:50) reports that the only rural area in the south which Bislama has acquired a dominant position is the Tisman Peninsula, where immigrants from Ambrym and Paama have settled semi-permanently, while retaining their own languages (Map 7). For the most part, however, Charpentier (1982a) reports that immigrant groups – whether from other islands or from other parts of Malakula – who have lived for more than one generation in a particular location tend either to become bilingual in their ancestral language and the language of their adoptive community, or to switch completely to the language of their new location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Immigrant</th>
<th>Bislama</th>
<th>Some Religious Materials</th>
<th>Other Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unua-Pangkumu</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navava</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newwerwver</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirak</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Malakula</td>
<td>**(*)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vao</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpotoworo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vovo</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malua Bay</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V'enen Taut</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larevat</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>some religious literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neve'e</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarian</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aveteian</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navwien</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorsoarian</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbwenelang</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surua Hole</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangsa'</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrul</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niviar</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivat</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naman</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombal</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matanvat</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.8 Ambrym

None of the languages of Ambrym have been comprehensively described by a trained linguist, nor has the extent of linguistic diversity on the island been definitively documented. Ray (1926:329–333) provides an overview of the linguistic situation on Ambrym based on previously published, and unpublished, materials. Patteson (1869) includes a vocabulary that is attributed to Ambrym, though the precise linguistic provenance of this source has not been determined. Tryon (1976) recognises five languages on Ambrym, though we suspect that more extensive descriptive work might produce some modification to the number of languages in some parts of the island. In particular, we feel that Tryon’s separate Port Vato and Dakaka languages may turn out to be mutually intelligible varieties of the same language. Map 10 summarises our current assessment of the situation.

The languages of Ambrym which are still actively spoken appear to have no specific locally used language names, so the discussion below discusses languages only by their geographical location. These languages, and their current estimated total numbers of speakers, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Ambrym</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ambrym</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ambrym</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ambrym</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.1 Southeast Ambrym

The language of Southeast Ambrym occupies some fifteen contiguous villages located around the southeastern region of Ambrym, with substantial areas of unoccupied coast – which have been severely affected by lava flows – separating these villages from villages to the west and north where quite different languages are spoken. After a volcanic eruption in the middle of the island in 1951, a fair number of people from Maat village were permanently relocated to a site adjacent to Mele village on Efate, where they remain as a peri-urban Southeast Ambrym–speaking enclave, in what is now known as Mele-Maat, and which is now the largest Southeast Ambrym–speaking village (Map 11).

Tonkinson’s (pers. comm.) estimate of the population of Southeast Ambrymese in their home villages from his own 1984 census was around 1,550, along with an additional 1,150 absentees living in Port Vila, Luganville or elsewhere, including approximately 500 Southeast Ambrymese living in Mele-Maat, giving a grand total of 2,700. Taking into account the annual population increase, this should give a total speaking population for the language today of approximately 3,700. A number of Southeast Ambrymese also speak Paamese as a second language, while a significant proportion of the population of Mele-Maat also has some command of the Mele variety of the Ifira-Mele language.

There is no name for the language as such, and Tonkinson (pers. comm.) reports that there is no local name for the language area either. Parker (1970a:30) includes Tansu as the name for the area, but this is apparently a borrowing from Paamese, where Southeast Ambrym is known as Tanso. There is some regional variation within Southeast Ambrym, with the northeastern villages of Endupoal and Endupahakul being most distinctive (Tonkinson pers. comm.). Lava flows in 1888 destroyed a number of hamlets between these villages and the
remainder of Southeast Ambrym, and this area is still uninhabited, so the sharp dialect divide here is possibly relatively recent, resulting from the loss of once transitional villages.

This language had not been recorded at all until relatively recently, with the earliest linguistic information being a few vocabulary items and verbal, prepositional and possessive paradigms gathered by W.F. Paton during the period 1933–48, but published much later as Paton (1971a:119–125). Tonkinson (1968:xv–xvi) also includes a few notes on the language, while terms of cultural significance are scattered through the text of Tonkinson (1968), especially on pages 13 and 18–40. Tryon (1976) includes two short wordlists which he himself collected from Toak and Maat villages.

An ecclesiastical literature in Southeast Ambrym was not developed by the Presbyterian missionaries. However, a small collection of Southeast Ambrym hymns is included as an appendix to the Paamese hymnal *Tus ten souen* (publication details of which are not available).

**Sources for Southeast Ambrym**

Parker (1968a) is a brief discussion of the phonology of Southeast Ambrym, including a treatment of phonotactics and stress.

Parker (1968b) presents a brief discussion of verbal affixation, cast in a strongly structuralist mould, with an extensive discussion of the complex pattern of verb-initial root mutation patterns.

Parker (1970a) is a smallish dictionary of this language, with an English finderlist, as well as a few example sentences.

Parker (1970b) presents an outline of the morphophonemic processes involved when nouns take pronominal possessive suffixes.

Crowley (2001a) is a short sketch of the language based on phonological and grammatical information from previously published work by Parker, and supplemented by a little original data from speakers of the language.

**3.8.2 South Ambrym**

In the Port Vato, Baiap and Sesivi areas on the southern coast of Ambrym, Tryon (1976) recognises two separate languages: Dakaka (spoken in the Baiap and Sesivi area) on the one hand and Port Vato (about half-way between the southernmost and westernmost points of the island) on the other. Both communalects are very poorly described, and Tryon’s decision to recognise two languages here was apparently on the basis of cognate scores between his Baiap and Port Vato lists of 76.6 per cent and his Sesivi and Port Vato lists of 77.3 per cent. Communalects sharing cognate figures lower than these in Tryon’s lists in Vanuatu have often subsequently turned out to be mutually intelligible, and we suspect that the same may turn out to be true here.

(a) **Dakaka**

On the previous census results, the current population of the Baiap and Sesivi areas is estimated to be around 1,200. This communalect – the only extant variety on the island known to have its own name – is poorly known. Tryon (1976) includes two wordlists,
recorded by himself, from Baiap and Sesivi. Otherwise, the only sources are lexical references scattered throughout Paton (1973) and the grammatical paradigms in Paton (1971a:105–118).

Materials in Dakaka

Although West Ambrym was the main church lingua franca on the island, some religious material was printed in the Dakaka variety of South Ambrym:


In addition, Paton (1971a:127) reported that a 144-page catechism and a hymnal consisting of forty-nine hymns in this language had been prepared in typescript form, though these had not yet been published (and we have no information to indicate if these were eventually published or not).

(b) Port Vato

This variety is spoken in the area of Port Vato, about half-way between the southernmost and westernmost points of the island. Based on the 1989 census results, we estimate the current population at around 1,300. This communalect is also poorly known. Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist, recorded by himself, while Paton (1973) includes a substantial number of Port Vato equivalents to West Ambrym words. Paton (1971a:105–118) includes a number of paradigms for pronouns, possessive forms and verbal prefixes in this language, with corresponding forms from other parts of Ambrym.

3.8.3 West Ambrym

This language is spoken in a number of villages in the Craig Cove area on the western tip of Ambrym. Extrapolating from the 1989 census results, we estimate that there are today about 1,200 speakers of this language. However, Paton (1971a:vi) indicates that this language had been used as a lingua franca by the Presbyterian mission in Ambrym since the late 1800s (though this presumably just meant north and west Ambrym, as there is no tradition of the use of this language in Southeast Ambrym). However, information in Paton (1971a:127) indicates that some religious materials had also been prepared in the Dakaka variety of the neighbouring South Ambrym language.

This language apparently has no name. While Paton often refers to it as Lonwolwol, Ray (1926:329) indicates that this is actually a name for the island as a whole. Other geographical terms are also frequently used to refer to the language as well: Craig Cove, Dip Point and Fanting. To be consistent with the names of the other Ambrym languages used in this volume, it has been decided to refer to this language here simply as West Ambrym.

Von der Gabelentz (1873:32–41), Codrington (1885a:449–459) and Ray (1926:333–347) all provide short sketches of this language, based on materials provided to the authors by missionaries. Goodenough (1876:323, 356–358) published a short wordlist collected from Dip Point, while Hagen and Pineau (1888:308–319) also include a wordlist. Tryon (1976) includes a single wordlist from Fali village, recorded by himself.
W.F. Paton was resident on Ambrym as a missionary between 1933 and 1948, and he gathered a substantial amount of linguistic material, which was submitted to the University of Melbourne as a doctoral thesis in 1956 and eventually published in several parts. Paton (1971a) is a longish sketch of the grammar of this language by a writer who was not formally trained in linguistics, so the phonology appears to be overdifferentiated, and the grammatical analysis is along fairly traditional lines. Paton (1973) is an extensive dictionary, though one drawback is that many of the example sentences are drawn from translations of religious materials rather than spontaneous speech. As with the grammar, it is not clear to what extent the phonology is overdifferentiated.

Materials in West Ambrym

Some secular materials have been produced in the West Ambrym language:

Paton (1971b) is a collection of vernacular stories gathered by the author during his time on Ambrym.

Paton (1979) represents a collection of texts and associated materials gathered by the author during his time on Ambrym.

West Ambrym was used as a church language and there is a fairly extensive printed religious literature, of which the following items are known:

1956. *Catechism and hymnary*. By W.F. Paton. (Reported in Paton (1971a:128) to have been in press.)

Chapter 3

3.8.4 North Ambrym

This is a large language spoken around the northern point of Ambrym. It is separated from both the West Ambrym and the Southeast Ambrym languages by areas of coast left unoccupied by lava flows. The census figures suggest that the present-day population of this language area is about 5,250. Despite its size, this language appears not to have been used extensively as a medium for mission literacy, and the language is as poorly known as the much smaller Dakaka and Port Vato communaealects.

The earliest linguistic source for this language is Murray (1894), which provides 65 names for different kinds of breadfruit. There is a number of grammatical paradigms for this language presented in Paton (1971a:105–118). In addition, Paton (1971a:254–335) includes a significant vocabulary in North Ambrym, with the corresponding forms in West Ambrym, organised alphabetically according to English meanings. Tryon (1976) includes two short wordlists recorded by himself from the villages of Fonah and Ranon, while Lebot and Cabalion (1986:90) list a handful of names for kava varieties in this language.

Materials in North Ambrym


3.8.5 Moribund and extinct languages

Ambrym is a largish island, many parts of which are currently completely unoccupied. There have been numerous significant volcanic eruptions since European contact and a number of major lava flows extend from the centre of the island right down to the coast. It is likely, therefore, that there was considerable and repeated dislocation of the population prior to colonial contact (and there have been at least two major volcanic eruptions that affected coastal areas in the twentieth century), so one might expect the original linguistic situation on the island to have been somewhat different from what we find today. For example, a number of hamlets were destroyed in Southeast Ambrym in 1888, which probably significantly affected the dialect geography within that particular language area.

As it is, however, there is little real direct evidence for any earlier further linguistic diversity other than that described above, apart from recent reports of an additional language, named Orkon (labelled as 3.8.5 on Map 10) from the northeastern part Ambrym, which is reportedly now known only by two people. No published information is available on this language, though Robert Early and John Lynch have recorded some preliminary data. It is not known exactly where this language was spoken. The replacement language in this case was the language listed above as North Ambrym.
3.8.6 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Ambrym</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>a few religious publications</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ambrym</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>a few religious publications</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ambrym</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>significant religious literature, some secular materials</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ambrym</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>a few religious publications</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkon</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Paama and Lopevi

3.9.1 Paamese

Paamese is one of the larger languages of Vanuatu, having many speakers living off the island of Paama as semi-permanent migrants in the towns of Port Vila and Luganville, as well as on the neighbouring island of Epi (Map 10) and the east coast of Malakula (Map 7). Crowley (1994a:9–12) estimates on the basis of the 1989 census results that there were probably about 4,500 speakers of Paamese in total, which corresponds to an estimate for the year 2000 of around 6,000. However, the language is now also spoken as a second language by significant numbers of people in northern villages of Epi, as well as in southeast Ambrym, and these figures do not include such people. Although the majority of Paamese speakers now live off the island, there is a strong tradition of language maintenance and use among the substantial number of semi-permanent Paamese residents of Port Vila and Luganville.

There is only one language that is indigenous to the island of Paama (known locally as Voum), and the same language was also spoken on the neighbouring island of Lopevi (known locally as Ulveah). The population of Lopevi was permanently relocated after a serious volcanic eruption in 1961 to the village of Laul (or Ngala) on the island of Epi to the south, though people living there retain land ownership on Lopevi. They still maintain gardens and go hunting there, and a small number of people are occasionally resident there. There is no indigenous name for the language, which local people refer to only as selusien tenout Voum ‘language of Paama’, as lanwis Pama in Bislama (even among people who originate from Lopevi).

Although the area where Paamese is spoken is small, there is some dialect variation, with members of the speech community generally referring to a split between northern and southern varieties, with the dialect of Lopevi being a variety of northern Paamese (Crowley 1982:8–19, 1992:ax–xvi). In reality, however, the situation is rather more complex than a simple two-way dialect split (Crowley 1997c:244–249). The differences between dialects are mostly phonological and lexical, though there are some grammatical differences as well. The dialect situation is complicated further by the fact that there is a certain amount of dialect levelling taking place among emigrant Paamese speakers on Malakula and in urban and peri-urban Espiritu Santo and Efate.
Early sources for Paamese include Von der Gabelentz (1873:30–31), who reprinted a short wordlist gathered by Patteson. Steel (1880:471) and Codrington (1885a:235) include some Paamese numerals, while Macdonald (1889:54, 57) includes some numerals and pronouns. Ray (1926:311–329) includes a short account of the historical phonology, which is followed by a fourteen-page grammar sketch of reasonable quality based on missionary translations. Paton (1971a:119–125) recorded a few vocabulary items and verbal, prepositional and possessive paradigms in Paamese by way of comparison with the languages of Ambrym. Gowers (1976) included a few names of trees in Paamese, and her list was supplemented by a much longer list by Wheatley (1992:261–262), while Lebot and Cabalion (1986:90) list a handful of names for kava varieties.

Tryon (1976) includes three Paamese vocabularies taken from Lironesa (listed as Lironessa), Vauleli (listed as Faulili) and Laul villages, collected by Tryon himself. The vocabularies contain significant numbers of phonemic and semantic inaccuracies, and the published cognate scores for the Paamese dialects are considerably lower than they should be (Geraghty 1978:76).

**Sources for Paamese**

Crowley (1982) is a quite detailed description of the phonology, morphology and syntax of Paamese, with an illustrative text.

Crowley (1983) presents an account of the loss of Proto Oceanic transitive suffixes in Paamese and the subsequent reanalysis of the oblique preposition as a new transitivising suffix.

Crowley (1987a) is a quite detailed discussion of verb serialisation and related syntactic phenomena in Paamese. This study points out some similarities in behaviour with patterns in other languages of central Vanuatu, which have often been analysed using a range of rather different terminology.

Crowley (1991a) examines two major ways in which part–whole relationships are expressed in Paamese, and shows that the ‘linked noun’ construction usually expresses a relation between a separable part and the whole.

Crowley (1992a) is a good-sized dictionary of Paamese, including some etymological information, with an English finderlist.

Crowley (1995a) examines the question of the interrelationship, or lack of it, between semantic inalienability and morphological direct suffixation, and concludes that there are degrees of inalienability, with only the more inalienable relationships being marked extensively by direct suffixation.

Crowley (1995b) is a short introduction to the wordlist for Paamese that is found in Tryon, ed. (1995).

**Materials in Paamese**

Paamese has been written since the early 1900s, and people frequently write letters to each other in the language. The only secular materials written in Paamese are the following, which are based on transcriptions of stories recorded on tape.
Crowley (1980) is a substantial collection of texts in Paamese, followed by free translations into English, but no interlinear glosses. These are given in a variety of regional dialects, according to the dialect of the original story teller, though most come from southern speakers.

Crowley and Mael (1984) is a short illustrated collection of edited stories in Paamese aimed at a younger reading audience. No English translations or interlinear glosses are provided. These stories have all been written in the northern dialect.

Otherwise, the printed literature in Paamese is exclusively ecclesiastical, and the earlier materials are now out of print and no longer available on the island. These materials are all based on the northern variety of Paamese. Publication in Paamese began in about 1870, and there were a few short hymnals, primers and so on produced between then and 1904 (O'Reilly 1958:162–163), many of which were amalgamated into the 1917 publication below.

1907. Selusien tahaus keke Mark mutisi ['The good word that Mark wrote']. Melbourne: No publisher. By Maurice Frater. (The 1907 version of Mark was superseded by one published under the same title in 1934 in London by the British and Foreign Bible Society.)

1910. Selusien tahaus keke Ioane mutisi ['The good word that John wrote']. Melbourne: No publisher. By Maurice Frater.


n.d. Taunaha ceile a mul en Bibel ['Things that are in the Bible']. Glasgow: R.L. Allan and Son. (A substantial collection of stories from the Old Testament retold in Paamese.)

n.d. Tus ten souen ['Book of songs']. No place: No publisher. (This is a collection of hymns in Paamese, with an appendix containing a small number of hymns in the Southeast Ambrym language.)

3.9.2 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paamese</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some religious publications, a little secular material</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 Epi

Epi suffered depopulation during the nineteenth century on a scale that was apparently more massive than in many other parts of Vanuatu (Early 1994:13–15). Documentary evidence, combined with knowledge that is recorded in oral history, suggests very strongly that the island was considerably more diverse linguistically than it is today (Early 1994:32). The once substantial original population of the interior was relocated to coastal villages after mission contact, with the result that today the interior of the island is almost completely unpopulated. In conjunction with depopulation, this movement of people presumably led to considerable dialect levelling, as well as the loss of an unknown number of distinct languages.

Early (1994:34–35) experiences difficulty in reconciling the brief amounts of early lexical data in Steel (1880) from Epi with present-day speech communities. This is consistent with the idea that Epi has suffered a considerable degree of linguistic attrition, as some of those communalects documented by Steel may simply have disappeared altogether.

Ray (1926:231–235) includes a short, but old, discussion of the historical development of these languages. A recent discussion of the historical situation regarding Epi languages which includes original material is Tryon (1986a), though a number of other sources include varying amounts of secondary data in discussing the historical placement of Epi languages (for example, Grace 1955, Dyen 1965, Pawley 1972). Early (in press) describes for Epi languages in general the way in which periphrasis is used to express new concepts rather than borrowing.

The various languages that are actively spoken on Epi, with their current estimated populations, are (Map 10):

- **Lewo**: 2,200
- **Lamen**: 850
- **Bierebo**: 800
- **Baki**: 350
- **Mkir**: 175

3.10.1 Lewo

Lewo – referred to by Ray (1926:229) also as Laevo – is the locally used name for the best known and most widely spoken language on Epi, though it has a somewhat discontiguous geographical distribution. Speakers of Lewo are located in the eastern Epi villages of Vaemali, Moriu, Nivenu, Nikaura, Nuvi, Lokopui, Lemam, Mate A, Lepa, Plate, Loporoga, Niuples, Nul and Lopalis; there are also about 15 Lewo speakers in the mainly Nakanamanga-speaking village of Filakara in the south and another 15 or so in the mainly Paamese-speaking village of Paia in the north. Lewo is also spoken on the western coast of Epi in the village of Alak, while about 10 speakers of Lewo are resident in Wenia (most of whom are Paamese speakers) and about 48 live in Malvasi, which is otherwise a Bierebo-speaking village (Early 1994:17).

Early (1994:17) estimates that there were around 1,400 first-language speakers of Lewo based on the 1989 census, including a small number of people living off the island. Extrapolating to 2000, this results in a current estimate of around 2,200 speakers, including town dwellers. In addition, a significant – but unknown – number of people from the
remaining language communities on Epi speak Lewo as a second language. In the village of Lokopui, Birebo seems to be currently giving way to Lewo. Lewo was originally rather more diverse dialectally than we find at present. Ray's (1893: 107-108) Tasiko – sometimes Tasiwo – and also Codrington's (1885a:470–471) Lemaroro and Maluba, referred to by Early (1994:21) as Malupa, were clearly dialects of modern Lewo (Early 1994:29), despite Tryon's (1976) claim that Tasiko represented a separate language, and Lynch's (1994a:35) listing of Tasiko as a separate language. Ray (1926:236–245) produced a sketch of the Tasiko dialect, which Miller indicates had become moribund by the time of his report to the Presbyterian synod in 1948. Early (1994:37) indicates that this sketch is of remarkably good quality, given that it was based exclusively on an analysis of translated biblical materials, as well as private correspondence with local missionaries.

Early (1994:31–32) indicates that in the very small village of Paia an unnamed communalect is spoken, which appears to be indeterminate in status between a language that is separate from both Lamen and Lewo. This constitutes a link between the two in a short dialect-chain situation.

Early (1994:43–48) presents a survey of a number of earlier sources which include Lewo material. Steel (1880) includes a few numerals from different parts of Epi, some of which appear to represent Lewo forms, though Early (1994:34–35) indicates that many forms exhibit similarities to a number of other modern Epi languages. Codrington (1885a:39–52) includes a number of lexical items from Epi, many of which appear to be from Lewo, though there is some admixture from other languages. Hagen and Pineau (1888) include a short wordlist which is largely derived from Lewo. Ray (1893) also includes a short wordlist from Lewo. Tryon (1976) includes seven separate wordlists collected by himself from the locations Visina, Mapremo, Nikaura, Nuvi, Mate, Nul and Filakara.

Sources for Lewo

Early (1993a) shows how the process of reanalysis of serial verbs has progressed to such an extent that most serialised verbs are now basically verbal suffixes, and no longer occur as verbs in their own right.

Early (1993b) discusses a typologically unusual negative construction in Lewo which involves tripartite marking (rather than the bipartite marking that is reasonably widely encountered in Vanuatu languages).

Early (1994) is a comprehensive modern grammar of Lewo that devotes special attention to verb serialisation and negation as typologically distinctive features of this language. This source also includes texts with interlinear glosses, as well as a substantial survey of the previous literature on this language. This work has not yet been published. Work is also reportedly in progress on the production of an extensive dictionary of Lewo (Early 1994:33).

Early (1995) is a short grammatical introduction to Lewo, which is intended to accompany the wordlist for the language that is included in Tryon, ed. (1995).

Early (2000) describes how the set of three cardinal posture verbs in Lewo, while continuing as lexical verbs, have also been grammaticised to occur with verbal aspect functions.
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Materials in Lewo

O'Reilly (1958:148–149) indicates that the following materials have been published in Lewo:


1910?. *Leta kie Paul vani li Kalatia latia* [Epistle to the Galatians]. No place of publication: No publisher. By T.E. Riddle.


Publications in the now extinct dialect of Tasiko began in 1888 with the production of small primers and other devotional literature (O'Reilly 1958:149–150), and these were then followed by translations:


From 1948 to 1968, work proceeded on the translation into Lewo of more than half of the New Testament, though this was never published. Work resumed in 1982 under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and Early (1994:33) reports that it is expected that the product of this work should soon be publicly available.
Early (1994:33) refers to a primer that was produced in 1898 for teaching literacy in Lewo. The only modern secular publication in the language is Luwi, Lemay and Young (1988), which represents a short illustrated collection of traditional stories produced in both Lewo and Bislama (but with no interlinear glosses). Siegel (1996a:106) reports that fourteen Bible stories had recently been translated into Lewo (and two other Epi languages) at three levels of reading difficulty.

3.10.2 Lamen

Early (1994:17) estimates that there were around 550 speakers of this language, living on Lamen Island (often also written as Lamenu Island), as well as adjacent areas of the mainland. This figure extrapolates to an estimated total for the year 2000 of approximately 850. These people also refer to their language by the name Lewo (Early 1994:22). Despite the common name, it is regarded locally as a separate language, and people use Bislama to communicate across the language boundary (Early 1994:32). The geographical name Lamen is chosen by Early (1994:32) to distinguish this language from the geographically more diffuse language referred to in the preceding section. This language was originally regarded as a dialect of Lewo by Tryon (1972, 1976, 1979a) and Lynch (1994a).

Tryon (1976) provides a single vocabulary in this language, labelled as Lamenu. Gowers (1976) includes a number of names of trees in this language, though Early (1994:38) indicates that the author has incorrectly identified these as being from Lewo. These items are reproduced by Wheatley (1992:256) in a single list. The only structural information on the language is Early (2001), which is a sketch of the language based on original materials.

Early (1994:33) reports that work is currently advanced on the production of a translation of the complete New Testament into Lamen. Apart from this, however, no materials are known to have been produced in the language.

3.10.3 Bierebo

Early (1994:17) estimates that there were around 500 speakers of this language, located in villages along the central western and eastern coasts, which results in a present-day estimated total of approximately 800. People from the village of Lokopui (also known as Tavio) are now bilingual in Bierebo and Lewo, and Early (1994:31) suggests that a shift to Lewo is currently under way there. Tryon (1996a) provides some information on verb-initial mutation in Bierebo. Codrington (1885a:469–470) provides a few scraps of information on this language, while Tryon (1976) includes four vocabularies collected by himself from Tavio, Bonkobia, Burupika and Yevali. Gowers (1976) includes about thirty names of trees, which are listed together in Wheatley (1992:256).

3.10.4 Baki

Early (1994:17) estimates that there were around 220 speakers of this language in the Burumba area of the west coast, which represents about 350 as a present-day estimated total. Tryon’s (196a:306) extension of the Baki territory right across the island is an error. Fraser (1891), Ray (1888–89) and Ray (1926:245–258) represent sketches of this language. Tryon (1996a) includes some information on the verb-initial mutation patterns in this language,
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while Tryon (1976) includes some lexical information under the location Burumba, and Gowers (1976) includes about thirty tree names, which are reproduced in Wheatley (1992: 255) as a single list.

Materials in Baki

Early (1994:33) reports that work is currently advanced on the production of a translation of the complete New Testament into Baki. Otherwise, the only materials that have been printed in this language are the following series of older biblical translations, which followed the initial production of a primer in the language in 1883, as well as a few earlier publications (O'Reilly 1958:146–148).


1911. Marik [Mark]. London: British and Foreign Bible Society. (Revision of 1886 and 1892 versions.)

1911. Mataiu [Matthew]. London: British and Foreign Bible Society. (Revision of 1892 version.)


3.10.5 Mkir

Early (1994:30) indicates that this language is known locally as Mkir, though it has often been referred to in the literature as Mai, Mari, Maii (Tryon 1979a) or Mae-Morae (Tryon 1996a). Early (1994:17) estimates that there were around 140 speakers of this language based on the 1989 census. Although this language is actively spoken, it is showing signs of undergoing shift in the direction of the immigrant languages Nakanamanga and Namakir (Early 1994:29). The present-day population of speakers is estimated to be approximately 175. Tryon (1996a) is the only modern source for this language, which represents an account of the development of verb-initial mutation patterns, while Tryon (1976) includes some lexical information under the name Mae-Morae.
3.10.6 Moribund and extinct languages

As indicated above, there appears to have been a considerable amount of linguistic attrition on Epi in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Information about those additional languages for which we have documentary evidence, or evidence from local oral tradition, is set out below.

(1) Bieria

Early (1994:17) estimates that there were around 50 speakers of Bieria in 1989. However, in a personal communication in 1999 he revises this downward to 25, with just a handful of families in Vovo village in the southern part of Epi continuing to use the language, indicating that it appears to be undergoing shift in the direction of the immigrant language Nakanamanga (§3.11.3) from the Shepherds Islands (Early 1994:29).

Ray (1893) cites this language as Bieri, later correcting this to Bieria (Ray 1926:229). Fraser (1891) includes some information on the language, while Tryon (1996a) includes some details on the verb-initial mutation patterns, and Tryon (1976) includes some lexical information under the location Vovo. Lebot and Cabalion (1986:90) list names for over a dozen kava varieties, which appear to come from this language.

Materials in Bieria

O'Reilly (1958:148) indicates that some religious materials have been translated into this language. The following items have been documented:


(2) Ianigi

A language known as Ianigi was formerly spoken in the village of Puruvanua, whose inhabitants have now moved to the Lewo-speaking village of Lokopui. Early (1994:32) reports that only a few old people now retain a knowledge of this language. As far as we know, nothing has been recorded in this language.

(3) Iakanaga

The language known as Iakanaga was spoken in the former village of Purupwe, though descendants of these people now live in the Lewo-speaking village of Lokopui. Early (1994:32) reports again that only a few old people now retain a knowledge of this language, which is again completely undocumented.
(4) Livara

Ray (1893:198, 230) cites Livara – or Liara – as having formerly been spoken in two villages on Epi, though Early (1994:30) notes that this had become extinct by the time that Miller submitted his unpublished report to the Presbyterian synod in 1948. This was reportedly either a variety of Nakanamanga (§3.11.3), or a separate language that was very similar to it. No linguistic information on this variety has been recorded.

(5) Revaliu

Early (1994:30) also mentions an additional language referred to by Miller in his 1948 report. This was unnamed, and it was also extinct by Miller’s time. The name Revaliu that we have used here for this language simply represents a geographical point of reference, as the language was apparently spoken in the interior behind present-day Revaliu on the western coast. No linguistic information on this language has been recorded.

3.10.7 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewo</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious publications, a little secular material</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamen</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bierebo</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baki</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkir</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bieria</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ianigi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakanaga</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livara</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaliu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10.8 Immigrant languages

Early (1994:27) indicates that approximately 800 Epi residents are immigrants from other islands who do not speak Epi languages. These immigrants involve three main language groups: Paamese, Nakanamanga and Namakir.

(1) Paamese

There are significant numbers of speakers of Paamese on Epi, including the group of people located from Lopevi to the west coast village of Laul (or Ngala) after the volcanic eruption of 1961. Immigrants from Paama also represent the majority of the population in the villages of Paia (about 25 speakers) and Wenia (about 100 speakers) (Early 1994:17).
This Paamese population is predicted to increase due to population pressure on Paama (Early 1994:15). The immigrants maintain Paamese as their first language, showing resistance to the acquisition of any Epi languages (Early 1994:29). In fact, many residents of northern Epi speak Paamese as a second language as a result of contact with this minority language on Epi.

(2) Nakanamanga and Namakir

Significant numbers of recent Nakanamanga- and Namakir-speaking settlers from the Shepherds Islands have moved into uninhabited or sparsely inhabited areas of southern Epi (Early 1994:15). Like the Paamese, they are maintaining their languages in their new locations, and Nakanamanga even shows signs of supplanting the local Bieria language.

(3) East Malakula

Early (1994:31) refers also to an immigrant language from eastern Malakula that is spoken on Epi. It is not clear from which specific language group this immigrant community is derived.

3.11 Efate and the Shepherd Islands

Efate is one of the larger islands of Vanuatu, though it does not have a large rural population. The interior of the island is completely unoccupied, with the rural population being concentrated in the relatively large peri-urban southern villages of Erakor, Eratap, Pango, Ifira, Mele, and the recently established village of Mele-Maat. Villages on the west and north coasts of the island are much more scattered, as well as being smaller. To the north of the mainland of Efate are the populated offshore islands of Lelepa, Moso, Nguna, Pwele and Emau. Together with mainland Efate, the total rural population is only slightly more than 11,000 according to the 1989 census. The Shepherds Islands, located between Efate and Epi, had a rural population in 1989 of nearly 4,000. In today's figures, the rural population of Efate and the Shepherds combined is estimated at over 20,000.

The capital, Port Vila (sometimes spelt Port-Vila, especially in French, and often abbreviated to Vila) is located on the southwestern part of Efate. The total population of the town is estimated today to be in the region of 25,000–30,000. This population is ethnically and linguistically very mixed: about one-eighth of the population are expatriates, and the Ni-Vanuatu population derives from all parts of the country, with no numerical dominance from any single language or island, though there has been a very substantial flow of semi-permanent migrants from some of the outlying parts of Efate and the Shepherds Islands into the urban area.

In the discussion which follows, we concentrate on describing only the distribution of languages in the rural areas. The various languages of this region, along with the estimated numbers of speakers of each, are set out below (Map 11):

- Ifira-Mele: 3,500
- South Efate: 6,000
- Nakanamanga: 9,500
- Namakir: 3,750
- Emae: 400
Villages in the areas shown as representing South Efate and Nakanamanga actually involve a dialect-chain situation, with different published accounts drawing different conclusions about both the number of languages involved, and the relevant language boundaries. Tryon (1972:64–65) argued for just a single language, while Tryon (1976:92–93) amends this by regarding North Efate (i.e. Nakanamanga) and South Efate as constituting two distinct languages, with the variety from Lelepa being assigned to South Efate. Grimes (1996) goes further in arguing that, in addition to South Efate and Nakanamanga, there are separate languages spoken in both Lelepa and Eton. Clark (1985a) shows that there is no obvious isogloss bundle separating South Efate and Nakanamanga, though he suggests that Lelepa should probably be grouped with Nakanamanga rather than South Efate.

Map 11: Efate and the Shepherd Islands
There have been two significant demographic cataclysms in the Efate-Shepherds area in recent centuries which have severely affected the linguistic situation. In an event that can be dated to 1453, a major volcanic eruption in the Shepherds Islands destroyed most of what was then known as the island of Kuwae, the remains of which now constitute the islands of Tongoa, Ewose, Valea and Tongariki. This catastrophe must have killed many people, and driven many survivors away to safer locations on neighbouring Epi and Efate until the islands once again became habitable. The present-day dialectal uniformity within the Namakir- and Nakanamanga-speaking areas of the Shepherds – as well as the discontinuities in the distribution of the languages – is consistent with a relatively recent settlement, presumably with people moving back from northern Efate (Clark 1985a:27, 1996). Codrington’s (1885a: 459) report of now extinct Livara (or Liara) on southeastern Epi, which was supposedly similar to (or a dialect of?) Nakanamanga, may also have represented descendants of these original refugees.

More recently, the interior of Efate was completely depopulated in the nineteenth century as a result of introduced diseases and mission pressure for people to relocate to coastal settlements (Clark 1985a:25). It is not known exactly what effect this population movement had on the original dialects (or languages?), and on the distribution of isoglosses on Efate today, but there is evidence for the loss of some of the original communalecs of this region.

The development of written materials in the languages of this region has an especially interesting history. Some early translation work involved the production of materials based specifically on the varieties spoken in Erakor (South Efate), Nguna and Havannah Harbour (Nakanamanga). However, Nakanamanga, Namakir and South Efate are all recognisably similar in a variety of ways, which led to attempts by missionaries in the nineteenth century to create an artificially mixed written standard. This attempt failed, but subsequent attempts to create a single written form for both Nakanamanga and the variety of Namakir spoken on Tongoa apparently proved to be more successful (Clark 1985a:4).

### Ifira-Mele

This is a Polynesian language that is spoken on the island of Ifira (formerly known as Vila Island, or Fila Island) which is located inside Vila Harbour, and within a short boat ride from downtown Port Vila. A mutually intelligible variety of the same language is spoken at Mele (Imere) village just a short distance to the west of Port Vila on the mainland adjacent to Mele Island (which was the traditional location of this village until it outgrew that site and moved to the mainland in 1950).

This language has no generic name, and it is often referred to in the literature simply as Ifira-Mele (or Vila-Mele/Fila-Mele or Mele-Vila/Mele-Fila), and sometimes simply as either Ifira or Mele. Local people refer to the language simply as Atara Imere (‘Mele language’) or Atara Ifira (‘Ifira language’). Mele village today has a population of around 2,000, while the population of Ifira is approximately 1,000. These figures, combined with the estimated number of town dwellers and other ‘absentees’ brings the total number of speakers of this language to around 3,500.

---

20 Other Polynesian languages spoken in Vanuatu are Emae (§3.11.5) and Futuna-Aniwa (§3.14.1).
A few wordlists in this language were recorded by missionaries in the nineteenth century (Inglis 1854; Turner 1861, 1884), while Gowers (1976) recorded the names of about a dozen different kinds of trees in Mele, which are reproduced by Wheatley (1992:255). Tryon (1976) included two short wordlists gathered by himself, one labelled as Fila and the other as Mele.

Given that Port Vila has been a significant urban centre and the centre of government since the earlier 1900s, and Efate has been a major area of missionary activity since the mid-1800s, it is somewhat surprising that no major account of this language has ever been produced. However, Ross Clark has been working on this language since 1974 and it is hoped that a comprehensive grammar will be published before long.

**Sources for Ifira-Mele**

Capell (1942) is a short vocabulary, grammatical notes and a text from Ifira, compiled on the basis of information obtained from a student in Fiji.

Biggs (1975) is a longish wordlist with an English index, which was based on a brief period of his own fieldwork, an incomplete typescript vocabulary collected by Samuel Elbert in the 1950s, along with earlier published material.

Clark (1975a) is a brief outline of the grammar and vocabulary of the Mele variety, with some comparative notes.

Clark (1975b) presents two texts from Mele, with English translations.

Kuki (1976) briefly discusses the language situation, conditions of fieldwork, previous publications on the language, some features of phonology and grammar and possible historical explanation of this information.

Clark (1978a) provides some discussion of the extensive influence of the Efate languages on Ifira-Mele.

Clark (1982) examines Bislama loanwords in Ifira-Mele, pointing out that many of these borrowings have displaced – or are replacing – perfectly ‘good’ words already in that language.

Clark (1986a) briefly discusses the connections between Vanuatu Polynesian outliers and the Fagauvea language of New Caledonia.

Clark (1986b) provides some discussion of the extensive influence of the Efate languages on Ifira-Mele.

Clark (1994) presents further discussion of the influence of the languages of Efate on Ifira-Mele.

Clark (1995) presents a short introduction to a wordlist for this language that is included as part of Tryon (1995).

Clark (1998) is a fairly extensive dictionary of this language, based on the Mele variety. It includes some etymological information, as well as a limited number of examples of forms used in illustrative phrases or sentences.

Clark (2001) is a short grammatical sketch prepared according to a standard format to allow for comparison with other Oceanic languages in the same volume.
Materials in Ifira-Mele

Although some of the languages of Efate and the Shepherds were adopted early by missionaries as the basis for written forms, the New Testament was only recently translated into the Ifira variety of this language. Materials in the language include the following:

1971. *Natus Nalag*. Sydney: Epworth Press. (Mostly in South Efate, but some Ifira-Mele hymns are included at the end.)


3.11.2 South Efate

People in the villages of Pango, Erakor, and Eratap along the southern coast of Efate, speak mutually intelligible varieties of the same language (Clark 1985a). People from Eton and Epau along the eastern coast speak divergent varieties which Clark (pers. comm.) indicates are transitional between South Efate and Nakanamanga in a dialect chain situation, making it impossible to uniquely assign these varieties to either language. However, these varieties are possibly more similar overall to South Efate than to Nakanamanga. (Grimes (1996) regards these eastern villages as having a separate language, which she refers to as Eton.) Once again, despite the proximity of this language to the capital, as well as its extensive use as a religious language, it is somewhat surprising that it has remained linguistically so little known, with even less having been published on this language than Ifira-Mele. The total number of speakers is currently estimated to be just over 6,000.

Inglis (1851) provides some lexical material which Clark (1985a:3) identifies as probably being from Erakor, while Turner (1861) also provides a wordlist from the same location. Von der Gabelentz (1873) combined material from these two lists into a new list of his own. However, the only published sources for this language are Tryon’s (1976) vocabularies from Pango, Eratap and Eton, as well as some additional material gathered from the field and included in Clark (1985a).

Work for a doctoral dissertation representing a description of this language is currently under way by Nick Thieberger (University of Melbourne). Both a publishable dictionary and collection of texts are under preparation, and early drafts of these materials have been archived under Thieberger’s authorship at the Vanuatu Cultural Centre. It is anticipated, therefore, that this language will soon jump from its current one-star status to five-star status.

Materials in South Efate

Despite the lack of published materials about the language, there has been extensive use of the language in religious texts since the 1860s. Those materials that have been produced in the language are as follows:


1890. *Natus Bei, nafisan ni Efate* ... [Primer]. By J.W. Mackenzie.


In addition to these religious materials, Carlot, ed. (1983) represents an illustrated collection of traditional stories for children in the language, for which no English translations are provided; while Kaluat (1992) is a collection of children’s songs with illustrations. Batick et al. (n.d.[1997?]) includes a short text about recruiting labourers to work in Queensland in the nineteenth century as told in South Efate by Tom Kaltal of Pango village, along with a sentence-by-sentence translation into Bislama.

### 3.11.3 Nakanamanga

Nakanamanga is the traditional name for the language that is spoken in the various villages of northern Efate (Paunangisu, Emoa, Siviri, Havannah Harbour), as well as the offshore islands of Moso, Pwele, Nguna and Emau. (Grimes (1996) treats Lelepa as having a
separate language. However, Clark (pers. comm.) argues that Lelepa simply appears to be the most divergent variety of Nakanamanga which is located at the end of a dialect chain.) Nakanamanga is also spoken in a geographically discontiguous area of the Shepherds Islands in the village of Sesake on Emae, and on the western half of Tongoa in the area of Woraviu. The total number of speakers is currently estimated to be 9,500, which includes a substantial number of people who live in the urban area. This language has most commonly been referred in print to by a variety of regional names, such as North Efate, Ngunese or Sesake.

Information in Codrington (1885a:459) and Ray (1926:198, 230) suggests that a variety of this language – or a closely related language – known as Livara (or Liara) was once spoken in the southeastern part of Epi, though this had become extinct by the early twentieth century. In the meantime, however, speakers of Nakanamanga have established a number of new settlements in the lightly populated southern area of Epi, alongside speakers of Namakir (Map 10).

Codrington (1885a:471–477) represents a brief description of this language, based on biblical translations, while Macdonald (1889:5–57, 1907) contains material from Havannah Harbour as well as material from other languages the area. His mixture of data of different provenances is further marred by his thoroughly discredited attempts to prove a Semitic origin for Oceanic languages. Von der Gabelentz (1873:5–30) includes some Nakanamanga material, while Ray (1887) represents a sketch of this language based on materials from Nguna. Patteson (1866) includes a wordlist taken from Sesake. (This latter source was incorrectly entered by Lynch (1994a:37) as representative of Namakir rather than Nakanamanga.)

Snippets of information in different varieties of this language are available in a number of more recent non-specialist sources. Lebot and Cabalion (1986:91) list names for just over about a dozen kava varieties from different parts of the Nakanamanga-speaking area, while Gowers (1976) provides a couple of dozen tree names, which are reproduced with some supplementary material in Wheatley (1992:255). Tryon (1976) includes short vocabularies collected from Woraviu, Sesake, Nguna, Pwele, Siviri and Lelepa. Hans Schmidt of the University of the South Pacific is currently collating lexical information recorded in the 1960s by Al Schütz and it is hoped that this will be published in due course.

Sources for Nakanamanga

Schütz (1968) looks briefly at the pattern of verb-initial mutation.

Schütz (1969b) is a fairly brief treatment of the phonology, morphology and syntax of the language, on the basis of information gathered from Nguna.

Walsh (1978b) is a lexicostatistical comparison of the Nguna dialect of Nakanamanga with Raga and two Fijian languages.

Clark (1985a) includes some vocabulary and structural observations on a number of different regional varieties of Nakanamanga.

Facey (1988:315–345) is a Nakanamanga–English glossary derived from Facey's collection of texts recorded on Nguna.

Materials in Nakanamanga

This language is unusual in that it is possibly the only Efate-area language for which there is more than one extensive published source of secular texts in the language, as follows:
Schütz (1969a) presents a substantial collection of texts from Nguna, with both interlinear glosses and free translations into English, as well as notes on significant points.

Facey (1988) is a major collection of texts gathered from Nguna Island, with English translations but no interlinear glosses, and followed by a thirty-page Nakamanga–English glossary. The texts are preceded by extensive ethnographic commentary.

The language has also been used extensively as the basis for a written religious literature, and the materials below have been recorded. It should be noted, however, that some of these materials reflect the attempts of nineteenth-century missionaries to create an artificial standard based on several different languages.


1883. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, translated from the original Greek into the language of Efaté*... No place: British and Foreign Bible Society. By D. Macdonald.


1886. *Nalegaana 49*. Tongoa: No publisher. By Oscar Michelsen. (Reprinted 1891 in Dunedin.)


### 3.11.4 Namakir

Namakir (often referred to also as Namakura) is the local name for the language that is spoken on the eastern half of Tongoa and the southern part of Emae, as well as the islands of
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Mataso, Buninga, Tongariki, and Makira. Ross Clark (pers. comm.) reports that it is also spoken in two villages on North Efate, one of which is Matarisu (whose inhabitants come from Magarisu village on Tongoa). Ewose was formerly occupied by Namakir speakers, but it has been abandoned since about 1900. Speakers of Namakir have recently established a number of new settlements in the southern part of Epi (Map 10), alongside speakers of Nakanamanga, as well as on the northern coast of Efate. There are also substantial numbers of Namakir speakers living more or less permanently in Port Vila. The total number of speakers is currently estimated to be approximately 3,750.

Codrington (1885a:471) includes a short note on this language, while Ray (1897) is a very brief grammar sketch and vocabulary and Ray (1926:222–228) is a grammar sketch, as well as providing comparative notes between this language and other Austronesian languages. Tregear (1896) is an early (but to date unseen) source on Namakir, while Lebot and Cabalion (1986:91) list just under a dozen names for different kava varieties in this language. Tryon (1976) provides vocabularies gathered by himself from Bongabonga, Tongariki, Makura and Mataso.

Sources for Namakir

Pakoa (n.d.) is a collection of kinship terminology in Namakir, along with possessive paradigms, accompanied by cultural notes. This was produced privately some time in the 1980s by a native speaker of the language.

Sperlich (1989) examines the Namakir glottal stop as a reflex of Proto Oceanic *q and concludes that it is a reliable witness.

Sperlich (1991–93) is an account of the phonology, morphology and syntax of this language based on a period of fieldwork in the 1980s.

Sperlich (1993) distinguishes between two types of verb serialisation in Namakir, and shows (like other studies in this area) that there are often difficulties in discriminating between serial and adverbial constructions.

Materials in Namakir


In addition, Sperlich (1986) presents a number of secular texts in Namakir clearly intended for local use, as there are no interlinear glosses or translations. Rivierre (1996) also provides a substantial text in Namakir on the Kuwae eruption and subsequent events, with an interlinear gloss, along with a discussion of the text and its provenance.

3.11.5 Emae

This Polynesian language is spoken on the island of Emae in the villages of Makatea and Tongamea on the eastern part of the island. Emae Island, while small, is linguistically quite complex, as there are speakers of Namakir living in villages to the west and speakers of Nakanamanga living in the central part of the island. With an estimated population of around
200 in Tryon (1979a:14), we may expect to find approximately 400 speakers of Emae today.

This language is one of the least known of all the Polynesian languages. Ray (1919–20) included a little lexical material, which was all that was known of the language until Capell (1962b) produced a fairly brief grammatical outline, with some lexical comparison with other Polynesian languages, as well as three short texts with English translations, but no interlinear glosses. This was based in part on printed materials, as well as material gathered by the author during a visit to Vanuatu in 1958, along with some written material supplied by Reverend Graham Miller. More recently, Tryon (1976) provided a single wordlist from this language listed under Makatea.

Materials in Emae

As far as materials in this language are concerned, Capell (1962b:3) refers only to a small hymnal in the language that was published in 1912. The title of this hymnal appears to be in Nakanamanga or Namakir, though it is possible that the text may be in Emae:


The lack of materials in Emae apparently derives from the fact that the Presbyterian church made extensive use of Namakir as a religious language within the Emae-speaking community, and there is extensive bilingualism with this language today.

There is also the following hymnal:


### 3.11.6 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ifira-Mele</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Efate</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>some religious materials</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakanamanga</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>middling</td>
<td>extensive religious materials as well as fairly extensive secular texts</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namakir</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>extensive religious materials, some secular texts</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emae</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11.7 Immigrant languages

Because of the proximity of Port Vila, Efate has become something of a Mecca for people from other islands, though the great majority of immigrants have settled in town rather than in the rural areas. In the discussion which follows, we refer only to significant communities of settlers living outside the urban area.

1) Tanna languages (Blacksands)

Blacksands refers to a substantial peri-urban community located on the coast between Port Vila town and Mele village. The population here comes predominantly from the island of Tanna but as far as we know represents a mixture of people from different areas of Tanna, and speaking a variety of Tanna languages (§3.13).

2) Southeast Ambrym (Mele-Maat)

Since 1951, people from Maat village in the Southeast Ambrym-speaking area (§3.8.1) have been resettled permanently in a single village adjacent to the much larger village of Mele. Tonkinson (pers. comm.) indicates that this new village is actually larger than any of the villages on Southeast Ambrym itself.

3) Bislama (Saama)

Saama is a village of North Efate in the Havannah Harbour area which is populated largely by the descendants of men from the northern part of Vanuatu who resettled permanently after working as plantation labourers in the 1930s and marrying local women (Crowley 1990a:384). Since that time, the children of this village have grown up with Bislama as their primary language, this being one of the few rural villages in Vanuatu where this is known to be the case. The original northern languages are reportedly no longer spoken, though many people nowadays also understand and speak Nakanamanga.

4) Kiribati (Forari)

The former manganese-mining centre of Forari on the southeastern coast was once host to a significant group of semi-permanent labourers, though this settlement has now been abandoned. Located nearby was a substantial settlement of Kiribati people (known locally as Gilbertese), though these settlers have now largely dispersed.

3.12 Erromango

Erromango is another island which suffered massive depopulation in the nineteenth century, and this had a major effect on the linguistic situation on the island, resulting in the loss of several languages, some with little or no documentation (Crowley 1997a). The interior of this large island is today almost completely uninhabited, as are many long stretches of coast. The name 'Erromango' (sometimes written 'Eromanga') is not the indigenous name of the island, which some older speakers suggest was named Nelocompne.21 (For some

21 The orthographic symbol c for this language represents a voiced velar fricative.
speakers, however, this represents a name for just a part of the island, rather than the island as a whole.)

Ray (1926:171–176) provides a survey of the situation on the island, along with some observations on the historical development of the languages. Capell (1954:107, 1962:221–223) also interprets the linguistic demography of the island on the basis of previously published sources, which is updated in Lynch (1983a). The full details of the original distribution of languages on the island will probably never be known. Crowley (1997a) represents the most recent and most comprehensive discussion of the subject.

The earliest source of linguistic material from Erromango is a brief wordlist in Bennett (1832:124). This is difficult to reconcile with the modern language, or any of the recorded extinct or moribund languages, which may be an indication that the original distribution of languages was more complex than can even be guessed at. A couple of other early short wordlists were published by Inglis (1854) and Latham (1860), though these have also not been identified as belonging to any particular language. Lynch, ed. (1983) summarises much of this early material.

Basically, the southern two-thirds of the island appears to have been occupied at initial contact by either two closely related languages or two separately named dialects of a single language: Enyau (or Yocu) on the one hand (3.12.1a on Map 12) and Sorug (or Sye) on the other (3.12.1b on Map 12). These communalects amalgamated under conditions of demographic stress to become modern Erromangan (3.12.1 on Map 13).

The modern language is sometimes known locally as Sye, occasionally referred to in the published literature as Sie (Tryon 1976, Lynch 1983a, Lynch and Capell 1983, Capell and Lynch 1983). Most of the northern third of the island was occupied by a second language, known as Ura (or Aryau). Oral tradition also records separately named Novulamleg and Uravat as occupying particular geographical areas of the north (Taki and Tryon 1994), though with a complete lack of linguistic information, it is impossible to know if these represent local dialects of the same language as Ura, or if they are separate languages. Finally, between the area occupied by Ura and the southern communalects in a small enclave in the west was a small language known as Utaha (or Etiyo). The traditional distribution of languages is shown in Map 12.

A number of comparative studies have taken into account data from the Erromangan languages. Lynch (1983e) represents a preliminary attempt to produce a bottom–up reconstruction of Proto Erromangan phonology on the basis of materials that were available at the time. Crowley (in press a) discusses the evolution of possessive constructions in Erromangan, as well as in Ura and Utaha, while Crowley (2000f) discusses the development of complexity and simplicity in the overall grammatical systems of Erromangan and Ura.

Lynch has produced a large number of studies of higher-level reconstruction in Proto Southern Vanuatu, and both the internal and external subgrouping of these languages, relying to varying extents on data from Erromangan languages (Lynch 1978c, 1986, 1992a, 1996b, 1999a, 1999b, 2000c, 2001a). Other comparative studies at an even higher level within Oceanic which include reference to data from Erromangan languages are Lynch (1975a, 1994b, 1996a, 1996c, 1996d, 1999c).
3.12.1 Erromangan

This language is generally known locally simply as nam Eromaga \(^{22}\) ‘Erromangan language’, or, in Bislama, as lanwis Eromanga. The older language name Sye (which is an archaic form of the word se, meaning ‘what’) is remembered by a few older people, but it is no longer widely recognised as the name of the language. This language is now spoken by the entire population on the island, which is thinly distributed along parts of the coast (Map 13). Taking into account the number of Erromangans living off the island, the total number of speakers (based on the 1989 census figures) was probably around 1,400, which extrapolates to an estimate for the year 2000 of around 1,900.

There is some evidence which suggests that original dialect diversity within this language on the island today underwent considerable levelling as a result of major realignments of population associated with depopulation and resettlement along the coast in the nineteenth century. While speakers of Erromangan often refer to a north–south dialect divide typified by a correspondence between northern s and southern h in words such as nasiven/nahiven ‘woman’, the reality is far more complex (Crowley 1998b).

\(^{22}\) Orthographic g represents the velar nasal.
The nineteenth-century communalects Sye (or Sorug) – spoken in the southeast – and Yocu\(^{23}\) (or Enyau) – spoken in the southwest – and amalgamated to become the modern Erromangan language, with some of the original features of the different communalects surviving as (partly) regionally distributed features, and other features ending up being shared as competing variants through the whole language (Crowley 1997a:52–55). The communalect names Sorug and Enyau represent the original local words for 'my', while Yocu is the same as the modern word that means '(s)he spoke'. Note, however, that there is some difference of interpretation on the status of Sorug/Sye vis-à-vis Enyau/Yocu, with Lynch (1983a) regarding it as a separate language altogether.

Gordon (1889:61–77) is a seventeen-page sketch and vocabulary of the Enyau/Yocu communalect, while Von der Gabelentz (1861–73:124–145) produced a sketch of the language on the basis of materials provided by Gordon, and Ray (1926:171–194) produced a sketch, again on the basis of second-hand materials produced by nineteenth-century missionaries. Kern (1906:142–146) provides a comparison of Erromangan and Anejom phonology. Ray (1893) included a short wordlist. All of these sources suffer considerably from the fact that the biblical translations of the nineteenth-century missionaries on Erromango that they were based on were particularly poor both phonologically and grammatically (Crowley, in press f).

\(^{23}\) Note once again that \(c\) is used to represent the voiced velar fricative. In other published sources, this segment is generally not distinguished from \(k\), so the name usually appears in written sources as \(Yoku\).
Turner (1861) includes a short wordlist, while Robertson (1902) and Humphreys (1926) include reasonable amounts of Erromangan vocabulary scattered throughout the text of these books. Comments about the original distribution of languages in these two sources, however, requires considerable exegesis in the light of other information (Crowley 1997a).

Tryon (1976) includes his standard vocabulary list from a single location, recorded by himself, and labelled as Sie. Johnson (1971) lists several dozen tree names in Erromangan, which are supplemented by over a dozen more in Gowers (1976). This material is all presented together in the form of a single list in Wheatley (1992:256–257). Lebot and Cabalion (1986:90–91) also provide names in Erromangan for just under half a dozen kava varieties.

Sources for Erromangan

Capell (1972) is a short and very incomplete account of the phonology and morphophonemics of Erromangan, with some notes on dialect variation.

Capell and Lynch (1983) is a short dictionary based on Lynch’s fieldwork and data extracted by Capell from older written texts, which are often of dubious reliability.

Lynch and Capell (1983) is a sketch of the phonology, morphology and syntax of Erromangan, based on some original fieldwork by Lynch, combined with Capell’s analysis of the language on the basis of older translated texts, many of which are of dubious quality.

Lynch (1983b) presents a brief statement of everything that is known (and knowable) about Sorug, which is not very much. Crowley (1997a) regards this as possibly being a dialect of the same language as nineteenth century Yocu (or Enyau) before the two amalgamated to become modern Erromangan, though Lynch (1983a) regards the two as having been separate languages.

Crowley (1998a) is a substantial grammar of this morphologically quite complex language, which provides particular emphasis on the verb-root mutation patterns and the echo-subject prefixes. One illustrative text with interlinear glosses is provided.

Crowley (2000b) documents the poor quality of translation into Erromangan by nineteenth-century missionaries, and the way in which this variety came to be accepted by modern Erromangans as a kind of high ecclesiastical style of writing.

Crowley (2000c) is a good-sized dictionary of Erromangan, with a considerable number of illustrative sentences, as well as an English finderlist.

Crowley (2000d) discusses the inflectional complexity of Erromangan verbs and problems in accounting for the historical development of these features.

Crowley (2001b) is a sketch providing a detailed outline of the main morphosyntactic features of the language – named in this source as Sye – for an audience of language typologists and Oceanic comparativists.

Materials in Erromangan

Erromangan has been written since the early 1850s, though the writing system that was developed by the missionaries is in many respects inadequate in that it ignores certain important sounds (notably, the velar fricative), it inserts vowels between consonants where there are none, or it simply misrepresents many sounds. The first publications appeared in
1852, these being mainly small primers, collections of Bible stories and the like (O'Reilly 1958:150–152). The first complete New Testament appeared first in 1890, and it was revised in 1909, with individual books appearing as follows: Luke 1864, Matthew 1869 (and 1884), and Acts 1880.

Ecclesiastical materials in Erromangan that are known are listed below. These are all written in the older northern variety, prior to the widespread shift of s to h. Most of these materials are written with quite a degree of systematic misuse of Erromangan grammatical patterns, which makes them particularly difficult for modern Erromangans to read.

1932. *Netaiyi Ugi Ruth* ['Book of Ruth']. London: British and Foreign Bible Society. (Translated by A. Capell without, at that stage, ever having been to Erromango.)
1992. *Narufo tompor Erromango* ['Holy songs of Erromango']. Port Vila: Netaiyi Tagkeli Committee. (Includes the original 1867 catechism and hymnal, with minimal modifications, as well as a substantial number of newly composed hymns to supplement the older hymns.)

Crowley (1997b) represents a substantial collection of traditional and modern stories in Erromangan which are versions of stories recorded in the language on tape. No interlinear glosses or translations into English or Bislama are provided. The spelling system that is used in this source is a regularised version based on how people generally write the language today, and any regional features are retained exactly as they were recorded on tape, with no attempt to artificially standardise the language in the stories.

### 3.12.2 Moribund and extinct languages

Grimes (1996) refers to Ifo as an extinct language of Erromango. Ifo, however, is simply the name of a (still populated) village located just south of Ipota, and the local language is – and apparently always has been – the same as that of neighbouring villages. We are not
aware of Grimes' source of information for her claim, though it is possible that she was using this name to refer to the variety that was spoken in southern Erromango in the nineteenth century referred to as Sorug (or Sye, 3.12.1b on Map 12). However, we have argued above that Sorug/Sye was possibly mutually intelligible with separately named Enyau (or Yocu, 3.12.1a on Map 12), with both varieties amalgamating to form modern Erromangan. Alternatively, these two communalects may have been closely related languages. Either way, these varieties are not 'extinct' in the normal sense of the word, as both traditions continue in the modern Erromangan language.

(1) Ura

The Ura language was formerly spoken over a wide area in the northern and northeastern part of the island (3.12.2 on Map 12), but younger people apparently began speaking modern Erromangan in favour of Ura from the 1920s. The last of the older fluent speakers of Ura had either died or become feeble by the late 1990s, though a number of younger people still retain something of an active command of the language and a surprisingly good passive command. However, opportunities to use the language are minimal, and everybody on Erromango recognises that Ura is destined to disappear. Salvage fieldwork in the 1990s probably represents as much as we are ever likely to learn about this language. The name of the language is Ura, which apparently has no other meaning in the language. Documentary sources indicate that it was alternately known as Aryau (Crowley 1997a:41), which was the local word for 'my'.

A distinct variety known as Uravat (3.12.2(1a) on Map 12) is reported to have been spoken along the coast just north of Potnarvin and well into the interior, within the area that is often attributed to the Ura language. Local knowledge suggests that this was probably a dialectal variant of the same language as Ura, though in the complete absence of any records of this communalect that presumably became extinct fairly soon after European contact, there is no way that this can be verified.

Novulamleg (3.12.2(1b) on Map 12) is reported to have been spoken to the north of Uravat in the northeastern area of the island. Local knowledge again suggests that this was probably a dialectal variant of the same language as Ura and Uravat, though in the complete absence of any records this can again not be verified. In fact, etymological evidence suggests the possibility that this word may in fact not be a language name at all, but simply a descriptive label, i.e. novul ‘language’ + amleg ‘lost’ (Crowley 1997a:50).

Gordon (1889:78–84) includes some lexical and grammatical information on Ura, as well as a translation of the Lord's Prayer, though this is structurally suspicious in the same way that many biblical translations into Erromangan are of dubious reliability. Tryon (1976) includes a standard vocabulary list for Ura that was collected by Capell on a visit to Erromango in 1958 but not previously published.

Sources for Ura

Lynch (1982c) is a brief summary about what was known of this language at the time on the basis of published older sources, as well as a brief period of fieldwork on the language by the author.

Lynch (1983c) presents a slightly more detailed sketch of the grammar and a somewhat longer vocabulary than Lynch (1982c), which was supplemented by access to previously unseen material collected by Capell on his fieldtrip to Erromango in 1958.
Crowley (1998c) is a rather more detailed outline of the main points of the phonology, morphology and syntax of this language, with a single illustrative text provided with interlinear glosses.

Crowley (1999) presents as detailed a description of this language as is likely to be published given its moribund status. This represents an expanded version of Crowley (1998c). It also includes the complete lexicon that the author was able to assemble, as well as his entire collection of texts, along with interlinear glosses and free translations.

(2) Utaha

The last speaker of Utaha reportedly died in 1954. Apparently, before he died he recorded some material in the language in two exercise books, though these were lost and have never been found. Jerry Taki, the local cultural centre fieldworker, has apparently recorded a few words of Utaha, and Crowley has also noted a handful of words which are reported to be from Utaha in his unpublished fieldnotes. The language is usually referred to today as Utaha, though documentary sources indicate that it was alternately known as Etiyo (Crowley 1997a:41), which was apparently the local word for ‘my’.

The only published primary data on this language are the few snippets which are found in Gordon (1889:78–84), though Lynch (1983d) attempts an interpretation of this data in the form of a brief grammatical outline and a vocabulary of just under 100 entries, which represents all that is known of the language. Crowley (in press a) also discusses the evolution of possessive constructions in the Erromangan languages, including some data from Utaha.

3.12.3 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erromangan</td>
<td><em>(</em>***)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some religious publications, a little secular material</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some secular material</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utaha</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>very brief</td>
<td>very brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13 Tanna

Unlike its neighbours Erromango and Aneityum, Tanna never suffered severe depopulation, and today is one of the most populous islands in the country, with an estimated population for the year 2000 of close to 30,000. Tryon (1976) and Lynch (1978c) recognise five languages spoken on the island, each of which has a number of dialects. The boundaries between the three northern languages (North Tanna, Lenakel and Whitesands) are quite ‘fuzzy’, and it appears that some kind of continuum may be involved here. Tannese people themselves have varying perceptions of the number of languages on the island, some (influenced by the prestige of the three main written varieties) saying that there are really only three, others treating recognisably distinct dialects as languages and counting as many as thirty.
It is particularly difficult on Tanna to estimate the number of speakers of the various languages, for a number of reasons. Firstly, the precise boundaries between languages have not yet been mapped, and on a relatively densely populated island like Tanna such uncertainty can easily have a significant effect on the interpretation of census data. Secondly, from the published census data it is quite difficult to ascertain what proportion of the population of particular parts of the island represent people speaking the local language, and what proportion represents outsiders, either from other parts of Vanuatu, or from parts of Tanna where other languages are spoken. The greatest numbers of ‘outsiders’ are known to be living in Lenakel- and Whitesands-speaking areas, but precisely what effect these numbers have on the final totals for each of the languages is not known.

These five languages are listed below (Map 14). We give a range of populations for each one, the lower derived from extrapolations from Tryon’s (1972) figures and the upper based on an extrapolation from the 1989 census figures. We have also tried to factor in the large number of speakers of Tanna languages who live in Port Vila especially, but also elsewhere in Vanuatu, as well as in New Caledonia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Population Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Tanna</td>
<td>3,500 – 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenakel</td>
<td>8,500 – 11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesands</td>
<td>5,500 – 7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Tanna</td>
<td>4,000 – 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwamera</td>
<td>3,300 – 3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of these languages – Lenakel, Whitesands and Kwamera – have been used as church languages for over a century, though the other two have not been used in this way.
There are some early vocabularies in Forster (1778), Inglis (1854) and Turner (1861), and some information on the linguistic situation in Gray (1892, 1894b), Ray (1893) and Humphreys (1926:101-105). Ray (1926:139-146) provides a general discussion of the language situation on Tanna before going on to a sketch of Kwamera grammar. Lynch (1967) summarises much of this early information.

There have been a number of comparative studies which have taken into account data from the languages of Tanna. Lynch (1978c) established the Southern Vanuatu subgroup of Oceanic, one of whose branches is the Tanna family; further work of this nature occurs in Lynch and Tryon (1985) and in Lynch (1986, 1992a, 1996b, 1999a, 1999b, 2000c). With more specific reference to the comparison of aspects of the Tanna languages, Lynch (1977b) looks at numerals and number markers, Lynch (1983f) at echo-subject marking in Lenakel and a number of other Southern Vanuatu languages, and Lynch (1992b) at the grammar and semantics of the possession of parts of wholes. Lynch (1994b) and Lynch and Fakamuria (1994) look at language and socio-cultural contact between Tanna and Futuna-Aniwa.

3.13.1 North Tanna

This name is used for a collection of dialects spoken in the northern part of the island, from Lenafa on the west and around the coast as far as Loniel, and in the intervening inland areas (‘Middle Bush’) around Fetukai, Tanna Coffee, Green Hill and Imafen, with an unsettled area in the interior and around the northeastern point of the island. There is apparently no local name for the language as a whole. A Summer Institute of Linguistics team is currently working in the North Tanna language area. Lebot and Cabalion (1986:92) provide just over two dozen names for different kinds of kava. Tryon (1976) includes his standard vocabulary list from just one unspecified location, as recorded by himself, while Blaymires (1995) is a very brief introduction to the wordlist found in Tryon, ed. (1995).

Materials in North Tanna

Only one item of scriptural material seems to have been produced:


3.13.2 Lenakel

Lenakel is spoken in the central west of the island, from around Lenaukas in the north to Isini in the south, and stretching across the island to about the area of Loanvialu Pass, where it borders on Whitesands. Approximately 200 Futuna-Aniwa speaking people from Futuna live in this area (Map 15), as well as an unknown but significant number of non-Lenakel speaking people from other islands and from other parts of Tanna, centred around the incipient urban centre of Lenakel and the provincial government headquarters at nearby Isangel. Taking into account the significant populations of Tannese living on Efate and elsewhere outside Tanna, the number of Lenakel speakers is estimated to total 10,000 or more.
Lenakel is perhaps the most prestigious of the five Tanna languages. The local name of the language is *Netvaar*, but most speakers refer to it as *Nakaraan taha Lenakel* ('language of Lenakel'). Tryon (1976) includes the standard vocabulary list from three locations: Lenaukas and Lonasilian, both recorded by Tryon, and Lenakel, recorded by Lynch. Wheatley (1992: 265–266) provides an extensive list of tree names, including also a handful contributed originally by Gowers (1976).

**Modern sources for Lenakel**

Lynch (1973b) is an account of the grammar of possessive constructions in Lenakel. Lynch (1975b), a published version of his PhD dissertation, is basically a description of the phonology of Lenakel in terms of generative phonological theory. Morphophonemic alternations, the assignment of stress, and the directional application of rules receive strong emphasis. A number of theoretical studies have carried the analysis of stress somewhat further, including Halle and Vergnaud (1987), Hammond (1986) and Hayes (1995).

Lynch (1977a) is a medium-sized dictionary (Lenakel–English with an English index). This was the first dictionary of a Tanna language to be published, and is actually the first reasonably comprehensive dictionary of a Vanuatu language ever published by a trained linguist.

Lynch (1978a) is a relatively ‘model-free’ description of the phonology, morphology and syntax of Lenakel, including two texts. It is the first substantial grammar of a Vanuatu language published by a trained linguist.

Lynch (1983f) describes the system of echo-subject marking in Lenakel (and other Southern Vanuatu languages), by which a verb takes a particular prefix if its subject is the same as the subject of the preceding verb – the mirror image of most switch-reference systems known at the time.

**Materials in Lenakel**

There were a number of publications of a religious nature in the early years of the twentieth century, which are listed below. More recently, a team from the Presbyterian Reformed Church has been carrying out a Bible translation.


**3.13.3 Whitesands**

This language is spoken in the central east of the island, from around Loniel in the north to Ipekel (Sulphur Bay) in the south, and across the islands westward to the ‘border’ with
Vernacular languages

Lenakel. Its local name is Nirak; it has been called Weasisi or Waesisi (and various other spellings) after one village in the area (Gray 1891), and also Napuanmen (Capell 1962a: 223), though today its name is taken from the other major commercial/government/church centre, Whitesands, and most speakers refer to it as Nagahatien raha Whitesands ('language of Whitesands'). Gray (1891) is a grammatical sketch of this language with some reference to the other languages of the island. Tryon (1976) includes his standard vocabulary list from two locations (Larkei and Loniel), both recorded by Tryon himself. Gowers (1976) lists just over a dozen tree names, which are gathered into a single list by Wheatley (1992:266).

Materials in Whitesands

The New Testament was published in 1924, though versions of some books appeared earlier: John in 1888, and Luke in 1895 and 1909. Primers, catechisms and hymnals were published from 1883 (O'Reilly 1958:171–172), with only the most recent of these being listed below.


3.13.4 Southwest Tanna

This language is spoken in a number of dialects (Nivai, Nivhaal, Nelpwaai; see Lynch 1978c) in the southwestern part of the island from Bethel south to Green Point and inland stretching across the centre to the area of Yasur volcano, although there are largish uninhabited areas between the eastern and western dialects. There is no general name for the language, which is why the geographical term Southwest Tanna is used. A large number of speakers of this language also speak, or are familiar with, at least one of the three church languages (Lenakel, Whitesands or Kwamera) – generally the one closest to their own village. Tryon (1976) includes his standard vocabulary list from four locations (Lapwangtoai, Imreang, Ikiyau and Enfitana), all recorded by him. The only structural information on this language is Lynch (1982a), which is a fairly brief description of the phonology and grammar, including two texts, and a vocabulary of about 750 lexical items, with an English index.

3.13.5 Kwamera

The language generally known as Kwamera has also been referred to as South Tanna. Its local name is Nininife (meaning 'say what', i.e. the language which uses nife as the word meaning 'what'), sometimes abbreviated as Nife. It is spoken mainly on and near the coast,

24 This actually means 'songs' or 'hymns'!
from around Green Point in the southwest to Port Resolution in the east. There are a number
of dialects, with that of the Port Resolution area being quite distinct. Von der Gabelentz
(1861:145–166) has a brief discussion of Kwamera, as does Ray (1926:146–171). Tryon
(1976) includes the standard vocabulary list from four locations (Ikiti, Isiai, Yatukwei and
Port Resolution), all recorded by him. Lebot and Cabalion (1986: 93) provide a handful of
names for different kava types. Gowers (1976) includes a handful of tree names, which are

Modern sources for Kwamera

Lindstrom (1981) is a sociolinguistic study of speech and silence, looking especially at
taboo on speech at the time that kava is drunk.
Lindstrom (1983a) discusses the metaphors and special speech styles used in argument
and debate in South Tanna society.
Lindstrom (1983b) discusses the way in which language differences are associated with
political boundaries on Tanna.
Lindstrom (1985a) looks at a number of problems relating to the production of a
Kwamera dictionary (Lindstrom 1986), in particular taboo words and 'nonsense' words.
Lindstrom (1985b) presents an analysis of names, personhood and descent.
Lindstrom (1986) is a medium-sized dictionary (Kwamera–English with an English
index), which contains much valuable cultural information.
Lindstrom (1990). Based on transcriptions of debate at several dispute-settlement
meetings on Tanna, this paper analyses rhetorical strategies by which speakers shape
consensus, the role of 'witnesses' who help enunciate a consensus, and the effect of
context on local evaluations of the truth
Lindstrom (1992) discusses the language of disputes and conflict-management in
Kwamera, focusing on the relationship between truth and power.
Lindstrom and Lynch (1994) presents a general outline of the phonology, morphology and
syntax of Kwamera.
Lindstrom (1995) is a very brief introduction to the wordlist found in Tryon (1995).
Lindstrom (1996) shows that, although the Tannese may lack notable traditions in the
material arts, they do engage instead in less material arts such as speech, debate and song.

Materials in Kwamera

The first publications in any Vanuatu language were two books in Kwamera written
probably by Samoan teachers and published in Samoa in 1845.25
1845. Naresian Te nankeriane fei lehova [Catechism]. Samoa: London Missionary Society
Press.
1845. Naukukua Kamauseni nankerian, Ia Tana Asori [Hymns and prayers]. Samoa:
London Missionary Society Press.

25 O'Reilly (1958:169), however, is of the view that the Reverend G. Turner had a role to play in these
publications.
Quite an amount of religious and educational material was produced by the early missionaries, including the New Testament, Bible stories, a catechism and a hymnal, as well as a school primer. The more recent of these are given below; fuller details may be found in O'Reilly (1958:169–171). It is not known if copies of these are available today.

1890. Primer. Tanna: Mission Press. By William Watt. (Earlier primers were produced, the first in 1869.)
1901. Hymnbook. Glasgow: The Glasgow Boys’ Foundry Press. By William Watt. (A number of earlier versions were printed, the first in 1873.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Tanna</td>
<td>**<em>(</em>)</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>a few religious publications</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenakel</td>
<td><strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some religious publications</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesands</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>some religious publications</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Tanna</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwamera</td>
<td><strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>brief</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a good number of religious publications</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.13.7 Immigrant languages

Since the headquarters of the Tafea Provincial Government are located on Tanna, as are the only high schools in the Province, there are significant numbers of people from many other parts of Vanuatu living on the island. With one exception, none of these form sizeable or coherent language communities. There are four settlements of speakers of the Futuna dialect of Futuna-Aniwa (§3.14.1 on Map 15) in the Lenakel area: Letenis, Lenus/Isua, Laprumat, and part of Tafea Coop. who probably number at least 400, and who maintain the use of their own language.

3.14 Futuna and Aniwa

3.14.1 Futuna-Aniwa

Two dialects of the same Polynesian language are spoken on the islands of Futuna and Aniwa (3.14.1 on Map 15). Both islands have experienced considerable out-migration, in part at least due to their contrasting physical environments, neither of which is conducive to supporting a large population. The 1989 census noted a population of 431 on Futuna and 361 on Aniwa. There is a significant settlement of Futunese on Aneityum at Port Patrick (about 100 people), and two or three on Tanna (with perhaps 400 people in all), in addition to an unknown number of Futunese and Aniwans living in Port Vila and Luganville. In addition, there has been a considerable amount of intermarriage between Futunese-Aniwans and other groups, especially Tannese. There are thus probably 1,000–1,500 native speakers of the language, and perhaps some hundreds of others who have some familiarity with it.

Map 15: Futuna, Aniwa and Aneityum
There are some minor phonological and lexical differences between Futuna and Aniwa. Little is known of whether the 'expatriate' populations on Aneityum and Tanna have developed distinct varieties of the language, or if any levelling between the two dialects is taking place.

The two dialects are known locally as *fesao Futuna* and *fesao Aniwa* (*fesao* 'language'), and as *lanwis Futuna* and *lanwis Aniwa* in Bislama. There is no local name for the language as a whole, and local non-linguists generally refer to "Futunese" and "Aniwan" as if they were separate languages. The language has often been referred to in the linguistic literature as West Futuna, or West Futuna-Aniwa, to distinguish it from East Futunan (Fakafutuna), spoken in the French territory of Wallis and Futuna.

Early sources specifically on Futuna-Aniwa include three grammar sketches (Ray 1888, Macdonald 1891:163–207 and Capell 1958:61–164), as well as more cultural or anecdotal information (Gray 1894a, Ray 1901, Humphreys 1926:118–119, 122). Capell (1931) discusses the morphology of possession in both dialects. Lebot and Cabalion (1986:93) provide a handful of names for different kinds of kava. Tryon (1976) includes two standard survey wordlists, one each from Futuna and Aniwa. Gowers (1976) lists a couple of dozen names of trees gathered from Futuna, which Wheatley (1992:258–259) reproduces in a single list.

Comparative studies on the Polynesian languages generally, Polynesian Outliers generally, or just Polynesian Outliers in Vanuatu, cover various aspects of the phonology, grammar and lexicon of Futuna-Aniwa; among these are Anonymous (1872), Ray (1919-20), Leverd (1922), Nevermann (1953), Pawley (1966, 1967), and Clark (1978a, 1986a, 1994).

**Sources for Futuna-Aniwa**

Dougherty (1977a) and (1978b) are discussions of colour categorisation and the acquisition of colour terms in the language.

Dougherty (1977b) examines the morphophonemic processes involved in reduplication and their syntactic and stylistic correlates.

Dougherty (1978a) is a discussion on bilingualism and multilingualism in Vanuatu, with especial reference to Futuna.

Dougherty (1983) is a grammatical sketch of about 140 pages, followed by a medium-sized dictionary (also containing some etymologies) and an English index. Terms for flora, fauna and kin terms are in separate appendices.

Capell (1984) has a 77-page grammar sketch followed by a shortish dictionary (with English index), based heavily on the manuscripts of Reverend Dr William Gunn (who died in 1935). It is not known how representative of the modern language it is, and there are some orthographic peculiarities.

Keller (1988)26 deals with the symbolism and technology of weaving baskets: Futuna terminology is critical to her analysis.

Keller and Lehman (1991) is a discussion of the cosmological concepts *hkana* and *ata* and the local theory in which they are embedded.

---

26 Note that Janet W.D. Dougherty and Janet Dixon Keller are the same person.
Thomas and Kuautoga (1992) contains a number of musical lyrics as well as an introduction in the Futuna dialect of the language by Kuautoga.

Lynch and Fakamuria (1994) examines linguistic and sociological evidence which suggests that Tanna societies borrowed a moiety system from Futuna or Aniwa, which then later borrowed the Tanna names for their moieties.

**Materials in the Futuna dialect**

There appear to be no secular publications, although Janet Keller and Takaroga Kuautoga are working on a volume of folktales and musical translations. Mission publication began in the 1860s, with various small primers and catechisms (for fuller details see O'Reilly 1958:152–154). Significant publications include:

1880. *Tabuk Tapu y Iesu Kristo, Mathyu ma Mark ma Luk ma Jon niser* [The four Gospels]. Sydney: F. Cunninghame and Co.
1919. *Afijikauga O Fakau Apostolo* [Acts]. Sydney: Samuel E. Lees. (Revised version of an 1888 publication.)
1930. *Tabuk Tapu: Tavajivisau fou: Avisau Paal, ma Jems, ma Pitar, ma Jon niserea, ma Anea nifakarea* [Epistles of Paul, James, Peter and John, plus Revelations]. Sydney: Robert Dey, Son and Co. By William Gunn. (Revised version of 1898 and 1912 publications.)

**Materials in the Aniwa dialect**

Mission publications began appearing about 1871. Various Gospels appeared individually, with the complete New Testament being published in 1898 (see below). Only some books of the Old Testament were published. There were also hymnals and catechisms, but only the most recent of these are included below. (For a fuller list see O'Reilly 1958:134–136.)


3.14.2 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Futuna-Aniwa</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some religious publications</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15 Aneityum

3.15.1 Anejoũ

The Anejoũ language is the only indigenous language of Aneityum, the southernmost inhabited island in Vanuatu and one of five inhabited islands in the Tafea Province (Map 15). It is known by its speakers as *intas Anejoũ* ('language of Aneityum'), in Bislama as *lanwis Aneityum*, and has been referred to as Aneityum (Hewitt 1966), Aneityumese (Inglis 1882) and Anejom (Lynch 1982b) in the linguistic literature.

European contact began with a visit by sandalwooders in the brig *Alpha* in 1830 (Bennett 1831:189), and the first missionaries arrived in 1841. “By 1858 there was a school in every district... Aneityum was the first successfully missionised island in Melanesia and was the headquarters of the Presbyterian Mission to the New Hebrides for many years” (Spriggs 1985:25). Education was mainly conducted in Anejofu, though numeracy teaching was conducted in English (Inglis 1887:83–84).

Aneityum was probably quite a populous island up until the early years of the nineteenth century. The mission census of 1854 recorded a population of 3,800, but the population fell to a low of 182 in 1930. The modern language community, including speakers of Anejofu living in Port Vila and elsewhere, probably numbers between 800 and 900. There is some evidence that there may have been more than one language on the island in earlier times (Lynch and Tepahae 1999), but today the language is spoken in a single variety throughout the island.

As with most other Oceanic languages, the first notes on vocabulary were made by early navigators and missionaries (Bennett 1831, Turner 1861), and the first descriptive work was undertaken by the early missionaries. The earliest Bible translations formed the basis of Von der Gabelentz’ (1861:65–124) description of the language. A good dictionary, with a brief grammatical sketch, was published by Inglis (1882), and notes on the language were also published by Codrington (1885a:477) and Lawrie (1892). These descriptive sketches, along with the Bible translations, were used by Kern (1906) in his comparative study of Anejofu, which was commented on by Ray (1926:137–139); and there are brief comments by Humphreys (1926:113). That was the end of descriptive work on the language for quite some time, although Lebot and Cabalion (1986: 93) list a dozen different kava varieties with their local names, and Wheatley (1992:251–253) includes an extensive listing of trees from Aneityum, including also a handful of forms from Gowers (1976).
A number of comparative studies (including Kern 1906 referred to above) have taken into account data from Anejofh. Tryon (1976) includes a standard vocabulary list for Anejofn collected by George Grace. Lynch (1978c) established the Southern Vanuatu subgroup of Oceanic, which includes Anejofn as one of its members, and further refinements of this may be found in Lynch and Tryon (1985) and in Lynch (1986, 1992a, 1996b, 1999b, 2000c). Studies focusing on language change in Anejofn itself include a general survey (Lynch 1991a), changes in grammar (Lynch 1995) and changes in the numeral system (Lynch and Spriggs 1995).

**Sources for Anejofn**

Hewitt (1966) presents a detailed discussion of Anejofn phonology, which also includes a wordlist of well over 1000 items (though it has no English index).

Lynch (1982b) is a ‘composite’ grammar of Anejofn, based partly on a grammar sketch written by A. Capell (but never published) and partly on a brief period of fieldwork by the author.

Lynch (1991a) describes the fairly drastic changes which have taken place in Anejofn grammar and vocabulary since the publication by Inglis of his dictionary and grammar sketch in 1882.

Lynch (1995) describes the subject-tense marking system of Anejofn, and examines changes which have taken place since the language was first recorded.

Lynch (2000b) discusses the various changes that have taken place in the last century or so in the marking of conditional clauses.

Lynch (2000d) is a fairly complete description of the phonology and grammar of the language, with three texts.

Lynch (2001b) is a sketch providing the main morphosyntactic features of Anejofn for an audience of language typologists and Oceanic comparativists.

Lynch and Tepahae (2001) is quite a large dictionary of Anejofn, with definitions in both English and Bislama, and with English and Bislama finderlists.

**Materials in Anejofn**

There was considerable activity in Bible translation and the production of other religious literature in the second half of the nineteenth century, facilitated by the establishment of the Presbyterian Mission press on Aneityum, which also produced an annual almanac (though in what years is not clear). In fact, biblical materials from many different parts of Vanuatu were printed on the press in Aneityum. The whole Bible was translated into Anejofn (see 1863, 1878, 1879 below), as was Pilgrim’s Progress (1868). Primers, catechisms and hymnals were also produced, many undergoing several reprints and re-editions (not all of which are mentioned here). Translated and original materials are listed below (all published by the Mission Press on Aneityum unless otherwise indicated).
Previous to the publication of the New Testament in 1863, individual books appeared separately: Mark in 1853, Mathew in 1856, Luke and John in 1857, Acts and some epistles in 1858. Similarly, some Old Testament books appeared individually before the complete Old Testament in 1878–79: Jonah in 1856, Daniel in 1858, and Genesis and Exodus probably in 1860. What is listed below is material for which full original titles are known. For many of these publications, no publisher or place of publication information is provided, though it is likely that these were produced on the printing press set up on Aneityum which also produced materials in a number of other languages in the nineteenth century.

1849. Intas Aneiteum. Intasviatai uhup [Primer].
1850. Intas Aneiteum. Intas ahodaig [Catechism].
1851. Nitai esvi itai itaup [Some Gospels and parts of the old Testament].
1853. Intas uhup, im Intas Ahodaig [Primer and Prayer Book].
1854. Nitasvitai uhup [Primer and Prayer Book].
1862. Intas Aneijom. Intas va Nijhi Pece an Nokohtan Asega ['A book about all the islands in the whole world'].
1865. Nitasvitai irai Salm is aged a tevit Natimairid irai upu Isreel [Psalms]. Halifax: By James Barnes.
1868. Intas va natga o Kristian, par apan an pece upene, intas ucsi pece ineigki, is aged a Jon Bunyan [Pilgrims' Progress]. By Mrs John Geddie. (Abridged version published in 1880.)

### 3.15.2 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Writing system</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anejom</td>
<td>*<strong>(</strong>)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>some religious publications</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.15.3 Immigrant languages

There are perhaps 100 people from Futuna living mainly in the Port Patrick area in the north of Aneityum, who have been there for a generation or two and who maintain Futuna-Aniwa (§3.14.1) as their first language.
In this chapter, we have been somewhat more selective about the kinds of sources we have included than we have for the preceding sections of this volume. Attempting to include references to everything written in Bislama, for example, would be a huge—and probably somewhat fruitless—task. A vast amount of material has been written in Bislama; consequently in this section we have provided a list of only major sources written in Bislama, where these are especially substantial, or where they are widely known and widely read titles.

We have also included only works that are primarily—or at least substantially—about Bislama, or which contain material about (or in) Bislama which is of considerable historical significance. For a fuller listing of sources that contain incidental material about Bislama, see Crowley (1990a:406–417). Sources within each section are listed chronologically so that users of this volume can appreciate the evolving context in which works have been produced. A listing in alphabetical order can be extracted from the full bibliographical entries at the end. (In many sources the term ‘Melanesian Pidgin’ is used as a generic cover term when Bislama is referred to along with mutually intelligible Papua New Guinea Tok Pisin and Solomons Pijin.)

4.1 Reference

This section contains dictionaries and grammars that were written as reference works. We have also included shorter sources that provide reference lists of a less comprehensive nature.

Guy (1974a) consists of two 50-page grammatical sketches of Bislama, one in English and one in French, plus wordlists (Bislama–English–French, English–Bislama and French–Bislama). This handbook suffers from a number of inadequacies and has largely been superseded by later publications. Reviewed critically in Lynch (1975c).

Camden (1977) is the first major dictionary of Bislama. It is attractively set out and provided with plenty of examples. It is marred by not having an English–Bislama index, as well as now also being somewhat dated. For a long time, however, this was effectively the standard reference work for the language.

Pickering (1981) is a useful collection of the Bislama names of birds, along with their scientific names, and other information to help with the identification of species.
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Tim blong Baebol Translesen blong Kokonas (1984) sets out to provide a standardised spelling system for Bislama, based on the version used in the New Testament translations. Pastor Bill Camden was one of the chief members of the team involved.

Cabalion (1984) presents a collection of names of trees and other plants in Bislama with their scientific names. This is a valuable source for ascertaining the scientific names of a fair number of species found in Vanuatu, though the spelling of the Bislama words is inconsistent and sometimes puzzling.

Bowden (1986) is a trilingual dictionary aimed at ensuring “adequate communication between health worker and patient”, with a concentration, therefore, on medical terminology. This consists of a main section English–French–Bislama, French–English and Bislama–English indexes, a brief ‘comparative’ section (English–Bislama–Tok Pisin–Solomons Pijin), and some useful phrases for health workers.

Crowley (1987c) is the first – and still the only – published grammar of Bislama as a complete work, which is also written in Bislama. (Parenthetically, it attempts to come to grips with the issue of creating a Bislama metalanguage.) This was written as part of a tertiary-level course taught in Bislama at the University of the South Pacific, to be used in conjunction with Crowley (ed. 1987, 1987d).

Crowley (1990b) builds on the work of Camden (1977) and other sources to provide a much more extensive and up-to-date dictionary of modern Bislama, with large numbers of useful illustrations, together with a comprehensive English index.

Crowley (1995d) is an improved version of Crowley (1990b), produced in response to community feelings that there should be firmer guidance in the matter of spelling words in Bislama. Spellings were vetted and approved by an ad hoc subcommittee of the Literacy Association of Vanuatu. At the same time, additional material was added, and improvements were made to the layout, binding and appearance of the volume.

4.2 Pedagogical materials

Materials listed below were produced primarily to teach foreigners how to speak the language. However, we have also included materials developed at the University of the South Pacific that were intended for the use of speakers of Bislama who wished to learn about their language through the medium of Bislama at the tertiary level.

Anonymous (n.d.), issued by the French Residency in French in the colonial 1970s, is basically a guide to the language for French people dealing in a colonial situation with ‘natives’. It uses a fairly idiosyncratic spelling system. Not in use today as far as we know.

Tryon (1985) is a popular description of Bislama which reportedly sells well to tourists.

Crowley (1987d) is a set of extension (or extramural) course materials designed as self-teaching materials in Bislama for students interested in the study of the history and structure of the language. It is intended to be used in conjunction with Crowley (ed. 1987, 1987c).

Crowley (1987e) is a brief introduction to linguistics, written in Bislama, and using Bislama examples to introduce the principles of grammatical analysis.

Crowley, ed. (1987) is a set of readings in Bislama for a tertiary course on the history and structure of Bislama, to be used in conjunction with Crowley (1987c, 1987d).
Tryon (1987) is a quite thorough course in the language for the new learner, marred only by occasional rather colonial-sounding conversations as learning exercises.

Iwasa (1993) presents a wordlist and phrase book for Japanese visitors to Vanuatu. Not having seen it, we are unable to comment on its usefulness.

Balzer (1999) presents a short introduction to the pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary of Bislama for the international traveller, along with some relevant phrases and cultural notes, as part of the *Lonely Planet* phrasebook series.

4.3 Descriptive phonology and grammar

This section includes materials that are descriptions of different aspects of the phonology, morphology or syntax of Bislama, which are primarily synchronic aimed at specialist linguists rather than a general audience.

Lynch (1975c) is a review article of Guy (1974a), which points out areas of major weakness in the linguistic analysis of Bislama in that volume.

Kuki et al. (1977) has not been seen, but the title suggests that it represents a descriptive account of Bislama.

Zhuang (1985) describes the ordering of elements within the verb phrase in Bislama, based on material available in previously published materials, as well as some original information from Bislama speakers.

Crowley (1987g) is a brief account of some of the kinds of phonological variation that are encountered in Bislama today. This was written in Bislama as part of Crowley, ed. (1987).

Crowley (1990a), while primarily a discussion of the history and development of Bislama, also describes a number of aspects of the modern-day morphology and syntax of the language in some detail.

Crowley (1990d) is an outline of verb serialisation, and a discussion of the development of prepositions (like *kasem*, *raonem*, *bitim* etc.) from serialised verbs.

Camden (1996). Published posthumously, this paper examines a range of verbs in Bislama, comparing those which carry the transitive suffix *-Vm* and those which instead mark the "object" noun phrase with the preposition *long*. Camden shows that this latter usage is perhaps much more widespread than has previously been suspected.

Siegel (1996b) is a short description of the pronoun system of Bislama, which demonstrates to a general audience that the pronouns are neither simplified nor English-like in significant respects.

Mühlhäusler and Baker (1996) provide an overview of the current use of Bislama, based on other published sources, in the context of a general discussion of English-lexifier contact languages in the Pacific.

Meyerhoff and Niedzielski (1998) discuss multiple discourse and syntactic functions for the form *olsem* in conversation, and propose possible structural constraints and grammaticisation paths.
Meyerhoff (1998b) argues that while prototypical *olsem* is a preposition (or verb), sentence- or clause-final instances are usually translated as adverbs (equivalent to English ‘thus’). Syntactic and perceptual evidence is presented to show that such tokens of *olsem* are still prepositions, with information that is known to the hearer being deleted.

Crowley (2000e) discusses evolving analyses of the ‘predicate marker’ *i* in Bislama, arguing that all previous discussions have in various ways oversimplified the behaviour of this form.

Meyerhoff (in press b). The focus is on phonological constraints on lexical reduplication and its meaning in use, while also briefly looking at syntactic reduplication.

### 4.4 Sociolinguistic works

Works in this section cover a range of topics, including the status of Bislama in Vanuatu today, as well as lexical and structural variability.

Charpentier (1979b) has two major parts: one dealing with the history and sociolinguistics of Bislama and its use in the public domain in the pre-independence period; the other a discussion of the origin of the different components of the lexicon.

Tryon (1979b) is a brief outline of the development, use and status of Bislama at the time.

Charpentier and Tryon (1982) briefly overview the use of Bislama in the immediate post-independence period.

Charpentier (1983) explores the social and linguistic significance of increasing anglicisation of Bislama, especially in Port Vila following independence.

Mühlhäuser (1985) looks at the language/dialect issue and the problem of ‘counting’ the number of separate pidgins/creoles in the Pacific, from both a historical and a synchronic point of view.

Tryon (1986b) discusses recent lexical innovations in the language by way of educated borrowings from English.

Crowley (1987h) discusses criteria for recognising genuine Bislama vocabulary items as distinct from *ad hoc* borrowings. Written in Bislama as part of a set of tertiary teaching materials.

Crowley (1990c) is a comparison of the status of Bislama in Vanuatu and Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea, with brief details on the *Komiti blong Bislama* and the use of the language in the public domain.

Tryon (1991c) presents a brief comparative study of regionalisms in Bislama, many of which show more affinity with Tok Pisin of Papua New Guinea than with “standard” Bislama.

Crowley (1991c) is a general overview of the development and status of Melanesian Pidgin, written for a lay audience.

Siegel (1993) describes how Bislama is unique among pidgins and creoles by being both the subject of study and the medium of instruction of a university-level course (Crowley 1987c, Crowley 1987d, Crowley, ed. 1987).

Crowley (1993b) discusses a range of problems encountered in the compilation of Crowley's (1990b) dictionary of the language, along with some academic criticisms of that dictionary.
Crowley (1995e) looks at the spontaneous creation of new terminology in Bislama associated with the renascent kava-drinking scene that is now burgeoning in urban areas. Crowley (1996) discusses the development of metalinguistic terminology for teaching at university level about Bislama in Bislama.

Lynch (1996e) discusses the anomalous position of Bislama, which is the constitutionally declared national language, yet at the same time is effectively banned from any kind of use within the formal educational system.

Siegel (1996c) discusses the place of Melanesian Pidgin as a medium for adult education and literacy programmes, with some specific reference to the situation regarding Bislama in Vanuatu.

Charpentier (1997) examines the role of literacy for local languages, arguing that greater emphasis should be placed on ensuring the survival of spoken languages than on promoting vernacular literacy. The promotion of literacy in Bislama comes under especially strong criticism.

Siegel (1998b) discusses literacy in Melanesian Pidgin, including Bislama in Vanuatu, critiquing arguments in Charpentier (1997) that literacy in Bislama should be regarded as a colonial imposition, and arguing that Bislama literacy is now largely under the control of speakers of the language rather than outsiders.

Crowley (1998e) discusses the development of an orthography for Bislama from the earliest colonial times through to moves to standardise the spelling of the language since the 1970s.

Meyerhoff (1997a), a PhD dissertation, is the first substantial quantitative study of variation in Bislama, which concentrates on pronominal marking in a variety of grammatical contexts. This study was based on a medium-sized corpus of conversational and narrative material recorded in urban Luganville and rural Malo.

Meyerhoff (1999b) is a popular account of the role of Bislama and the media in intercultural communication in Vanuatu.

Meyerhoff (2000) is a slightly revised version of Meyerhoff (1997a) in published form.

4.5 Historical works

We have included in this section all works which either deal with the historical development of Bislama since the middle of the nineteenth century, or which represent significant sources about the nature of the language in earlier times. We have also included in this section materials which discuss the possible influence of substrate languages in the development of Bislama.

Churchill (1911b) is a general account of pidgin languages with some reference to 'Beach-la-Mar'. Although this is a valuable early source, there is a major flaw in that it does not represent specifically early Bislama. Rather, it contains an amalgam of material from different Pacific pidgins that were spoken at the time.

Pionnier (1913) is a grammatical sketch of late nineteenth-century Bislama, with a short vocabulary and some sentences. The spelling of the language shows decidedly French influence, though the materials are otherwise easily interpretable. This is the earliest
explicit account of the grammar and vocabulary of Bislama, which gives this work major historical significance, as described in Crowley (1993a).

Jacomb (1914) is a short Bislama lexicon with some illustrative sentences from a time in the history of Bislama when it was not well documented.

Asterisk (1923) mostly consists of edited letters from Vanuatu that were published anonymously, and which contain little information about Bislama. However, pages 324–334 of the volume contain a skit in Bislama about life in early twentieth-century Vanuatu which represents the first attempt at literary expression in the language, in a form of the language that looks remarkably convincing.

Schmidt (1957) presents a brief (600-word) French–English–Bislama wordlist from a time when almost nothing else was being written about the language.

Wurm (1971) is a discussion of pidgins, creoles and contact languages in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, with a brief mention of “Beach-la-Mar” in Vanuatu, and including mention of a non-existent French-lexifier pidgin in the country.

Clark (1977) examines the history of the name ‘Bislama’, by showing that the term Beach-la-Mar (now Bislama) probably derived from Portuguese *bicho do mar* ‘trepang, bêche-de-mer’, was used in New Caledonia in the middle of the last century to denote the pidgin variety of English used there, and was borrowed into French as *biche-la-mar* and subsequently into English as *Beach-la-mar*.

Clark, Ross (1978b) is a further note on ‘Beach-la-Mar’. It cites a few additional, and earlier, sources in support of the arguments given in Clark (1977).

Charpentier (1979b) is presented in two major parts: one dealing with the history and sociolinguistics of Bislama and its use in the public domain; the other being a discussion of the origin of the different components of the lexicon.

Camden (1979) provides a strong argument in support of the Oceanic substrate theory by outlining many syntactic parallels between Bislama and the Tangoa dialect of South Santo.

Clark (1979–80) is a major comparative-historical study of Pacific pidgins and creoles (including Bislama), with an attempt to show, in family-tree format, the degrees of relationship between them.

Clark (1983) examines historical records of contexts in which early instances of Pacific Pidgin, i.e. the ancestor of modern Bislama, were used, and examines continuities between those features and the modern language.

Walsh (1986) is a semantic comparison of certain semantic fields in Bislama and the substrate languages, showing that the semantic parallels of the Bislama terms can be found mainly, though by no means solely, in Oceanic languages rather than in English.

Clark (1987) examines the origin of the phonological system of modern Bislama, and in particular the influence of substrate features.

Lynch (1987a) is a classification of the French-derived vocabulary in Bislama into semantic domains, with some attempt to explain why French rather than some other language was the source of that vocabulary.

Lynch (1987b) presents the ideas of Lynch (1987a) in Bislama in a volume intended for tertiary teaching purposes at the University of the South Pacific.
Mühlhäusler (1987) traces the history of the ‘predicate marker’ *i* in Melanesian Pidgin, incorporating some observations from Bislama.

Keesing (1988). Mainly, though not solely, dealing with Solomon Islands Pijin, this significant work looks at syntactic congruences between Oceanic languages and Melanesian Pidgin, and has provided important fuel to the fiery debate about the importance of substrate influence.

Crowley (1989c) comments critically on Keesing’s interpretation of material on South Seas Jargon in primary sources, arguing that he has probably exaggerated the appearance of modern features in earlier Melanesian Pidgin.

Crowley (1989d) is a comparative-historical analysis of the complementiser *se*, looking at other functions it is acquiring, and examining possible syntactic-semantic ‘reinforcement’ from English *say* and French *c’est*.

Crowley (1989e) is a historical treatment of the expansion of Bislama vocabulary, relating stylistic developments to the development of a national identity and culture in Vanuatu.

Crowley (1990a). Representing a major contribution to the history and development of Bislama, this volume looks at the social history of the language, the sources of its vocabulary, and the development of various Bislama grammatical constructions. It is based on detailed research from primary sources.

Crowley (1990d) presents an outline of verb serialisation, and a discussion of the development of prepositions (like *kasem*, *raonem*, *bitim* etc.) from serialised verbs.

Tryon (1991b) looks at some regionalisms in Bislama, and especially at regional conservatism, which may throw light on the history and development of the language.

Crowley (1991d) critically examines early sources on Melanesian Pidgin with a view to establishing their usefulness in deciding how and when the three national dialects diverged from each other.

Crowley (1991e) outlines the development of a coherent set of prepositions out of “a seemingly highly variable syntactic jumble” in earlier stages of the language’s history.

Crowley (1992b) shows, *contra* Mühlhäusler, that Melanesian Pidgin was probably rather more stabilised in the 1870s than had previously been thought, and looks at a number of substratum influences on the language.

Crowley (1993a), using materials from the 1890s, shows that many features of modern Bislama were fairly well established by that time. Some features which Mühlhäusler has said represent twentieth-century innovations were probably earlier developments.

Baker (1993) is a detailed historical account of the contribution made to Melanesian Pidgin (including Bislama) from Australian pidgins/creoles or varieties of English used in Australia. His claim is basically that Melanesian Pidgin English derives from Queensland Pidgin English, itself a continuation of New South Wales Pidgin English.

Crowley (1998f) discusses the content of the lexicon of Bislama prior to 1914 on the basis of written attestations of the language, with a view to assessing claims that the language up to that period was lexically highly impoverished. Concludes that the language was lexically rather more developed than has often been argued.
Siegel (1998a) argues that different substrate features in the languages of Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu may be responsible for structural differences between the three modern varieties of Melanesian Pidgin.

Siegel (1999) discusses what sorts of substrate features are likely to be incorporated into a pidgin/creole grammar, making significant reference to data from Bislama.

Meyerhoff (1999c) discusses the emergence of subject–verb agreement.

4.6 Theoretical works

Works in this category were written primarily for a broader sociolinguistic audience with theoretical interests, though they do contain reference to original material on Bislama.

Meyerhoff (1997b) is a working paper version of Meyerhoff (1998a).

Meyerhoff (1998a) argues on the basis of Bislama data that inter-individual accommodation should not be invoked as a post hoc ‘solution’ when exceptions to generalisations about linguistic variation are found. Variables with inherent inter-group significance merit the use of accommodation theory. This is the published version of the working paper listed in Meyerhoff (1997b).

Meyerhoff (1999a) finds that data on sex-preferential distribution of apologies show shared practices not to constitute a community of practice in the recent theoretical sense.

Meyerhoff (in press a) explores the interface between social psychological theory and sociolinguistics. Three sociolinguistic variables in Bislama are used to illustrate processes of differentiation and attraction.

4.7 Significant publications in Bislama

In this section, we include only a selection of significant works written in Bislama – for example, regular publications (like national newspapers), major translations (like the Bible), or book-length original publications. Shorter and more ephemeral publications are not listed.

Vanuatu Weekly/Hebdomadaire is a government-published weekly newspaper which appears with material in Bislama, along with both English and French.

Vanuatu Trading Post is a non-government bi-weekly newspaper appearing in English, with regular Bislama supplements.

Ol sing blong nyu laef: buk tri (1983, Port Vila: Christian Council of Vanuatu) is the third edition of a collection of hymns in Bislama that are widely sung in Vanuatu’s churches.

Crowley (1987c, 1987d) is a substantial collection of materials written as extension (i.e. extramural) teaching materials in Bislama studies at the University of the South Pacific.

Brown and Crowley (1990) is a collection of materials offering practical help for preschool teachers in Vanuatu. It is loosely adapted from a similar set of materials written in Tok Pisin for preschool teachers in Papua New Guinea.

Batick et al. (n.d. [1997?]) is a collection of stories and historical discussion in Bislama about the sugarcane recruiting era in Vanuatu, with a number of archival nineteenth-century photographs of those involved.
Baebol long Bislama (1997) is the first translation into Bislama of the complete text of the Old and New Testaments, which appeared under the auspices of the Christian Council of Vanuatu. It was published in Suva by the Bible Society of the South Pacific. (Between 1971 and 1997, a series of volumes appeared in Bislama, representing translations of different parts of the Bible. These will not be listed separately here now that a complete and definitive translation of the entire text has appeared.)

Lindstrom and Gwero, eds (1998) is a substantial collection of recollections by Ni-Vanuatu about happenings during World War II, organised around a wide variety of themes. These stories are edited versions of stories recorded on tape, rather than materials translated from English.

Ligo (n.d. [1999]) is a medium book-length account of a famous recent murder trial in Vanuatu from a legal perspective.
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Appendix: research guidelines

The Vanuatu Government welcomes linguistic researchers wishing to document the many lesser known languages of the country. This volume enables potential researchers to check which work has been done on which languages, so that they may decide on a research topic as far as possible without fear of duplicating the work of others.

Intending researchers should, of course, acquaint themselves with the published literature relating to their area of proposed research before submitting an application for permission to conduct research, if only to avoid unnecessary duplication of research in a very open field. It would also be valuable for them to understand something of the historical context in which the activity is embedded in Vanuatu, which will also lead to an appreciation for a number of ethical concerns. Bolton (1999) represents a valuable source of information in this respect.

In order to conduct research in Vanuatu, researchers require permission from the Vanuatu National Cultural Council. The Vanuatu Cultural Centre has been given responsibility for executing the decisions of the Council, so intending researchers should, at an early stage, make contact with the Vanuatu Cultural Centre in order to ensure that the project receives all of the appropriate support and attention. Contact details are:

email  
VKS@VANUATU.GOV.VU

Postal address  
Vanuatu Cultural Centre
PO Box 184
Port Vila
Vanuatu

Fax  
+(678) 26590


Additionally, it would be useful for those interested in conducting research to contact the Pacific Languages Unit of the University of the South Pacific, which is based in Port Vila. Staff in that unit – notably Robert Early (early_r@vanuatu.usp.ac.fj) and John Lynch (lynch_j@vanuatu.usp.ac.fj) – have extensive linguistic research experience in Vanuatu and would be happy to advise potential researchers. Other contact details are:

Postal address:  
Pacific Languages Unit
Emalus Campus
University of the South Pacific
PMB 072
Port Vila
Vanuatu

Fax:  
+(678) 22633
For the information of potential researchers, we present on the following pages the text of the Vanuatu Cultural Centre's policy document relating to the conduct of research by overseas academics.

1. Definitions

"Kastom" : traditional political, social, religious and economic structures, and their associated practices, systems of knowledge and material items.

"Local community" : the group(s) of people that are the subject of the research effort and/or live in the area in which research is being undertaken.

"Ni-Vanuatu" : a citizen of the Republic of Vanuatu as defined by the Constitution of the Republic of Vanuatu.

"Products of research" : publications (including reports, theses, books, manuscripts, academic articles, sound recordings, film and video, computer databases), field notes, illustrations, photographs, film and video, sound recordings, collected material artefacts, specimens.

"Cultural research" : any endeavour, by means of critical investigation and study of a subject, to discover new or collate old facts or hypotheses on a cultural subject; the latter being defined as any ethnographic or anthropological study, including basic data collection, studies of or incorporating traditional knowledge or classification systems (eg. studies of the medicinal properties of plants, land and marine tenure systems), documentary films, archaeology, linguistics and ethno-historical accounts. This excludes any research undertaken by Ni-Vanuatu, by Government officers in the execution of their duty or at the request of the Government of the Republic of Vanuatu.

"Tabu" : a subject to which access is restricted to any degree. Such subjects can include places, names, knowledge, oral traditions, objects and practices.

"Traditional copyright" : the traditional right of individuals to control the ways the information they provide is used and accessed. The issue of traditional copyright arises when individuals either own or are the custodians of specialised (and usually tabu) knowledge and its communication. This knowledge can include names, designs or forms, oral traditions, practices and skills.

2. Guiding principles

(i) Kastom is the expression of the achievements of the people of Vanuatu and encompasses the many different and distinct cultures of Vanuatu.

(ii) Kastom belongs to individuals, families, lineages and communities in Vanuatu.

(iii) The people of Vanuatu recognise the importance of knowing and conserving their kastom and history.

(iv) Knowledge is founded upon research in the broadest sense, that is, upon the collation of new facts and hypotheses and the criticism, evaluation and interpretation of existing ones. Inevitably research is the product of researchers and their particular viewpoints.
(v) The knowledge and dissemination of the kastom and history of Vanuatu should be directed firstly, if the subject is a particular culture, to the people of that culture, secondly to other Ni-Vanuatu and lastly to non-citizens.

(vi) Research in practice is a cooperative venture involving researchers, individual and groups of informants, local communities, chiefs, cultural fieldworkers, cultural administrative bodies and local and national governments, and should be approached as such.

3. Policy statements

(i) Responsibility for research in Vanuatu

The Vanuatu National Cultural Council is responsible for research in Vanuatu under cap.186, 6(2)(e) of the Laws of the Republic of Vanuatu. It is the role of the National Cultural Council to define and implement national research policies (including those outlined in this document), to define national research priorities, and to sponsor, regulate and carry out programs of research. As part of its regulatory function, the National Cultural Council will determine whether it is desirable that a foreign national undertake research in the stated field.

(ii) Approval of research proposals

(1) Evaluation

All research proposals must receive the approval of the Vanuatu National Cultural Council and the local community. An explanation of the proposed research project to the local community by the researcher and/or the Cultural Centre is a prerequisite to the local community giving approval. Other bodies that should be consulted include the local government and the area council of chiefs. In cases where there are conflicts of interest (for example the local community wants a researcher but the local government disapproves) it is up to the National Cultural Council to determine whose wishes take precedence. The National Cultural Council may bring in advisors such as the Minister responsible for culture, chiefs, academics and professionals to assist in the evaluation of a research proposal. All researchers must provide to the Council the name and address of a referee of professional standing to assist in its evaluation of the proposal.

(2) Fees/Guarantees

An authorisation fee of 25,000 vatu\(^1\) must be provided by the researcher before the research proposal can be approved. Where research involves more than one visit, and this is clearly stated in the Research Agreement, a fee of 5000 vatu\(^2\) is to be paid on each subsequent visit after the first. In addition, researchers not affiliated with a recognised research institution will be required to provide a deposit of 40,000 vatu\(^3\) to ensure compliance with the conditions for the deposit of products of research as stipulated in section 3(vi) of this document. This fee is retrievable once such deposits are made. For

---

1 At the exchange rates applicable in mid-2001, this is approximately US $172 or Australian $330.
2 Approximately US $35 or Australian $65.
3 Approximately US $275 or Australian $525.
affiliated researchers, a letter from the relevant institution guaranteeing the deposit of products of research by the researcher is required before the research proposal can be approved. All funds received from the researcher will be used by the Vanuatu Cultural Centre to cover all administrative costs incurred in the setting up and implementation of the research venture and to fund the general work of cultural resource management in Vanuatu, including cultural research, documentation and revival projects. In cases where it is necessary for Cultural Centre personnel to travel to the proposed research location to help facilitate the research venture (either prior to, during or after the period of research), the researcher will agree in writing to reimburse the Cultural Centre for any costs incurred in such travel, and this agreement will be recorded in section 12 (Additional clauses/conditions) of the Research Agreement. The National Cultural Council may waive any or all of the above fees.

(3) Signification of approval

The approval of a research proposal is signified by the signing of the Research Agreement by the researcher(s) and the National Cultural Council, the latter signing on behalf of the local community and the national government. In research ventures that involve more than one researcher, a separate agreement may be required for each researcher stating exactly what the research topic and capacity of each individual is to be, and which may carry its own unique obligations. As a foreign national, the researcher will be registered as working for the Vanuatu Cultural Centre under the Immigration Act category of a “person seconded to the Government of Vanuatu” (Cap.66, 9(b) of the Laws of Vanuatu). Should the National Cultural Council decide to terminate a research venture (see section 3(x) of this document), the Research Agreement will be annulled and the researcher’s visa withdrawn.

(iii) Encouragement of Ni-Vanuatu performed research

With a view to maximising opportunities for Ni-Vanuatu to conduct research it is the responsibility of the National Cultural Council to: (a) initiate research ventures to be undertaken by Ni-Vanuatu, including cooperative ventures with expatriates; (b) ensure input by Ni-Vanuatu into all research projects; and (c) ensure that a research proposal received from a foreign national does not conflict with research undertaken by a Ni-Vanuatu, which will involve identifying the possible research aspirations of Ni-Vanuatu scholars in training. It is desirable that participatory research (where members of a community undertake research on their own culture) and research by non-academics in local communities, as well as by scholars, is encouraged. The national government has a role in encouraging research by Ni-Vanuatu and in the support, recognition and provision of facilities for Ni-Vanuatu researchers.

(iv) Training

There must be maximum involvement of indigenous scholars, students and members of the community in research, full recognition of their collaboration, and training to enable their further contribution to country and community. Such training will be in specific areas determined by the researcher but should be generally concerned with cultural research and documentation skills, and have the aim of facilitating the continuation of research once the
foreign researcher leaves the country. The National Cultural Council may nominate individuals to be involved in research and/or trained.

(v) **Benefit to the local community**

All research projects will include a cultural product of immediate benefit and use to the local community. This product will be decided upon by the researcher, the local community and the Cultural Centre as part of the initial agreement, and the Cultural Centre should have a role in assisting the researcher in its provision. Such products could include booklets of kastom information, photo albums of visual records, simple educational booklets for use in schools (the provision of all products for use in schools should be coordinated by the Curriculum Development Centre), programs for the revitalisation of particular kastom skills in the community, training workshops in cultural documentation, etc. This product will be provided no later than 6 months after termination of the research period.

(vi) **Deposit of products of research**

Copies of all non-artefact products of research are to be deposited without charge with the Cultural Centre [under cap.88 of the Laws of Vanuatu] and, where feasible, with the local community. Two copies of films and videos are to be provided, one for public screening and the other for deposit in the archives. In the case of films, a copy on video is also required. Any artefacts collected become the property of the Cultural Centre unless traditional ownership has been established as stipulated in the Traditional Copyright Agreement. The carrying of any artefacts or specimens outside the country is prohibited as stipulated under cap.39 of the Laws of Vanuatu. Artefacts and specimens may be taken out of the country for overseas study and analysis under cap.39(7), with conditions for their return being stipulated in the Research Agreement. The Vanuatu Cultural and Historic Sites Survey is to be consulted about the provision of information on any sites of cultural or historic significance recorded.

(vii) **Accessibility of products of research**

The researcher will be responsible for the translation of a publication in a language other than a vernacular language of Vanuatu or one of the three national languages of Vanuatu into a vernacular or one of the national languages, preferably the one used in education in the local community. They will also make the information in all products of research, subject to copyright restrictions as stipulated in the Traditional Copyright Agreement, accessible to the local community through such means as audio cassettes or copies of recorded information, preferably in the vernacular. Researchers are also required to submit an interim report of not less than 2000 words no later than 6 months after the research period has ended giving a reasonable precis of their work. This should be in one of the national languages and in 'layman's terms' so as to be of general use to all citizens.

(viii) **Benefit to the nation**

Having a trained person working at a local community level is an opportunity from which the nation can gain significant benefit, and the National Cultural Council, the Cultural Centre or the national government may therefore request the researcher to perform certain services additional to their research work. For instance, researchers could provide assistance to government by providing information on sideline topics of a general nature from their
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community research perspective, such as health surveys, information on the viability of certain development projects, etc. They could also provide free and independent consultancies to national bodies and teaching and curriculum development services. Similarly, the Cultural Centre could benefit from requesting the researcher to undertake specific lines of inquiry of an anthropological nature for its own purposes concurrently with their own research topic. Furthermore, such a trained person could initiate in their host community projects on behalf of the Cultural Centre such as libraries, education centres, Cultural Centres, etc. Foreign researchers can also provide for the Cultural Centre invaluable access to materials on Vanuatu held overseas, contacts overseas, and might be able to facilitate scholarships for Ni-Vanuatu students in overseas educational institutions. Any such undertaking(s) expected of the researcher will be stipulated in the Research Agreement.

(ix) The Traditional Copyright Agreement

The Traditional Copyright Agreement is intended to protect traditional copyrights and to ensure the respect of this indigenous method of controlling information and the communication of specialised knowledge and form. In all instances where information or material data is obtained by the researcher, the researcher and the supplier of this data must complete the Traditional Copyright Agreement which will state the conditions under which this material may or may not be used. The purpose of this agreement is to make the subjects and informants of research aware of their ownership and rights over the information they impart and to contractually enshrine these rights, thus obligating the researcher to respect them.

(x) Termination of a research project

The National Cultural Council may revoke its approval of and terminate a research venture should the researcher fail to comply with any of the conditions agreed to in the Research Agreement. Should a research project be terminated before its completion, copies of all products of research made prior to termination are to be deposited with the Cultural Centre as outlined in section 3(vi) of this document. In the case of termination by the local community, the National Cultural Council may reconsider the research project for another locality.

(xi) Role of the Vanuatu Cultural Centre

The Cultural Centre is responsible for facilitating, coordinating, and administering all research projects in the country and for ensuring feedback on these projects to national government and non-government bodies. In this capacity the Cultural Centre will:

1. Identify potential subjects and areas of research, formulate research proposals and invite foreign and Ni-Vanuatu researchers to undertake certain projects.

2. Facilitate and assist the undertaking of research by Ni-Vanuatu.

3. Identify and facilitate opportunities for local communities to request trained researchers to assist them with research of their kastom and history.

4. Provide advice on obtaining permission to conduct research and on conditions of work and living in potential areas of research to interested parties.
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(5) Assist in the formulation of research proposals to involve input by Ni-Vanuatu, and nominate persons for involvement.

(6) Provide advice to the National Cultural Council.

(7) Facilitate and ensure awareness of the research proposal in the local community and assist the members of the community in making a decision as to their involvement.

(8) Educate local community members and the researcher(s) as to their rights under the Research Agreement and the Traditional Copyright Agreement.

(9) Assist the local community and the researcher in determining the product of immediate benefit and use to be provided by the researcher and assist in its provision.

(10) Inform the local government, area council of chiefs and any other relevant regional and national bodies of the undertaking of a research project.

(11) Monitor the research venture with a view to ensuring compliance with the Research Agreement and providing feedback to relevant national bodies.

(12) Assist the researcher.

(13) Receive and caretake deposited products of research.

(14) Facilitate the provision of products of research to schools and assist the National Curriculum Centre in their preparation.

(15) Publicise this policy within Vanuatu and to overseas research institutions, universities, etc.

(xii) Commercial ventures

Where any of the products of research are to be used for commercial purposes, a separate agreement between the National Cultural Council and the researcher will be made specifying the basis on which sales are to be made and the proceeds of sales are to be distributed. The details of this agreement will be recorded in section 12 of the Research Agreement. The National Cultural Council will be responsible for distributing the funds received to the designated individuals, communities and institutions within Vanuatu. Where research is engaged in for commercial purposes, it is the responsibility of the researcher to make all informants and suppliers of information aware of this fact, and to come to an agreement with them (recorded in the Traditional Copyright Agreement) on the amount of royalty to be paid on received data. Copies of all commercial products of research are to be deposited with the Cultural Centre as specified in section 3(vi) of this document.
The Table of Contents (pp.v–x) in this volume is quite detailed, so where a heading there leads the reader to a particular section, this information will generally not be repeated here. This index, therefore, aims to guide users to more specific kinds of information not included within the Table of Contents. This means that there is no index entry for *placenames* since the heading for §1.2.3 includes this word. There is, however, a reference to *Cape Cumberland* in the index from within this section, as this points to significant information which is not directly indicated within the section heading.

The reader will find detailed information about individual languages only under the language names which are used in section headings and maps in this volume. Since many languages have been referred to in print by a wide variety of names (see §1.2.3), this index lists all alternative language names (and names of local dialects) which have been referred to in this volume, whether these simply represent alternative spellings, or even if they are spurious. When looking up such 'non-standard' language names, the user is guided to the main entry by a cross-reference, e.g. East Tanna (see Whitesands), where the detailed page references are set out.
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kava 31, 32
Kiai 55–56
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Lamen 1–2, 101, 103
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<td>Livara</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>36</td>
</tr>
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<td>see Loh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Lombal</td>
<td>80, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longana</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Lorediakarkar</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navut (see Central Santo)</td>
<td>51, 54</td>
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